

## THE ASSESSMENT NOT DONE: LEGISLATIVE TEXTUALISM AND EDUCATIONAL BUREAUCRACY (1982-2013)

**KALERANTE EVAGGELIA<sup>1</sup> & LOGIOTIS GIORGOS<sup>2</sup>**

Associate Professor, University of Western Macedonia<sup>1</sup>

Head of School Vocational Orientation, Secondary Education in Athens<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The present paper delves into the course towards Assessment through studying legislation along with exploring political transfers pertaining to education policy construction. Emphasis is placed on political – educational interconnections, while secret codes of political “fiction” emerge in an attempt to approach the issue of refuted legislation on educational Assessment. Besides the institutional framework, issues of educational collective action and strategies are being explored. By means of differentiated educational “empirical occurrences”, they form educational discourse practices based on imposed, contributing political constructions tied to Assessment. Both conceptual patterns of legislation and understanding teachers’ reactions are very interesting. In this vein, issues of authoritative structures and political definitions are being analysed within a dialectical approach of the issues power – knowledge and society – economy. Legislation content analysis is conducive to highlighting both the institutional structure and issues of political definitions, educational disciplines and political supervision models. The theoretical non differentiation throughout 1982 – 2013 serves as an opportunity to approach the issue on a post-interdisciplinary basis so as to determine the multi-level political games and the macro-educational developments pertaining to Assessment.

**Key-words:** Assessment, Educational Community, Legislation, Political Discourse, Pressure Groups

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

As from the political changeover era<sup>1</sup>, given the questioning of the supervisor’s role<sup>2</sup> and its effectiveness, broader issues on teaching work<sup>3</sup> and teachers’<sup>4</sup> assessment have been re-

---

<sup>1</sup> Between 1974 and 1981 we are introduced to different governments such as: a) Government of National Unity (24<sup>th</sup> July 1974 – 10<sup>th</sup> May 1980) / (Ministers of Education: Nicolaos Louros (24<sup>th</sup> July 1974 – 21<sup>st</sup> November 1974), Panagiotis Zepos (21<sup>st</sup> November 1974 – 5<sup>th</sup> January 1976), Georgios Rallis (5<sup>th</sup> January 1976 – 28<sup>th</sup> November 1977) and Ioannis Varvitsiotis (28<sup>th</sup> November 1977 – 10<sup>th</sup> May 1980) and b) New Democracy (10<sup>th</sup> May 1980 - 21<sup>st</sup> October 1981) / (Minister of Education: Athanasios Taliadouros (10<sup>th</sup> May – 21<sup>st</sup> October 1981).

<sup>2</sup> See (indicatively) in the 1974 assessment model the teacher is assessed for: a) morality (respect to moral principles, faith and devotion to the country and national ideals, faith to the teacher’s mission), b) emotional qualities (persistence – perseverance, willpower, self-control – courage, courage to express opinion, self-confidence – willingness, spirit of co-operation, initiative-taking), c) conduct (general conduct within and out of the service), d) scientific knowledge, e) pedagogic knowledge and f) administrative capability. In the 1977

examined. Despite the reactions, the forming education policy includes a broader assessment model based on Elementary Education supervisors, general supervisors, prefectural supervisors and other supervisors<sup>5</sup>. The definitions of a different educational model seem to be evolving throughout this period, while they also include thematic approaches stemming from movement actions of May '68<sup>6</sup>. Throughout the Dictatorship in Greece, the young and broader population groups did not face the opportunity to integrate into the new political social framework of action – uprising against authoritative structures<sup>7</sup>. The fall of the dictatorship along with the constitution of democracy since 1974 has been conducive to bringing at the forefront issues of former periods pertaining to education reformations. At the same time, they have put forward ideologies relevant to the intervening dynamic role of education in system reformation. The democratization of education is included in the context of educational definitions in an attempt to showcase policies on reinforced educational rights.

In particular, different educational policy narratives have integrated pedagogic principles, psychological standpoints and sociological proposals for a different form of education emphasizing the child and teachers' policy of rights by theoretically specifying the existing principles about compulsory education and the right to education. A total of proposals were put into practice through legislation between 1974 and 1981. Among others, they include the establishment of the vernacular language and the differentiated content of knowledge

---

assessment model, the teacher is assessed upon five factors: a) scientific, b) teaching, c) administrative, d) diligence and e) action and conduct within and out of the service (Teachers' files, Samos – Ikaria Archives).

<sup>3</sup> Quote the issue of teachers' assessment is highlighted by the first government of king Otto and the corresponding L. 6/1834. In particular, articles 34 up to 55 stipulate the supervision of elementary schools, supervision committees and more specific issues of supervision committees operation. Up to 1914 the bureaucratic structure was gradually re-adapted and seemed to remain the same until 1929. The supervisor's responsibilities are mainly reinforced by L. 5341/1932, according to which the supervisor is responsible for teachers' transfers and dismissals. These responsibilities are further reinforced during I. Metaxa's dictatorship mainly with M.L. 767/1937 and M.L. 2180/1940 (Mandatory laws). Much later, according to the 9<sup>th</sup> resolution in 1964 teachers are dismissed for political reasons. As from 1950, teachers' assessment has been re-visited and emphasis has been placed mainly on teachers' supervision and less on their instructive guidance. Important differentiations are proposed throughout 1963-64 when the theoretical framework on the supervisor's role changes and their pedagogic and instructive guidance are emphasized (Bouzakis, 2002).

<sup>4</sup> See (indicatively) Andreou & Papakonstantinou, 1994; Frangos, 1986.

<sup>5</sup> K. Karamanlis' government represented by New Democracy outvoted in the elections of 17<sup>th</sup> November 1974 and passed three education laws directly tied to the organisation of education and teachers' assessment. 1) "On Educational Studies and Training Centres" (KEME) [L. 186/75]. This centre will replace the supreme education board, which is abolished (L. 186/75, art. 13,5), 2) "On General Education organization and administration" (L. 309/76), 3. "On Technical and Vocational Education organization and administration" (L. 567/1977).

<sup>6</sup> See (indicatively) about social, political and educational issues tied to the content of movement actions of May 1968 with emphasis on different interpretations and circumscriptions based on the interconnection of juvenile culture with broader issues of questioning authoritative forms and bureaucracy (Bourg, 2017; Mitchell, 2015; Singer, 2013).

<sup>7</sup> See (indicatively) Greek students' participation in the movement actions in France which also put forward the demand for democracy in Greece. The dictatorship regime in Greece introduced the French uprising as "occurrences" of mayhem and anomy. The "exhortive" interventions towards the Greek juvenile population relevant to patriotism and the obligation to protect the state were emphasized (Altousser, 1988; Kitides, 2008; Tariq, 2008; Veikos, 1988).

characterized by elements of modernity and political liberalism<sup>8</sup>. It could be schematically stated that prior to the advent of PA.SO.K. in 1981 and the change of the political system, a new educational framework had been formed conducive to transcending authoritative definitions and political subjugations developed by the aspects of conservative policy.

Comparatively, it could be said that enriched textual references and political discourse of the period 1963-1964<sup>9</sup> came back. The new fact is that expectations about the redistribution of rights through re-investing in trusting institutions tied to the redistribution of rights were aligned. The internal policy of the Nation-State tied to civil change and the open system of political expectations for institutional definitions, as the outcome of international considerations and educational questioning of the 1960s<sup>10</sup> are reflected in the Greek education policy.

In this paper, the period 1982-2013 is under exploration and in terms of scientific exploratory reasons this period is divided into four smaller ones in order to potentially showcase political and educational meanings of assessment through emerging pivotal legislative points and educational occurrences. It is interesting to put forward the complex ideological context and the controversies and refutations pertaining to assessment. These controversies and refutations seem to gradually transcend the confined, limiting interpretations based on political parties and the proposed policies of the parties. The aim is to approach legislative regulations through the broader framework of socio-political construction, while common approaches relevant to the progressive or conservative legislative pattern or the placing of education policy in the right or left policy are not taken into consideration. However, it should be clearly stated that the parties' different political composition is not disregarded. On the other hand, the interpretative framework is based on the exploration of socio-political representations to which the complex historic reality belongs, as a construction which perhaps refutes the restricting intentions of parties and virtually mitigates intense political differentiations<sup>11</sup> from this time period and on.

All in all, through reflecting the macro-level of legislative developments in combination with the interpretative process and volunteering tendencies of acting teachers, the competitive, contradicting practices are emphasized and their composition as political constructions is explored.

A new composition of elements that can give meaning to action carriers is pursued, so that, beyond superficial behaviours and reactions, the implicit normalities are approached – in the form of political, composed anti-conventional discourse on institutionalized Assessment. Studying the legislation and carriers reactions paves the ground to develop a macro-holistic understanding of the composition – reproduction of conflicting discourse on Assessment as a

---

<sup>8</sup> See (indicatively) critique and comments on the policy of 1974 – 1976, representative of a brief introductory democratic discourse on education (Kalerante & Harris, 2011).

<sup>9</sup> See (indicatively) about general features and the legislative development of education policy of that period (Bouzakis, 1999).

<sup>10</sup> See (indicatively) comments and standpoints on a period characterised by intense political reversals and considerations on issues of institutions and political culture including questioning on social and cultural elements (Edited Work, 2008; Eleftheriou & Niarchos, 2005; Farber, 2012; Kornetis, 2013)

<sup>11</sup> See (indicatively) about the developing "a-political situation" in which the parties' different ideological standpoints are gradually limited (Dravaliaris & Peppas, 2008; Karabelias, 2016).

non-paradoxical phenomenon, but rather as one expected on the basis of competitive forms of assessment.

## 2.0 INSTITUTIONAL EDUCATION DIFFERENTIATIONS BASED ON THE RE-CONSTRUCTION OF IDEOLOGICAL PROJECTIONS (1982 – 1985)

The election of PA.SO.K. in 1981<sup>12</sup> is tied to broader changes in education. Differentiated narratives on institutional changes along with emerging ideologies pertaining to social equality, political transparency and meritocracy are incorporated in the political culture of intentions. Education is theoretically integrated into the structural setting of democratic constitution. The political culture includes discourse on political morality conceptualized by the principles of social participation and confidence in the political system<sup>13</sup>. The education policy is interrelated with the changing symbolic discourse on policy.

Based on this perspective, authoritative structures and intervening policies considered to be ineffective for the system and, consequently abolished due to their being interpreted as conflicting practices between citizens and the state. In terms of education, this policy is articulated through seeking new inter-participatory educational fields and practices within a complex model for educational effectiveness. Thus, in relation to the issue under exploration, that is assessment, the institution of Supervisor is abolished by L.1304/82. This could be considered the first education communicative occurrence towards refuting former assessment practices. An authoritative mechanism, a supervision model, an institutional model of bureaucratic authority and political interference is virtually abolished. The interventions of pressure groups have already been introduced, putting forward new orders of political discourse on assessment in an attempt to direct governmental political intentions through interpreting the educational space and preparing legislative regulations towards a differentiated assessment model<sup>14</sup>.

Political analytical categories of discourse and educational themes are conducive to distinguishing between teaching work assessment and teachers' personal assessment as factors that opt for a form of differentiated assessment process. Assessment is part of the broader democratic process of discourse composition on effective education being the individual's right and a prerequisite for economic, social and political composition. Taking a thorough look at legislation and clarifying circulars it could be said that a prevailing assessment process is integral to a different model of democratic education with encapsulated operational principles on mitigating social inequalities and reinforcing social mobility through education.

---

<sup>12</sup> Ministers of Education: a) Eleftherios Veryvakis (21<sup>st</sup> October 1981 – 5<sup>th</sup> July 1982) and b) Apostolos Kaklamanis (5<sup>th</sup> July 1982 – 25<sup>th</sup> April 1986).

<sup>13</sup> See (indicatively) sociological and political analyses on the policy of PA.SO.K. emphasizing social political discourse (Gravaris, Zambarloukou et al., 1998; Mouzelis, 2002).

<sup>14</sup> Reference is indicatively made to the 1<sup>st</sup> Educational Conference of O.L.M.E. (Secondary Education Teacher Association) in 1981 in which the highlighting viewpoint is that "the today's authoritative system is in need of the supervisor [...] who assesses teachers' work based on entirely subjective criteria, [whereas] a de-centralized and democratic system is in need of the Scientist, Pedagogue, Psychologist and Guide" (O.L.M.E., 1982:159). This Conference is distinctive of new political analyses about the change of the political content of education both in the Curricula and in terms of a differentiated operation of the bureaucratic organization.

The period of 1982 until the passing of L.1566/85<sup>15</sup> that could be characterized as a transitional stage, does not seem to be ideal to accelerate re-adaptations towards an effective assessment process. This is due to a series of reasons, the most important of all being perhaps the non-operation of collective carriers within the micro-level of education institutes. Additionally, the field for discourse and educational community feedback were not formulated resulting in the individual and isolated presence of teachers within the teaching space. At the same time, the consuming society, the technological development and different interpretations of prosperity seem to deregulate people by generating spots of interest beyond the educational space<sup>16</sup>.

At the same time, the political leaders of the Ministry of Education, taking into account the political expense and ideological standpoints, adopt a non-controversial attitude towards the educational community regarding teachers' assessment. This attitude is illustrated in the outline law on the structure and operation of Primary and Secondary Education (L.1566/85). Although this law seems to be a turning point for a great number of educational issues, it does not seem to be so for assessment issues. Thus, this passing law could be considered the democratic co-articulation of teachers, policies and practices, while the issue of assessment is not included and analysed in these articles<sup>17</sup>. On the contrary, deconstruction is prevalent and it could be said that the meaning is confined in procedural issues, while the developing, structural discourse conducive to consolidating meaning relevant to interpreting educational situations, potential interventions and correspondence to challenging, developing educational patterns is absent. In other words, even during this period when the political system is addressed with confidence and acceptance, while structural-operational educational differentiations could have taken place, the political time period to legalize and naturalize teachers' interactions along with educational discourse composition by themselves seems to be missing.

### 3.0 EXEMPLIFYING EDUCATIONAL CONTROVERSIES AND POLITICAL RE-ADAPTATIONS (1986-1992)

Between 1986 and 1992<sup>18</sup>, assessment<sup>19</sup> is part of discourse marketization. This entails the settlement of educational discourse based on the articulation of conflicting discourse against

---

<sup>15</sup> See (indicatively) L. 1566/85: "Structure and Operation of Primary and Secondary Education and other provisions". It focuses on teachers' work assessment and stipulates the issuing of a presidential decree by which assessment criteria, the process, type, time, content and instruments are set along with the rights and guarantees on behalf of the assessed parties and any other assessment-related necessary details. Moreover, Chapter D' about school administration and more specifically article 11 about the school principals' instruments, selection, placing, service status and duties defines that principals, assistant principals and heads in schools participate in Primary and Secondary Education teachers' assessment.

<sup>16</sup> See (indicatively) about broader issues of social and political organization emphasizing the everyday micro-level (Sotiropoulos, 1996; Vryonis, 1991).

<sup>17</sup> L. 1566/86, article 11 (D, 1) about school administration refers to the following: "The school principal [...] also participates in the school teachers' work assessment and collaborates with school counsellors".

<sup>18</sup> Between 1986 and 1997 there was a number of governments consisted of: a) PA.SO.K. (5<sup>th</sup> June 1985 – 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1989) / Ministers of Education: Antonis Tritsis (25<sup>th</sup> April 1986 – 9<sup>th</sup> May 1988), Apostolos Kaklamanis (9<sup>th</sup> May 1988 – 22<sup>nd</sup> June 1988) and Georgios Panandreu (22<sup>nd</sup> June 1988 – 2<sup>nd</sup> July 1989), b) New Democracy, Coalition of Left and Progressive Wings (2<sup>nd</sup> July 1989 – 12<sup>th</sup> October 1989) / Minister of Education: Vasilis Kontogiannopoulos (2<sup>nd</sup> July 1989 – 12<sup>th</sup> October 1989), c) Temporary Government (12<sup>th</sup> October 1989 – 23<sup>rd</sup> November 1989) / Minister of Education: Konstantinos Despotopoulos (12<sup>th</sup> October 1989 – 23<sup>rd</sup> November

authoritative fields. Differentiated pressure groups form political discourse orders that entrench groups, teachers in this case, within an uncommon (*sui generis*) political inter-verbality. There is a shift of interest from teaching work assessment, schools operation and democratic educational discourse formation – production towards teachers' "protection" through the structural development of financial issues. Communicative policies generated both by the Government and pressure groups are conducive to transforming assessment-related discourse to negotiate on the single-sided teachers' professional role rather than the meaning of education.

At the beginning of the 1990s any attempt to put assessment in effect is downsized<sup>20</sup> due to emphasized issues relevant to school organisation and operation and the consequent turmoil on political level. It is noteworthy that the major issue of the National Debate on Education introduced by the Ministry is teacher assessment<sup>21</sup>. This debate may indicate the political leaders' weakness in handling the issue. The dialogue virtually serves to time extension so as the political situation settles down.

At the same time, assessment, as instrumental discourse towards developing discourse on the educational paradigm, is based on verbal practices that associate assessment with teacher's scientific role. The teacher's role is defined within a distinctive, broader group of scientists. Thus, a new dynamics that eventually associates the professional role with high social status is developed by the discourse and practice on assessment. Therefore, education serves as the means by which education and society are connected, while the educational identity is re-adapted. This model also includes the plan proposed by the Committee in 1988<sup>22</sup> which is distinctive of its pedagogic nature, yet not favoured by educational associations.

In these extreme versions of assessment-related discourse transition in which the development of political discourse is weak in giving meaning to a democratic education organisational process, an emerging conflicting discourse towards deconstructing political

---

1989), d) New Democracy, PA.SO.K., Coalition of Left and Progressive Wings (23<sup>rd</sup> November 1989 – 11<sup>th</sup> April 1990) / Ministers of Education: Kostas Simitis (23<sup>rd</sup> November 1989 – 13<sup>th</sup> February 1990) and Konstantinos Despotopoulos (13<sup>th</sup> February 1990 – 11<sup>th</sup> April 1990) and e) New Democracy supported by Democratic Restoration (11<sup>th</sup> April 1990 – 13<sup>th</sup> October 1993) / Ministers of Education: Vasilis Kontogiannopoulos (11<sup>th</sup> April 1990 – 10<sup>th</sup> January 1991) and Georgios Souflias (10<sup>th</sup> January 1991 – 13<sup>th</sup> October 1993).

<sup>19</sup>See (indicatively) about the development of teachers' assessment with emphasis on the political interpretation of educational choices (Doukaw, 1997).

<sup>20</sup>Quote. Since the beginning of the 1990s there is proved scientific interest in special issues tied to assessment organisation based on the co-articulation of different pedagogic, sociological and psychological discourses (Barth, 1990; Bollington, Hopkins & West, 1990).

<sup>21</sup>In 1990, the Minister of Education V. Kontogiannopoulos puts forward a model to arrange a number of issues tied to all educational grades. This is interpreted by the educational community and broader pressure groups as the refutation of the policy of rights conducive to an escalating political controversy. To directly relieve the political conflicts, the new Minister of Education G. Souflias announces on 8/3/1991 the commencement of National Debate on Education based on four axes: a) notification of the educational community and society standpoints through institutionalized processes, b) nonpartisan nature, c) making use of expertise knowledge and d) promoting educational system modernization.

<sup>22</sup>The committee assumed the development of a Presidential Decree Plan on assessment. In this plan reference was made to: a) the concept and aim of planning of the teaching work assessment, b) the process of planning on school level, c) the School Counsellor's role to guide this process. See (indicatively) (Doukas, 1997; Kassotakis, 2016).

articulation on assessment is being reinforced. In this respect, assessment is definitely identified with the authoritative sovereign interference.

Orders of equivalent discourse are developed around assessment issues, tied to educational competition, changing of working space and dismissals, intensifying this way the conflicts between pressure groups and political committees.

Gradually, the issue of assessment as textual discourse is included in political controversies about teachers' marginalization and exclusion. Thus, education is being enfeebled within an explicit inter-textuality with Democracy and redistribution of rights within education. It moves on in countless combinations and mixings throughout the following time period.

#### **4.0 COMPETITIVE POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON ASSESSMENT WITHIN SYMBOLIC CONTRASTING EDUCATIONAL FIELDS (1993 – 2010)**

The period 1993 – 2010<sup>23</sup> is distinctive of intervening legislative arrangements. As regards the field of intentions, assessment is evidently associated with verbal political processes showcasing the unifying organisations operation. Therefore, education is integral to political discourse – a theoretical term about system performance effectiveness. Teachers, as subjects, are integrated into a specific interpretative pattern in which assessment as political discourse is deemed an end in itself and is inscribed in the policy of impressions developed by committees and ministers. Political processes are developed, unfolding, simultaneously, educational scenarios stemming from international organisations, namely O.E.C.D.<sup>24</sup> In other words, there is observed convergence of meanings about education and teaching work performance developed by European committees<sup>25</sup> and international organisations<sup>26</sup> supported by broader verbal discourse production and creation of meaning in an attempt to communicatively promote the necessity of assessment. This is about political processes of political discourse, in which the "truth" about assessment is interconnected with the carriers' political statuses interpreting system needs, transforming educational discourse and generating policies.

---

<sup>23</sup> Between 1993 and 2010 there was a number of governments consisted of: a) PA.SO.K. (13<sup>th</sup> October 1993 – 17<sup>th</sup> January 1996) / Ministers of Education: Demetrios Fatouros (13<sup>th</sup> October 1993 – 8<sup>th</sup> July 1994) and Georgios Papandreou (8<sup>th</sup> July 1994 – 25<sup>th</sup> September 1996), b) PA.SO.K. (22<sup>nd</sup> January 1996 – 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004) / Ministers of Education: Gerasimos Arsenis (25<sup>th</sup> September 1996 – 13<sup>th</sup> April 2000) and Petros Eftymiou (13<sup>th</sup> April 2000 – 10<sup>th</sup> March 2004), c) New Democracy (10<sup>th</sup> March 2004 – 6<sup>th</sup> October 2009) / Ministers of Education: Marietta Giannakou (10<sup>th</sup> March 2004 – 19<sup>th</sup> September 2007), Euripides Stylianides (19<sup>th</sup> September 2007 – 8<sup>th</sup> January 2009) and Aris Spiliotopoulos (8<sup>th</sup> January 2009 – 7<sup>th</sup> October 2009) and d) PA.SO.K. (6<sup>th</sup> October 2009 – 11<sup>th</sup> November 2011) / Ministers of Education: Anna Diamantopoulou (7<sup>th</sup> October 2009 – 7<sup>th</sup> March 2012).

<sup>24</sup> See (indicatively) completed reports with differentiated content about operational issues which also include teachers' assessment (O.E.C.D., 1997; O.E.C.D., 2010). Since 2000 students' assessment (PISA) has already been established and in which, based on students' performance in the contest, countries are classified indicating each country's educational system assessment (Meyer & Benavot, 2013).

<sup>25</sup> The European dimension on more special assessment issues with focus on the European course is specialized in 1990 by special conventions reflecting the European content, such as the Maastricht Convention in 1992 and the Green and White Bibles 1991 – 2001 (Reichert & Wächter, 2000).

<sup>26</sup> Quote, since 2006 there has been strident criticism on PISA results (Programme for International Student Assessment). K.E.E. will provide interesting comments in its report in 2006 (K.K.E., 2006).

As a consequence, the political message about assessment is elaborated during this period with corresponding supplementary textual analyses about its necessity. Therefore, legislation seems to focus mainly on procedural arrangements and less on textual references. This is accomplished by organisations and European committees that have undertaken the co-articulation of political discourse within a broader model of definitions of acceptance and naturalisation of proposed policies driven by social consent, a newly emerging system necessity.

Even though educational associations stand up against assessment, the Presidential Decree 320/93 refers to teaching work assessment on school and educational region level, emphasizing teacher's individual assessments by the School Principal and School Counsellor. Nevertheless, it is not put in effect given that the following government decides upon its suspension in an attempt to make reformations towards disengaging assessment from teachers' in-service development. A communicative discourse is virtually articulated in order to relieve the negatively formed conditions around assessment.

It worth mentioning that, up to the period under exploration, despite the fact that all political parties with governing roles, regard assessment as a process conducive to meritocracy and improvement of teaching work, no relevant laws or planning are put in effect. Thus, reference is made to unfulfilled political intentions.

L.2525/97 regards assessment as a process of educational quality<sup>27</sup> appraisal as well as it indicates the extent to which its objectives are fulfilled. It also stipulates assessment being performed by School Principals, Heads of Directorates and Education Services, School Counsellors and the Permanent Assessors Board (S.M.A.).<sup>28</sup>. At the same time, different viewpoints on assessment are conceptualized on an international level emphasizing either democratic principles on education organisation and operation or economic effectiveness. In this respect, school operation is particularly underscored in terms of human force economic administration<sup>29</sup>. These trends are seemingly manifested by the Pedagogic Institute (P.I.)<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> At the same period there is intense interest in assessment in other countries as well. Emphasis is placed on the theoretical correlation of assessment and democracy along with methodological issues of objective assessment organisation (Broadfoot, 1996; Clarke & Dawson, 1999; Earley, Fidler & Ouston, 1996).

<sup>28</sup> See (indicatively) the Presidential Decree 140/1998: "Terms and process of Primary and Secondary Education teachers' official establishment and their in-service development, guarantees for the assessed personnel and process of finalizing assessment reports". In articles 1 and 2 teachers' assessment is linked to their official establishment. It is the first time that this process is introduced, meaning that newly-hired teachers will not be officially established. At the same time, issues pertaining to teachers' in-service development are specialized. This will be further elaborated by the Ministerial Decision YA D2/1938/27/2/1998. See (indicatively) political focus on education assessment with extensive references to the necessity of assessment across the public sector (Palaiokrasas, Dimitropoulos, Kostaki & Vretakkou, 1997).

<sup>29</sup> See (indicatively) during this period the issue of assessment is put forward in a fundamental theoretical framework tied to issues of democratic organization and citizens' civil rights (Stoll & Mortimore, 1997; Schratz, 1997).

<sup>30</sup> During the political changeover period, the "Centre for Educational Studies and Training (K.E.M.E.) is established by L.186/1975. The Pedagogic Institute is re-established and K.E.M.E. is abolished by L. 1566/85.



and narrowed down on a multi-faceted assessment model<sup>31</sup> based on a broader rescheduling of teaching work and a policy of monitoring and interfering in the educational process<sup>32</sup>. M. Kassotakis' role seems to be decisive in a different narrative on the educational process. The political meaning of education is re-visited within the broader socio-political conventions. At the same time, representations on the development of the educational community become meaningful. It clearly conceives social relations and political discourse orders in an attempt to move beyond common educational meanings. In terms of education policy planning, political signifiers and the importance for radical educational changes remain mere proposals for one more time. The transition from structural educational discourse of that period will be pending<sup>33</sup>, as its educational implementation will not be completed because the law will not be applied and its provisions will be abolished by L. 2986/2002<sup>34</sup>.

At the same time, new provisions are stipulated and are typically in effect for some years due to strident criticism that the law serves mostly market demands rather than education<sup>35</sup>. It is of cumulative nature and is subject to the O.E.C.D. policy and recommendations, conducive to gradually aligning the education theoretical framework with the economic paradigm<sup>36</sup>. The planning of the Education Research Centre (K.E.E.)<sup>37</sup> could be deemed the preliminary stage for self-assessment. Given its role as counsellor and instrumental modulator of education policy, it virtually forms a different assessment model emphasizing democratic school operation and disengagement from large interfering assessment patterns that had generated negative attitudes among teachers. It also faces the possibility to opt for the implementation of a broader assessment plan. A different version on assessment is perhaps put forward by the P. I. that is a differentiated model distinctive of radical bureaucratic changes in education

---

<sup>31</sup> Quote differentiations within the Pedagogic Institute by highlighting democratic principles of organising and associating assessment with social progress (Solomon, 1999).

<sup>32</sup> See (indicatively) the operational framework and more special issues of theoretical approach and practice (Mattheou, 2000).

<sup>33</sup> See (indicatively) about the period 1996-2000 Minister of Education G. Arsenis' viewpoints in his book *Why I did not do well* (2015) which is a combination of autobiography, political facts and situations and archive material. The book can be classified as an autobiographical reference by highlighting the limits of authority within a different autonomous political game.

<sup>34</sup> Quote L.2986/2002, article 5 stipulates an assessment system performed by the school principal and the school counsellor in charge. The concept of school and teachers' assessment is theoretically put forward, while it is associated with locality and corresponding carriers' responsibilities within the limited school framework.

<sup>35</sup> Quote the issue of assessment is included in field research of various research groups. In this respect, dysfunctions and inconsistencies are highlighted as well as proposals from the educational community (Sakonidis, Tsatsaroni & Lamnias, 2002).

<sup>36</sup> See (indicatively) critical O.E.C.D. reports that support the implementation of the economic paradigm in education (O.E.C.D., 2003a; O.E.C.D., 2003b).

<sup>37</sup> See (indicatively) K.E.E. (2004) teaching work assessment within the school, self-assessment process. Unpublished work of the K.E.E. working group, Athens: K.E.E. Group members V. Koulaidis and A. Kotsiras' introduction at that period is of special interest. In particular, V. Koulaidis was Assistant President and Managing Director of the Education Research Centre (October 2000 – November 2004), Greek Representative in the European Union Education Committee (December 2000 – March 2004), Greek Representative in the O.E.C.D. Education Committee (December 2000 – June 2004), Member of the PISA / O.E.C.D. Board of Participating Countries (January 2002 – June 2003) (Koulaidis & Kotsiras, 2004)

organisation and operation by integrating former assessment models<sup>38</sup> that do not coincide with the new pedagogic and political principles. There is evident disagreement between the educational instruments of P.I. and K.E.E., with the latter expressing a new education policy paradigm focused on qualitative and quantitative researches and a policy of expanded social reformation<sup>39</sup>.

L. 3848/2010 is an attempt to establish an implementation assessment system for the Greek education and it stipulates that: *"assessment on schools action is followed [...] by teachers' assessment which is implemented according to the provisions in effect"*.

The new political discourse developed is supposed to gradually reinforce the association of assessment with all fields of economic functionality through a system of political processes and international organisations decisions. Nevertheless, it is merely fragments of the history on education policy, as there is simultaneous guile of the official policy that penetrates situations and creates a grid of relations towards shaping competitive verbal fields. As a result, even during periods of downsizing syndicalist unions and reinforcing state ideologies, people resist and refute assessment policies, as they consider them authoritative manifestations against their labour rights.

At this point, new elements of political questioning are gradually integrated, being the outcome of economic crisis, while controversies with authoritative centres are enhanced and confidence in political institutions is refuted.

## **5.0 REFLECTIVE POLICIES ON SELF-ASSESSMENT BASED ON SYMBOLIC STRUCTURES OF DEVELOPING EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE (2010 – 2013)**

Assessment is generally part of verbal discourse pursuing the combination of theory and practice through creating an assessment model for the entire public sector based on the corresponding legislation (L.4057/2012) on public administration and initially on public education (L.3848/2010)<sup>40</sup>. It seems that L.3848/2010 manifests more explicitly school teachers' self-assessment through the association of educational discourse, democratic educational operationability and human force management<sup>41</sup>. Based on this law, the Greek education policy is selectively aligned to the European educational setting and O.E.C.D. recommendations<sup>42</sup>.

---

<sup>38</sup> See (indicatively) more special issues on assessment planning and organisation as defined by the P. I. (Lamnias, 2004). Since 2002 the Pedagogic Institute has processed a corresponding model (Konstatinou, 2002).

<sup>39</sup> A. Dimaras' seems to be crucial to teaching work co-ordination based on using educational history and research findings. It was him who showcased divergent educational practices from political intentions (Dimaras, 2013).

<sup>40</sup> Quote. In Lisbon in 2000, during the first summit on public administration and education quality, a new model of quality administration was introduced: Common framework of assessment (C.F.A.) (Passias, 2006). See (indicatively) more general comments and recommendations on the public sector in Greece (O.E.C.D., 2011).

<sup>41</sup> It is about article 32 of L. 3848/2010.

<sup>42</sup> See (indicatively) about the association of assessment, the efficient school managing in direct correlation with competitiveness reinforcement (O.E.C.D., 2012).

Throughout 2010 – 2013<sup>43</sup> an attempt is made to put forward school self-assessment processes within the framework of the National Strategic Framework of Reference (E.S.P.A.) special funding, with K.E.E. being in charge. This venture is on trial throughout 2010 – 2013 and fully implemented throughout 2013 – 2014<sup>44</sup>.

Promoting a self-assessment plan in schools is part of the framework of an educational organisation with political discourse that manifests an educational planning policy based on developing deep understanding on educational space operation. The establishment of the Education Policy Institute (I.E.P.)<sup>45</sup> is part of the educational changes emphasizing educational research and studying educational issues. It is about an organisational policy based on explicit objectives relevant to studying, planning and organising education policy. In terms of theoretical content tied to developing political discourse orders with corresponding educational practices, a set of dialectical relations between the scientific community and the Ministry of Education as performing instrument are showcased. The operation of I.E.P. could be correlated with that of the Pedagogic Institute throughout 1963 – 1964<sup>46</sup> which, based on its transformation, could acquire a political role with scholars being involved in forming political proposals on education. A. Dimaras<sup>47</sup> presence is critical to the structural performing process of the education model ideologising, social inequalities updating with emphasis on intervening education policy in opportunities structures through education. During I.E.P.'s first operational period, with Dimaras in chair, K.E.E.'s<sup>48</sup> work continues and it is further enhanced as an instrumental entity of developing education policy after the abolishment of the, perhaps competitive, Pedagogic Institute.

In this respect, assessment is transformed from a superficial, performing process into a democratic ideological institution integral to democratic development. The supervising

---

<sup>43</sup> Between 2010 and 2013 there was a number of governments consisted of: a) PA.SO.K. (6<sup>th</sup> October 2009 – 11<sup>th</sup> November 2011) / Minister of Education: Anna Diamantopoulou (7<sup>th</sup> October 2009 – 7<sup>th</sup> March 2012), b) PA.SO.K., New Democracy and LA.O.S. (11<sup>th</sup> November 2011 – 16<sup>th</sup> May 2012) / Ministers of Education: Anna Diamantopoulou (7<sup>th</sup> October 2009 – 7<sup>th</sup> March 2012) and Georgios Babiniotis (7<sup>th</sup> March 2012 – 17<sup>th</sup> May 2012), c) Temporary Government (16<sup>th</sup> May 2012 – 20<sup>th</sup> June 2012) / Minister of Education (Aggeliki – Efosini Kiaou 18<sup>th</sup> May 2012 – 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012) and d) New Democracy supported by PA.SO.K. and DIM.AR. (20<sup>th</sup> June 2012 – 26<sup>th</sup> January 2015) / Minister of Education (Konstantinos Arvanitopoulos 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012 – 9<sup>th</sup> June 2014).

<sup>44</sup> A study by K.E.E. proceeded: Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs & K.E.E. (2011). Teaching Work Assessment, School Self-assessment Process, Educational Planning, Action Plans Examples. Especially for Secondary Education, during the same time period, the basic self-assessment framework was formulated: (Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs & K.E.E., 2011). Quote, since 2010 the process of self-assessment has theoretically been formulated in terms of laws. This was specialized by M.D. 30972/G1/15-03-2013: "Assessment of Teaching Work in Schools – Process of Self-assessment", P.D. 152/5-11-2013: "Primary and Secondary Education Teacher Assessment", Circular G1/190089 / 10-12-2013: "Implementation of School Teaching Work Assessment throughout the school year 2013 – 2014 – Processes".

<sup>45</sup> I.E.P. is established under L. 3966 (G.G. A' 118/24-05-2011). According to this law the following organisations are abolished: a) Pedagogic Institute (P.I.), b) Education Research Centre (K.E.E.), c) Teacher Training Organization (T.T.O.) and d) Institute for Expats Education and Intercultural Education (I.E.E.I.E.).

<sup>46</sup> The Pedagogic Institute was established in 1964 by the Prime Minister and Minister of Education Georgios Papandreou under the L.4379/1964 (Kalerante, 2005).

<sup>47</sup> A. Dimaras (1932-2012) was President of K.E.E. and I.E.P.

<sup>48</sup> See (indicatively) the policy on teaching work assessment (Ministry of Education, Religious Affairs, Culture and Sports & Institute of Education Policy, 2012)

Association for Quality Assurance for Primary and Secondary Education (A.D.P.P.D.E.)<sup>49</sup> seems to be included in the policy pertaining to interconnecting theoretical educational constructions through I.E.P. with corresponding supervision practices.

The official policy of P.D. 152/2013 is characteristic of the different viewing of K.E.E., the so-called I.E.P. afterwards. The new ideological productive capital on school autonomy and self-assessment is not included in this Presidential Decree. On the contrary, assessment-related operations are integrated into institutional sub-systems towards an adaptive assessment updating with extension of assessment networks, perhaps emphasizing pre-constructed operational arrangements of mandatory selections<sup>50</sup>. Thus, political performativity, beyond rational estimations and reflection practices, brings back obsolete teachers' assessment processes, while democratic operational prerequisites that would perhaps include a broader plan to upgrade education are less emphasized.

The new SY.RI.Z.A. – AN.EL. Government elected in 2015, suspends the implementation of all laws pertaining to school assessment for one more time. Thus, teachers and teaching work systematic assessment is pending again.

This is about a mature political stage in which it is made well-understood that assessment cannot be a piecemeal process. On the contrary, it is part of broader democratic political narratives, it is part of consistencies or inconsistencies of the institutional space and it is related with the questioning about broader policies on economy and the operationability of supranational carriers, such as the European Union. Therefore, any institutional structural arrangements are not neutral. Symbolically and practically speaking, they are integral to broader criticism on the political representative structure which contains institutional networks, political actions and social subjects.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

The implementation of assessment presupposes a change in discourse in order to generate new relations, mainly within the micro-level of educational institutes, so that acknowledgment on assessment of educational occurrences as scientific phenomena is accelerated. This can be achieved in a different inter-political course of relations and situations in which the time allotted for developing educational phenomena is valued. As a result, reference could be initially made to an educational field in the form of autonomous educational space in which members' action emphasizes relations and interactions. In this respect, educational occurrences could be the means by which different educational discourses could be highlighted as the structural operational factor of the educational community.

---

<sup>49</sup> A.D.P.P.D.E. is established under L. 4142/2013 and "it assesses the quality of teaching work and supports the Ministry of Education, Religious Affairs, Culture and Sports in improving the National Strategic Planning on Primary and Secondary Education [...]"

<sup>50</sup> P.D. 152/2013 quantifies assessment with detailed reference to assessing characteristics corresponding to grading both for the administrative and instructional fields: i) 0-30 insufficient, ii) 31-60 sufficient, iii) 61- 80 very good and iv) 81 – 100 excellent. The viewpoints of the Panhellenic Association of School Counsellors (P.A.S.C.) are of special interest. In their bulleting of 4/1/2013 they underline the malfunctions and given the syndicalist unions' reaction they manifest their oppositions to assume the new role of supervisors.

Assessment brings the discussion back to political – social system weaknesses encapsulated in what is put forward as crisis of Democracy, meaning the refutation of operational prerequisites towards the structural development of collectivities with concurrent decrease of their dialectical relations. Through the operation of groups on the micro-level of educational spaces, exemplifying processes may be formed within a broader reflection on the role of education, among changing conditions that are seemingly the external framework and symbolic space which explicitly or implicitly define education.

To make assessment meaningful, the social subjects', that is teachers, interpretations should be emphasized in all pending signifiers of assessment representations relevant to exclusion and marginalization.

Any assessment-related interventions should repel contrasting discourse conducive to generating attitudes and behaviours because the implementation of a system without confidence in the institution will be nothing more than a textual version without political meaning and it will be non-applicable. In this case, rendering responsibilities due to the education system failure, based on international organisations reports, is conducive to stigmatizing teachers rather than assisting the development of efficient educational discourse. The intense marketization of education-related discourse, meaning focus on market discourse, does not contribute to articulating a democratic humanistic inter-verbality of policy and practices in order to construct new meanings towards changing the education model.

The Ministry of Education, governed by SY.RI.Z.A. – AN.EL., seems to be considering these facts. What is documented as the narrative of refuted assessment could be the opportunity to institutionalise an assessment model tied to reasonable practices of people's involvement in the process, while they abide by the ideological characteristics of assessment and the symbolic political capital on the right to education.

## REFERENCES

- Altousser, L. (1988). May "student" or "labour". *O Politis*, 91, 34-41.
- Andreou, A. & Papakonstantinou, G. (1994). *Authority and organisation – education system administration*. Athens: nea Synora – Livanis.
- Arsenis, G. (2015). *Why I did not do well*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents and Principals Can Make the Difference*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bollington, R., Hopkins, D. & West, M. (1990). *An Introduction to Teacher Appraisal*. London: Cassell.
- Bourg, J. (2017). *From Revolution to Ethics*. Second Edition: May 1968 and Contemporary French Thought. London: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Bouzakis, S. (1999). *Georgios A. Papandreou 1888-1968*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Bouzakis, S. (2002). *Education Reformations in Greece (vol. A')*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Broadfoot, P. (1996). *Education, Assessment and Society: A Sociological Analysis*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Clarke, A. & Dawson, R. (1999). *Evaluation Research: An Introduction to Principles Methods and Practice*. London-Thousand Oaks-New Delhi: SAGE.
- Dimaras, A. (2013). *History of Modern Greek Education*. Athens: Metailmio.
- Doukas, Ch. (1997) *Education Policy and Authority: The Case of Teacher Assessment (1982-1994)*. Athens: Grigoris.
- Drabaliaris, T. & Pappas, T. (2008). *The end of bipartisanism*. Athens: Polis.
- Earley, P., Fidler, B. & Ouston, J. (1996). *Improvement Through Inspection: Contemporary Approaches to School Development*. London: D. Fulton Edited Work. (2008). *The brief decade of '60*. Athens: Kastaniotis.
- Eleftheriou, M. & Niarhos, Th. (2005). *The 1960s*. Athens: Kastaniotis.
- Farber, D. (2012). *The Sixties: From Memory to History*. USA: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Fragos, Ch. (1986). From the supervisor to school counsellor. *Neoelliniki Paideia*, 1(3), 5-46.
- Gravaris, A., Zambarloukou, St., Ioakimoglou, H., Lyrintzis, Ch. & Maloutas, Th. (1998). *PA.SO.K. Party, State, Society*. Athens: Patakis.
- Kalerante, E. (2008). The Pedagogic Institute: The novice proposal of G. Papandreou's government and the systems of close groupings in an open education system. In Alkis, Rigos, Serafim I. Seferiadis, Evanthis Hatzivasileiou (eds.) *The Brief Decade of '60* (pp. 389-404). Athens: Kastaniotis.
- Kalerante, E. & Haris, K. (2011). Education policy 1974 – 1976 : The Greek demotic in the Curricula of Primary School 1st and 2<sup>nd</sup> Grades. Anniversary Scientific Conference, *1976-2011: 35 Years from Linguistic-Educational Reformation*. Proceedings, <http://ins.web.auth.gr>
- Karabelias, G. (2016). *Beyond the left and right, the transcendence*. Athens: Enallaktikes Ekdoseis.
- Kassotakis, M. (2016). The modern international trends in school and teacher assessment and the case of Greece. *Greek Education Assessment Review*, 1-2, 43-75.
- K.E.E. (2006). *PISA 2006: Report on the Results of Greece*.

- Kitidi, A. (edited volume). (2008). *1968*. Athens: Polytropon.
- Konstantinou, Ch. (2002). *Assessment Framework for Teachers and Primary and Secondary Education Executives*. Pedagogic Institute: Department of Assessment.
- Kornetis, K. (2013). *Children of the Dictatorship, Student Resistance, Cultural Politics, and the "Long 1960s" In Greece*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Koulaidis, V. & Kotsira, A. (2004). "Quality Assurance in Education: Self-evaluation process at the level of the school unit". In *Quality of Education : Teachers professional training and development*, Conference Proceedings, Education Research Centre of Greece.
- Lamniatis, K. (2004). *Assessment Framework for Teachers and Primary and Secondary Education Executives*. Pedagogic Institute: Department of Assessment.
- Matthaiou, D. (2000). *A Guide on in-service Teaching Work Appraisal and Planning for Primary and Secondary Education*. Pedagogic Institute: Department of Assessment.
- Meyer, H.D. & Benavot, A. (2013). *PISA, Power, and Policy: the emergence of global educational governance*. Oxford: Oxford Studies.
- Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs & K.E.E. (2011). *Teaching Work Assessment in Secondary Education. In-service Assessment Process*.
- Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports & Institute of Education Policy. (2012). *Teaching Work Assessment in Primary Education. In-service Assessment Process*. Athens.
- Mitchell, P. (2015). *The Coup at Catholic University: The 1968 Revolution in American Catholic Education*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Mouzelis, N. (2002). *From change to modernity*. Athens: Themelio.
- OECD (1997). *Reviews of National Policies for Education: Greece*. OECD.
- OECD (2003a). *Education At A Glance: OECD Indicators 2002*. OECD.
- OECD (2003b). *Financing Education, Investments and Returns: Analysis of World Education Indicators, 2002*. OECD.
- OECD (2010). *Education at a Glance 2010: OECD Indicators*. OECD.
- OECD (2011). *Greece: Review of the Central Administration*. OECD.
- OECD (2012). *Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education Education Policy Advice for Greece*. OECD.

- Palaiokrasas, S., Dimitropoulos, S., Kostaki, A. & Vrettakou, V. (1997). *Education Assessment : European Trends and Proposals on a Greek Policy Framework*. Centre for Political Research and Training. Athens: Ion.
- Passias, G. (2006). *European Union and Education*. Athens: Gutenberg.
- Reichert, S. & Wächter, B. (2000). *The Globalization of Education and Training: Recommendations for a Coherent Response of the European Union*. Academic Cooperation Association (ACA), European Council, September 2000, 32.
- Sakonidis, H., Tsatsaroni, A. & Lamnias, C. (2002). Pedagogic Models, Teachers' Frames of Interpretation and Assessment Practices. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 25 (2 & 3): 171-186.
- Schatz, M. (1997). *Initiating Change through Self-evaluation: Methodological Implications for School Development*. CIDREE Collaborative Project 'Self-evaluation in School Development', Dundee
- Singer, D. (2013). *Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968*. Cambridge: Haymarket Book.
- Solomon, I. (1999). *Internal Assessment and In-service Teaching Work Assessment and Planning: A Framework on Work and Support*. Pedagogic Institute: Department of Assessment.
- Sotiropoulos, D. (1996). *Populism and Bureaucracy: The Case of Greece Under Pasok, 1981-1989*. Paris: University of Notre Dame.
- Stoll, L. & Mortimore, P. (1997). *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. In Tariq, A. (2008). *1968*. (transl. in Greek Michail, S. & Iliopoulos, K.). Athens: Agra.
- Veikos, Th. (1988). '68 Students Uprising. *Anti*, 373, 38-40.
- Vryonis, S. (1991). *Greece on the Road to Democracy: From the Junta to PASOK, 1974-1986*. Aristide D. Caratzas.
- White, J. and Barber, M. (Eds), *Perspectives on School Effectiveness and School Improvement*. London: Institute of Education University of London.