

EL DÍA QUE EL INSPECTOR ABANDONÓ EL AULA

THE DAY THE INSPECTOR LEFT THE CLASSROOM

José María Alén de la Torre

Inspector de educación. Pontevedra. Comunidad de Galicia

Resumen

En el método científico, una hipótesis es un enunciado que precisa ser verificado para ser considerado válido. En general, la inspección, no solo la educativa, utiliza diferentes sistemas de pruebas para comprobar que el sistema funciona según la normativa establecida. Sin embargo, surge la siguiente pregunta: ¿son adecuadas estas pruebas para acreditar que la realidad cumple la normativa? Por otra parte, ¿cuál es la finalidad última de la existencia de los diferentes cuerpos de inspección? ¿Se pretende tener una diagnosis del sistema o corregir las deficiencias de éste? La respuesta a estas preguntas tiene más consecuencias de lo que pueda parecer inicialmente. La elaboración de los planes de inspección, el destinatario final de esa inspección, las consecuencias de ésta en la mejora del sistema e incluso los requisitos para ejercer la función inspectora están determinados claramente por la respuesta a las preguntas que formulamos en el párrafo anterior.

Palabras clave: Calidad, eficiencia, eficacia, gestión administrativa, supervisión curricular.

Abstract

In the scientific method, a hypothesis is a statement that needs to be verified to be considered valid. In general, the inspection, not only the educational one, uses different test systems to verify that the system works according to the established regulations. However, the following question arises: are these tests adequate to prove that reality complies with the regulations? On the other hand, what is the ultimate purpose of the existence of the different inspection bodies? Is it intended to have a diagnosis of the system or to correct its deficiencies? The answer to these questions has more consequences than it may initially seem. The design of the inspection plans, the final recipient of this inspection, its consequences in improving the system and even the requirements to exercise the inspection function are clearly determined by the answer to the questions that we formulated in the previous paragraph.

Keywords: Quality, efficiency, effectiveness, administrative management, curricular supervision.

1. THE RAISON OF BEING OF THE INSPECTION

The Royal Decree of March 30, 1849 (Gaceta de Madrid, April 2) created the inspection of professional primary education and established in its article 22 that "The main purpose of the general inspectors will be to visit the normal and ordinary schools of the provincial capitals, also carrying out all the commissions entrusted to them by the Government for the advancement of primary education". Their work was centered on visiting schools. In this way, the personnel of the inspection corps verified the functioning of the school through direct observation in the classroom.

Antecedents to the creation of the educational inspection corps also point to a direct supervision of the teacher's work in the classroom. Thus, in a draft decree of the sixteenth century when it is indicated that: "And because the one and the other do what they should and are obliged to do, I command that the judges of these kingdoms, each in its jurisdiction, visit the school once a year, and the teachers examined and approved to see if they teach well and with the care they should according to what my letter commanded".

Currently, the LOMLOE establishes among the functions of the educational inspection (article 151): "To supervise, evaluate and control, from the pedagogical and organizational point of view, the functioning of the educational centers, as well as the projects and programs they develop, with respect to the framework of autonomy that this Law protects".

What has changed since the creation of the inspectorate to make pedagogical supervision equal to organizational supervision? The change resides in the fact that the State has increased the use of a body designed for pedagogical supervision for the administrative control of schools.

The question is: is the inspector's visit to the classroom still necessary? We defend that the inspector's visit to the classroom is still essential, and the only way for all the sectors involved in education to know the reality of the education that is learned in the classrooms. In this way, the inspector, on the one hand, supervises the work of the centers and, on the other hand, makes his superiors aware of the real situation of education in the centers. However, the day to day of the inspection drags us into an inspection focused on documents that are intended to reflect the reality of the classroom. But are these documents a mirror of what happens in the classroom? In our opinion these documents per se do not reflect the reality of the classroom. The added value lies in the direct observation of the inspection. First of all, we could say that "paper bears all things". Secondly, most of the huge amount of documentation produced by the centers does not have a direct translation to the classroom. This is the case with the didactic programs or the significant curricular adaptations (ACS), which do not include the specific learning activities carried out by the students to work on the corresponding curriculum. Thus, as an inspectorate, we can positively evaluate from the office a specific didactic program that, in reality, has very little significant translation to the classroom. On the other hand, when we visit classrooms, as an inspectorate, we may find an excellent teaching practice that does not correspond to the curriculum of that subject and course. A program may include a certain methodology and in the classroom the teacher may use another one. These and other issues make it necessary for the inspectorate to focus on the contrast between the written document and the classroom.

But then why is there a growing trend towards an almost exclusively documentary inspection? This is not only true for educational inspection, but many inspection services of other agencies suffer from the same problem. The most significant example is the inspection services of the tax agency, which carry out inspections based on documents, but with the counterpart that the access to real citizen information by this agency is much greater than in any other inspection service. However, this counterpart does not exist in other inspections,

such as educational inspection. To find the answer to the question we were asking, perhaps we should think about the profitability in numerical terms of the inspections carried out. A documentary inspection allows a much higher number of inspection reports and inspection reports to be produced than those obtained in inspection visits. However, what is the scope of these documentary inspections? Do these inspections contribute to the improvement of the system? Documentary inspections are enormously efficient from the point of view of the number of actions, and tremendously inefficient from the point of view of improving the system.

2. DIAGNOSTIC OR CORRECTIVE INSPECTION

The model of inspection that we carry out, exclusively documentary or centered on the visit to the educational center, determines the purpose of this inspection. Documentary inspections make it possible to obtain an x-ray of the analysis of the documents provided by the educational centers and, therefore, to obtain a "supposed" diagnosis of the educational system. On the other hand, the inspection focused on the visit to the educational center presents a capacity of analysis of the relationship between the center's documentation and its daily classroom practice. This allows interaction with the school's teaching staff, and the correction of those aspects that can be improved.

Obviously, we can affirm that, in the case of the documentary inspection, nothing and no one prevents, initially, the inspection from sending the educational center a request for the correction of the regulatory deficiencies in the document that has been sent to us. However, in this case we encounter two problems. The first is that we would continue correcting the paper, and we would not affect classroom practice, so that we could arrive at a formally correct document and, nevertheless, continue with a bad teaching or operational practice. The second problem lies in the fact that this type of inspection makes it possible to carry out a large number of actions in the centers, which would saturate the centers with correction reports. This may not initially be a bad thing, but, in practice, schools

would work only to correct documents, with the consequent neglect of the practical aspects of the application of these plans, projects, programs..., that is, documents in the classroom. In short, we could apply the principle of doing what is important well, instead of doing everything well, but without a minimum of quality.

This question leads us to another equally worrying issue: Are as many documents as those generated -or should be generated- by schools today really necessary? The answer to this question is that schools should generate the documents that are minimally necessary for the operation of an educational center. Thus, the essential documents in any educational center would be the Center Organization Document (DOC), which contains teachers' schedules, teaching staff and other organizational data of the center; the Norms of Organization and Functioning (NOFC), which regulate the norms of coexistence of the center; and the Classroom Programs, where the activities that are carried out in the classroom to work and evaluate the different elements of the curriculum are collected, while they are linked to the different projects and plans in which the center participates. It gives the impression that the centers dedicate themselves to preparing documents in which they repeat what is already contained in other documents or in the regulations themselves, with no connection to daily classroom teaching practice. Moreover, the plans and projects end up becoming an addition to the curriculum that is addressed in an ad hoc and isolated manner. We must remember that educational centers are organizations dedicated to the maximum development of the potential of each student, so that they become autonomous, responsible, self-confident, and capable of teamwork. Our *raison d'être* is, precisely, the student body and, therefore, our organization has to focus on this student body. It is incomprehensible to see how we have a curriculum that we leave aside and replace it with a textbook and twenty thousand plans and projects, the result of various initiatives, which add up like parts of a puzzle in which the pieces are made to fit together, but they don't form a single image.

In returning to the subject of diagnostic or corrective inspection, it is necessary to reflect on the abuse that has been made of diagnosis in the last decade. Again, this is not only an educational problem, but extends to other areas such as gender violence. There are already enough studies to prove that what we already know. Continuing with the example, what we need is to introduce mechanisms to correct these gender inequalities. Well, as in the case of gender violence, we can inspect the documents of educational centers over and over again, but if the centers do not receive feedback from these inspections, the functioning of the centers will remain the same. In order to improve or correct a system, it is necessary to intervene, from a position of authority and with judgment, to correct these deficiencies where they occur. Thus, inspection is useful for the centers. The problem is that diagnostic inspections end up becoming mechanisms for informing our superiors, information that is used to carry out studies or respond to requirements from different higher administrative bodies, but which do not correct the problem that occurs in the interaction with our students. An educational organization should never forget that all the actions it implements must be directed to the students. No organization carries out actions that are not aimed at knowing the degree of attention of its clients and improving the attention they receive. Well, the same thing happens in the educational field, and that is why we defend inspection focused on correction, not diagnosis.

3. CENSUS OR SAMPLE INSPECTION

A parallel discussion to the question addressed in the previous point is the issue of the scope of the inspection actions. Should these be census or sample-based. Again, it is a matter of resources and priorities. Obviously, the answer should be census-based; however, the fact that they should be census-based implies human resources that the educational inspection services do not have. For this reason, those responsible for the different educational inspections have often opted to carry out census-type inspections, but only of certain aspects. We will explain this through two examples related to teaching programs. As a first example, let us imagine that the action entrusted to the Education Inspectors

consists of checking that these programs have all the points that the regulations establish that educational programs must have. Undoubtedly, this action would have hardly any impact on the improvement of the operation of the centers, since the review would be limited exclusively to the revision of the points, and not to their content, which is where the issues to be improved and corrected are usually found. As a second example, let us suppose an action where the qualification criteria are reviewed. This second example would have an impact on the improvement of the operation of the centers, since it addresses the content of one of the points that a program should contain. However, it is doubtful that an inspector can review all the qualification criteria of all the programs sent to him/her by the schools in the area assigned to him/her, since each school provides at least ten programs per year, so if we multiply by the number of courses in each school —let us say, for example, 6 courses— and by the number of schools assigned to that inspector —for example, 20 schools—, we have a figure of over a thousand programs —in our example, 1,200 programs—. Thus, if each inspector reviews these qualification criteria for each program, issues the corresponding report in which he or she makes the appropriate corrections and sends it to each school, we would need 171 days to process seven programs per day. It is enough to remember that the academic year has 174 school days to realize that we would need to double the number of Education Inspectors to have half of them reviewing the qualification criteria of the programs, and the other half to carry out the rest of the actions of the educational inspection service. In view of these two examples, we can affirm that the first action that we proposed as the first example has no impact, and in the case of the second one, it would have an impact, but it is unfeasible to do it in a census form. In conclusion, we advocate inspections with impact, and this necessarily implies that they should be sample-based.

4. THE EVIDENCE AND THE REALITY

Inspections seek to know the reality of what happens in classrooms. However, how do we know that reality? To know it we have to record the evidence, that is,

the proof, and this is where we can look for evidence based on documents or evidence extracted from our visit to the classroom. Thus, for example, a program may indicate that a certain methodology is being used, but it is in the classroom where the proof that this methodology is being carried out in the classroom is obtained. It is true that any direct intervention of the inspector in the classroom alters in some aspects the normal development of what happens in the classroom, but it is also true that there are issues that are not modified by the presence of an inspector. The classroom visit makes it possible to detect certain issues that are beyond the teacher's control, and that reflect the way of working in the classroom. These issues are observed not so much in the behavior of the teachers as in the behavior of the students. The routines internalized by the students are something that cannot be improvised, and the students' reaction to a different way of working cannot be improvised either. Of course, student behavior improves with the presence of a person from outside the classroom, and even more so if this person is an inspector, but these routines and reactions are something that cannot be foreseen.

The relationship between evidence and reality is something that affects in general all inspection services, and it is something that inspections must work on in order to know the reality. For all these reasons, we advocate evidence that directly reflects what is happening in reality, and therefore we believe that the document has to be contrasted with reality. Otherwise, we may have the false sensation that something is working correctly and in reality, it is not.

5. ACCESS TO INSPECTION

So far, we have talked about how the actions of the educational inspection plan should be and how they should be carried out, but we have not talked at all about the people who carry out these inspections. At present, access to inspection requires, among other things, a minimum seniority of eight years, as a career civil servant in a teaching corps, and teaching experience of the same duration. Then, the candidate had to undergo a selective process of competitive

examination. The competitive examination phase served to accredit the candidate's knowledge of educational legislation. Once this knowledge of the legislation had been accredited, the applicant went on to a competitive process, in which, among other aspects, his or her seniority and experience in the performance of different positions were assessed. There are many who defend that in order to become an inspector it should be required to have been a managerial team of an educational center. This issue has never been taken up, beyond being valued in the competition phase as a merit. The reason given by the advocates of introducing this requirement is based on the fact that people who have been school directors have experience in knowledge of the regulations of the area to which the school they direct belongs and have had experience in the management and organization of human resources. In relation to the knowledge of the functioning and legislation of the area to which the center belongs, it is interesting, but it does not determine the knowledge of the functioning and legislation of other types of education other than those provided by the center they direct, or even of centers of a different typology. Study and experience are needed to understand each educational stage, and this takes time. In relation to the management of human resources, it seems to us something fundamental, since exercising management or inspection often consists of being able to motivate the teaching staff to get the best out of themselves in favor of the students and of a democratically decided way of working in the center that, while respecting the regulations, gives the center its identity.

That is why we cannot defend the requirement of having been a school management team, although it should be valued as a preferential merit, but we cannot accept that candidates are not subjected to a competitive examination process in which they have to prove a deep knowledge of all educational legislation.

In the access to the inspectorate, we must also talk about specialties. Until the publication of the LOE, the exercise of educational inspection was by specialties. Thus, in the LGE there were primary education inspection, secondary education inspection and technical inspection. The specialties continued until the LOCE with the following specialties: Preschool, early childhood and primary education; Language; Humanities; Foreign languages and language teaching; Mathematics; Science; Technology and Vocational Training; Physical Education and Sports; Artistic Education; and Pedagogy or Psychology. However, with the LOE the specialties disappeared, a situation that continued with the LOMCE. Both models can be defended. The model by specialties allows, as its own name indicates, a greater specialization in the person who carries out these inspections. The generalist model allows for a broader vision of the education system as a whole. This vision makes it possible to detect and analyze the deficiencies detected in the students of each stage and to introduce mechanisms for solving these deficiencies by coordinating and working together with professionals from the different stages. In short, it builds bridges and recognizes the difficulties and needs of those who live on the other side of the bridge. Undoubtedly, this capacity for global vision and action benefits education, and in coherence with the argument we have maintained throughout this article, we defend a generalist inspection without specialties.

6. THE CURRICULUM AND THE STUDENT BODY AS A REGULAR ACTION OF EDUCATIONAL INSPECTION SUPERVISION

In view of the above, the question of where educational inspection plans should place emphasis must be addressed. Undoubtedly, the central place of action of educational inspection should be the classroom. It is there that the educational act that justifies the existence of educational centers and of the inspectorate itself takes place. But what should we supervise in the classroom? To find the answer we must start from the educational curriculum. This determines the curricular elements to be worked on, the way to evaluate them and the necessary methodology so that this curricular structure and this evaluation can make sense.

In order to examine the curricular elements, it is enough to analyze the curriculum of the course in which we are and verify that the curricular elements that are being worked on are found in it. This, which is so obvious, does not always occur, since there are numerous occasions in which teachers present the curricular elements found in the textbook, without reflecting on whether the textbook corresponds to the curriculum of that course. It is worth remembering that textbooks, since the LOGSE, do not pass a supervision that makes them authorized texts by the Ministry of Education or the Regional Ministries of Education. On the other hand, the scheme of didactic programs inherited from the LOGSE, which needs a thorough revision for its updating, prevents its transfer to the classroom and hinders the supervision by inspection of what is really happening in the classroom. The didactic programs have become a document whose usefulness in terms of teaching practice and supervision is practically nil. The curricular elements to be taught are found in the curriculum and, therefore, replicating them in a program does not contribute anything to it. On the other hand, didactic programs do not provide guidance in relation to the learning activities that teachers design to be carried out in the classroom. Thus, we find ourselves with programs in no man's land and, therefore, they become formal documents that must be sent to the educational inspectorate every year. However, it is possible to take advantage of current technologies and give a twist to the traditional programming scheme, so that teachers design and shape their classroom learning activities as the course progresses and prior to their implementation in the classroom. These activities would be linked by teachers to the elements of the curriculum to be worked on and evaluated, so that both teachers and the educational inspectorate can monitor the progress of the treatment and evaluation of the curriculum in the classroom. The result would be a dynamic program, much closer to the classroom, real and easy to supervise. In this way, the programs would have a static part made up of elements such as the contextualization of the classroom and a dynamic part that links the curriculum with classroom activities and their evaluation, as determined by the curriculum.

A second aspect refers to assessment. A curriculum determines what to assess and therefore the suitability of the instrument to be used. It is a matter of assessing the curricular element set out in the curriculum as it is contained in it, and therefore with an instrument that responds to what the curriculum establishes. This is one of the most important points for the actual implementation of a new curriculum. If public administrations do not supervise assessment and teachers do not become aware of the change in assessment, nothing will change, and we will continue to be anchored in the curriculum designed for Law 14/1970 (LGE) and in that assessment. It is surprising to observe how educational laws succeed one another and yet, in a significant percentage of classrooms, nothing changes. This leads to the fact that the only aspiration is to repeal the current educational law in order to approve a new one, and to a percentage of teachers who take refuge in the continuous changes of laws to talk about the lack of training, the need for time to be updated and the instability that all this produces. At the end of this journey, we find ourselves with a system designed for a society that is very different from the current one, a system that we pretend to disguise as modernity by providing it with computers and digital blackboards to do the same things that were done five decades ago.

In order to explain evaluation, we will give several examples. The first two correspond to the LOMCE curriculum and are real examples, while the last one corresponds to the LOMLOE curriculum and could occur after the implementation of the new curriculum.

The first one is framed in the subject of Biology and Geology of 4th ESO. In this subject we find the following curricular element:

Content	Evaluation criteria	Learning standard
Earth structure and composition.	Understand and compare models that explain the	Analyze and compare models that explain the

Geodynamic and geochemical models.	structure and composition of the earth.	structure and composition of the earth.
------------------------------------	---	---

This particular curriculum element has been assessed as follows: "Indicates the composition of the different layers of the earth".

After applying this evaluation instrument, we have been able to verify if the students know what the different layers of the earth are, but we cannot accredit if they know how to analyze and compare the models that explain the composition of the earth, which is what the evaluation criterion of the learning standard actually indicates. It is possible that, as teachers, we do not agree on the evaluation criteria, and we find it more interesting to identify the different layers that make up the earth. However, that would put us in the role of curriculum designer, which is not our responsibility. In short, the assessment instrument is not appropriate for the curriculum to which it is applied, nor is it appropriate for what the teacher intends to assess.

A second example, also real, can be found in the subject of Spanish Language and Literature in 5th grade.

Content	Evaluation criteria	Learning standard
Conjugation of the most frequent regular and irregular verbs.	Apply basic knowledge about the structure of the language, grammar (grammatical categories) [...] to favor a more fluent communication.	Correctly use the simple and compound tenses in the personal and non-personal forms of the indicative and subjunctive mood of all verbs when producing oral and written texts.

The evaluation instrument proposed in this case indicates: "Conjugates the past perfect tense of the indicative mode of the verb cantar".

It is clear that students must know the different conjugations corresponding to the verb tenses and modes, but the criterion and, especially, the learning standard goes beyond that, and speaks of "correct use". The evaluation instrument does not respond to the curriculum and neither does it respond to what the teacher intends to evaluate. We fear that this example is all too common in our classrooms.

The third example refers to a possible evaluation instrument of the LOMLOE curriculum in the subject of mathematics in the 2nd cycle of primary school. Here we find a "basic knowledge" ("content") that indicates: "Addition, subtraction, multiplication and division of natural numbers solved with flexibility and meaning in contextualized situations: strategies and tools of resolution and properties". Well, it is not possible to evaluate this with a card full of multiplications in which students are asked whether or not they know how to multiply. This instrument is not adequate. In the first place, because there is no evaluation criterion that refers to solving operations of this type out of context, and, secondly, because the scheme of specific competencies set by the Ministry does not include it. Not only does the instrument fail, but also what the teacher wants to evaluate. Of course students will have to know how to multiply and solve multiplications, but the objective is much more ambitious, students must perform these operations in a real context where they know how to apply this multiplication and where their competence is evaluated in the resolution of real situations where students have to put into practice their knowledge, skills and abilities. In short, the LOMLOE assessment is competency-based and, therefore, the contents are one more element to solve that real situation that concludes whether the student is competent or not.

An important reflection, which is rarely made, has to do with the failure to comply with the assessment established in the curriculum. This non-compliance is materialized in the non-adequacy of the assessment instruments, which per se is

a breach of the Organic Law of Education, which would make a hypothetical claim for grades prosper, but even more, if this non-adequacy is continuous over time, it is very likely that the corresponding administration could be subjected to a procedure of patrimonial responsibility. Both situations are undesirable, so we believe it is essential to emphasize the adequacy of assessment instruments and their content as determined by the curriculum. Teachers must evaluate what is set as evaluation criteria and in the way it is determined in the curriculum. Therefore, teachers cannot introduce new assessment criteria, no matter how interesting they may seem to them, if they are not included as such among those established by the curriculum. To do otherwise would place the teacher in the position of curriculum designer, which is not his/her competence.

The third and last point of classroom supervision refers to methodology. Educational laws and curricula establish the principles and goals of the educational system, as well as the aims and objectives of each educational stage. All of them lead to the methodology to be used in the classroom. Attention to diversity, inclusion, coeducation, coexistence, peaceful conflict resolution, respect, effort, perseverance or meaningful learning require certain methodologies that put students in situations that allow them to work on the curriculum as a whole and not only on its more traditional aspects. To this end, the teacher must cease to be the center of the classroom and move towards the students. Teamwork on the part of the students makes it possible to work on aspects such as respect, peaceful conflict resolution, responsibility, attention to diversity, inclusion, coeducation and coexistence. On the other hand, when the students are the actors who carry out the activities that the teaching staff entrusts them with, they discover the difficulties of the task and are in a position to learn from the mistakes made. Thus, the teacher observes the difficulties that each student manifests and obtains very relevant information regarding the appropriateness of the proposed activities. When students face challenges, they develop self-confidence and perseverance, so that their self-esteem increases. Finally, the activities proposed by the teachers must engage the students and

they will do so if they are perceived as something useful for their daily life, or if they are motivating because they are focused as a game that motivates them and internalizes the values of effort, respect and perseverance.

7. THE CURRICULUM AND THE STUDENT BODY IN NON-ROUTINE EDUCATIONAL INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

In the previous section we have defended the work that educational inspection must carry out in the classroom. The focus has been on the students and the curriculum, that is, on the two elements that give meaning to the existence of the school itself: who is the target and what is to be taught. This approach focuses on the service and the recipient and leaves aside the tasks that have no impact on the education our students receive.

In the same way, the participation of the inspection service is necessary within work teams with the participation of other teaching groups and even other administrative bodies. We frequently come across training programs, plans or activities where the transversal and integral vision of educational inspection is necessary. We often see plans, projects and even training activities that, instead of being integrated into the curriculum as a whole, end up becoming layers that leave the curriculum, the very essence of education, in the background. All these layers consume time and resources in activities with no impact on curriculum learning. Thus, for example:

- a) The organizational structure of the educational system is made up of the educational centers themselves, the training and resource centers, and finally, the educational inspection service. However, there is a lack of a connection between these three elements that would give the system an added value with important benefits for student learning. The training and resource centers have been providing important training focused on the curriculum and its transfer to the classroom. However, the impact that such training has had on daily teaching practice has been residual. It is necessary to move forward along this line since it is not acceptable for an organization to train its

personnel without monitoring the day-to-day application of this training. This mismatch undermines all this training and makes it necessary to rethink the economic resources invested in it. If the objective of teacher training is to improve teaching practice, it is necessary to evaluate it, and this is where it is supervised by the educational inspection service. Based on this premise, we will be in a position to know the impact that this training has had, and we will also detect the needs of teachers in their daily teaching practice. In this way, training centers, schools e inspección educativos actuarán de forma coordinada e interrelacionada.

- b) b) The educational inspectorate must be part of the working groups that develop the educational curricula for the different courses of study. The curricula of the different teachings and stages are developed by teachers. Undoubtedly, teachers who teach in these stages and subjects should be part of these working groups. But the participation of the educational inspectorate in these working groups provides the curriculum with a global vision at the stage level and also links it to the principles and purposes of the law. This comprehensive vision is not often found in teachers who specialize in a particular subject. This global approach to the education system, its stages and its principles and goals, gives the curriculum an overall value that it does not have if it is approached in isolation and without connection to the rest of the curricula and the law. These same arguments are also applicable to the presence of inspectors in teacher selection tribunals, a situation with a long tradition and where the presence of the educational inspection service provides the added value of identifying the teacher who, beyond knowing a certain subject very well, is capable of connecting with the students for whom the class is intended.
- c) c) The plans that other administrations propose to the educational administration often lack the necessary and integrating curricular approach. In this way, they lose the curricular educational impact that directs the school and become activities that could perfectly well be framed in leisure or extracurricular activities, competing with the purpose of the school. For all

these reasons, the participation of the educational inspectorate is necessary to integrate these plans with the curriculum, to determine the prior training that teachers must receive before applying them, and to determine the instruments and indicators of achievement that will allow them to be evaluated.

8. THE ADMINISTRATIVE WORK OF EDUCATIONAL INSPECTION

In relation to the administrative tasks performed by the inspectorate, there are tasks that must necessarily be carried out by the educational inspectorate and others that, although they usually fall to the inspectorate, should be assumed by administrative personnel. In order to determine which administrative tasks are the responsibility of the educational inspectorate, the corresponding educational administration must decide which ones require the necessary intervention of an inspector. From there, the administration itself will have to resize the staff to carry out these tasks.

The educational inspection personnel see how the different general sub-directorates and delegations of education set functions and competencies for them. Much of this work is purely administrative: admission of students, staffing tables, instruction of disciplinary proceedings, teaching planning, supervision of center organization documents, etc. Some of these tasks involve a purely bureaucratic part that should be carried out by auxiliary administrative personnel, leaving the technical part to the inspector. For example, in the admission of students, the review of documentation, the correction of applications, the drafting of resolutions and the notification of these, are tasks that fall within the field of action of administrative assistants. However, in many occasions it is being carried out by inspectors. It is necessary to reserve only the technical part of the evaluation of this documentation to the inspectors. This would make effective and efficient use of the human resources available to the administration.

Since we are not in this situation of effective and efficient use of resources, the administrations should assess whether the educational inspection service has the necessary inspectors to carry out all the actions entrusted to them; if not, they should reduce these administrative tasks so that they are in line with the size of the corresponding service.

In this context, the corresponding administrations should assess whether the labor costs involved in the bureaucratic and technical intervention of inspectors in these tasks is something they can or should assume. In any case, it is necessary to size the educational inspection services in order to adapt the workload to the number of available inspectors. It is true that in certain temporary periods the group of inspectors makes an effort to meet this workload, but this cannot be permanent due to the risk of stress and demotivation to which the inspection would be subjected, thus undermining the ultimate purpose of educational inspection.

One of the aspects that does form part of the administrative work of the inspection is the recording of the actions carried out. It is clear that the work must be documented, but as we have argued throughout this article, the record should serve to inform our superiors and, above all, so that schools and teachers have feedback on the correct aspects and those that need to be corrected and improved.

We advocate that records should not be standardized. In recent years we have observed how the reports and records handled by the educational inspectorate respond to prefixed models that, while standardizing the different educational centers, do not provide information and concrete guidelines to the centers that allow their improvement. The reports should be useful for schools and teachers, and not necessarily for the higher educational inspection bodies or the educational inspectorate itself. The objective cannot be the registry itself, but rather the objective is to improve learning and treatment of the curriculum both in

the methodological aspects as well as in the evaluation established in the curriculum.

9. **CONCLUSIONS**

The computerization of administrations has led to a documentary inspection in which documents that do not necessarily correspond to teaching practice in the classroom are valued. This leads us to reflect on its usefulness for improving the educational system. This documentary inspection in which we are immersed responds to quality standards focused on reporting based on pre-established records and with the exclusive quality indicator of the number of records and not the content. Therefore, we propose an educational inspection whose working space is the classroom. We cannot forget what the purpose of education is and, therefore, what the inspection should focus on: the learning of the curriculum, the methodology it requires and, especially, the evaluation that is carried out with its corresponding evaluation instruments. In this way, the indicator would cease to be the number of records and become the number of corrective actions in the centers, weighted according to the impact that these corrections will have on the education of students. The records would collect information that directly influences students' education. This paradigm shift would put the focus of inspection on students and, as a consequence, on improving the education of the society in which we live. It is a matter of turning the model upside down and inspecting the classroom to act on the classroom, and not inspecting the paper so that the administrations can extract statistics that, in many cases, neither correspond to reality nor improve it.

10. **SPECIAL THANKS**

I would like to end by expressing my gratitude for their help and advice to Yolanda Cadórniga Díaz and M^a Ángeles Aramburu Núñez, Education Inspectors of the Consellería de Educación de la Xunta de Galicia.

REFERENCES BIBLIOGRAPHICS AND NORMATIVES

- Camacho Prats, Alexandre. (octubre 2015). Los antecedentes remotos de la inspección educativa española durante el antiguo régimen. *Supervisión21*, 38(38), 14. Retrieved from:
<https://usie.es/supervision21/index.php/Sp21/article/view/123>
- López del Castillo, María Teresa (2013). Historia de la inspección de primera enseñanza en España. *Secretaría General Técnica. Subdirección general de Documentación y Publicaciones. Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte*.
- Camacho Prats, Alexandre. (2022). LA VISITA DE INSPECCIÓN. *Supervisión 21*, 65(65). Retrieved from:
<https://usie.es/supervision21/index.php/Sp21/article/view/629>
- Polo Martínez, I. (2018). La visita de inspección en riesgo de extinción. *Avances En Supervisión Educativa*, (29). Retrieved from:
<https://avances.adide.org/index.php/ase/article/view/623/500>
- Pérez Jiménez, J. M., & García Ballesteros, P. E. (2022). LA VISITA A LAS AULAS: EL ETERNO RETORNO. *Supervisión 21*, 60(60), 54. Retrieved from:
<https://usie.es/supervision21/index.php/Sp21/article/view/537>
- Royal Decree of March 30, 1849 (Gaceta de Madrid, April 2).
- Royal Decree 276/2007, of February 23, 2007, which approves the Regulations for admission, access, and acquisition of new specialties in the teaching bodies referred to in Organic Law 2/2006, of May 3, 2006, on Education, and regulates the transitory regime for admission referred to in the seventeenth transitory provision of the aforementioned law (BOE no. 53, of March 2).
- Royal Decree 334/2004, of February 27, 2004, which approves the Regulations for admission, access, and acquisition of new specialties in the teaching bodies which teach the school education system and in the Corps of Education Inspectors (BOE no. 51, of February 28).

- Royal Decree 2193/1995, of December 28, 1995, which establishes the basic rules for the access and the provision of jobs in the Corps of Education Inspectors and the integration of the current Inspectors (BOE No. 312, of December 30).
- Royal Decree 1538/2003, of December 5, 2003, which establishes the basic specialties of educational inspection (BOE No. 295, of December 10).