
This is the **published version** of the article:

Segura Torres, Joan; Silva García, Patricia; Gairín Sallán, Joaquín. «Contributions of the Catalan Educational Inspection in the Process of the Autonomy of Didactic Centers». International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation (IJERI), Núm. 12 (2019), p. 169-183. DOI 10.46661/ijeri.3504

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/237911>

under the terms of the  license



Aportaciones de la Inspección educativa catalana en el proceso de autonomía de centros

Contributions of the Catalan Educational Inspection in the Process of the Autonomy of Didactic Centers

Joan Segura Torres.
University of Lleida.
j.segura@pip.udl.cat

Joaquín Gairin Sallan.
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
joaquin.gairin@uab.es

Patricia Silva.
University of Lleida
silva@pip.udl.cat

RESUMEN.

Cataluña es un referente en autonomía de centros a partir de la aprobación de la Ley educativa (LEC) aprobada el 16 de julio de 2009. Esta supuso la concreción de dos principios fundamentales sobre organización y gestión educativa: el Decreto de autonomía de centros educativos y el Decreto de Direcciones de centros públicos.

Analizando esta situación educativa y social, es de interés todo el trabajo y la influencia que desarrolla la Inspección en el proceso de la autonomía de centros para la mejora de la calidad educativa. Se entiende que la Inspección es uno de los mayores responsables en la búsqueda de esta calidad y de la obtención de la mejora de resultados que nos igualen a los mejores países de Europa educativamente hablando.

En este nuevo escenario queremos conocer a partir de la figura de la Inspección educativa, que aportaciones realiza en este proceso innovador de autonomía de centros que nos encontramos en Cataluña. Para la realización de este estudio nos basamos en una revisión bibliográfica de diferentes autores expertos en la materia, de la normativa educativa actual que compete en Cataluña y la aplicación de un marco metodológico a partir de diferentes instrumentos como son el cuestionario, la entrevista en profundidad y los grupos de discusión.

PALABRAS CLAVE.

Inspección educativa, autonomía de centros educativos, aportaciones.

ABSTRACT.

Catalonia is a point of reference in the whole picture of the autonomy of centers after the approval of the Education Law (LEC) accepted on July 16, 2009. This involved the realization of two fundamental principles on organization and educational management: the Decree of autonomy of educational centers, and the Decree of Management of didactic centers.





Analyzing this educational and social situation, we observe that all the work and the influence that the Inspection develops is of interest in the process of the autonomy of centers for the improvement of quality in education. It is understood that the Inspection is one of the most responsible in the search for this quality, and in obtaining the improvement of results that equal us, educationally speaking, to the best countries in Europe.

In this new scenario, we want to know from the figure of the Educational Inspection, what contribution is made in this innovative process of the autonomy of centers that we are going through in Catalonia. In order to carry out this study, we relied on a bibliographic review of different expert authors on the subject, of the current educational regulations in Catalonia, and on the application of a methodological framework based on different instruments, such as the questionnaire, the in-depth interview, and the focus group.

KEY WORDS.

Inspection in education, autonomy of educational centers, contributions.

1. Introduction.

As a result of the approval of the Catalan Education Law (2009), the Decree 102/2010 of the use of educational centers first arises. According to the government, created with the aim of improving performance and educational outcomes of students and greater social cohesion. And that is why it provides the centers with a series of instruments, until now in the hands of the administration, so that they can manage and organize their resources according to their specific needs and singularities.

One of the most significant aspects is to give the management teams elements to realize concretely strong ideas, and able to launch solid educational projects. This supposes on the part of the School directorates, to assume some tasks that until now were exclusive competence of the Educational Inspection.

Subsequently, and continuing with the autonomy of centers, Decree 155/2010 of November 2, of the Management of the teaching centers, was approved. This is developed with the need to strengthen the figure of the director, granting him or her more competences and more responsibilities to lead solid educational projects for their centers. This entails a series of changes in their functions, and at the same time, in the scope of Educational Inspection.

From the deployment of the LEC and more specifically these two Decrees discussed, the functions of the educational inspection will vary with these changes, and in this case its relationship with schools and management teams, and if not also indeed their contributions to the process.

Starting from these two Decrees, it might be pointed out that many of the attributions assigned to the Inspection go to the School Administrations. According to Colom (2011), this implies that the role that the Inspection should assume in this new context, will evolve at the same pace that the application and the implementation of management autonomy given to the centers do.

Therefore, it is considered that there have been changes in the educational field. We have long been in a period of autonomy of centers with a new Catalan Education Law (2009) that drives with considerable influence together with different Decrees, such as autonomy (2010)





and the Directorates (2010) that legitimize, recognize, and develop the autonomy of educational centers. We might ask what is the Educational Inspection contributing to all of this, even if it has not updated the Decree that regulates the body of the Inspection with the most recent date going back to the year 2000? How does this autonomy help? How does it aid the different educational agents? What functions does it exercise to positively develop the process?

Decree 102/2010 specifies that "the educational Administration must respect and support the exercise of the autonomy of educational centers, within the framework of the general legal order, and has the powers of supervision and control provided for in the order" and that "the Inspection of Education must adapt the actions that correspond to it in the exercise of their functions to the autonomy regime of the centers and in the assignment of responsibilities to their areas" (Article 3).

Consequently, it is understood that the actions of the Educational Inspection should be subject to the autonomy that is defined in each center and for each director. Among the documents that have largely helped over a period of time to determine the actions of the Educational Inspection, we found the Master Plan (2011-2015); among the priorities to promote we posit these comments:

1. Recognizes the importance of the moment with the implementation of the autonomy of centers.
2. Adaptation of the actions of the Inspection to the autonomy regime of the centers and the assignment of responsibilities to their addresses.
3. This new framework will require adjustments in the planning of the Inspection's actions.
4. In view of these changes, the supervisory, advisory and evaluation functions will be strengthened.
5. To embroider the deployment of the LEC in relation to the organization and functions of the Inspection and, therefore, the revision of the Decree 266/2000.

This document serves as a guide in the actions that the Educational Inspection has to carry out in the educational centers. In addition, it also uses Decree 266/2000 that regulates the Inspection, with a single drawback; the year that the autonomy of centers was approved was not established.

From these changes that are occurring, different authors speak of a period of reflection and changes in the model of educational inspection here explicated that continue to contribute to the development of the autonomy of centers in its functions in this new scenario proposed by us.

Bolívar (2013), considers that the Educational Inspection requires an inevitable restructuring. The first step to take is to create an Inspection Body that is far from its instrumentalization at the service of political power. From this new situation, it is committed to a "post-bureaucratic" regulation that resituates the traditional role of the Inspection, since the current forms of bureaucratic control have been insufficient.

Secadura (2013), also believes in the need for a change in the Inspection model. Among the different factors that justify it, one is the growing autonomy of the centers; and in its





framework the recognition and reinforcement of the role of the directors. The author follows the argument in the following way:

Both the autonomous capacity of the centers and the new profile of the managers are components that justify another intervention model of the Educational Inspection, which should not have such a constant and regular monitoring of the activity of the centers, normally reduced to routine findings; but a methodical and periodic supervision, at medium or better long term, with statistical processes, valid for the analysis of accountability and the extrapolation of data and proposals (p.9-10).

On the other hand, Jiménez (2016) understands that, although the educational Administrations tend to attribute numerous functions and tasks, the Educational Inspection must exercise its three traditional functions of control, evaluation, and advice, but giving them a new meaning and developing in new contexts.

Our society needs a quality education to grow as a country, but this desired situation does not occur given PISA results (MECD, 2013, 2014) of recent years. The studies (Camacho Prats, 2015; Silva, 2008), support that one of the factors to improve the quality of education is the commitment to the autonomy of centers, and that this depends on the leadership of the Directorates, and the work of the Educational Inspectorate. That confirms its development is correct.

Escudero and Moreno (2012), also consider that the implication of the Inspection in the development of the autonomy of centers is very important and under many aspects actually the key. One must rely on 4 factors to put into place and define the new roles of this Body in all these changes that are taking place in schools.

1. The Inspection within an external system of support to centers and to the teaching staff.
2. The Inspection and the guarantee of compliance with the law.
3. The Inspection and the creation of capacities and commitments towards the improvement of education.

4. Inspection and recognition of how things are going in order to make informed decisions. Starting from this situation, from the current context and the current legislation, information has been collected to really know what the Educational Inspection is contributing in this new change of scenery. From these data, the new situation will be analyzed for further analysis, and work towards a few conclusions of the study.

2. Material and methods.

This article has been carried out within the framework of the Doctorate Program of the Universidad Autonomía de Barcelona.. The purpose proposed by this research belongs to one of the 6 objectives that correspond to the doctoral thesis, and what is intended is to know the contribution of the Catalan educational inspection in the process of improving educational quality in the face of the new changes that have been incorporated in the Decree of Autonomy in the centers of Catalonia. The methodology has combined quantitative and qualitative approaches, and has considered the region as a case study.





The field study has included the application of a questionnaire with a final sample of 88 inspectors from the 243 existing, 12 in-depth interviews and 2 discussion groups of 5 educational inspectors, and 6 school leaders.

The quantitative study performs a descriptive analysis and the qualitative investigation deepens some data and seeks interpretative processes by those involved in the subject. Figure 1 presents the phases of the study and the processes involved.

| Phase | Instrument | Types of information | Types of sampling | Sample |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| Descriptive | Questionnaire Interview in depth | General complementary | Non-probabilistic sampling random Intentional casual non-probabilistic sampling | All inspectors of Education in Catalonia (243) Education Inspectors of Lleida (12) |
| Interpretive | Focus group | Constrast | Non-probabilistic sampling of causal type I intentional | Education Inspectors to Lleida (5) Directors of public educational centers (6) |
| Of proposal | Group of experts | Suggestion | Intentional non- probabilistic sampling | General Secretaries of Education, General Inspection Subdirectorate, General Subdirection of Addresses, Chief of Inspection |

Figure 1. Study phases

In a first descriptive phase of our investigation, the questionnaire helps to offer a general vision and within this same phase, the interview is worked in depth to provide a more specific vision. Therefore, in this initial phase the qualitative and quantitative methodology is combined.

The statistical treatment of the questionnaire is carried out with the intention of covering several purposes, depending on the objectives of the research. Thus, two types of statistical analysis are carried out a descriptive approach of the answers collected in the questionnaire, and a second inferential of the variables involved characteristic of the sample: 1) Professional situation and 2) valuation in the Inspection. The sample was considered as statistically representative of the study population, with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of $\pm 8: 34\%$, in the worst case scenario of maximum variance ($P = Q = 1/2$).

The questionnaire is validated by 12 education specialists linked to the Educational Inspectorate and the school directorates. The application that was used is Google Drive, and the use of the information is made through the statistical application IBM-SPSS-22.





The interviews seek the identification and treatment through categories, combining processes of repeated revision and saturation of the documentation with the computer tool ATLAS-TI (version 7). Regarding the type of sampling at the beginning, it is casual or depends in some sense, on accessibility; those individuals who have greater accessibility are used as a sample, depending on several circumstances. Later one employs purposive sampling, which means that when one has already made an agreement with participants who volunteer, those who meet criteria previously established, such as parity, situational work in Inspection, and time already spent in work.

To identify, validate, and triangulate information, we wanted to create different discussion groups with the educational agents (inspection, school management). The purpose was to contrast the opinions of the participants and to know the participants' experience on the topics covered in the interviews and the questionnaire. The type of sampling is the same as in the interview, casual at the time of accessing the population, but intentional in selecting them for the discussion group. The selection of groups seeks diversity following criteria such as experience, age, sex, educational stage, among others, depending on the group.

The descriptive and interpretative phases are completed with a third propositional phase that is submitted to validation by 6 experts from the educational world and the sphere of Inspection. This group of experts (general secretaries of education, general sub-directorate of the inspection, general sub-directorate of the addresses, and heads of inspection ...) help to compare the results obtained in the selected sample and to finish defining the improvement proposals arising from the conclusions. It is accomplished through a questionnaire of validation and suggestion to the agents of the Educational Administration with a lot of experience and high positions. The type of sampling used to select the sample was totally intentional. The criteria selected were the responsibility in the position held and the relationship with the Inspection.

3. Results.

The results are presented more directly related to questions 12, 23 and 24 of the questionnaire; 11 and 12 of the interview and 4 of the focus group that are related to the contributions of the Educational Inspection from the Decree of Autonomy in the centers of Catalonia. The purpose is to respond to the objective: Know the contribution of the educational inspection in the process of improving educational quality in centers that develop autonomy.

The 2011/2015 Master Plan includes a series of actions for the implementation of school autonomy. Among these actions we have the adaptation of the actions of the Inspection to the autonomy regime of the centers, and in the assignment of responsibilities to their areas, adjustments in the planning of the Inspection actions and to enhance the functions of supervision, advice and evaluation.

Question 24 of the questionnaire recovers these actions and asks the degree of agreement with them. The degree of agreement is high in reference to the efficiency in the development





of the three priority actions that should be promoted for the implementation of the autonomy of centers according to the design of the 2011/2015 Master Plan. All of them have average values of 3 or more points, with the respondents concentrated in values 3 and 4, with high homogeneity among responses. Among them, the most outstanding is the empowerment of supervision, advisory and evaluation functions.

It is understood that the effectiveness of these actions has been developed in a successful manner both in adapting the Inspection's actions to the autonomy regime of centers; in adjustments in the planning, and strengthening of the functions of supervision, assessment and evaluation of the Educational Inspection.

| ITEMS | N valid | % of Grau according | | | | Descriptive | | |
|---|---------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|--------|-----------|
| | | 1 Nothing | 2 A Little | 3 Sufficient | 4 Total | Average | Median | Deviation |
| 24. Actions for the implementation of the autonomy of centers according to the Master Plan 2011/2015 ... | | | | | | | | |
| 24.1. Adaptation of the actions of the Inspection to the autonomy regime of the centers and the assignment of responsibilities to their addresses | 86 | 0.0 | 15.1 | 69.8 | 15.1 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 0.55 |
| 24.2. This new framework will require adjustments in the planning of the Inspection's actions. | 88 | 0.0 | 13.6 | 67.0 | 19.3 | 3.06 | 3.00 | 0.58 |
| 24.3. In view of these changes, the supervisory, advisory and evaluation functions will be strengthened | 88 | 2.3 | 5.7 | 48.9 | 43.2 | 3.33 | 3.00 | 0.69 |

Table 1. Results of question 24 of the questionnaire.

In view of these actions mentioned and considered with success, the Inspection has always developed some functions that will help to improve in general the educational system itself. The functions may not have changed, but the dedication has in time spent in each of them. With autonomy, it is found that counseling and evaluation are the most significant, followed by supervision. Here we give a brief example of the answers from the participants. The first one to consider is that the Inspection is contributing a lot to the autonomy process in general, and that it is developing in a positive way.

The Inspection has always been in favor of the autonomy of centers, of organizing, of having control over the project itself, of putting it into practice. We must bear in mind that autonomy is an organization that constantly learns. It is understood that there is a process of reaction-investigation-modification, and that it conjugates with the internal





and external evaluation. In this sense, one can clearly affirm that the inspection has favored in some way the autonomy of the evaluation, for example. More specifically, in an evaluation not focused on control, but rather in making a diagnosis of the center, together with advice offered outside the nonspection. P11: EIE-11- 11:25 (73:73) [1]

Not only do they contribute, but they also value their involvement in this process to help with the Inspection's own actions.

Obviously we are involved to different degrees with the inspectors at any time questions are pedagogical, or imply innovation, etc. Sometimes we get involved advising or redirecting, and sometimes invigorating or encouraging. Therefore, we always involve ourselves within the established normative regulatory framework.

P 7: EIE-07- 7: 5 (21:21)

Question 12 of the questionnaire reinforces these comments when it consults matters on the implication and commitment of the educational Inspectorate to favor in all this process of implantation of the autonomy of centers. The values of the answers issued (N = 88) vary in the range 3-10 with an average of 8 points. In fact, it is this value (8) where the highest concentration is observed (36.4%) followed by 7 (21.6%) of 9 (19.3%). That is why the average is 7.48 points (standard deviation 1.48) and allows us to affirm that opinion tends towards excellence (remarkably high).

| ITEM | N valid | Descriptive | | | Most frequent responses expressed as percentage ^a |
|--|---------|-------------|--------|-----------|--|
| | | Average | Median | Deviation | |
| 12. El involvement and commitment in favoring the autonomy process of centers | 88 | 7.48 | 8.00 | 1.48 | 8 points or s (36.4%) |

Table 2. Results of the questionnaire (Question 12)

Entering more concretely into the contributions of the Educational Inspection in the process of autonomy, question 23 offers us a lot of information. It is related to the support of the Educational Inspection as a key aspect for the centers, has a range of possible answers between [1-5]. The description of the items of the same is summarized in Table 3 ordered from highest to lowest degree of agreement (not by its presentation in the questionnaire). The degree of homogeneity among subjects is high since the statistical deviations are mostly less than 1 point, especially under the most valued aspects.





| ITEMS | N valid | % response | | | | | Descriptive | | |
|---|---------|------------|------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--------|-----------|
| | | 1 Nothing | 2 A Little | 3 Normal | 4 Sufficiently | 4 A lot | Average | Median | Deviation |
| 3:10 In the evaluation of the center, teaching and directive function, plans and programs ... | 88 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.7 | 23.9 | 70.5 | 4.65 | 5.00 | 0.59 |
| 23:12. In the solution of complaints and denunciations | 88 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 34.1 | 64.8 | 4.64 | 5.00 | 0.51 |
| 23.9. In the advice to the centres, management team, teachers | 86 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.7 | 34.9 | 69.5 | 4.56 | 5.00 | 0.59 |
| 23. 1. At school areas | 88 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 51.1 | 44.3 | 4.40 | 4.00 | 0.58 |
| 23.6. In the resolution of conflicts | 88 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 51.1 | 35.2 | 4.17 | 4.00 | 0.80 |
| 23.8. In orientation to the centers | 88 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 11.4 | 54.5 | 31.8 | 4.14 | 4.00 | 0.79 |
| 23.3. To the improvement of the educational quality | 87 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 11.5 | 69.0 | 17.2 | 3.99 | 4.00 | 0.71 |
| 23:13 In the dissemination of good practices | 88 | 8.0 | 0.0 | 14.8 | 61.4 | 15.9 | 3.77 | 4.00 | 0.99 |
| 23.5. In mediation | 88 | 4.5 | 0.0 | 26.1 | 53.4 | 15.9 | 3.76 | 4.00 | 0.88 |
| 23:11 To work in the network | 88 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 29.5 | 47.7 | 15.9 | 3.66 | 4.00 | 0.98 |
| 23.4. In the training of the professional and management teams | 88 | 14.8 | 0.0 | 22.7 | 51.1 | 11.4 | 3.44 | 4.00 | 1.17 |
| 23.7 In educational innovation | 88 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 35.2 | 48.9 | 6.8 | 3.44 | 4.00 | 0.97 |
| 23.2. to the teaching staff | 88 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 42.0 | 37.5 | 6.8 | 3.24 | 3.00 | 1.07 |

Table 3. Results of the questionnaire (question 23).



The greatest agreement has been found in the support to the evaluation of the center, the teaching and directive function, the plans and programs (70.5% a lot, average 4.65 out of 5 p.) Followed closely by the one related to the solution of complaints and denunciations (64.8% a lot, average 4.64) and completing the podium is the support in the advice to the centers, management team and teachers (69.5% a lot, average 04:56). On the other hand, it has been observed that the least support is perceived by teachers (42% normal, only 6.8% very much, average: 03.24), followed by educational innovation (48.5% sufficiently, average 3.44) and the teacher training and management teams (51.1% sufficiently, average 3.44). This question 23 is based on a closed list, but in the interview the option was given so that the participant could openly add what type of contribution the Inspection offered to the autonomy process of centers. Many of these contributions were repeated from the list, and others added new ones. Also one might observe that Inspection assesses their contributions, first as very significant by the center, and second in benefit of an improvement in educational quality. Among the most commented on contributions is :

a) Analysis of results

I would say the analysis of results, analysis of internal and external tests, the analysis of strategic planning. **P 4: EIE-04 - 04:22 (67:67)**

b) Evaluation concerning the directors

One has to be very careful when choosing the areas, and when evaluating them. Looking towards the next course, it seems that there is the idea of starting to make a continuous evaluation of the directors that is understood to be very positive because until now they were evaluated every 4 years, **P 2: EIE-02 - 02:22 (58:58)**

c) Evaluation of centers

When the focus is on the center, it is always done through the area and it is the person who knows firsthand what the work and reality of the center is through the AVAC evaluation (evaluation of centers) . This tool has improved this work and this knowledge especially because it will not only evaluate the educational returns but also the organization, the objectives, the achievement of the objectives through the memories, the annual plans. **P10: EIE-10 - 10:19 (70:70) .**

d) Contrast pedagogical learning environments

One of the functions that the inspection has, not of a normative nature but of the quotidian life, is that it is very valuable the possibility of seeing, contrasting different pedagogical learning environments, in addition to the feedback that can be produced with other colleagues of a team of inspectors or a territorial staff of inspectors. Inspection is the only element of the educational system that has the possibility of entering a center and observing, together with the directing team of the corresponding center. **P 2: GD1 IE - 02:12 (20:20).** [\[2\]](#)



**e) Arbitrariness**

One of the contributions is that one becomes a bit of an arbitrator because of course the issue of autonomy implies a dynamic, before a change one does not go so much by remote control. This phrase does not want to be confused with an audit, but it is interesting that it is a question of having another technical and professional opinion. **P 7: EIE-07- 7:18 (62:62).**

f) Projects of centers

Entering projects, supporting one's own projects of centers or of projects put in action by part of the department of education, and to which the center adheres. **P 5: EIE-05- 5: 15 (65:65).**

g) Proposals for improvement in the center

Another contribution by the Inspection are improvement proposals that are offered in the centers. The important role of INSPECTION is from all the documentation gathered, all the results, and all indicators to offer proposals to improve the functioning of. **P 4: EIE-04 - 04:24 (68:68)**

h) Training

The whole issue of training or assessment one considers doing some very positive contributions. If we manage that the directors are capable of having tools to establish evaluation systems in their centers, we will be able to create them as instruments so that they have more and more autonomy and can make the decisions that this autonomy entails. These can be decisions of pedagogical, administrative, etc., type. **P10: EIE-10 - 10:17 (64:64).**

i) Advice

With the power assigned to directors with autonomy, you find directors who may consult you, although other directors have little, and only when you are already in conflict does the issue arise, and you have to say, "You should have called me before." Therefore, another of the contributions is the increase in counseling with the resolution of problems with families, many consultations of separated parents, modes of action, difficulties in choosing the center, ... **P 8: EIE-08- 8:17 (68:68).**

The assessment of Inspection in their contributions throughout the autonomy process is very positive for the centers. They consider them an important piece with respect to the actions developed, helping the increase in autonomy and giving discernment to school areas with their experience, in order to better the educational quality of centers. As has already been observed, they are influential and help in such important aspects as the evaluation of the Centers, and the evaluation of areas, training, analysis of results, or proposals for improvement in the centers themselves, among other considerations





4. Discussion and conclusions.

There have been changes in the educational field, ... we have long been in a period of autonomy of centers with a new Catalan Education Law (2009) that drives forward, and with the aid of different Decrees, such as the Autonomy Decree (2010), and the Directions Decree (2010), that legitimize it, recognize it, and develop it.

Decree 102/2010 specifies in its article 3 that the educational Administration must respect and support the exercise of the autonomy of the educational centers and adds that it must adapt the actions that correspond to it in the exercise of its functions to the autonomy regime of the centers and in assigning responsibilities to their various areas. Another document that helps determine the actions of the Educational Inspection in Catalonia is the Master Plan (2011-2015); commented on in the introductory part.

The Educational Inspectorate considers that its actions are being carried out as marked by the Master Plan. Everyone agrees that the actions of the Inspection have to adapt to the autonomy regime of the centers and the assignment of responsibilities to their different fields. In addition, adjustments are needed in the planning of these actions and the supervisory, advisory and evaluation functions are being strengthened. Only in the latter, they affirm that what was intended has not been defined, since the period of 4 years marked by the Plan has expired and no new Decree that revises updates or modifies Decree 266/2000 has emerged.

Entering more concretely on the contributions of the Educational Inspection in the autonomy process, a closed list is presented where different actions were indicated that the Educational Inspection offered as a key aspect for the development of the autonomy in the centers.

The greatest agreement is found in the support to the evaluation of the center, the teaching and directive function, the plans and programs closely followed by the one concerning the solution of complaints and denunciations and the podium completing the support in the advice to the centers, management team and teachers. On the lower side and with a lower quorum, they consider that they contribute less in the actions directed to the teaching staff, followed by the educational innovation and the training of the teaching staff and directing teams together with the network work. These results coincide with other information that has been collected throughout the practical framework of the investigation.

According to Vera Mur (2014), the development of the autonomy of the centers opens new possibilities for each one of the centers and should be oriented to ensure the equity and excellence of the educational activity. The educational projects of each center become key elements for pedagogical innovation and the improvement of the quality of teaching. Currently, according to current legal and regulatory regulations, supervision and control, advice and evaluation are basic and fundamental functions of inspection in all contexts.





Among the contributions discussed openly through different views and focus group that have been collected, these match those expressed by Vines (2005). The author affirms that in view of the growth that autonomy entails in educational centers, it is committed to adapting the methodology and actions of the Educational Inspection. Given this fact, it presents a list of traditional actions but adapted to the new educational and legal framework:

- General supervision.
- Advice / advice management initiatives.
- Dissemination of good practices.
- Training follow-up
- Evaluation of centers, teaching and directive function, plans and programs.
- Networking.
- Solution of complaints and denunciations.
- Supervision of general data.

Other authors add what actions should not be carried out on the part of the Inspection. García Andreu (2013) affirms that the Educational Inspection must recognize the real life of the centers and of the classrooms and not confine themselves to mere tasks of bureaucracy. For this reason the author suggests that the actions of the educational INSPECTION cooperate and strengthen in: teacher training in specific prior training of management teams to lead the innovative proposals in the centers and the implementation of diagnostic assessments.

Located in context, and having analyzed the results obtained from the methodological framework and relevant discussion of results, the next step is to develop the conclusions. Among the most significant we state:

1. The evaluation of the Educational Inspection in relation to the contributions that it is developing in the autonomy process of centers and the involvement with which it intervenes is perceived in a very positive way. They are an important piece in all the actions they carry out, helping this deployment of autonomy and giving support to the school administrations with their experience, to improve the educational quality of their educational centers.
2. The 2011/2015 Master Plan includes a series of actions for the implementation of the autonomy of centers that have been respected and developed as planned by the Educational Inspection, such as: the adaptation of the inspection actions to the autonomy of the centers and in the assignment of responsibilities to their directorates, adjustments in the planning of the actions of the inspection to the new framework and enhance the functions of supervision, assessment and evaluation.
3. Among the functions that contribute the most in this autonomous sea are: the evaluation of centers, teaching and directive functions, plans and programs; advice and guidance to centers, management team and teachers; and mediation and resolution of conflicts with the objective of improving educational quality.



4. The possibility of seeing, analyzing, contrasting pedagogical learning environments by providing a dissemination of good practices and knowledge to other centers is very valuable.
5. Influence in one's own projects of the centers suggesting proposals of improvement to them.
6. The support of training in evaluation to the school directorates by the Educational Inspectorate has helped the growth of autonomy to schools.
7. Aspects such as educational innovation, networking, training for teachers and management teams, and contact with teachers, we have seen work, but one can contribute much more.

After reviewing the conclusions, it is understood that the Inspection is one of the key elements in the whole autonomy process of centers and their contributions will be essential in the ultimate goal that is the attainment of educational quality.

It can be affirmed that the Educational Inspection is and should be an agent that promotes educational change, and therefore has a fundamental role in establishing the necessary conditions to improve the quality of school education. The support of the people who carry out the Educational Inspection is the key for the educational centers to carry out their improvement processes (Silva, 2011).

References

- Bolivar, A. (2013). Inspección educativa y mejora de la educación en un contexto de autonomía. Associació d'inspectors d'Educació de Catalunya. *VI Congrés de l'Associació d'Inspectors d'Educació de Catalunya. Inspecció, innovació, reflexió, perspectives*. Sant Feliu de Guixols. Recuperado de: https://es.slideshare.net/inspectorate/089-aiec-sfgantoniobolivar?qid=3fbd0335-f0cc-481e-a005-7d130c8031b0&v=&b=&from_search=13
- Camacho Prats, A. (2015). Recension-Doctoral Thesis: Funciones y quehaceres de los inspectores de Educación en Baleares. Un estudio de casos. *Teoria de la Educació. Revista Interuniversitaria*, 27(1), 205–206. Recuperado de: <http://revistas.usal.es/index.php/1130-3743/issue/view/teoredu2015271>
- Colom, M. (2011). El paper de la Inspecció en el marc del nou Decret d'autonomia. *Fòrum. Revista d'Organització i Gestió Educativa*, (25), 13–14.
- Decret 102/2010, de 3 d'agost d'autonomia de centres educatius (2010).
- Decret 155/2010 de 2 de novembre, de direcció dels centres docents (2010).
- Decret 266/2000, de 31 de juliol, pel qual es regula la Inspecció d'Ensenyament (2000).
- Escudero, J. M., y Moreno, M. Á. (2012). Mejorar la educación, la autonomía de los centros y el servicio de inspección educativa. *Avances En Supervisión Educativa*, (17), 1–16.
- Garcia Andreu, M. (2013). La autonomía de los centros. Un debate abierto. *Revista supervisión* 21. (30), 14-20. Recuperado de: http://usie.es/SUPERVISION21/2013_30/SP21_30SECCART_Laautonomia.pdf



- Jiménez, J. (2016). Una nueva y vieja inspección. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, (441), 58–62.
- Llei 12/2009, del 10 de juliol, d'educació (2009).
- MECD (2013). *Panorama de la educación. Indicadores de la OCDE 2013. Informe español*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa. Recuperado de: <https://www.mecd.gob.es/inee/dam/jcr:40bcb1e2-01e4-4528-b5d6-0412f7bef448/panorama2013.pdf>
- MECD (2014). *Panorama de la educación. Indicadores de la OCDE 2014. Informe español*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Evaluación Educativa. Recuperado de: <http://www.mecd.gob.es/dctm/inee/indicadores-educativos/panorama2014/panorama-de-la-educacion-2014informe-espanol-05-sep-.pdf?documentId=0901e72b81a722ac>
- Secadura, T. (2013). El referente de la Inspección educativa: ¿El Centro docente?, ¿El Sistema educativo? *Revista Supervision* 21, (30), 1–20. Recuperado de: http://usie.es/SUPERVISION21/2013_30/SP21_30SECCART_Elreferente.pdf
- Secretaria de Polítiques educatives (2011). *Pla director de la Inspecció d'Educació (2011-2015)*. Barcelona: Departament d'ensenyament. Recuperado de: <http://ensenyament.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/departament/inspeccio-educacio/pla-director/pla-director-2011-2015.pdf>
- Sierra Nieto, J.E.; Caparrós, E.; Díaz Moreno, N. (2015) Nuevas miradas en investigación educativa: indagar pedagógicamente la experiencia. *IJERI: International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation*, (5), 184-194. Recuperado de: <https://www.upo.es/revistas/index.php/IJERI/article/view/1624/1327>
- Silva, P. (2008). *La Inspección Escolar en Cataluña. Un estudio de Casos* (Tesis Doctoral). Barcelona. DOE- UB: Manuscrito sin publicar
- Silva, P. (2011). La inspecció escolar i l'autonomia dels centres educatius. *Fòrum. Revista d'Organització i Gestió Educativa*, (25), 22–24.
- Vera Mur, J. M. (2014). Supervisión e inspección, a través del tiempo. *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, (441), 63–66.
- Viñas, J. (2005). La autonomía de los centros docentes y sus implicaciones en la actuación inspectora. *I Jornadas de Inspección Educativa. La inspección de educación y la autonomía de centros*. Madrid: MEC. Recuperado de: <https://nanopdf.com/download/mesa-redonda-catalua.pdf>

