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Abstract

The "School of Skills" is dominated by trends for developing innovative teaching practices by teachers, which accelerates the evaluation process, upgrades the quality of the learning provided, and complies with the new, scientific data. However, the institutionalization of the evaluation of the educational project was and continues to be a focus of intense confrontation between the educational leadership and part of the educational community. The purpose of this study is to highlight the needs and priorities of teachers in the direction of upgrading their educational work, to map their opinions and attitudes regarding the evaluation of the educational work, and to capture the challenges created by the inclusion of the evaluation of the educational project in the learning process. It is a three-stage mixed methods research design, carried out in elementary schools in the prefecture of Kavala, during which quantitative and qualitative research data were collected. In the first stage, a questionnaire with a high index of consistency and coherence was sent in electronic form to teachers in the prefecture (Katoleon, 2022). In the next stage, with the interview technique of open-ended semi-structured questions, 15 teachers, permanent and substitute, expressed their opinions without restrictions. In the last stage, the procedures for archiving and maintaining the assessment forms in evaluative fields A1, A2, and B were noted, as described by 5 principals of multi-seat primary schools. Teachers seem to accept both the value of assessment and its usefulness, so they indicated the intention to participate in the process. Hesitation, however, was noted regarding the procedures included in the existing evaluation system.
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Introduction

Assessment is a necessary improvement process in the age of social change and technological innovation. Evaluation of educational units, processes, means, resources, infrastructure, planning, results, and human resources. The broadness of the term also includes the evaluation of the educational work of teachers, which constitutes an object of intense scepticism for the educational world, linked more to the content, forms, and purposes than to the process itself.

The concept of educational assessment traces its origins to 1834, when the institution of the Inspector appeared, which was maintained until 1982. Clearly, the inspectorate was called upon to overcome several challenges, including inadequate training of teaching staff, who in some cases had limited reading skills (Malamata, 2023). After the long duration of the institution, it was replaced by the school counsellor, an institution mainly of guiding character rather than controlling, within the school units and the school classes field of activity, for whom it was stated that "participates in the process of evaluating the teaching staff and, as the case may be, in the competent collective bodies" (Law 1304/1982). Three years later, the Pedagogical Institute (P.I.) -renamed afterward as the Institute of Educational Policy (I.E.P.)- operates as an advisory body of the Ministry of Education, responsible for studying and evaluating educational practice (Law 1566/1985). A part of P.I. was the Evaluation department, which started operating in 1996.

The next year, in 1997, a Permanent Assessors' Body, a School Unit Evaluation Committee, was established, which operated at the highest level, to evaluate teachers, directors, supervisors, and school counsellors of all types and forms of Primary and Secondary Education schools. According to that applicable legislative framework, the evaluation of the educational project was "a process of assessing the quality of the education provided and the degree of implementation of its aims and objectives, as determined by the applicable legislation" (Law 2525/1997). Five years later, after the purpose was clarified, the task of evaluating the educational activities was assigned to the Educational Research Center (E.R.C.) and the P.I. while the teachers themselves to the Director of the school unit and the relevant School Counselor, through individual reports (Law 2986/2002).

In the "New School" action was planned with educational objectives per year, in each school unit and was evaluated, in the form of a report, which summarized the overall performance of the school unit, the achievement of the objectives of the action plan, successes, weaknesses, problems that were dealt with during the school year, as well as suggestions for improvement with the accompanying evaluation of the teachers (Law 3848/2010). After three years, there was an attempt to implement the Internal Self-Assessment, in which each school unit (Director and Teachers' Association) self-assessed itself in terms of the educational project and the EEP Observatory (Evaluation of the Educational Project) was created on the website of the Institute of Educational Policy (Zika, 2022). Furthermore, A.Q.A.P.S.E. (Authority for Quality Assurance in Primary and Secondary Education) was formed, charged with assessing the quality of educational work and the action of educational units as the final recipient of all actions of Law 3848/2010 (Law 4142/2013). Afterward, the planning and evaluation of the educational work was part of the tasks of the teachers' association, which meets on issues "related to the course of implementation of the school's educational planning, the evaluation of the educational work, the evaluation of the school actions to derive the necessary assessments and feedback and the recording of proposals to improve the educational project in the following year" (Presidential Decree 79/2017). The present, current, legislative framework is implemented in the
form of the internal self-evaluation of the school unit in 3 functions, which are
categorized into 14 axes and 45 indicators, but also the external evaluation by the
coordinators of the educational project with reports submitted to the Regional
Educational Planning Centers (R.E.P.C.), the A.Q.A.P.S.E. and in the I.E.P. (Law
4547/2018; Law 4692/2020).

In conclusion, it is possible to state that although the varied, reforming attempts of the
last thirty years in the field of educational evaluation had as a prerequisite the
continuous adaptation of the evaluated, an element that in some cases seemed to
hinder the operation of school units or the functionality of their educational potential,
however, demonstrates the crucial role of the assessment process in upgrading the
quality of education provided. Therefore, in this paper seeks to highlight the
ministration needs and priorities of teachers in the direction of upgrading their
educational work, to map their views and attitudes regarding the evaluation of their
work, and to capture the challenges noted by the inclusion of their evaluation in the
educational process within the framework of law 4692/2020.

Theoretical Framework

Evaluation and Evaluation Models

The evaluation of the educational work has been the subject of research internationally.
Worthen & Sanders (1973) defined educational evaluation as an effort to collect
information that can be used to judge the value of a program, a process, a product, a
purpose, or the possible usefulness of some alternative solutions, that were designed
to the realization of specific purposes. Sigalas (1992) defined the objectives of the
evaluation of the educational project "as an evaluation of all its contributors at all levels
for feedback and improvement of planning processes: a) drawing up syllabi, b) writing
textbooks, c) providing educational materials, materials, and equipment, d) education,
professional training and training of teachers and e) teaching methods and school
activities. For his part, Dimitropoulos (1999), considered educational evaluation as the
systematic and organized process, in which processes, systems, people, contexts, or
results of an educational mechanism are evaluated based on predetermined criteria and
predetermined purposes.

In the context of assessing the effectiveness of the teacher, it was considered necessary
to distinguish his quality, i.e. the set of personal characteristics, skills, and
understandings that a person brings to teaching, from the quality of his teaching, i.e.
the strong instruction that allows wide range students to learn (Darling-Hammond,
2012). However, the quality of teaching was perceived to be partly a function of the
quality of the teacher (knowledge, skills, dispositions) but also the context of teaching
(the curriculum, the assessment system, the 'fit' between teacher qualifications and
content and teaching conditions).

The theory for evaluation today is contained in a series of theoretical formations,
models, and systems that constitute its theoretical background. These differ both in
the starting point of their presenters and in the way of approach the evaluated subject.
The different starting point mainly means that there are different philosophical,
epistemological, and ontological orientations. An example of such a different approach
is the positions of "subjectivism" or "objectivism", "technocratic" or "humanism",
"naturalism" or "rigorous experimentation". The differentiation of the starting point
as well as the differentiation in terms of the situation that the evaluation is called upon to serve in each case creates a different perception as to the purpose of the evaluation. A well-known categorization of approaches to evaluation is made into five categories that are very briefly described below (Fitzpatrick et al., 2009; Dimitropoulos, 2007):

- **Objective evaluation** (Goal-oriented): The evaluation here focuses on specific goals and objectives extending to the causal approach of what has been achieved.
- **Management evaluation**: With the central interest in the recognition and gathering of information needs for management decision-making.
- **Consumer evaluation**: With a central interest in the development of evaluation information for products and service accountability, for use by consumers.
- **Expert assessment** (Critical): For a professional opinion on the judgment of quality in any assessment effort.
- **Participatory evaluation** (Naturalistic): Where the participation of those involved in the evaluation (whether they are evaluators or recipients of the evaluation) is at the center of the process to determine the values, aspirations, criteria, data, and conclusions for the evaluation.

All theoretical approaches to evaluation may well be used by the evaluator to generate and generalize questions as well as uncover various themes.

**Literature Review**

Regarding modern teacher evaluation systems, several focus on student achievement scores on the one hand to determine teacher effectiveness and on the other hand to hold students accountable to student performance standards (Williams & Hebert, 2020). For teachers, the outcomes of these assessment systems determine their promotion, tenure, dismissal, and compensation (Harris et al., 2014). Feuer (2013) noted that these incentives and accountability policies implemented at the school level by principals may improve the level of performance and efforts of existing teachers, but at the same time exacerbate teacher stress levels (Danielson, 2007), especially beginners, while raising questions about the feasibility of these systems.

The equity of assessment systems was particularly challenged in cases where assessors made judgments about the teaching practices of the evaluated (Danielson & McGreal, 2000). A common problem with performance evaluations was the comparison of novice teachers with experienced teachers on the same rating measures. In situations like this, novice teachers struggled to adjust their teaching practices to keep up with expectations that had been established by the effective practices of experienced teachers, but whose practices had been refined after years of successful teaching (Roberson & Roberson, 2009). Furthermore, such instances of assessment systems influence teacher characteristics, which impact the learning environment, student experiences, and student performance, both in the short and long term (Harris et al., 2014).

By conducting research reviews on the issue of teacher evaluation for further improvement, directions were proposed and conclusions emerged to strengthen these evaluation systems. Firstly, what emerged was the conclusion that teacher evaluations should be linked to clear standards and competencies, secondly they should be
embedded in wider observational contexts, thirdly they should be based on multiple
measures, fourthly they should be accompanied by timely feedback linked to specific
ideas for improving instructional strategies and opportunities for practice and fifthly
concluded that professional development should be aligned with identified
development needs and encourage the development of Communities of Practice
within and between school units (Looney, 2011).

In conclusion, it can be formulated that, none excluding the multitude of teacher
evaluation systems worldwide, insurmountable weaknesses are found in the
procedures themselves or in their aftermath, even though it seems that teachers are
being mobilized, enriching their teaching, upgrading didactic their practices, practice
new methodological techniques and improve the quality of the education provided,
achieving more learning objectives.

Research Methodology

In the present study, triangulation was applied to the three-stage data collection
methods. In the first stage, a questionnaire with a high index of consistency and
coherence was sent in electronic form to teachers in the prefecture (Katoleon, 2022).
In the next stage with the interview technique of open-ended semi-structured
questions, 15 teachers, permanent and substitute, expressed their opinions without
hesitation. In the last stage, the procedures for archiving and maintaining the
evaluation forms in fields A1, A2, and B were noted, as described by five (5) principals
of multi-seat primary schools in the Prefecture of Kavala in semi-structured interviews,
to establish both the accessibility of the contents and the feasibility of custody. The
survey took place between February and April 2024.

Regarding the reliability and validity of the research, knowing that it is a combination
of qualitative and quantitative research, the interest shifted in depth to the views of the
teachers regarding the evaluation process creating an open dialogue, supplemented by
the quantification of the measurements to generalize the results and to verify previous
investigations.

For the analysis of the research data, the convergent parallel design method was used,
where qualitative and quantitative data were analysed in parallel. The three sets of
results are then merged based on points of convergence and divergence (Plano Clark,
2017). Regarding the qualitative data of the semi-structured interviews, a thematic
analysis followed, while SPSS was considered suitable for the quantitative analysis.

Research Questions

Four research questions were posed that formed the thematic axes of the research:
1. What are the characteristics of the sample?
2. What are the views and attitudes of the teachers regarding the content and
   procedures of the assessment?
3. What are teachers' views and attitudes about evaluators and the purpose of
evaluation?
4. What are the teachers' opinions and attitudes about the consequences of the
   assessment?
Results of Quantitative Questionnaire Data

The research sample consisted of 49 teachers, 33 women and 16 men, 12% of whom, were aged 22-30, 42.9% from 31-45, 24.5% from 46-55, and 20.4% from 56 and over. More than half served as permanent teachers (39) while the rest as substitutes. 61.2% held a master's degree, 14.3% a second degree, while 24.5% had no additional studies.

The first and third sections of the questions of the questionnaire aimed at capturing the views of the teachers on the evaluation of the educational work but also at answering the second research question. Specifically, in the question about their intention to participate in the procedures, 63.27% answered positively, 24.49% negatively, and 12.24% appeared uncertain (Figure 1).

Regarding its usefulness, only 16.33% did not consider it particularly useful while the responses of the rest of the sample ranged from moderately to very much (Figure 2).

However, the large majority (87.8%) rate the current evaluation system as moderate, a little, or not at all adequate and reliable (Figure 3). In the questions that focused on its contribution to the identification of teachers' weaknesses, to the self-awareness of the pedagogical work, to the development of cooperation between the members of the teachers' association, and also to professional development, the answers indicated agreement in terms of the positivity of the contribution but differentiation as to the degree (Figures 4,5,6,7).
**Figure 3. How Reliable and Adequate is the Existing System for Evaluating the Work of Teachers in Primary Education**

**Figure 3. It Contributes to the Development of Cooperation Among the Members of the Educational Staff**

**Figure 4. It Contributes to the Identification of Teachers' Weaknesses**
The emotions, that were connected to the assessment, were mostly classified as moderate, great, and maximum degree of insecurity, anxiety, suspicion, fear, and control (Tables 1,2,3,4).

Table 1. To what Extent does It Cause Insecurity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. To what Extent does It Cause Anxiety?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. It contributes to the Self-Awareness of the Pedagogical Effort

Figure 6. Contributes to Professional Development
Table 3. To what Extent does It Cause Suspicion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. To what Extent does It Cause Fear?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct observation and self-assessment reports were taken as the recommended assessment methods, while percentage assessment and comparative assessment were found remarkably low in the sample's preference (Tables 5, 6, 7, 8). In addition, the combination of internal and external was considered as a preferable form of evaluation of the educational work (Table 9).

Table 5. To what Extent do You Consider the Direct Observation Method Appropriate for the Evaluation of Your Educational Work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. To what Extent do You Consider the Self-Assessment Report Appropriate for the Evaluation of Your Educational Work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. To what Extent do You Consider the Comparative Evaluation Method Appropriate for the Evaluation of Your Educational Work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. To what Extent do You Consider the Percentage Evaluation Method Appropriate for the Evaluation of Your Educational Work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. What is the most Appropriate Form of Evaluation of the Educational Work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Evaluation</td>
<td>18.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluation</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination of internal and External</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Assessment</td>
<td>12.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 degrees</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second section of the questionnaire sought an overview of teachers' views on assessors, criteria, and purposes of assessment, as well as in answering the third research question. In particular, teachers, mentors/supervisors/qualified consultants, and psychologists were preferred as evaluators, followed by pedagogical responsibility consultants, school directors, and scientific responsibility consultants, while students' parents were rejected from the procedures (Figures 8,9,10,11).

![Figure 7. How Suitable are the Teachers to Participate in the Assessment of Your Work?](image)

![Figure 8. How Suitable the Mentors/Supervisors/Qualified Advisers are to Participate in the Assessment of Your Work?](image)

The vast majority of the sample admitted that they were influenced by certain factors in forming a negative attitude toward the existing evaluation system. The strongest factors that emerged were the lack of trust in the real motives of the state, the lack of clear, specific, and systematic standards and evaluation procedures, the inadequate methods for evaluating teachers, due to a lack of fidelity and validity, the time required to complete the procedures, the excessive workload, the bureaucratic, technocratic and controlling nature, the categorization of teachers, the use of evaluation for salary cuts,
withholding of promotions and job losses, and the development of dependency relationships between evaluators and teachers (Table 10 in Appendix).

The third section of the questionnaire questions aimed at capturing the teachers' views on the consequences of the assessment and answering the fourth research question. The majority of participants expressed the opinion that the results should be linked mainly to moral rewards in the case of positive judgments or to an obligation to participate in educational programs in the case of negative judgments. The majority of participants also appeared to agree that it should not be followed by deprivation of grade progression, reduction in salary scale, or material reward (Table 11 in Appendix).

**Results of Qualitative Teacher Interview Data**

The sample of the research was 15 teachers of Primary education, ten of whom have been in the field of education for almost three decades and have experienced many of
the reforms of the education system. Most were permanent (6 out of 15), 4 substitutes, and 5 newly appointed probationary to be evaluated. From the general picture from the work profile of the sample, it could be concluded that these were teachers with high experience in education, with increased formal qualifications.

The second thematic axis grouped four subcategories, which investigated the views of the teachers regarding the implementation of the assessment, the procedures for conducting it, as well as the calculation of the qualifications of the teachers during its implementation. Fourteen out of fifteen teachers agreed to the implementation of the evaluation with several modifications, however, regarding its character and method of application. In particular, one teacher stated: "I believe that the evaluation of teachers should be done after the parameters and the appropriate evaluation criteria are taken and of course, the correct evaluation dialogue between the teachers and the government should be held to set the right framework." (Teacher14). Another added: "In principle, I am not negative about the concept of evaluation. Second, work methods and work promotion are something positive. It is something important in the context of monitoring the progress of a process. Now if we are talking about this specific evaluation, I have a lot of objections." (Teacher8). In the opinion of another: "And simply yes and with many other expressions and certainly and definitely and why not but also with an explanation." (Teacher6).

About whether teachers' qualifications should be taken into account in their evaluation, the question was general but participants mainly identified academic qualifications as a benchmark. One teacher expressed: "Of course, yes qualifications and years of service should also be assessed." (Teacher1). Another added: "Now academic qualifications are taken a lot of them with money so I don’t know how much it can be considered a qualification to get a positive scale in the assessment because you have some qualifications because you could afford to buy so I don’t know which grade what you pay to get is counted in the evaluation. That is, someone who does not have the financial comfort to get a master's degree, let’s say, but is very good at his job and does his work very well." (Teacher15). Someone else added: "Let me tell you my opinion and that’s why they have these qualifications and master’s degrees and doctorates and two master’s degrees, both degrees and three maybe. I think an evaluation of an educational and not a university theorist should have a lot of weight in the classroom and the school area, otherwise, these teachers with their parchments and degrees and doctorates could also cover other areas of education. I don’t say that in a derogatory way. Supervisors, advisors, health education, environmental issues, special issues. Because it can with all these scrolls of course and must be measured. But imagine a teacher with a simple degree, very dear to the children, parents, colleagues, and the director only having this degree. And now I get into the deeper meaning of evaluation. Imagine this teacher getting a low grade because be doesn’t have ten degrees, ten parchments, he hasn’t done any work, but this teacher produces work for a whole life, half the years of his life, and I just know this kind of teacher. He is not interested in collecting points, but I think we have to balance between the skills, the degrees, and the scrolls, but also look at those who can be teachers with a simple degree in their specialty who perform at their best but in the evaluation up to the other colleague who may have escaped the evaluator gets the maximum mark. What is the point? Performance in children. So there we have a minus based on the assessment because I think from the little I know, the parchments count too much and I am very afraid that on the way we will lose the goal of the assessment, that is the performance at school and relations with colleagues and the school community, parents, superiors, children." (Teacher6).

Regarding where the emphasis should be placed in the evaluation procedures, one teacher said the following: "The pedagogical part, the collective in terms of the relationships within the school community, the pedagogical climate, the subjects, and the scientific competence of the teacher." (Teacher5). Another quoted: "Academic qualifications are not enough. I consider that there is also work experience, which means previous service and involvement in all phases of the educational
process from all positions." (EKP8). Another pointed out: "In addition to the knowledge of the teacher and his teaching methods, his behavior should of course be evaluated, the way he cooperates with the students and with the parents." (Teacher7).

Regarding the methods that can be used for evaluation, a teacher had the following opinion: "Observation, not just once, continuously, at times when the teacher does not know that he is being evaluated, and in this way we can perceive incidents with "closed lights" that we say from many factors, whether it is the counselor, whether it is the director or other teachers, colleagues, and parents." (Teacher7). Another said: "Through cross-observation as it is now, but not with a phone appointment so they don't prepare for a teaching and it's all set up. Everything should be simpler." (Teacher13).

The third thematic axis referred to the adoption of teachers' views-attitudes with the "who" and "why" of the evaluation. The first subcategory was related to which person they consider suitable as an evaluator. One teacher reasoned: "The Principals and Counselors of each subject." (Teacher3). Another expressed the following opinion: "First of all, the evaluation system must be agreed upon. Who will participate in the evaluation process is the second. How is the assessment carried out, if an assessment is carried out? The evaluation must be done. Let's just say I agree. If we say that the evaluation is done, certain parameters must be clarified. With what constants, will be the ultimate reference points of the evaluation, and what will be considered the perfect pedagogical work to evaluate someone in terms of their pedagogical work? What will be, let's say, the exemplary, perfect teaching with a point of reference against which the educational work of the teacher will be evaluated? These have not been clarified and I do not think that both the educational work of teachers and the more general parameters that make up teaching and school life can be standardized, measured, or evaluated in such a bureaucratic way." (Teacher8). Someone else emphasized: "As I said, the school can participate internally, that is, colleagues or teachers who may have some more qualifications, more experience, help someone with the other observation and give them feedback on possible mistakes that happen at some point the counselor may also make an observation to somehow confirm what we observed in school." (Teacher15).

Regarding the profile of the evaluator, one teacher decided: "I think he should be impartial, he should have taught in a classroom himself, that is, he should not be far from the everyday life of education, he should have definite knowledge and a good attitude, positive attitude toward the teacher who evaluates and not a critical attitude." (Teacher14). Someone else in the same vein said: "He has to be as objective as possible, flexible, have classroom experience, have been through it himself, otherwise he won't be able to give his opinion on something and emphasize the practical part of the work, whether he can control the class, do the lesson properly, have communication relationships." (Teacher12). Another claimed: "Educational counselor, the school principal, and a psychologist." (Teacher11). They all agreed on the knowledge, experience, and soft skills that the evaluator should possess while stating that in addition to the consultant and the manager, evaluators could also be colleagues through peer observation and circular feedback, without excluding the opinion of the parents, giving weight to the daily informal evaluation by the students themselves.

To evaluate teachers in the current phase, one teacher had the following opinion: "As far as I know, for them to become permanent. They need to be assessed so they are not probationary. Now if there is something else hidden behind it, I don't know." (Teacher9). Another commented: "It's very confusing, at least to me. I think the teachers have not understood. They think the bogeyman is coming to check on them. One day your teaching must be good, you must have prepared in a very short period and I think that what should be and what is evaluated has missed the mark and I am very afraid that people who just that day will be evaluated with very good grades day they will have been well prepared and organized and the slightly more stressed, slightly fresher in the profession will not have had time to coordinate their work samples. They should be evaluated on their
performance in child psychology, in the education of children, in their relationships with colleagues, in their relationship with the community of parents in all of these should be evaluated.” (Teacher6). Another quoted the following: “Because it is a proposal of the European Union. The purpose is done purely to serve the European Union and has no other essential purpose in terms of the pedagogical work”. The teachers gave a similar answer (Teachers 1,13,14,15), while the rest justified that the evaluation is done for the permanence of the teachers and the upgrading of the quality of the educational work that will have an impact on the students’ learning.

Finally, in the fourth thematic axis, where the teachers’ opinions on the "after" of the evaluation process are listed, opinions were expressed on the positive or negative impact that the evaluation could bring. It should be noted that six of the fifteen teachers agreed (Teacher 5,6,8,9,11) that the positive evaluation should also result in a salary increase with the possibility of professional development and assuming a position of responsibility when the appraisee requests it. More specifically, one teacher said: "Increase in salary, rent, allowance or bonus in some way, must have financial incentives and possibly not in crises in his professional development.” (Teacher5). Another agreed: "Certainly if we’re asked to be assessed on the work we have to do for the assessment piece individually, meaning all these forms, self-assessments, reports, platforms, it’s all a huge workload outside of work, beyond working hours, which is not financially rewarded, so I think that there must be a financial reward and that will count at some point, I imagine if you want to take some position of responsibility that it will play its role, but mainly to promote your project you will there must be something they are offering you that is enticing. So to have done all this work and just be a good teacher I already knew I was, so there should be something in return. I think the financial is a strong motivation for all of us today in Greece.” (Teacher15). At the same time, a teacher said: "I think it should be a moral reward and not just I got a ten. It would be great to hear that the class teacher got the credit. It wouldn’t sound bad to me, I have heard from tax authorities, security bodies, and financial departments, that a bonus, a small one, a medium one, a big one, wouldn’t be bad, because we are not the best paid in Greek society for our honorable role. Perhaps a financial upgrade and perhaps some favor in some of his choices, to be favored in some transfers, in some assignments. A worthy colleague to ask something from his Directorate has something positive in mind for the school community. So his opinion when he speaks should be heard a little more and count.” (Teacher6).

Regarding the negative consequences of an evaluation, thirteen out of fourteen teachers suggested that targeted training and intra-school discussions with the help of the consultant, would be a good practice to improve the quality of the educational work of the particular teacher, with two participants supporting the following views on overall: "Possibly a second evaluation should be done and if not, the teacher who is not evaluated correctly should leave the schools, change jobs.” (Teacher7). And another expressed documenting: "In the first place the goal should be because we are not dealing with criminal colleagues, to bring the colleague back. The purpose is not to argue with him, nor to get angry with him, or to embarrass him, but a process should be found that is balanced, friendly, and condescending from the evaluators to the subordinates, to sit down to discuss with the evaluators and with some who were assessed to have a positive outcome for students. Now for punishment or a salary reduction, I would not like to think about it, until I make sure that this colleague wants to be evaluated, because I am very afraid that there are colleagues who, after making sure that they are not working properly, may say that this is how I am, this is how I continue. I think there should be another approach there. A small penalty and even removal at some point. It could simply be that the person does not remain unemployed and covers some other field, and some colleagues do not want to change, as if the class is theirs. No, the class belongs to the parents, to the society, and to the children to have a proper education.” (Teacher6).
Results of Qualitative Data from Manager Interviews

Through the interviews of the five principals of multi-seat elementary schools of Kavala, the importance of maintaining the record became clear not only in terms of the process of teacher evaluation fields but also of its general organization over the years. All the principals concluded that the school record is the most important book, and object of study and constitutes the “life of the school unit over the years”.

Regarding the reason for the creation and management of the file, a school director argued: “The school file is kept for about a decade without being something legally standardized but after the decade there are some procedures, where the file leaves the office and will go to another part of the school that will be for any of their parents current or past students who will be looking for some certificates. These specific books, student records, and study certificate books are never destroyed. They continue and exist. Of course, if 200 years pass, they will be museum objects.” (Principal2).

Referring to the importance of the file, the reason for its existence, updating, and quality, the same director added: “The file is very important, it is updated when there are events or issues or incoming documents that need to be logged.” Regarding the preservation, management, and maintenance of the archive, another director argued: “In general, the school maintains an archive by what is provided for in the presidential decrees of the Ministry of Education. That is, we have 31 folders, in each folder there are separate sections. There is a presidential decree. If I remember correctly, it is 899 of 1980. There it says how many years each document must be kept at the school and there is also a circular from the Ministry of the Interior, I think, in which it mentions the procedure that must be done to clear a file. Because documents that are of historical importance after they are recorded and since the documents that were recorded in the state archives are sent if something is of historical importance be asks for it and we file it there. Otherwise, they are recycled. They are destroyed.” (Principal 3).

Regarding the second category, which concerns compliance with the assessment fields A1, A2, and B, a director stated: “This year is the first year that we have organized the file. In this school, we keep two forms. In electronic form for each teacher who is evaluated, in the modules that are evaluated and there is also the hard copy that I have in confidential documents that are locked and only the Director can access. This file was created with the start of teacher evaluation.” (Principal1). About the second sub-question, whether it exists in paper or digital form, all the managers unanimously answered that they keep it in paper form compulsorily and in digital form at will. In particular, one manager mentioned that: “In print form, it should be kept and in digital form, we do it because it is more secure for us and it is also easier to use.” (Principal2).

Finally, regarding access to the part of the file that concerns the evaluation, a manager informed us that: “We have 31 folders, in each folder there are separate sections. The subcategories that we have in this folder concern each teacher. Only the A2 field and the B field are kept in the school. These are the fields that the principals evaluate. The A1 field that the training advisor evaluates is in his file. And of course, all this is recorded on the special platform for evaluation. If an assessee now wants to see what you have written, their report, they can see it from the archive. In any case, we also communicate them to the assessee. He knows what the manager has written about him. He is notified and if he has any objections he can file an objection. So we must share it. He doesn’t have to come to look for it himself in the archive. Its assessment is communicated.” (Principal3).

Conclusion

Teacher evaluation systems serve to assess teacher quality and promote school improvement through professional development.
Teachers seem to accept both the value of assessment and its usefulness, so they indicate the intention to participate in the process. Hesitation, however, is shown regarding the procedures included in the existing evaluation system, which is considered insufficient. It is therefore not surprising that insecurity, anxiety, suspicion, and fear emerge as emotions associated with the procedures. Factors that make teachers’ attitudes difficult include the lack of trust in the real motives of the state, the lack of clear, specific, and systematic evaluation standards and procedures, the inadequate methods for evaluating teachers, due to a lack of fidelity and validity, the time required to completion of procedures, excessive workload, bureaucratic, technocratic and controlling nature, categorization of teachers, use of evaluation for salary cuts, withholding of promotions and job losses, and the development of dependency relationships between evaluators and teachers.

Direct observation and self-assessment reports are stated as preferred methods and an internal combination is the recommended format. Other teachers, mentors/supervisors, pedagogic pedagogy and scientific responsibility advisors, and principals are cited as the most appropriate evaluators while parents are shown to be the least appropriate.

It is also concluded that the evaluation should not result in the deprivation of grade progression, the reduction of the salary scale, or even the material reward, but the moral reward or the obligation to participate in educational, supportive programs to improve the quality of the educational work provided.

Therefore, it is of utmost importance that the tools and procedures for teacher evaluation, whether conducted internally or externally, are valid and reliable and that the evaluation criteria are linked to clear teaching standards. This is especially true for summative assessments that have an impact on teachers' backgrounds and career prospects. The validity of teacher evaluation means that the instruments and procedures for evaluation meet their intended purposes. Reliability means that raters' judgments are consistent across repeated observations.

Overall, effective teacher evaluation and development can potentially play a vital role in improving the quality of teacher education work, but there is still much room for improvement, conceptually and empirically, as well as in designing effective strategies for policy and implementation.
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Appendix

Table 10. Negative attitude shaping factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the lack of trust in the real motives of the state affect the formation of a negative attitude?</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>192,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Consequences of the assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>To what extent do you think that assessment results should be linked to grade progression?</th>
<th>To what extent do you think the results of the assessment should be linked to salary progression?</th>
<th>To what extent do you think that evaluation results should be linked to material reward?</th>
<th>To what extent do you think that assessment results should be linked to grade progression deprivation?</th>
<th>To what extent do you think the results of the assessment should be linked to a reduction in salary scale?</th>
<th>To what extent do you think that the results of the evaluation should be linked to an obligation to participate in training programs?</th>
<th>To what extent do you think the results of the evaluation should be linked to the withdrawal of the teacher from the school classroom?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.7347</td>
<td>2.5306</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>1.9796</td>
<td>1.6327</td>
<td>3.5102</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>134,00</td>
<td>124,00</td>
<td>124,00</td>
<td>175,00</td>
<td>97,00</td>
<td>80,00</td>
<td>172,00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>