

Pedagogical meaning of teacher's evaluation*

Liliana Saavedra Rey

Sneider Saavedra Rey

Mg. of Education Pedagogica Nacional University

Abstract

The social context determined by neoliberal policies, has turned teacher's evaluation into results measurement practices, payments for merits and delivering reports unrelated to the complexity of the educative processes. In front of this situation, this article of reflection emphasizes the pedagogic meaning of evaluation as an activity of comprehension of teacher job, in order to overcome grading as a means of professional exclusion, and produce transformations that contribute to improve education processes.

With this purpose in mind, the characteristics of the context, origins of evaluation and the current educational demands are primarily considered. Secondly, a possible pedagogical meaning for these processes is proposed due to the repercussions on the subject formation. This leads to the discussion on the differences in grading and evaluating, emphasizing on the second one which derives in ten basic principles of pedagogical evaluation. Due to objectives in which the research is based, this proposal focuses on the teachers according to the importance of their educative labor so the payment for merit practices and delivering reports can be overcome. Finally, based on the study of the Colombian legislative framework in regard to this matter, evaluation for teachers transcending administrative and bureaucratic interests must be avoided. As a conclusion, beyond the techno instrumental rationality of current teachers' evaluation for salary adjustments, evaluation implies a constant that re-configures the act of human's formation.

Key words: Teachers' evaluation – Pedagogic evaluation, Law of evaluation Merit pay Accountability.

* Article of reflection derived from research Meaning of teacher evaluation parting from definition of complexity of teacher duties. An approach to their pedagogic resignification, presented graduation as a Master of Education from National Pedagogic University, distinguished as meritory, and was prepared within the research group Evauando_nos (Category C of Colciencias)

Introduction

Political transformations such as constitution of the neoliberal State (Diaz, 2000), its dynamics of privatization of the public sector, and bureaucratic in all social scopes (Diaz, 2007), have reoriented education system toward utilitary purposes, of insertion to certain social classes, and education projects determined by labor and business demand, (Barnett, 2001; Laval, 2004). As a consequence, curricular constitution by depending on transnational political guidance, has affected professional autonomy of teachers, and has caused unfavorable conditions to their professional exercise. Specially, through the speech of quality education, the school institution is located at the place of any other business organization (Santos, 2003), and it is audited according to its economic profitability.

In this context, pedagogic debate on education and teaching-learning processes have claimed reclassification of educative evaluation as a “didactic component” (Litwin, 2001), since it configures “the duty of being” of pedagogic practices, learning, students, teachers, the school and, in general, the education system. In fact, it is within evaluation, where controversy on education projects surge: their ideas in front of contextual reality, pedagogic purposes in front of administrative deployment, personal imaginary in front of social conventions, among other, since evaluation “determines subject performance, not only taking into account results it may provide, but, because evaluation pre-establishes, what the desirable is, what the valuable is, what should be” (Bretel and Crespo, 2005:25).

Therefore, it is necessary a restatement of evaluation processes in education, which includes its administrative origin and economic purpose, since acknowledgement of its deficiencies regarding analysis and comprehension of education processes. In this sense, this article emphasizes the pedagogic meaning of teachers’ evaluation, aimed at developing its formative purpose through reflection of its exercise. This task implies transformations in student learning process, and professional formation of teachers.

The concept of evaluation surged in XX Century as a means of behavior control and results within business organizations. Passion for technification and objectivity of this historical era, makes evaluation to surge in education by the middle of the Century through basic principles of the curriculum (Tyler, 1986). In this manner, it is determined how a control strategy, through measurable and quantifiable, a justified technique for its “efficiency and objectivity”, unrelated to any education element, through which the other education units would acquire a new meaning for tracking and continuous improving.

Niño Zafra (2006), evidences the importance of this perspective of educative evaluation. Taking into account conceptions such as performance tests from psychometry, Theory of Scientific Administration of Taylor’s work, Bloom’s behavior objectives, education technology and, currently, neoliberal rationality, education has inherited practices justified and used by evaluation. With no pedagogic meaning, due to its origin and strategic use, evaluation is related to grading, by imposing practices posing serious implications for education: the human has been displaced by technical training, experience by punctuation; subjects are qualified according to their school performance, and standardized according to standardized criteria, which promote unique curriculum and thought. In other words, eagerness for objectivity and its guidances for efficiency and efficacy has changed the role of justice, participation and cooperation in educative encounters.

Otherwise, proposals such as illuminative evaluation by Parlett and Hamilton (1977), artistic by Eisner (1998; 2002), or formative and critic proposed by Santos (1998), Alvarez (2005), or, in the Colombian context, Niño (2001, 2006), and his group Evaluando_nos (2010, 2013), have redirected search for meaning of educative evaluation. Based

on qualitative observation and hermeneutic interpretation in order to explore essence of formation processes, these perspectives propose to disembowel the meaning of educative work, by understanding it in its complexity, and simultaneously producing improvement alternatives. These proposals do not cause conflict or distinction between learning situation and evaluation, as it happens in instrumental ones, but regard evaluation and educative practices as sources which bedback each other, to benefit education, and, thus, configure a pedagogic meaning.

Precisely, recognition of this dilemma between the educative and characteristics and purpose of the evaluative - proper of comprehension of pedagogy as a science of the spirit or culture, which purpose of study is education (Spranger, 1935; Dilthey, 1940; Luzuriaga, 1991)-; current need of redefining this later concept surges. Currently, promoted by marketing society, and justified under precepts of measurement and grading, evaluation has caused a cracking of education sector through standardized deslegitimation of certain knowledge, discrimination of some social sectors; supremacy, at the opposing side, of those holding favorable economic conditions and, regarding teachers, loss of prestige and loss of professional status of their formation (Imbernon, 1994). New demands are made from teachers, funds invested according to profitability are controlled, and accountability is required by sectors unrelated to the pedagogic one.

Therefore, it is intended to analyze these policies which have contributed to standardize, under a globalizing idea, a specific educative event, depending on its intrinsic characteristics and contextual coordinates. In fact, what discussed, is implementation of private sector elements in a public right, market rules in education processes, of administrative organizations in the field of pedagogic reflection.

From technical grading to pedagogic evaluation

Within recognition of evaluation as a “didactic component” (Litwin, 2001), it is concerning how this practice is implemented in the education system. As stated by Alvarez (2003), in spite of the fact that cognitive approaches, constructive and hermeneutic in education, are currently promoted, in evaluative praxis continuity is given to objectivist approaches, proper of positive-behaviorist rationality, in which memory governs, exact data, reproduction of standardized knowledge, and, therefore, control, sanction, and exclusion.

Both Alvarez (2005) and Santos (1998), have differentiated two paradigms in evaluation: the traditional, vertical, containing summative criterions, and encourages exact measurement of teachers, through exams which confuse confound with evaluation itself, since its interest is to check, through a final instance of accumulation of determined skills. In this paradigm, evaluation is supported on technical-instrumental rationality and retakes postulates of Tyler (1986), regarding grading an objective from measurement of its performance. This fact impacts in that the evaluated (student or teacher), considers as an end of education, achievement of high scores, grades or certificates, without making his formation and learning any meaningful act. Therefore, it does not promote any pertinent learning environment, but an orientation regarding tests programming.

Traditional evaluation is anti-educative, it is far from any formation trait and, otherwise, it produces negative prints, and sometimes traumatic. In addition, results of this evaluation, at being non-contextualized, hold very little practical use; they are not applicable to the teaching process, or personal growth of the student, or curricular improvement. (Alvarez, 2005. Cited by Bretel and Crespo 2005:27).

This type of evaluation supposes efficiency, objectivity and efficacy regarding results achieved in the process, but it dilutes as a pseudo-scientist mechanism in which just any performance is measured or an objective is graded, without accounting for the whole process in terms of formative action. Which is not pertinent of this approach, is to attend the educative phenomenon as simple and stable object of study, that does not evolve or depend on many factors in its complex conception; that is, not to understand specific traits of simultaneous acts of teaching and learning, but, continue with treatment of the educative fact, in terms of business projections and achievements. In this kind of evaluation, fairness is expressed in measuring observable performance of the examinees, promoting repression, discrimination, selection and dominant social reproduction.

Otherwise, evaluation based on practical and critical rationality does not imply a final evaluation, but, promotes formation of individuals composing education processes, on continuous process basis, recognizing subjectivities of their thoughts in performance of a true communication action. Brown and Glasner (2003) define it as “the process that allows to define, select, design, collect, analyze, interpret and use information to improve learning” (p. 43). Therefore, this evaluation is flexible, negotiated, equitable and fair, oriented toward integral evolution of all of those involved. “Evaluation to value, evaluation to improve learning, evaluation as contents to be learned for its future use” (Bordas and Cabrera, 2001:26). Thus, it also results pertinent in education activity, at respecting its integral formation purpose, marking its distinctive features regarding measurement and grading, which are engaged and overcome by the concept of pedagogic evaluation. What it is evaluated here, is not the single school performance, or scoring of any test, but, teaching and learning to understand them, and, therefore, correct shortages and promote achievements.

Evaluation becomes a joint effort of dialogue and reflection leading to the last enrichment of this encounter between trainer and trainee: personal formation of all subjects, and qualified professional growth for teachers. “The teacher learns with the purpose of knowing and improving teaching practice in its complexity” (Alvarez, 2005:12), in addition to recognition of new life horizons and experience embodied in accompanying subjects, who question their own thought parting from new arguments. These students, in turn, learn through the action of correcting their errors, critical discussion promoted by their teacher, also facing them to new horizons and perspectives of the world. Then, evaluation makes a horizontal and human arrangement leading to comprehension of the same evaluation process and, therefore, improvement of education; this is, man and humanity under formation.

Principles for pedagogic evaluation

Fernandez (1994), has proposed ten principles for formative evaluation, fundamental for any evaluation proposal with pedagogic meaning, since, in summary, they prescribe formation purpose, taking into account ethics, justice, and integral formation of processes. Such proposal surges from a conception of the human being intended to be educated, highlights his conduction and contextual development, promotes participation of all of those involved in communication exercise, up to become a reflection-action of education, without pointing at individual success or failure, but promoting the process as a whole. In a schematic manner, the ten principles supporting/composing evaluation, make it:

a. Holistic and integrating, since the various education components are globally stated within a project showing complexity and systemic feature of teaching-learning processes, in which, obviously, evaluation is included.

- b. Contextualized, since it depends on particular traits of the environment where it is performed; of the diachronic context (education and evaluation statements made within spatial-geographic framework), and synchronic context (political-educative and social characteristics at the time).
- c. Coherent, according to education project under evaluation, and in epistemological terms; that is, coherent with relationship between theoretic-pedagogic body which it is supported on, and the way of taking evaluation to practice.
- d. Formative, since its purpose is to understand and perfect teaching and its impact on formation of integral subjects.
- e. It should surge and develop in negotiation and discussion; that is, turn into a process which involves the various actors mediated by communication action in order to agree various statements, criterions, purposes, practices and instruments used in evaluating.
- f. Promoting participation, not only regarding student-teacher relationship, but with the various social bodies involved in education action.
- g. Comprehensive and motivating, since it is not reduced to grading and measurement, but discovers the meaning of education activity, up to find the bottom of success and failure, and, accordingly, motivate improvement and perfecting actions by the participants.
- h. Naturalist and qualitative, regarding perspectives through which data is collected and analyzed in order to improve education action.
- i. Collects data through multiple methods and plural sources, in order to present various points of view for discussion that evidence complexity of education phenomenon.
- j. Ethics, since it is not an enforcing weapon to exercise control, but a justice act which purpose is to promote better education of subjects, and, therefore, the society (Fernandez, 1994).

Each principle provides foundation to distinctive and meaningful budgets of every educative evaluation, within which, the one related to teachers, acquires sense, pertinence, and importance, as a constituting and integrating part, that not only defines and constantly provides meaning to teacher work, but also their impact on learning processes of their trainees, and, therefore, the education act in its complexity.

From accountability and payment for merits to teachers' pedagogic evaluation

Notwithstanding evaluation practices have emphasized on student learning, specially on what Anglo-Saxon world knows as assessment - achievement of students approached to grade the whole education system, and its responsible ones, current speech on quality education, has installed new devices and approached other sectors and practices, such as administrative instances, academic procedures, management processes, and, in particular, teacher work. In this later scope, evaluation systems have assigned so much importance to teachers, that in many countries there are relationship of salary revenue for teachers- or, inverted apostrophe, his standstill or exclusion from certain job scope, according to scores or grades of their students, or institutions in process of evaluation, certification, accreditation or audit. In fact, obtention of certain labels which ensure "quality" of institutions have turned into one of such indicators for salary readjustment year by year,

in which case, many times, the fundamental purpose of such centers: to educate human beings, is disregarded.

One reason to activate these practices is the incidence and responsibility of teachers in learning process of their students. However, for such salary incentives, and contract advantages, experience, degrees, merits and academic productions, professional actualization, research exercise, have been taken into account among other measurable aspects, which suppose scoring represented in the national list of teachers. Thus, scales have been determined which classify the evaluated individual from aspects composing his job, but do not explore the essence of his work as an educator; that reflects his action, and builds pedagogic speech (Stenhouse, 1987). Teacher evaluation has been hardly achieved with educative purpose, monitoring, and realignment, in which development, a diagnostic is outlined to empower their pedagogic job. In other words, evaluative culture of students from the speech of quality, goods and symbolic processes which most interest to education are disregarded, it has been passed to teacher evaluation through immediate labor and salary consequences.

In this sense, Niño (2001), has classified four predomining trends in teacher evaluation: its development as accountancy and payment for merits, in antipodes of evaluation as professional growth and for school improvement. The first two, based on technical-instrumental rationality, and business administration, impose a model for evidence collection regarding certain teacher duties, in order to relate student and institutional performance with teacher performance for attainment of measurable outcomes.

In a first place, “[...] giving accounts, is to present productivity results about schools performance to employers, directors, or local, district, regional or national authorities” (Niño, 2001:47), according to the interest in economic investment made in the institution. Therefore, it is more related to a report which makes it possible to request, or investment continuance, according to products presented before external evaluators who press achievement of such objectives. In turn, evaluation of payment for merit, is even more emphatic in this economic interest, since, according to obtention of certain measurable results, the evaluated (teacher), obtains a salary benefit, with all education implications of this type of policies.

This valuation of teacher work, in other aspect, involves another way of interference by governments in school system, by placing the system to directly depend on an economic rationality, and market demands being the ones determining, what, how, and what for to teach; what kind of teachers, and what skills should be promoted supported on the type of exams to be applied, either directly, or through the students. (Niño 2001:51).

This type of evaluation governs the Colombian education system, with some specific issues which restrict even more, formation possibilities for teachers. Among other, from these trends, it is the evaluator who unilaterally determines conception of the evaluation, with no objectives, interests and purposes, as well as strategies, mechanisms, tools and execution time. Likewise, teacher evaluation is used as stimulus-answer strategy for teachers, since, either, they may achieve major payment for their results of efficiency, or, they are discredit for failing to meet certain requirements. Their incorporative promotion, firing, hierarchy ranking of their work sites, according to their “competence” are stimulation and intimidation stratagems which become in, and are justified as a regulator device and controller of the system, stating very varied methods, which do not explore the essence of education work, but, rather express contract requirements, administrative duties, and bureaucratic performance.

Such external intervention raises multiple questions from pedagogic reflection: ¿what to evaluate for?, ¿who evaluates?, ¿how does the evaluator evaluate?, ¿is he competent to evaluate?, ¿why does he evaluate?, ¿what are criterions for evaluation?, ¿whom or what such process serves? And, ¿how is this practice evaluated (meta-evaluation)?; in summary, varied questions which answer would reveal the subjascent economic and administrative interest.

In response to this perspective, evaluation trends, as professional growth and evaluation for school improvement, propose a more complex approach, which trends to reflexive exercise of teachers as professionals of education. In this evaluation processes, performance approach is encouraged toward analysis of planning, the curriculum, evaluation and other pedagogic processes which impact the institution and the society.

Raising the professional role of the educator implies his participation in construction of knowledge, by researching, and examining the reality daily experienced in the classroom, and at school, understanding what happens in education, in permanent search for pedagogic knowledge (Niño, 2001:54).

This comprehension supposes, as expanded by evaluation trend for school improvement, a rigorous work, academic, and systematic of teachers as professionals, who analyze and reflect their work within a located context, in order to strengthen education institutional transformations. It is a matter of evaluating the teacher's action from a pedagogic sense, for purposes of understanding the act of teaching. Therefore, it searches for efforts, the context, used means, learning rhythm, strengths and weaknesses, threats, opportunities, the same formative purposes, and its consequent evaluation criterions.

It becomes imprescindible then, to assume a critical posture on each element of educative evaluation and, in this case, of teachers, in order to disarticulate univesalized systems, controllers, standardized, qualifiers, and disqualifiers; these do no improve education practice but create a hostile environment of designations which cause discredit, and progressive weakening, which promotes hate to any evaluation process, seen as strategic mechanism of intervention to the system or institution. Therefore, this process related to teachers is raised “[...] in a routinary manner and contributes little to improve the teacher actuation” (Root and Querly, cited by Villa, 2001:191). Which question is worsen in school contexts such as the Colombian one, where evaluation is not only non-substantial in improvement process, but serves exclusion of teachers from the education system.

Therefore, interests created on evaluation omit the pedagogic meaning which any education process supposes. Otherwise, it is limited to market forces, that, from outside, articulate evaluations and become evaluating agents, which adversely affect education development, since “connecting teacher evaluation to quality improvement, reinforces conservative values in education, passes to education the productive approach of the company, reinforces technical rationality, without stating a true policy to improve teaching”. (Gimeno, 1993:26). This fact may be evidenced Colombian education policies regarding these processes.

Material and Methods

The research meaning of teacher evaluation parting from definition of complexity of teachers' functions. An approach to its pedagogic importance, which this article derives from, aims to create awareness on interpretation of a social reality: teachers job, its evaluation and educative implications. Therefore, it is regarded as a qualitative research, which provides an picture of the reality through communication action and interpretation of the various languages in the complex entanglement of human and social life.

Therefore, parting from data collected and systematically analyzed, theory has been raised founded on functions of the teacher and his evaluation as a pedagogic proposal, as stated by Corbin and Strauss (2002). In this process, ideas preconceived on the studied phenomenon are eliminated, and the researching framework is approached according to collected information, since “the most likely, is, that theory derived from data, seems more to the “reality” (Strauss and Corbin, 2002:25). Specifically, we have worked parting from data on teaching job, and its evaluation, (supplantation of education concepts due to interests of other social bodies, which as resulted in loss of educative identity, lack of teacher autonomy, and, therefore, loss of reputation, and proletarianization of the profession), to state new elements and confirm existing theories on critical basis, (pedagogic, ignoring budgets and interests of external paradigms), thanks to hermeneutic interpretation of data, which include, as allowed and facilitated by qualitative approach of research, discussion of valid and pertinent documents, and, even, the same experience of researchers in education field.

First, remarks and informal interviews were analyzed, as well as open-question questionnaires to 88 teachers of education schools: Mi dulce refugio infantil home, I.D.E. Cristobal Colon (Santa Cecilia Office), Liceo Catolico, and Liceo de Cervantes schools, and National Pedagogic University, providing education levels of preschool, basic, middle and higher. These tools facilitated, on more spontaneous and “free” basis, an approach to the social reality of teachers: How they perceive their functions, and how they are evaluated, with emphasis on what they consider that should be performed in such practice, according to their pedagogic formation.

Secondly, a critical reflection was made on consulted theory about teacher duties, and how to be evaluated, in order to reveal various meanings, beyond the explicit in theoretic texts, and regulations. These exercises facilitated to investigate the bottom of imagination underlying teacher evaluation, and the close relationship kept with description of the work performed by teachers, in mutual determination and dependence.

Exploration of these meanings facilitated confronting reality-theory which served as a constant guide, both for theoretic body, and for contexts of education practice, building a substantive theory, founded or fundamented. This production, which is a part of conclusions of the research, was performed through exploration phases (preliminary reading of texts, and contexts), description (initial discussion of experiences), interpretation (information collected and described, both explicit and implicitly); conceptual arrangement (organization and classification of data, according to criterions related to their properties and dimensions), and theorization (conding as a conceptual framework of the whole procedure). From the three general categories, which the research was based on, this article directly refers to the second one, titled Teacher’s evaluation. According to the analysis of experiences, theoretic texts and legislative, and answers given by teachers in the questionnaires, relevance of this process was seen from its articulation to regulating framework of education policies in the country. Therefore, as seen below, discussion of this category emphasized on technical rationality underlying teacher evaluation practice from regulations and its formation possibilities according to the expressed conceptual and legal frameworks.

Results: Discussion of teacher evaluation from the Colombian legal framework

Within legal framework, Law 115, 1994, on Basic Education and Middle, and Law 30, 1992, on Higher Education, become a reference for analysis of Colombian education policies. Specifically, legal instruments such as Decrees 1278 and 1283, 2002, and Law 715,

2001, more accurately propose policies related to evaluation that, far from being conceived as learning means, comprehension and education, determine a bureaucratic and penalizing management, expressed in control mechanisms and tracking, for exclusion of teachers, who are left at pleasure of institutional evaluations, and the system, which evaluates quality of service provided to students. As stated by Santos (2003), in this case, quality is not assumed with a pedagogic meaning, but as effectiveness and efficacy, in performance of plans and compliance with just contract and administrative matters, thus comparing the education institution to any other business organization. Such approach becomes even more complex through amendment to articles 347, 356 and 357 of the Political Constitution, which results in a decrease of public education fund allocation.

Indeed, in public competitions to join the education system, applying teachers are subject to multiple evaluations, which will continue upon their hiring/appointment, and in any unfavorable case, will adversely affect their permanence in the education system. In this manner, such evaluation becomes a selection, discrimination and exclusion mechanism (Alvarez, 2001), which is stressed by the results information system, which, by being published, creates a grading state from major to minor regarding education quality.

Such mechanism of control, measurement and selection, continues with the same students who should undergo tests in grades third, fifth, seventh, and ninth (Knowledge Tests), administered on semestral basis in Basic Education and Middle, Knowledge Tests II for high school students, and Higher Education Quality Tests, Knowledge Tests pro, for last semester student of university careers. Not to mention exams and international tests applied in our country, and multiple simulation tests, and performance at closing academic terms, and academic semesters at education institutions. A concerning situation, since subjects are left at pleasure of continuous grading tools which purpose is not formative, but, depend more on commercial interests and competitive, which intend to define, by means of scoring, the higher performance of institutions, and education systems to legitmate them, justify or causing them losing prestige, in the same manner, the account for teachers' work. Regarding evaluation of learning, this situation has been reinforced through implementation of Decree 1290, 2009 which, notwithstanding proposing creation of institutional evaluation systems, at its first article, already provides for control of such processes, by means of tests standardized in domestic and international scope.

Now, emphasizing on teachers evaluation, it is worth to review chapter 3, General Law of Education, titled Evaluation. This chapter provides the elements of this process for teachers, staff teachers, private, and state, and institutions. Such document justifies this process on grounds of search for "improvement of education quality" (MEN 1994:5). Again, "quality", an expression that, although mentioned 27 times in this Law, is never defined or explained; it is justified only "in terms of adjustment to the Constitution and legal mandates in abstract; that is, there is no a concept of formation, education, but, compliance with the standard" (Bustamante, 2005:65). In this sense, its objectives of control, measurement, and sanction are clearly perceived in article 81 on tests that teachers should take every six years, in order to demonstrate their "academic qualification", and pedagogic and professional updating.

Any educator failing to achieve the required score in the test, will have the opportunity of taking a new test. If, in this test, taken within a maximum term of one year, such teacher fails to achieve the required score, then he teacher incurs in cause of professional inefficiency, and shall be sanctioned under provisions of the Teachers Statute (MEN: 1994:44).

Any pedagogic interest is lost here, when a grade in a test issued by the National Government regulation, (external, standardized, non pedagogic, non formative), degenerates in that, teachers may be sanctioned and stigmatized as “inefficient” in professional terms.

If the above does not reveal major seriousness, then Law 715 takes prevalence, through which decrees 1278 and 1283 are created in order to evaluate the education system for controlling and punishing purposes. About such law, mention may be made of provisions of chapter fourth, Decree 1278, also titled Statute or teacher professionalization, which name already shows such discrimination that the political system has published toward teachers, which, according to the above, is needing a statute that actually creates professionalism of their job. In such chapter, article 26, provides that “exercise of teacher career will be connected to permanent evaluation” (MEN, 2002:25), which process teachers must be subject to, and their labor incentives (salaries and promotion) depend on such results and, even more concerning, their permanence, or exclusion from the system.

The evaluation will check that, in performing their duties, teachers and directors keep qualification, quality, and efficiency which to justify their permanence in their posts, promotions in the Teacher List, and relocations in salary levels within the same rank (MEN, 2002:26).

This event is questioned because evaluations, besides being standardized, external, and with no pedagogic support, receive as a first hand criterion, information from hierarchic seniors at the institution, who usually are managers, concerned for profitability of the service they provide, but not for human formation performed by teachers.

In addition, article 28 refers to evaluation objectives, as “establishing on objective basis”, promoted teachers or directors, either, remain in their level, are relocated, or” separated from service because of not achieving quality minimal level required to perform their duties” (MEN, 2002, 28). Again, it is seen such easiness to assume teacher job, far from its complexity, and specific meaning. In addition, it is seen how grading and measurement replace justice, learning and formation, justified by the “objectivity”, which is a disputable concept, since every approach to the world, even through a simple description, convokes participation of an observer, who, wanting or not, mixes it to its subjectivity, purposes and interest (Eisner, 1998).

This reality is stressed when it is included as a principle of evaluation its pertinence at considering “reasonable distribution of grades in various positions that allow properly distinguishing lower performance, middle and superior” (MEN, 2002:29). Here, selectivity and discrimination is released through percentages to evidence competence and performance of professionals, but which, because of their quantitative feature, do not allow comprehension of education real practice performed by teachers, in order to valueate their meaning, pertinence and coherence.

This evaluation is performed parting from aspects which demonstrate disregarding for formation actions, performed by a teacher at his institution. As stated by article 34, it is evaluated, among other, dominion of strategies and pedagogic and evaluation skills, in terms of knowledge and skills, related to the academic plan, general attitudes toward students, treatment, and management of group discipline, sense of institutional commitment, and result achieving. However, these aspects are not sufficient to see complexity of teacher job, according to formation purpose.

The mechanism used, and measurement criterions are not proper either: ¿how to grade or scoring relations kept by the teacher with his students?, ¿how to Rank formation, beyond learning indicators?, ¿how to evidence didactic management of his special area, if it

is related to certain action, contextual pertinence, through an external standardized test?, ¿how to measure institutional commitment?, ¿how to link the act of teaching to the fact of achieving some results?. Serious questions on such disregarding maintained by the law for evaluation processes, which core includes non-comprehension of actions performed by teachers. If teachers job is not established from pedagogic reflection, ¿how to intend performing an evaluation under formative meaning?

In turn, Higher Education also depends on regulations and strategies according to this perspective of grading. Law 30, 1992, provides that the Statute of the University Teacher, contains an evaluation system of teacher performance, that should be periodical, and institutional, therefore, proper mechanisms of execution should be established by institutions, and the corresponding programs. This task ends diluting, in most of the cases, in instrumentalization through documents that routinely respond, without allowing any realignment or reorientation of the process. This, “evaluation is reduced to forms which are filled out for specific periods of time, and archived later, with no effect on daily academic performance, or learning process” (Huertas, 2010:140).

Likewise, Decree 1279, 2002, which establishes salaries and social benefits for state university teachers, takes scoring as the main criterion for payments and salary increase, which end being set forth by standards such as university degrees, experience, academic productivity and researching. On these same scoring terms, state university teachers are applied semestral evaluations, to obtain salary liquidation of the year, and an allowance system, on academic productivity from the Internal committee of Score Assignment and Recognition (CIARP). This event is another example of an administrative and bureaucratic management which weakens the education labor, turning teacher work into a competition for “collecting the highest amount of points”, according to the trend of payment for merits. Thus, intellectual production is not justified in itself, but in accumulation of positive grades to achieve better salary conditions, and certification of their participation in congresses, conferences, and other academic events, or their publication in journals, that, in a replica of the control system which audits researching quality, have achieved ranking in a determined category.

Within this context, it is recognized such contradictory management, performed from the administration regarding teacher evaluation, which is determined by quantitative evaluations that do not properly represent, and do not recognize their work as teacher and educator, but simplifies the activity to execution and evidence of observable actions that determine low performance, middle of high. Within this without-meaning from the pedagogic, grading lead to discreditation of the work, exclusion from the post, or, in positive cases, salary incentives from the above mentioned trends of accountability, and payment for merits; in other words, the traditional education procedure of prize and punishment, which never presumes any realignment of the process or its subsequent improvement.

Discussion and conclusions: Teacher evaluation, and its pedagogic effects

As a fundamental actor within processes of discussion of thought and constant construction and re-construction of knowledge, pedagogic improvement of the teacher promotes fitting and perfecting practices realized with students, processes improvement, and skills prepared and reconfigured at the classroom, as well as in the other social and political contexts which are impacted. In summary, integral improvement of formation processes.

In this pedagogic sense, teacher evaluation may not continue as an appendix of the education process, or an argument held from the administration to disqualify and cut down teacher plant. Although it has misinterpreted, evaluation is, not an epilogue, but a con-

stant feedback which reconfigures and is reconfigured on permanent basis, by the same act of educating human beings.

Beyond administrative and bureaucratic bets, in which teacher evaluation has been developed from technical-instrumental rationality, tending at salary and contract readjustments, or exclusion from institutions, and systems from standardized criteria, it is worth asking again teachers and pedagogues, from the question that Bain (2007) considers as fundamental for evaluation in this scope: "Do teachers help and encourage students to learn, as to achieve a positive difference, substantial and sustained, on how they think, act, or feel – without causing them any substantial damage?" (Bain, 2007:182). An essential question for the professional of education, who holds specific formation in psychosocial, cultural, political, pedagogic, didactic and evaluative terms, to reflect on their exercise, self-evaluate, and evaluate at school basis, beyond external mechanisms that seek to control their actuation.

Teacher evaluation, together with the other scopes and subjects on which evaluation is performed, is a fundamental part of formation processes, since parting from evaluation, and in a constant reflection, it constructs, and reconstructs educative proposal, according to its participants and practices. In this manner, it is possible to overcome practices of accountability, and payment for merits, sanctioning and excluding, for a teacher evaluation that, based on pedagogy as a science of education, promotes personal, professional, institutional and education system development, in general. This event turns into recommendations aimed at changing education culture regarding teacher evaluation:

a) A process based on recognition of pedagogic formation of teachers, as a professional statute for their education work, "opposed to such practices of weakening the teacher professionalism, which consider that any other professional, scientific or technician, may attend and perform these education duties" (Saavedra and Saavedra, 2013:35), or that any individual, without related formation and experience, may tell and decide how to teach, how to educate. Beyond difficulties to act on autonomous basis in education, due to social, economic, cultural and political dominating interests, and complexity related to this job because of approaching the human being, the teacher holds a professional knowledge that guides his exercise. Therefore, education of his job starts by respecting his professional knowledge and professional.

b) Teacher evaluation involves various education actors – students, teachers, administration staff, and families, united by the same horizon of sense: Human formation as a fundamental purpose of education, but not just a guarantee of learning evidenced by tests, degrees, accreditations or certifications of teachers, students or institutions.

c) Within such horizon, education actors evidence strengths and weaknesses that, once feedbacked, may not be used as a means of comparison, judgment, sanction or exclusion of teacher job, and much less as incentives or salary or contract repression – but as information to understand formation processes and, as a consequence, qualify his professional job from his potential and failures, in enrichment or reorientation of such processes. In fact, from the ethic scope of education, individuals do not have a comparison point, but, each one has "qualifications", which constitute "qualification" of his formation, apart from the speech of quality and its requirements in terms of measurable of controllable performance.

d) Therefore, teacher evaluation may not be performed through filling out forms or standardized tests on their professional knowledge; either diagnostic or disciplinary. Their development is supported on contexts and individuals, where the teacher shares his daily education activity, according to education purpose of his education institution.

This fact implies development of continuous informal evaluations, and their formalization through field daily and qualitative approaches, observations, in-deep interviews, school work, expert meetings, which facilitate qualification of teacher exercise, as well as creation of space to continue teacher pedagogic formation, which include disciplinary, theoretic, psychopedagogic, epistemologic, researching, didactic, evaluative, curricular, social, political, and cultural skills.

e) These evaluation and qualification alternative practices require a collective work by teachers, against the “culture of teachers’ room”, created because “teachers are trained to work alone, that is, as the unique adult among many children”, and are not encouraged to “observe classes of their colleagues, and much less, to involve in deep discussions on teaching learning” (Allen, 2004:33). In this sense, balcanization of academic areas and their teachers, should be changed by school encounters and knowledge Exchange in the shared horizon of educating.

f) Notwithstanding, in the education reality, there is excess of functions for teachers, which does not allow these reflection process on teaching-learning practice through evaluation (Saavedra, 2008); otherwise, their acts have been deviated by means of contract functions of management and administration, that, added to their academic, politic, social and cultural responsibilities, have turned them into “teacher of everything, wise of nothing”, according to Imbernon’s famous expression (1994), and has demonstrated teacher concern for an overcharge of obligations in education sector. In this context, pedagogic evaluation deserves wide time and space for discusion and formation, that should be set forth in contract functions, academic chronograms, and curriculums; not as an additional task to the ones mentioned, but as substitute of those belonging to scope other than the pedagogic one.

In summary, these recommendations imply a change of education culture, passing through imaginations of its participants (the teacher is a professional, he knows what he does, according to his pedagogic formation; parents, administration staff, and students, should participate in his evaluation from such recognition, and sharing his horizon of formation sense, instead of personal interests or advantages for promotion or certification; human formation provided by any institution, a teacher or a student, is not a matter of quality indicators); evaluation practice (approaches among teachers as a group of experts, observations, discussions, and qualitative records, authentic processes of co-auto and heteroevaluation), time taken for development (not at closing an academic term, but process approach and continuous to education practices), and curricular transformations, and labor responsibilities, which provide teachers with time and space to evaluate, and being evaluated; to reflexively assume their role as teachers. And over all, time and space for such evaluation to bear a realizable purpose, a sense: enriching his formation, and professional exercise, accordfing to institutional context, and student population which teacher job is aimed at.

Referencias bibliográficas

- Allen, D. (2004) *La evaluación del aprendizaje de los estudiantes. Una herramienta para el desarrollo profesional de los docentes*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Álvarez, J. (2000). *Didáctica, currículo y evaluación*. Madrid: Miño y Dávila.
- Álvarez, J. (2005). *Evaluar para conocer, examinar para excluir*. Madrid: Morata.

- Bain, K.** (2007) *Lo que hacen los mejores profesores universitarios*. Valencia: PUV.
- Barnett, R.** (2001). *Los límites de la competencia: el conocimiento, la educación superior y la sociedad*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Bordas, I. y Cabrera, F.** (2001). Estrategias de evaluación de los procesos centrados en el proceso. En: *Revista Española de Pedagogía*. Año LIX (ene-abr) Pp. 25 – 28.
- Bretel, L. y Crespo, E.** (2005) *La evaluación como medio para asegurar los aprendizajes*. Consultado el 2 de junio de 2012. Disponible en: <http://breteleando.blogspot.com>
- Brown, S. y Glasner, A.** (2003). *Evaluar en la universidad. Problemas y nuevos enfoques*. Madrid: Narcea.
- Bustamante, G.** (2005) A diez años de la Ley 115, ¿Cómo se materializó la preocupación por la calidad? En: *Pedagogía y saberes*. Bogotá: UPN.
- Díaz, A.** (2000) *Evaluar lo académico. Organismos internacionales, nuevas reglas y desafíos*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Díaz, R.** (2007). Políticas, evaluación y metaevaluación en la reforma neoliberal: connivencia o acción transformadora. En: Niño, L. (Comp.). *Políticas educativas. Evaluación y metaevaluación*. Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.
- Dilthey, W.** (1940). *Fundamentos de un sistema de pedagogía*. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Eisner, E.** (1998). *El ojo ilustrado. Indagación cualitativa y mejora de la práctica educativa*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Fernández, J.** (1994). Evaluación del currículo: Perspectivas curriculares y enfoques en su evaluación. En: Ángulo, F. y Blanco, N. *Teoría y desarrollo del currículo*. Málaga: Aljibe.
- Gimeno, J.** (1993) (Evaluación) El profesorado. En: *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*. No. 219. Barcelona.
- Huertas, P.** (2010). Evaluación pedagógica de los docentes: más allá de la rendición de cuentas. Aportes conceptuales. En: Niño, L. (Comp.). (2010). *De la perspectiva instrumental a la perspectiva crítica. Pedagogía, currículo y evaluación*. Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.
- Imbernón, F.** (1994). *La formación del profesorado*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Laval, C.** (2004). *La escuela no es empresa. El ataque neoliberal a la enseñanza pública*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Litwin, E.** y otros. (1998). *La evaluación de los aprendizajes en el debate didáctico contemporáneo*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Luzuriaga, L.** (1991). *Pedagogía*. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- MEN** (1994) *Ley General de Educación*. Bogotá: Magisterio.

- MEN** (2002) *Estatuto de profesionalización docente*. Bogotá: Magisterio.
- Niño, L.** (2001) Tendencias Predominantes en la evaluación de docentes. En: *Opciones Pedagógicas* No. 24. Bogotá: Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.
- Niño, L.** (2006) El sujeto en la evaluación educativa en la sociedad globalizada. En: *Opciones pedagógicas*. No. 32-33. Bogotá: Universidad Distrital Francisco José de Caldas.
- Saavedra, L.** (2008). La profesión docente, sus múltiples funciones y campos de acción: aproximación a la resignificación pedagógica. En: *Pedagogía y saberes*. No. 29. Bogotá: Universidad Pedagógica Nacional.
- Saavedra, L.** y Saavedra, S. (2013). Entre lo deseable y lo realizable: didáctica, currículo y evaluación. En: *Currículo y evaluación críticos: pedagogía para la autonomía y la democracia*. Bogotá: UPN.
- Santos, M.** (1998). *Evaluar es comprender*. Buenos Aires: Magisterio del Río de la Plata.
- Santos, M.**(2003). *Trampas en educación. El discurso sobre la calidad*. Madrid: Muralla.
- Spranger, E.** (1935) *Las ciencias del espíritu y la escuela*. Madrid: Publicaciones de la *Revista de Pedagogía*.
- Stenhouse, L.** (1987). *La investigación como base de la enseñanza*. Madrid: Morata.
- Strauss A. y Corbin J.** (2002) *Bases de la investigación cualitativa. Técnicas y procedimientos para desarrollar la teoría fundamentada*. Medellín: Universidad de Antioquia.
- Tyler, R.** (1986). *Principios básicos del currículo*. Buenos Aires: Troquel.
- Villa, A.** (2001). Evaluación de la función docente y desarrollo del profesorado. En: Marcelo, C. (Ed.) *La función docente*. Madrid: Síntesis.