

MANAGING EDUCATIONAL SECTOR VIA SELF-EVALUATION POLICY

Kristi Ploom, Reelika Irs
University of Tartu

Abstract

Performance evaluation is not a new concept in private sector, while in public sector organisations it has been taken into use since the implementation of performance management. Evaluation is necessary to make the future-oriented management decisions based on the information available today, in order to achieve desired performance. The authors analysed self-evaluation reports prepared in Estonian general schools in 2008. Self-evaluation reports were analysed to see, if the relationships and roles, patterns of governance and accountability, flow of resources, the headmaster's role, educational and other values in Estonian schools have hanged enough, to provide education service, which responds to the high expectations of contemporary society. Although the analyses of OECD surveys' results show that the organising of the Estonian educational sector is a good example for many other countries, the actual situation in the schools is not as positive. There are high expectations put on schools by the policymakers' level, but schools do not have enough ability to reach them. There is a lack of financial resources, knowledge and organisational willingness.

Keywords: self-evaluation, performance appraisal, external evaluation, internal evaluation

JEL Classification: I20

Introduction

While measuring educational sector's performance, the value added to the society is discussed. In education there are two conflicting goals: to achieve excellence and efficiency, while ensuring social, gender, and racial egalitarianism. It is widely accepted, that effective education and training systems can create economic growth, and equitable systems – social cohesion, the positive externalities. Therefore, principles and tasks in education, are multiple and vague, and performance relative to these goals is difficult to measure. Some areas of performance do not allow quantification. For many decisions the immeasurable might be more important than the measurable. Quantification also often means simplification. This is especially true when considering quality, consumer satisfaction and the effectiveness of social services. (Jackson 1988) That is why the question is raised (Neely 2005) – how to develop dynamic rather than static measurement systems and how to ensure an appropriate focus on public organisation's performance management, rather than simply performance measurement.

All the developed countries have taken several steps towards performance oriented education polices. The Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD

(2007), like many other researches suggest that school headmasters should be given extensive authority, which leads to good school performance. Likewise, organised monitoring and evaluation evidence can be seen as more important in a decentralised than in a centralised system (Webb and Vulliamy 1998). With a view to motivate the autonomous local education providers to act in pupils' and parents' interests, competition is heightened between schools via the pupil based funding. To survive, every autonomous school should work with a quality improving management system. The key to this is a cycle of performance evaluation, feedback and improvement. Likewise, the schools accountability to the state as a subscriber of educational service as well as to local community and other stakeholders is increased. The lowest level of governance, with extensive autonomy, accountability and competition enables to overcome the difficulties concerning the evaluation of the offering performance of public sector's service, especially educational service. All that results in schools' bigger efforts in the interests of pupils. Wößmann et al. (2007) recent empirical analysis, based on PISA 2003 results, suggests that different facets of accountability, autonomy and choice are strongly associated with pupil achievement.

There is a survey carried out by OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) (2008) in 2007 among 25 OECD member states and candidate countries (including Estonia) in order to investigate the education legislation system in terms of decision making and accountability pattern in education systems. The survey shows that compared to other countries, Estonian general schools have relatively high authority of decision concerning the matters of school curricular, human resource management, development planning and budgeting. The vast majority (66%) of the decisions contained in the questionnaire have been delegated to the school level. A similar result could be seen only six countries (including Estonia) out of 25. 30% of the schools' organisational issues are being decided at local government's level. Less than 10% of the decisions employed in OECD questionnaire are being decided at the national level in 9 countries. In Estonia the corresponding figure is 4%, as well as in Hungary and in England, this is also the lowest level among all the surveyed.

In order to realise schools' accountability, both the state monitoring and social control of school activities have been increased. With the view to monitor school headmasters' and teachers' performance, national examination system, the school self- and external evaluation and the claim for schools for publicising schools' performance indicators has been introduced. Surveys carried out in 2007 among the OECD countries and candidate countries (including Estonia) (OECD 2008) show that school self- and external evaluation system is employed only in half of the countries surveyed (in 14 countries out of 29). The feedback received from self-evaluation directly influences school management decisions only in 11 countries and the feedback from self-evaluation is influential only in 9 countries. Thus the external and self-evaluation of schools' activities is not so wide spread in developed countries' educational policies and this field is relatively poorly studied as well. In Estonia the both, external and self-evaluation are being applied. The renewed self-evaluation system is compulsory for all the schools since 2010. Therefore, with its

highly decentralised education system, Estonia is an interesting example to investigate the performance evaluation policy in the educational system.

The implementation of systematic thinking in evaluation implies the creation of self-evaluation system, which integrates different areas and enables to evaluate the causalities of different activities and performance results. This all demands a new perspective, structure, target setting and systematic data collecting process, as well as determining performance indicators. But unfortunately the main hindrances for an educational institution are lack of knowledge, conservative attitudes, hopes for a universal and “ready-to-use” solution, and certainly human and material resources. Another problem is employees’ as well teachers’ resistance to the new management system, which is often said to result from an opposition to change. Thus perhaps one of the main challenges for the headmasters is to deal with change management, changing attitudes and understandings, and creating a unitary view in their school.

This paper purports to analyse the situation of schools self-evaluation based on the example of the Estonian educational sector and brings out the main problems on the basis of schools’ self-evaluation reports. The article consists of three main parts. Firstly the evaluation in educational sector is being discussed. The second paragraph describes the methodology of the analysis of this article. Thirdly, the findings of self-evaluation reports in 14 Estonian general schools are brought out aiming at assessing how well is the evaluation policy employed in Estonian educational system.

Evaluation in the educational sector

The term “evaluation” in management has broadened substantially over the years. Evaluation used to have a rather elementary and raw control function in which employees’ performances were given quantitative estimations by their superiors (Pratt 1991). Nowadays it also includes several activities by means of which the organisation tries to evaluate, train, develop and promote its employees, as well as improve the organisations effectiveness. Also rewards are provided for efficient work. (Mani 2002) The aim of evaluation has shifted towards self-evaluation, development and motivation, and is more directed to the present and the future rather than the past (Sisehindamise... 2009). Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation criteria and methods (development interviews and group work) are important, and the evaluator and the evaluatee are more like partners who respect and accept each other.

For many years school evaluation has been tantamount to external evaluation, performed by the professional evaluators or inspectors with a view to find out if schools are fulfilling their duties. At the same time it is hoped that such external evaluations would motivate teachers and school headmasters to work harder in order to improve their schools. (Nevo 2001) There are both pros and cons to external evaluation. The most commonly mentioned disadvantage is the inability of the external evaluator to give an objective estimation because he/she does not fully know and understand the context and the fear that comes with it. At the same time

external evaluation provides schools considerable information from the outsider's perspective.

An external evaluation is performed by an evaluator or a group of evaluators who are not the employees of the particular school. External evaluators might be the state department of education or the ministry of education, using professional evaluators or regional inspectors, school district, or a district/state/national evaluation department. An external evaluation of the school could also be conducted by an independent evaluation consultant or evaluation firm, commissioned by the school itself or its governing board. (Nevo 2001) The purpose of external evaluation is to give schools and its headmasters' feedback on the school's activity and performance (Kitsing 2008).

The external evaluation of schools is also carried out through nationally developed standardised tests and examinations. Tests and examinations, performed on a uniform basis give schools and teachers an opportunity to assess and compare their pupils' academic performance nationwide. On the other hand, external evaluation of the results provides an input to the planning of changes in the national curriculum, textbooks, and teacher training.

Although school evaluation used to be seen as tantamount to external evaluation, nowadays it is seen as more of a supportive device allowing the more autonomous schools to view their performance through the external perspective. Thus external evaluation provides additional information to schools management, helps seeing themselves from different perspectives. It gives the needed information for comparison, broadening and deepening a school's self-knowledge. (Swaffield, 2005)

In order to increase schools' social responsibility, the results of external evaluation should be made public (Tolofari 2005). This also supports competition between schools, since the results provide more information about schools for parents and usually parents have an opportunity to choose the school for their children. This is also the practise in Estonian education policy, that schools are being evaluated based on the results of national exams and standardised tests which are public information. However, ranking schools by these principles may be dangerous, because schools and teachers may become too obsessive about focusing on just raising tests' and examinations' results (Bay *et al.* 1999). Bevan and Hood (2006) have pointed out that in order to show better results for public, organisations may depart from the recognition on behalf of dishonestly influence the results. At the same time, different schools may not be comparable to the results of a variety of reasons. Tiit (2006), Kass (2007), Piirpuu (2007), Koorits and Kuus (2007) have found that behaviour like this has led to dissatisfaction among parents, teachers and school administrators in Estonia.

The schools which have a larger autonomy are often funded by the central governments per capita. They must compete for higher budget, ensuring the best possible learning and development conditions for pupils. Likewise they have recently started to evaluate and analyse their activities more systematically. More

attention is now given to self-evaluation which is implemented alongside external evaluation. Schools' inclination to engage in self-evaluation emanates from the changing policy environment, the increasing and intense demands for change, and the new competition for pupils (Glasman *et al.* 2002). With a view to turn educational institutions' attention to the need for self-evaluation in school development, self-evaluation is one of the main priorities of states general education policy in Estonia starting from 2001.

Self-evaluation can be defined as a continuous and systematic analysis of learning processes, as well as school management and performance evaluation for making strategic decisions about managing the pupils' and school's development. Swaffield and MacBeath (2005) determine school self-evaluation as something that schools do to themselves, by themselves and for themselves. Through self-evaluation, educational institutions' strengths and weaknesses are determined; development and action plans compiled. As Towler and Broadfoot (1992) point out, reflection and evaluation can encourage understanding of what is expected, improve motivation, lead to pride in positive achievement and offer a realistic appraisal of weaknesses. Thus professional self-evaluation should bargain the sustainable development of a school.

The idea of self-evaluation is not to evaluate individuals but processes, and the results are used for creating unity, not to bring out the peculiarities of different individuals. Likewise, self-evaluation is not only about evaluating yourself but consists of evaluating others and also others evaluating you (Lilleste 2007). Self-evaluation is needed to introduce changes in schools and evaluate those actions. It is especially important in the event of rapid changes. Regular evaluation (once a year on average) enables to fixate the organisation's shape, to bring out the dynamics of change, the organisations' problems and its needs for development, also development strategies are specified. Furthermore, self-evaluation allows to see the development of employees and to find out the effectiveness of methods employed during changes. Studies emphasise that the most resultant is self-evaluation process itself rather than specific results.

Literature makes it clear that the context for school self-evaluation is school improvement. But school improvement is defined in various ways. One of the most common views is also pointed out by Saunders (1999), who defines school improvement to all intents and purposes as raising the standards of pupils' performance. Thus working explicitly towards specific measurable improvement year-on-year in pupils' test and examination results is the main idea behind school improvement which can be achieved through evaluation. In the authors opinion this is quite a narrow viewpoint. Academic results are certainly important, but general skills, which are not expressed in test results, also need to be taken into consideration. It is often said that general skills are those that constitute a person's success in the future rather than his/her grades in school.

Self-evaluation implies the selection of appraisal objects and subjects and the use of fitting appraisal criteria and methods. The objects of self-evaluation can be schools'

objectives, the arrangement and the results of the learning process, schools' microclimate and image, teachers' teaching activities and pupils' learning process or the performance of the school's headmaster. The subjects are evaluators themselves. (Aro 2006)

Self-evaluation is not only seen as a good mean of development for a school in general, but for individuals as well. A study of Kyriakides *et al.* (2002) showed that teachers were interested in identifying mechanisms for measuring their performance. They initially suggested that the measuring of their performance could be achieved through a self-evaluation procedure. Some teachers suggested that their efficiency could also be measured by asking pupils and/or parents to express their views. However, this suggestion was not accepted by all teachers. Self-evaluation raises the awareness and responsibility of the teachers and increases the self-respect for their achievements. It also encourages teachers to develop themselves and to apply their competence creatively. In general, there are three values connected with teachers' self-evaluation (Kyriakides *et al.* 2002):

- 1) Teachers are seen as natural learners through the methods they use and the way they behave. They learn and acknowledge when their actions are effective for their pupils;
- 2) Authentic development must come primarily from within the school;
- 3) The preferred mode of commitment arises from ownership of the development process. Asking teachers to name a number of qualities that characterise an efficient teacher gives them the opportunity to reflect upon their work and decide who among them are efficient and who are not.

Accordingly, there is a need for encouraging teachers' involvement in the formation and evaluation of their own school policy of efficiency. Teachers' involvement is crucial not only in the implementation of school policy, but also in its planning and evaluation. One of the common flaws is that organisations are focusing only on the creation process of the performance evaluation system, but they forget to enhance the communication and employees' involvement. The evaluation system works only if it is an integral part of the school's culture; is seen to be fair and open; understood by everyone and based on shared commitment to supporting continuous improvement and recognising success (Performance... 2000). If it is not done this way, evaluation systems will not work even when they are suitable and reflect the organisation's objectives, strategy and other important processes accurately. Likewise, Marsden and French (1998) claim in their study that teachers' resistance to the new performance management system results from their resistance to changes. Employees should not only be aware of the objectives, business plan and evaluation system, but they should also have the opportunity to contribute to their formation.

Hence, by means of the teachers' involvement in the self-evaluation process, they become more sensitive and feel commitment towards matters concerning their work. Thereby the teachers' professional development can be promoted. Recent research carried out by McKinsey&Company (2007) acknowledges that the most important factor of pupil performance is the quality of instruction and teachers. Hanushek and Rivkin (2003) suggest that the magnitude of estimated differences in teacher quality

is extensive. This is why promotion of schools' self-evaluation has a crucial importance when implementing the policies that affect pupil achievement.

The authors emphasise that the implementation of self-evaluation in a school demands a certain framework, where schools have a broader autonomy to create their own policy while also state support in regard to knowledge and practical guidance materials should be present. It is impossible to use one and the same self-evaluation system in all schools because an evaluation system becomes useful and reliable only when it is implemented in accordance with school context and characteristics. Therefore both the external and internal environment of the school should be taken into account. Saunders (1999) points out the conditions that need to be considered while implementing reliable self-evaluation, which must be:

- democratic - promote democratic beliefs and practices through consultation and negotiation;
- responsible - the learning, success and happiness of all pupils are emphasised;
- involve teachers, pupils, parents (and other stakeholders);
- allow for the participation of a critical perspective;
- based on trust, teamwork, ownership and fun, as well as on clear objectives and procedures;
- aim to understand people's real-life experiences, vested interests, as well as to analyse data;
- shared with participants, from setting out the aims to disseminating the outcomes.

Despite the positive gains from school self-evaluation there are also many objections to self-evaluation. Sedikides (1993) argues that the self-evaluation process is likely to be motivating. Individuals involved in self-evaluation strive to enhance the positivism of their self-conceptions or protect the self from negative information. For that reason, people process information relevant to them selectively. For example, people tend to focus on information that has favourable implications for themselves and avoid information with unfavourable implications. But Dunning *et al.* (2004) argue that people rarely have all the information they need to render accurate self-judgments. Therefore, achieving accurate self-knowledge is an inherently difficult task. Secondly, people tend to neglect information which leads them to assessments worse than they are capable of, people overestimate themselves. Likewise, Fitzgerald, White and Gruppen (2003) studied medical students' ability to self-assess their performance. As a conclusion they found that when the task was one in which the students had limited experience, self-assessment accuracy suffered, as did performance.

Thus every evaluation method has its error rate but it can be solved by implementing extra evaluation methods. Therefore it is argued that self-evaluation should be used alongside external evaluation. The authors of this article emphasise that an evaluation system works best if implemented rightly. And because many schools are starting to use performance evaluation, it is vital for the school headmasters to manage the changes happening in their schools. It is time for the schools to start introducing future changes and involving school members in the creation process of

performance evaluation systems. Certainly one must not forget the important role of the policymakers, who are responsible for creating the necessary infrastructure for schools. The authors emphasise the policymaker's role in doing lobbyism among school headmasters and other stakeholders with the view to make them realise the importance and necessity of new political perspective to their school. Likewise, they need to create the framework for employing new policies, i.e. self-evaluation. Their responsibility is to ensure schools with financial resources and know how as well creating a network between all stakeholders while implementing new educational policies. Thus the cooperation between policymakers, headmasters, teachers and other schools' stakeholders is crucial in successful implementation of changes.

External vs. self-evaluation

Nevo (2001) elicits that in many educational systems, "everybody seems to hate external evaluation while nobody trusts self-evaluation". At the same time there is proof that self-evaluation has more positive effects for schools. For example, a study by Webb and Vulliamy (1998) showed that external evaluation inspections can cause loss of confidence, feelings of inadequacy, deprofessionalisation and extreme anxiety, which combined with exhaustion from the intensification of work and stress, can halt the creativity and development even of schools deemed successful and render them debilitated. At the same time, schools who implemented self-evaluation despite all the limitations of school self-evaluation, had ownership over their methods of data collection and analysis as well as commitment to respond to evaluation findings, which led to direct and immediate changes in practice.

However, it is essential to mention that despite the development of self-evaluation, schools' external evaluation is also important and one cannot substitute the other. Nevo argued that both types of evaluation are needed as they both have important roles in the development of schools, teachers and educational systems. The results of external evaluations of school performance provide valuable additional input for the school's self-evaluation system. For example, in Finland the National Board of Education has been seeking ways of utilising external evaluation in addition to promoting school self-evaluation, in order to obtain an overview of the impact of the reforms in education policy and to improve the comparability of standards between schools by providing schools with both a broad frame of reference and specific benchmarks against which to judge their own performance. (Webb and Vulliamy 1998). Thus, there are also signs in Finland that the move to a culture of school self-evaluation will be accompanied by serious efforts to systematise the use of external evaluation and to provide national evaluation of school achievements.

Since 1997 the Estonian educational sector has implemented the external evaluation of pupils' achievement. Since 2006 the self-evaluation of education institutions has been legitimated. At the same time the role of the external evaluation of education institutions was reduced. Today, an external evaluation consists of the evaluation of study results and it is conducted by means of national examinations and final examinations and national standardised tests.

According to the law, (Basic... 1993) the self-evaluation of schools is an ongoing process, designed to ensure the schools consistent development and supporting the development of pupils. The results of self-evaluation give an input for elaboration of school development and action plans. School headmasters have an important role to play, because they introduce the order for the self-evaluation process. During self-evaluation teaching and learning process, school management and their performance is being evaluated. Schools are obligated to conduct a self-evaluation report least once in every three school years and to submit it to the Estonian Ministry of Education and Research. The report is approved by the school's headmaster and coordinated by the school's board which consists of the representatives of parents, local government, pupils and teachers.

The self-evaluation reports should be based on educational institution's performance indicators, which are elaborated by the ministry of Education and Research and are available to everyone through the Education Information System. The self-evaluation should be conducted based on the following aspects:

- 1) leadership and management, including strategic management;
- 2) human resource management, including the need-for-staff evaluation, recruitment, involvement, support, development, evaluation and motivation of staff in the results, including the achievements of staff, training, satisfaction, personnel statistics;
- 3) cooperation with stakeholders, stakeholder involvement, cooperation with stakeholders and interested parties relating to the evaluation results, including the school board, parents and other stakeholders in activity, publicity, involvement in decision-making, feedback and satisfaction;
- 4) resource management, including budgetary, material and technical basis for the development of information resources management, sustainable management and the environment;
- 5) teaching and learning process, including the pupil development, curriculum, teaching arrangements and methods, values and ethics, results of the pupils, including pupils with special educational needs, recreational activities, health, statistics of pupils, pupils satisfaction and performance.

The findings of external evaluation in Estonia are met as one input of the self-evaluation process. The central level, ministries role is to ensure the reliable results of evaluation (as well as external, as the self-evaluation). (Kitsing 2008) Self-evaluation reliability should be provided via elaboration of functional system of self-evaluation in schools. The system involves as well as manuals to school leaders and other stakeholders as well the assistance of schools by trained advisors. This advice is intended to provide recommendations about the implementation and the analysis of the results of self-evaluation analysis and the revision, whether everything is done according to the law.

As discussed previously, the changes in the institutional arrangements of the educational systems have led to schools' greater autonomy and larger accountability to society. In turn, this has led to a reduction in schools external evaluation intensity, and more effort is put on schools' self-evaluation. The extensive performance

evaluation in schools must be accompanied by changes in the responsibilities of school headmasters, teachers and other stakeholders, as well organisational climate. Tolofari (2005), has investigated the England's and Scotland's education systems, where the schools are given large authority in managing. They have outlined the structural changes in England's and Scotland's schools and relationship of schools to the wider society as follows:

1. Roles and relationships have changed both within the school and between the school and its environment. For instance, staff participation in decision making, devolved management of schools, statutory powers have been given to parents to be involved in the decision-making process, more intensive collaboration with stakeholders.
2. Pattern of governance – schools themselves now exercise most powers, including planning and budgeting, resource allocation, hiring and firing, as well as evaluation and monitoring.
3. The flow of resources – The number of pupils a school has on its lists determines directly the size of its budget. Schools must compete with each other in attracting pupils.
4. Pattern of accountability – accountability to parents and other stakeholders is emphasised. Teachers are also to be accountable to each other.
5. Headmasters' roles – the headmaster is now more of a manager, in the business style, therefore there is a need for new skills in finance, budgeting, etc., and to spend more time on managing performance and the outward image of the school.
6. The educational and other values that underpin schooling – there is a divergence between the social and cultural values of schooling and managerialism. The impact of managerialism is that the emphasis on performance and output measures and resource management has diminished the traditional collegiality within the teaching profession.

Concerning state policy, the authors emphasise that external evaluation concentrates mostly on inputs and outputs and self-evaluation on outcomes. Because schools' main objective is to offer a good outcome for the society, the role of governmental appraisal should be decreased and instead appraisal based on schools' performance should be valued more highly. It is important to emphasise, however, that self- and external evaluation must become much more mutually supportive and integrated. The synergy must be achieved. Synergy of self- and external evaluation stands for the integration of knowledge and experience coming from different sources and people (Syneva 2007). In a process which creates synergy between self- and external evaluation, the visions of different parties should be shared. The visions are essential because they give directions to the purpose of the evaluation.

Methodology

The empirical part of this article consists of two studies employed in Estonian education sector. The authors have chosen to analyse the Estonian schools, because the analysis of the institutional arrangement of educational system shows that Estonia is quite an interesting example of reforming the educational system in a

developed country. Because of the fact that the Estonian educational system is strongly based on the approaches that have proven to be performance-enhancing, the analysis gives an overview and information to those countries that have not reached so far with the restructuring of the educational system. As the analysis of OECD surveys' results show, the organisation of the Estonian educational sector is a good example for many countries. As discussed previously, the extensive decentralisation of educational sector must be accompanied with school's internal changes – changes in organisational climate, in teachers' and headmasters' competencies and in organisational mindset to ensure the accountability to society and competitive education. These changes are described by Tolofari (2005). Have these changes been taken place as well in Estonian schools, which have been operating relatively autonomously, that will be examined in the next section.

Firstly, the authors analysed the self-evaluation reports prepared in Estonian general schools in 2008. To be more precise, authors analysed the Estonian schools' self-evaluation reports to see whether the structural changes, outlined by Tolofari (2005) – the relationships and roles, patterns of governance and accountability, flow of resources, the headmaster's role, change of educational and other values – have taken place in Estonian schools, in order to provide education service responding to the high expectations of contemporary society.

Although the newly elaborated self-evaluation system is compulsory for the Estonian general schools from 2010, there is already an opportunity to analyse the results of the test-period. This gives an opportunity to appraise the shortcomings of the Estonian general education policy and therefore enables to develop solutions for overcoming them. As the participation in this study was voluntary, only 14 schools participated in this process, which is an important limitation of this study. Only the reports of the schools who participated voluntarily in the trial project could be analysed. Therefore further study should be implemented when all the schools have already practiced self-evaluation as a management mean.

The authors compared these results with a second study – pilot study employed in Estonian general educational schools in 2009. The research was carried out in May 2009 and was executed in five stages:

- 1) collecting background information;
- 2) compiling a questionnaire;
- 3) testing of the questionnaire;
- 4) selecting schools and implementing the research;
- 5) analysing the data.

In the first stage, background information about Estonian educational field was collected. Secondly the questionnaire was compiled based on the gathered information and practices. Before implementing it, the questionnaire was tested among some headmasters and teachers. All the questions that were not understood were redefined. In this stage, the technical solutions for implementing the research were also carried out. Fourthly, authors selected randomly eleven schools from three Estonian counties where the research was held. Altogether 10 Estonian general

schools from three different counties – Lääne (3), Viljandi (4) and Tartu County (3), and one vocational school from Tartu County participated in this research. These schools were selected randomly and all schools' headmasters were contacted by the phone and e-mail. Headmasters informed the teachers about the inquiry who then voluntarily participated in it. In order to achieve the goal of this research, both, headmasters' and teachers' opinions were discovered and compared to each other.

The inquiry was held electronically, while teachers and headmasters had an opportunity to fill out the questionnaire online, via internet. For the research, electronic solution called eFormular was used. It is a unique tool providing possibility for creating electronic forms (eFormulars) and conducting surveys via the Internet. The questionnaire consisted of both open and closed questions. The answers to the closed questions were given in 5-point scale (1 – do not agree at all; 2 – rather do not agree; 3 – hard to evaluate, do not actually know; 4 – rather agree; 5 – totally agree). There was also a possibility to answer 0 which stood for having no information or ineptitude to answer. Altogether 51 teachers and 11 headmasters participated in this inquiry. The data was analysed by Microsoft Office Excel and based on this research recommendations for improving the questionnaire for future research in all Estonian general and vocational schools were made.

Findings of the analysis of self-evaluation reports

In 2008, a new model of self-evaluation for Estonian educational institutions was introduced. The first analysis of the Estonian educational sector's self-evaluation system was executed in 14 Estonian general schools in 2008. The authors analysed these self-evaluation reports to see whether the management principles applied in the Estonian education system are in accordance with the principles viewed by Tolofari (2005), who have outlined the performance oriented structural changes in autonomous schools as follows:

- 1) Changed roles and relationships,
- 2) New pattern of governance,
- 3) The flow of resources,
- 4) The accountability,
- 5) Headmasters' role.
- 6) The educational and other values that underpin schooling.

The results of the analysis can be seen below in the table 1. Firstly, it can be seen, that the relationships and roles in Estonian general schools have not changed much. The Estonian schools' self-evaluation reports show that teachers do not understand their role as a school developer. Teachers are only partly involved in the creation and implementation process of self-evaluation, while the development planning and appraising has so far been quite management centred. For example there was only one school where most of the decisions were previously discussed and decided in teams based on consensus. Likewise, there were only three schools where most of the schools' personnel was aware and understood the self-evaluation system and knew their role in the self-evaluation process.

Table 1. Results of the self-evaluation reports

| Number of schools giving the positive answer (N=14) | |
|--|---|
| Roles and relationships | |
| Most of the decisions are previously discussed and decided in teams based on consensus. | 1 |
| Schools' personnel is aware and understands the self-evaluation system. | 3 |
| Schools' personnel know their role in the self-evaluation process. | 3 |
| School implements the concept of learning organisation while its development and evaluation. | 3 |
| School has determined its stakeholders. | 3 |
| School has involved all important stakeholders in the self-evaluation process. | 8 |
| Pattern of governance and the flow of resources | |
| School has a great autonomy in managing its budget and resources. | 9 |
| Local authorities dictate schools' costs, teachers' salaries and workload, and school budget. | 5 |
| Pattern of accountability | |
| School is routinely interested in parents' expectations and needs. | 3 |
| School is conducting satisfaction surveys among parents. | 3 |
| School is dealing with external stakeholders by conducting surveys among its alumni. | 1 |
| School is compiling leaflets for giving feedback to its stakeholders. | 1 |
| The board of pupils conducts satisfaction surveys among fellow pupils. | 1 |
| The board of pupils analyses and presents the results of the surveys to school management. | 1 |
| Schools' approach to arranging the learning process is motivated by a wish to reach every pupil and offer them help to emphasise their individuality and raise their academic performance. | 6 |
| Teachers have active and positive attitude towards changes and learning. | 2 |
| Teachers are willing to compare their work performance with colleagues. | 2 |
| Regularly conduct development interviews which enable feedback for improving school management and performance. | 3 |
| Headmasters' roles | |
| School's headmaster is a leader in developing school development, self-evaluation and teamwork. | 4 |
| School has defined the main objectives of self-evaluation. | 3 |
| Schools have selected the evaluation criteria and methods to employ self-evaluation. | 2 |
| The educational and other values that underpin schooling | |
| School has determined its values and traditions. | 3 |
| Defined values are shared among school personnel. | 3 |

The second study illustrated the same results (see the table 2). Only half (54%) of the teachers confirmed that they were involved to the creation process of teachers' performance appraisal system; 30% of them could not evaluate it and 12% did not agree with that claim. While teachers are not sufficiently involved to the creation process of performance appraisal, dissatisfaction and negative attitudes are more common. Only half (52%) of the teachers answered that the performance appraisal system and its principles were well understood. At the same time this opinion is shared by 82% of the headmasters. Altogether 12% of the answered teachers shared an opinion that they do not understand the appraisal system implemented in their

school. Thus the headmasters' opinion concerning evaluation is much more positive. This result was predictable, because headmasters are those who are responsible for the creation and development of these systems in Estonia and they also decide whether and how much they involve their subordinates into this process.

Table 2. Results of the pilot study – appraisal process (N(HM)=11; N(T)=51)

| Claim | Totally and rather agree (%) | | Hard to evaluate (%) | | Rather do not or do not agree at all (%) | | Do not know; do not have information (%) | |
|--|------------------------------|----|----------------------|----|--|----|--|---|
| | HM | T | HM | T | HM | T | HM | T |
| The appraisal process of teachers' work performance and activities is organised systematically. | 82 | 69 | 18 | 22 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| The performance appraisal system and its principles implemented in our school to appraise teachers' performance are well understood. | 81 | 52 | 18 | 34 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 2 |
| In our school, teachers are involved to the process of creating performance appraisal system. | 73 | 54 | 18 | 30 | 9 | 12 | 0 | 4 |
| The appraisal system used in our school enables to appraise teachers' work fairly. | 73 | 44 | 27 | 32 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 6 |

* HM- headmasters; T- teachers.

0 - do not know, do not have information; 1 – do not agree at all; 2 – rather do not agree; 3 – hard to evaluate, do not actually know; 4 – rather agree; 5 – totally agree

Teachers should be more involved in the discussion of the school's vision and values, and their awareness of the self-evaluation and the role that personnel has in it must be increased. Also raising teachers' awareness of the organisational theory (e.g. learning organisation) and different methods of self-evaluation is essential. Only three of the analysed schools implemented the concept of learning organisation while developing and evaluating their schools.

The results of schools self-evaluation also show that there is a need to determine the organisation's stakeholders more clearly. Only three schools who participated in the self-evaluation trial period had determined its stakeholders. At the same time it is quite interesting that 8 schools out of 14 stated that they involved all important stakeholders in the self-evaluation process while they had not even determined who those interested parties that should be involved in important processes were. Furthermore, there is a need for schools to set the purposes of co-operation, to plan and implement it, and evaluate the efficiency of the co-operation with stakeholders. Today we can say that the number of schools' stakeholders is too varied and co-operation is rather random. It is also interesting to point out that schools do not see co-operation with stakeholders as being in their interests. The modest results in

public relations may imply that schools are not aware of the impact of public relations to educational institutions' development and reputation.

While talking about structural changes in the pattern of governance and the flow of resources, schools' increased power is being discussed. In Estonia, schools and local governments are largely responsible for organising educational system. They have quite a broad autonomy in regard to making their own decisions. The law says that schools should deal with planning and budgeting, they manage their resources, as well as make their own decisions about whom to hire or fire. Likewise there has been an increase in the competition between schools, and mostly because of the flow of resources. Starting from 2001 the main factor for allocating money to schools from the central government's budget in Estonia is the number of pupils in the school or region. On even terms with public general schools the private general schools are also subsidised from the state's budget. That increases the competition between local authorities who determine their schools' budgets. But although the survey of OECD showed that schools in Estonia should have great autonomy in managing their budget and resources, the self-evaluation reports show that the headmasters' opportunities in managing resources vary enormously, because often the local authorities dictate schools' budget, costs, teachers' salaries and workload, and school budget. Therefore the authors imply that the efficiency of resource management is difficult to evaluate.

Thirdly, concerning the pattern of accountability, the management of Estonian schools has so far been organised externally through the council, which has a mainly consultative role. The self-evaluation system, which involves the schools' stakeholders like the local authorities, parents etc, is unfortunately not systematic enough. For example, only three schools out of 14 are routinely interested in parents' expectations and needs and are conducting satisfaction surveys among parents. Likewise, only one school is dealing with external stakeholders by conducting surveys among the alumni of the school and compiling leaflets for giving feedback to stakeholders. At the same time there is also one school where the board of pupils conducts satisfaction surveys among fellow pupils, analyses and presents the results of the surveys to school management with a view to improve the school's learning process, security and microclimate. Despite the quite modest results in involving parents and pupils, more than half (6) of the schools indicated that their approach to arranging the learning process is motivated by a wish to reach every pupil and offer them help to emphasise their individuality and raise their academic performance. While the new structural changes in the pattern of accountability should also include teachers being accountable to each other, only two schools admit that their teachers have active and positive attitude towards changes and learning and they are willing to compare their work performance with colleagues. There are only three schools that regularly conduct development interviews which enable feedback for improving school management and teachers performance.

The second study showed (see the table 3) that schools mainly take into account the results of satisfaction surveys while planning its activities. 78% on teachers totally or rather agree with that claim and 92% of the headmasters share this opinion. More

than half of the teachers (58%) and 67% of headmasters participated in this pilot claimed that their school is regularly communicating with its alumni. 14% of teachers disagreed with this claim.

One again it is possible to conclude that headmasters have a much positive opinion compared to teachers. A little problematic is that 18% of the teachers could not evaluate whether it is true that school takes into account the results of satisfaction surveys and in the opinion of 26% teachers, they cannot evaluate whether teachers' opinions and proposals for school development and management are important to school managers. This might be a sign of miscommunication or that schools have not conducted such inquiries at all.

Table 3. Schools relationship with its stakeholders (N(HM)=11; N(T)=51)

| Claim | Totally and rather agree (%) | | Hard to evaluate (%) | | Rather do not or do not agree at all (%) | | Do not know; do not have information (%) | |
|--|------------------------------|----|----------------------|----|--|----|--|---|
| | HM | T | HM | T | HM | T | HM | T |
| While planning its activities, school takes into account the results of satisfaction surveys conducted among pupils and parents. | 92 | 78 | 8 | 18 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Teachers' opinions and proposals for school development and management are important to school managers. | 100 | 66 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| School is regularly communicating with its alumni | 67 | 58 | 33 | 22 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 6 |

* HM- headmasters; T- teachers.

** 0 - do not know, do not have information; 1 – do not agree at all; 2 – rather do not agree; 3 – hard to evaluate, do not actually know; 4 – rather agree; 5 – totally agree

The authors of this article discuss the structural changes of educational and other values that underpin schooling. The external evaluation system has been in use since 1997 in Estonia. It consists of schools' inspection, national academic standardised tests and national examinations. Based on OECD's comparative study, schools get a lot of information and feedback on their performance from those sources. Lately also the results of OECD PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) survey have been added to that feedback, where Estonian pupils' performance was assessed very highly. However, the evaluation of pupils' development in the learning process and acknowledging those results needs much more attention. So far, the pupils' development is seen only through academic performance (exams and academic placement tests). 58% of the teachers participated in the second study claimed that while analysing schools learning and teaching process they are analysing the results of national exams. Therefore the efficiency of learning must be viewed more broadly and schools must also analyse whether the supporting systems are implemented correctly and how efficient they are. The analysis shows that the

supporting systems have been well applied but resources' impacts that are directed to supporting systems are often not evaluated. Likewise, the development of school curriculum is weakly related to the evaluation of pupils' development, personnel's development and extra-curricular activities. Also the relations between the school's defined main values and the learning process are lacking. For example, only three of the analysed schools (via the self-evaluation reports) had determined their values and traditions and that these values were shared among school personnel.

Schools' self- and external evaluation is supported by the Estonian Education Information System's database. Each school has the opportunity to see the main indicators that constitute schools' performance and also to compare their results to other similar schools. The self-evaluation report's analysis shows that schools lack the knowledge and skills to understand these performance indicators and therefore they cannot make any conclusions based on that data, and also they are not able to plan improvement activities.

Last but not least, the headmasters' role has broadened; they are now more seen as managers of the organisation. Unfortunately the analyses of Estonian schools' self-evaluation reports imply that the headmasters' knowledge in leadership and management is lacking. The managers of educational institutions need more support in acknowledging the role of leadership and in viewing the connections between leadership and other criteria and results. For example, only four schools admitted that their headmaster is a leader in developing school development, self-appraisal and teamwork. The headmasters admit that they would need more support in setting measurable objectives. The self-evaluation reports showed that only three schools have defined the main objectives of self-evaluation; likewise, only in two schools have the evaluation criteria and methods been selected.

As a result, authors may imply that the situation with self-evaluation in Estonian general schools is not so positive. Schools have a lot to do and they need the support from the state. Likewise headmasters should be aware what the benefits from self-evaluation is and how could they increase school's performance in general. But because self-evaluation was not compulsory for Estonian schools until 2010, many schools have not dealt with this topic yet. Thus this research is also limited and needs further examination.

Conclusion

Self-evaluation in educational policy is seen as a priority in increasing the performance of general educational system. Swaffield and MacBeath (2005) determine school self-evaluation as something that schools do to themselves, by themselves and for themselves. As Towler and Broadfoot (1992) point out, reflection and evaluation can encourage understanding of what is expected, improve motivation, lead to pride in positive achievement and offer a realistic appraisal of weaknesses. Thus professional self-evaluation should guarantee the sustainable development of a school.

Although the analyses of OECD surveys' results show that the organising of the Estonian educational sector is a good example for many countries, the actual situation in schools is not as positive. There are high expectations put on schools by the policymakers' level, but schools do not have the ability to reach them. There is a lack of financial resources, knowledge and organisational willingness.

There should more cooperation and involvement of all the parties – policymakers, local governments, headmasters, teachers, parents and pupils. Because the implementation of new management means and policies usually come with reluctance and negative attitudes, the policymakers' responsibility is dealing with lobbying among school headmasters and other stakeholders. They should guarantee the necessary financial resources and framework for knowledge sharing, including the precise manuals to carry out self-evaluation.

Likewise headmasters' responsibility is to create the supportive organisational culture for employing new management means. But the problem is that although headmasters are the ones that impose regulations and orders for self-evaluation in their schools, there is a lack in their knowledge in doing it correctly. Also they are usually doing it by themselves, by not involving teachers and other stakeholders into this process. One of the common flaws is that organisations are focusing only on the creation process of the performance evaluation system, but they forget to enhance the communication and employees' involvement. Therefore headmasters should encourage teachers' involvement in the formation and evaluation of their own school policy of efficiency. The self-evaluation should not only be a formality in school but should be seen as a way of raising school performance and effectiveness. Otherwise schools do self-evaluation themselves, by themselves but not for themselves.

References

1. **Aro, V.** (2006). Enesehindamine enesehindamises. *Haridus* 1-2, lk 33-36.
2. **Barber, M., Mourshed, M.** (2007). *Kuidas maailma tulemuslikumad haridussüsteemid on jõudnud tippu*. McKinsey&Kompanii, OECD väljaanne, 62 p.
3. **Bay, J., Reys, B., Reys, R.** (1999). The top ten elements that must be in place to implement standards-based mathematics curricula. – *Phi Delta Kappan*, March, pp. 503-506.
4. Basic Schools and Upper Secondary Schools Act (Põhikooli- ja gümnaasiumiseadus) (1993). (RT I 1993, 63, 892), came into force in 10.10.1993.
5. **Bevan, G., Hood, C.** (2006). What's measured is what matters: targets and gaming in the english public health care system. – *Public Administration*, Vol. 84, No 3, pp. 517-538(22).
6. Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD (BIAC). (2007), "Discussion Points on school Leadership", working paper, OECD International Workshop OECD International Workshop on School Leadership Development Strategies 3rd Workshop of Participating Countries, Dublin November 7th 2007.

7. **Dunning, D., Heat, C., Suls, J. M.** (2004). Flawed Self Assessment: Implications for Health, Education, and the Workplace. – *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 69-106.
8. **Glasman, N., Cibulka, J., Ashby, D.** (2002). Program Self-Evaluation for Continuous Improvement. – *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No. 2, pp. 257-288.
9. **Hanushek, E. A., Rivkin, S.** (2003). Pay, working conditions, and teacher quality. – *The Future of Children*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 69-86.
10. **Jackson, P.** (1988). The Management of Performance in the Public Sector. – *Public Money & Management*, pp. 11-16.
11. **Kass, M.** (2007). Õpilasliidud: koolide pingereastamine on vale. – *Postimees*, 24.08.
12. **Koorits, V., Kuus, A.** (2007). Koolid jagunevad võitjateks ja kaotajateks. – *Postimees*, 04.12.
13. **Kyriakides, L., Campbell, R. J., Christofidou, E.** (2002). Generating Criteria for Measuring Teacher Effectiveness Through a Self-Evaluation Approach: A Complementary Way of Measuring Teacher Effectiveness. – *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 291-325.
14. **Lilleste, S.** (2008). Sisehindamissüsteem õppeasutuses. In *Õppeasutuse sisehindamine II*. Estonian Ministry of Education and Research, Tartu, pp. 10-19.
15. **Mani, B. G.** (2002). Performance Appraisal Systems, Productivity, and Motivation: A Case Study. – *Public Personnel Management*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 141-159.
16. **Marsden, D., French, S.** (1998). *What a Performance?: Performance Related Pay in the Public Services*. Centre for Economic Performance.
17. **Neely, A.** (2005). The Evolution of Performance Measurement Research: Developments in the Last Decade and a Research Agenda for the Next. – *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, Vol. 25, No. 12, pp. 1264-1277.
18. **Nevo, D.** (2001). School evaluation: internal or external? – *School of Education*, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel Studies in Educational Evaluation 27, 2001, pp. 95-106.
19. OECD. (2008). *Education at a Glance 2008*. Paris: OECD, 525 p.
20. *Performance Management in Schools: Performance Management Framework*. (2000). Guidance for Headteachers, Teachers & Governors.
21. **Piirpuu, M.** (2007). Kooli kvaliteet ei sõltu ainult riigieksamitulemustest. – *Postimees*, 30.08.
22. **Pratt, H. J.** (1991). Principles of effective performance management. – *Records Management Quarterly*, Vol. 25, Issue 1.
23. **Saunders, L.** (1999). Who or What is School 'Self'-Evaluation for? – *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 414-429.
24. **Sedikides, C.** (1993). Assessment, Enhancement, and Verification Determinants of the Self-Evaluation Process. – *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 65, No. 2, pp. 317-338.
25. *Sisehindamise rakendamisest haridusasutuses: Abiks juhile*. (2009). Riiklik Eksami- ja Kvalifikatsioonikeskus, Tallinn.

26. **Swaffield, S., MacBeath, J.** (2005). School self-evaluation and the role of a critical friend. – *Cambridge Journal of Education*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 239-252.
27. Syneva.net (2007). Quality Assurance through Synergy of Internal and External Evaluation of Schools. Its Impacts on Learning and Teaching.
28. **Tiit, E-M.** (2006). Koolide pingerida – kellele see on vajalik? – *Eesti Ekspress*, 07.09.
29. **Tolifari, S.** (2005). New Public Management and Education. – *Policy Futures in Education*, Vol. 3, No 1, pp. 75-89.
30. **Towler, L., Broadfoot, P.** (1992). Self-assessment in the primary school. – *Educational Review*, Vol. 44, Issue 2.
31. **Wößmann, L., Lüdemann, E., Schütz, G., West, M. R.** School Accountability, Autonomy, Choice, and the Level of Student Achievement - International Evidence from PISA 2003. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 13, OECD publishing, 86 p.
32. **Webb, R., Vulliamy, G.** (1998). External inspection or school self-evaluation? A comparative analysis of policy and practice in primary schools in England and Finland. – *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 24, Issue 5, pp. 539-557.

HARIDUSSÜSTEEMI JUHTIMINE LÄBI SISEHINDAMISE

Kristi Ploom, Reelika Irs
Tartu Ülikool

Tulemuslikkuse hindamine on erasektoris ulatuslikult levinud, avalikus sektoris hakati seda rakendama seoses tulemusjuhtimise rakendamisega. Nii era- kui avaliku sektori organisatsioonides on tulemuslikkuse hindamine vajalik selleks, et teha olemasoleva info põhjal tulevikku suunatud otsuseid lähtuvalt organisatsiooni eesmärkidest ja nende saavutamiseks kasutatud meetmetest. Haridussüsteemi tulemuslikkuse hindamine on keerukas selle eesmärkidevahelise konflikti ning oluliste positiivsete välismõjude tõttu. Ühelt poolt soovitakse saavutada suurepäraseid tulemusi – koolitada tarku kodanikke, kes panustaks riigi majandusarengusse, teisalt tuleb igapäevastele tagada võrdsed võimalused, rahvastiku sotsiaalne sidusus. Selliste eesmärkide täitmist on keeruline mõõta ja hinnanguid anda; veelgi keerulisem on kujundada hindamise põhjal hariduspoliitikat, kuna paljus on olulised pigem kvalitatiivsed väärtused.

Käesoleva artikli eesmärgiks on analüüsida, kuidas enesehindamise poliitika rakendamine Eesti haridussüsteemis on end õigustanud ja millised on peamised probleemid ning võimalikud lahendused. Selleks analüüsitakse haridussüsteemi enesehindamist¹ Eesti üldhariduskoolides ning tuuakse välja peamised probleemid, tuginedes koolide enesehindamise raportitele ning koolides läbiviidud küsitlustele. Artikkel koosneb kolmest osast. Esimeses osas antakse ülevaade nii enese- kui välishindamise olemusest haridussüsteemis. Detailsemalt keskendutakse enesehindamisele, kuna viimane on tunnustatud koolide tulemuslikkuse tagamisel eriti oluliseks. Teises osas kirjeldatakse meetodikat, mida rakendati Eesti koolide enesehindamissüsteemi analüüsimisel. Kolmandas osas tuuakse välja analüüsi peamised tulemused ja autorite poolsed soovitused.

Paljud arenenud riigid on vastutuse haridussüsteemi tulemuslikkuse eest delegeerinud koolidele. Tõdetakse, et kohaliku tasandi otsused tagavad ühiskonna suurema rahulolu ja kulutuste tõhususe. Et koolid tegutseksid maksimaalselt õpilaste ja nende vanemate huvides, tekitatakse koolide vahel konkurents, rakendades nii õpilasepõhist finantseerimissüsteemi kui vanemate ulatuslikku vabadust oma lapse kooli valiku osas. Samuti on suurendatud koolide tulemusvastutust nii ühiskonna kui riigi ehk hariduse finantseerijate ees. Selleks rakendatakse õppeasutuste enese- ja välishindamist ning riiklikult hinnatavaid eksameid ja tasemetöid. Wößmann et al. (2008) uurimus kinnitab, et selline haridussüsteemi institutsionaalne korraldus, mida iseloomustavad koolide ulatuslik autonoomia, tulemusvastutus ja konkurents, on tugevalt seotud ka õpilaste parema tulemuslikkusega.

¹ Kuigi Eesti seadusandlus ja vastavasisuline kirjandus räägib antud kontekstis koolide sisehindamisest, on autorite hinnangul tegu pigem enesehindamisega, vastava valdkonna teaduskirjanduse terminoloogia kontekstis.

OECD (*Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development*) (2008) liikmes- ja kandidaatriikide (sh Eesti) seas läbiviidud uuring näitab, et võrreldes teiste riikidega on Eesti üldhariduskoolidel seaduse tasandil määratud ulatuslik autonoomia otsustamaks kooli õppekorralduse, personalijuhtimise ja eelarve ning arenguga seotud küsimuste üle. Ka on Eestis rakendatud õppeasutuste enesehindamist kõrvuti välishindamisega, sh riiklikult hinnatavad eksamid ja tasemetööd, mis OECD uuringu kohaselt teistes arenenud riikides veel väga laialt levinud ei ole. Seega on Eesti ulatuslikult decentraliseeritud haridussüsteem huvitav näide uurimaks haridussüsteemi tulemuslikkuse hindamist.

Haridussüsteemi hindamisega seotud probleematika on tabavalt kokku võtnud Nevo (2001), väites, et keegi ei salli välishindamist, samal ajal kui keegi ei usalda enesehindamist. Kuigi koolide välishindamine (nt riiklikult väljatöötatud ühtsetel alustel eksamite korraldamine, koolitatud inspektorite poolt õppetundide külastamine) põhineb üldiselt objektiivsetel alustel, tekitab see koolides vastuseisu, enesetsalduse ja professionaalsuse langust (Webb and Vulliamy 1998). Uurimused kinnitavad, et koolide enesehindamisel on üldiselt tugevam positiivne mõju õpilaste õpitulemustele, kui välishindamisel. Ideaalis viivad enesehindamist läbi koolid ise, iseenda tarvis iseennast hinnates, eesmärgiga hinnata oma tugevusi ja nõrkusi ning seada arengu- ja tegevusplaanid paremate õpitulemuste saavutamiseks (Swaffield, MacBeath 2005). Hinnatakse mitte inimesi, vaid protsesse, et identifitseerida tegevused, mis tagavad tulemuslikkuse ning korrigeeritakse oma tegevust vastavalt sellele. Kui osalised ise tajuvad hindamisest saadavat kasu, motiveerib see neid ka enam tulemuslikkuse panustama. Nii toetab toimiv kooli enesehindamissüsteem ka õpetajate professionaalset arengut ja motiveerib neid enam õpilaste edusse panustama (Towler, Broadfoot 1992). Kuivõrd õpetajad on mitmete uuringute kohaselt (nt McKinsey&Company 2007; Rivkin 2003) olulisim tegur õpilaste heade õpitulemuste saavutamisel, on toimiva enesehindamissüsteemi oskuslik välja-töötamine ja rakendamine hariduspoliitika suureks väljakutseks.

Selleks, et kooli enesehindamissüsteem tagaks oodatud tulemuste saavutamise, on oluline selle väljatöötamisse kaasata ka õpetajad ja teised hindamisel osalevad huvigrupid. Enesehindamine peab olema oluline osa organisatsiooni kultuurist, igapäevase silmis õiglane, arusaadav ja läbipaistev ning põhinema jagatud vastutusel tulemuslikkuse ning edu saavutamise eest. (Performance... 2000) Lisaks sellele, et töötajad on teadlikud organisatsiooni eesmärkidest, juhtimis- ja hindamissüsteemist, peab meil olema ka võimalus nende väljatöötamisse ja arendamisse panustada. Vastasel juhul leiab kooli enesehindamissüsteem suure tõenäosusega vastuseisu õpetajate seas, nagu tõdesid Marsden ja French (1998) oma uurimuses.

Siiski on uurimusi, mis kinnitavad ka vastupidist. Sedikides (1993) väidab, et indiviidid püüavad hoiduda negatiivsest informatsioonist ja tõlgendavad infot endale sobival moel. Hoidutakse negatiivse ja ebameeldiva tunnustamisest, mistõttu kalduvad nad end pigem ülehindama (Dunning *et al.* 2004). Tuleb tõdeda, et igasugusel hindamisel on olemas veategur. Seetõttu on oluline läbi viia ka koolide välishindamist, nagu näiteks riiklikke eksameid ja tasemetööd, mis kajastavad õpitulemusi ühtsetel objektiivsetel alustel. Samas ei võimalda välishindamine

hinnata osaliste rahulolu ja teisi väärtusi, mis haridussüsteemi oodatud mõju – väärrika ühiskonna – saavutamise seisukohalt samuti olulised on. Kajastavad ju õpitulemused vaid haridussüsteemi vahetat väljundit. Seega on oluline, et koolide välis- ja enesehindamisest tekiks sünergia, et erinevatest allikatest pärinev info saaks ühendatud kooli arengu heaks (Syneva 2007). Et tulemuslikkuse hindamisest oodatud kasu saada, peavad muutuma koolijuhi, õpetajate ja teiste kooli huvigruppide rollid ja vastutus, organisatsiooni sisekliima. Tolofari (2005) on süstematiseerinud Inglismaa ja Šotimaa koolides toimunud struktuursed muudatused ning koolide suhted ühiskonnaga seoses koolide suurema autonoomiaga järgmiselt:

1. Muutunud rollid ja suhted – nii koolisiselt kui koolide ja väliskeskonna vahel. Kooli töötajad ja ka lapsevanemad osalevad kooli juhtimises, arengu planeerimises; koolidelt eeldatakse aktiivsemat koostööd huvigruppidega.
2. Haridussüsteemi juhtimismudel – koolid ise on olulisimad otsustajad, tegeledes eelarvestamise ja planeerimise, ressursijaotuse, personali värbamise ja valikuga, tulemuslikkuse hindamise, jälgimise ja edendamisega.
3. Uued rahastamis põhimõtted – kooli eelarve määrab õpilaste arv koolis. Koolid peavad üksteisega konkureerima, et olla õpilastele võimalikult atraktiivsed.
4. Tulemusvastutuse olulisus – tähtsustatakse koolide tulemusvastutust huvigruppide ja lapsevanemate ees. Ka õpetajad vastutavad üksteise ees.
5. Koolijuhi uus roll – koolijuhi amet sarnaneb enam äriettevõtte juhile, vajalikuks osutuvad teadmised finantseerimis-, eelarvestamis- ja juhtimis põhimõtetest. Enam tuleb tegeleda kooli tulemuslikkuse juhtimise ning välise positiivse imago kujundamisega.
6. Hariduslikud ja teised väärtused õpetamises – üha enam pööratakse tähelepanu tulemuslikkusele ja selle hindamisele ning ressursside juhtimisele. Kollegiaalsus, mis traditsiooniliselt õpetajaametiga kaasas käis, on vähenenud.

Eestis on alates 1997. aastast rakendatud õpitulemuste välishindamist. 2006. aastal seadustati uus õppeasutuste enesehindamise kord, mis alates 2010. aastast on kohustuslik kõikidele üldhariduskoolidele. Paralleelselt on vähendatud välis-hindamise osatähtsust, mis täna seisneb valdavalt õpitulemuste hindamises riiklike eksamite ja tasemetööde põhjal. Põhikooli- ja gümnaasiumiseaduse (Basic... 1993) kohaselt on koolide enesehindamise eesmärgiks tagada kooli jätkusuutlik areng ning toetada õpilaste arengut. Enesehindamise protsessi juhib koolis direktor, kes kinnitab ka kooli enesehindamise korra. Seaduses on ette nähtud, et koolide enesehindamine peab keskenduma järgmistele aspektidele:

1. eestvedamine ja juhtimine, strateegiline juhtimine;
2. personalijuhtimine;
3. koostöö huvigruppidega;
4. ressursside juhtimine;
5. õppe- ja kasvatusprotsess.

Antud artikli analüüsiosa on struktureeritud lähtuvalt Tolofari (2005) kirjeldatud muutustest, mis peaksid aset leidma autonoomselt tegutsevates koolides, et saavutada oodatud tulemuslikkus. Ehk täpsemalt, analüüsib tuuakse välja, mil määral on Eesti koolides muutunud rollid ja suhted, juhtimismudel, rahastamis põhimõtted,

tulemusvastutuse olulisus, koolijuhi roll ning muud väärtused õpetamises. Käesoleva artikli empiiriline osa tugineb kahele Eesti koolides läbiviidud uurimusele:

1. Analüüsiiti Eesti üldhariduskoolides 2008. aastal läbiviidud enesehindamise raporteid, mis põhinesid juba uuel enesehindamise korral. Kuna uus enesehindamise kord on koolidele kohustuslik alates 2010. aastast, oli antud artikli raames võimalik analüüsida vaid 14 kooli tulemusi, kes vabatahtlikult viisid enesehindamise läbi juba enne kohustuse tekkimist. Seetõttu tuleb tunnistada, et analüüsi tulemused on võrdlemisi piiratud väikese koolide arvuga, ning seda tuleks korraldada siis, kui kõikides koolides on enesehindamine läbi viidud.
2. Lisaks lülitati analüüsi teine uuring, mille pilootküsitlus viidi läbi Eesti üldhariduskoolides 2009. aasta mais. Elektroonilisele küsimustikule vastas kokku 51 õpetajat ja 11 koolijuhti 11st üldhariduskoolist, mis valiti välja juhuslikult.

Analüüsi tulemused näitavad, et koolisisesed suhted ja rollid ei ole Eesti koolides vajalikke muutusi läbi teinud. Õpetajad on ainult osaliselt kaasatud sisehindamissüsteemi väljatöötamisse ja enesehindamise läbiviimisse: vaid ühes koolis oli enamus otsuseid ühiselt läbi arutatud ja konsensuselise otsustatud. Ainult kolmes koolis tunnistasid õpetajad, et mõistavad enesehindamise vajadust ja tunnetavad enda olulisust selle läbiviimisel. Sama näitas ka teine, pilootuuring: vaid pooled õpetajad tunnistasid, et nad on olnud kaasatud oma kooli õpetajate tulemuslikkuse hindamissüsteemi väljatöötamisse ja et koolis rakendatavad tulemuslikkuse hindamise põhimõtted on neile arusaadavad. Samale küsimusele vastas positiivselt 82% kooli direktoritest. Seega on koolijuhtide suhtumine tulemuslikkuse hindamisse märksa positiivsem. Seda võis ka eeldada, kuna seaduse kohaselt vastutab enesehindamissüsteemi väljatöötamise eest koolidirektor, kes otsustab ka selle, millisel määral seejuures õpetajaid ja teisi sihtgrupe kaasata. Uuringud kinnitavad, et enesehindamissüsteemi juurutamisel organisatsioonides on peamiseks probleemiks see, et keskendutakse liialt hindamissüsteemi ja vastava raamistiku väljatöötamisele ning unustatakse kaasata töötajaid.

Enesehindamise raportite analüüs näitab, et koolid ei ole selgelt määratlenud oma huvigruppe – vaid kolm kooli olid määratlenud oma huvigrupid, samal ajal tödesid kaheksa kooli, et kõik nende huvigrupid olid kooli enesehindamisse kaasatud. Seega, kui koolid ei ole teadvustanud, kes on nende peamised huvigrupid, ei saa nad neid ka kooli juhtimisse kaasata. Võib järeldada, et koolid ei pea huvigruppide kaasamist kooli arendamisse oluliseks, samal ajal kui uuringud kinnitavad, et huvigruppide kaasamine kooli juhtimisse on tugevalt seotud kooli tulemuslikkusega.

Eesti haridussüsteemi juhtimismudel põhineb ulatuslikul kooli ja kohalike omavalitsuste autonoomial. Alates 2001. aastast finantseeritakse koole õpilasepõhiselt. Munitsipaalkoolidega samadel alustel rahastatakse ka üldhariduslikke erakoole. Seega on loodud konkurents mitte ainult munitsipaalkoolide vahel, vaid konkurentsituatsiooni süvendavad veel ka erakoolid. Seadus näeb ette, et koolijuht vastutab eelarve ja arengu planeerimise; personali värbamise ja valiku eest. Koolide enesehindamise tulemused näitavad aga, et koolijuhi otsustusvabadus varieerub ulatuslikult. Tihti dikteerib kohalik omavalitsus koolile detailse eelarve ja kulud, õpetajate palgamäärad ning töötingimused.

Tuleb tunnustada, et Eesti koolid ei teadvusta tulemusvastutuse olulisust – vaid kolm kooli 14st viisid läbi lapsevanemate seas rahulolu-uuringuid. Vaid ühes koolis korraldatakse õpilaste rahuloluküsitlusi, ja seda hoopis õpilaste eestvedamisel. Ainult kahes koolis tunnistasid õpetajad, et nad sooviksid oma töö tulemuslikkust oma kolleegidega võrrelda. Õpetajate arenguestlusi korraldatakse kõigest kolmes koolis. Teine, pilootuuring näitas, et koolid üldiselt arvestavad rahuloluküsitluste tulemusi oma tegevuste planeerimisel – nii vastas 78% õpetajatest ja 92% koolijuhtidest. Probleemaatiline on, et teatud hulk õpetajatest ei osanud öelda, kas õpetajate või õpilaste/lapsevanemate arvamustega on koolijuhtimisel arvestatud (vastuste osakaal õpetajate seas vastavalt 26% ja 18%). Sellised vastused viitavad arusaamatusele ning võib olla, et koolides ei korraldata rahuloluküsitlusi üldse.

Järgnevalt analüüsiti struktuurimuutusi ja hariduslikke väärtusi õpetamises. Koolide enesehindamise raportite analüüsist järeldub, et vaid kolmes koolis on määratletud kooli väärtused ja traditsioonid, mida jagavad ühtlasi ka kooli töötajad. Eestis on võrdlemisi pikka aega korraldatud riiklikke eksameid ja tasemetöid. 58% pilootuuringus osalenud õpetajatest tõdesid, et nad analüüsivad oma õpetamise tulemuslikkust riigieksamite ja tasemetööde tulemuste põhjal. Koolide enese- ja välishindamissüsteemi toetab Eesti Hariduse Infosüsteem, kust iga kooli kohta on võimalik näha nende peamisi tegevusnäitajaid ja neid ka teiste sarnaste koolidega võrrelda. Enesehindamise raportitest aga järeldub, et koolides on vajaka teadmistest ja oskustest nende tulemusindikaatorite tõlgendamisel.

Viimaks analüüsiti koolijuhi rolli Eesti üldhariduskoolides. Enesehindamise raportitest ilmnes, et koolijuhtidel napib juhtimisalaseid teadmisi. Vaid nelja kooli puhul leidis kinnitust, et koolidirektorit peetakse liidriks kooli arendamisel, enesehindamisel ja meeskonnatöö korraldamisel. Ka koolijuhid ise tunnustavad, et nad vajaksid enam tuge eesmärkide seadmisel ja tulemuslikkuse mõõtmisel. Vaid kolme end hinnanud kooli puhul olid määratletud peamised enesehindamise eesmärgid; vaid kahes olid määratletud enesehindamise kriteeriumid ja meetoodika.

Kokkuvõttes ei ole Eesti koolid valmis ulatuslikuks vastutuseks hariduse tulemuslikkuse eest, mille neile riiklik hariduspoliitika on neile on määranud. Koolidirektori amet on Eestis väga vastutusrikas ja eeldab temalt suurepäraselt juhtimiskompetentsi. Seega on äärmiselt vajalik riiklik tugi koolidele koolituste pakkumisel ning enesehindamise meetoodika väljatöötamisel ja rakendamisel. Koolijuhid peavad ennekõike ise uskuma enesehindamise kasulikkusesse ja mõistma selle rakendamispõhimõtteid ning eesmäärke. Nii, nagu koolijuhid peaksid tegema enam koostööd koolisisese enesehindamissüsteemi juurutamisel ja rakendamisel, peaksid ka poliitikakujundajad tegema koolidega tihedat koostööd, et tagada koolidele enesehindamise läbiviimiseks vajalikud ressursid, detailsed juhendmaterjalid ning teadmised. Alles siis on võimalik enesehindamist rakendada soovitud oodatud tulemused haridussüsteemis.