Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Issue 66, 2016, 407-428

# Ministry of National Education Inspectors' Adoption Level of Risk-Based Inspection Model and the Consideration of Its Applicability at Schools

**Ilke KATIPOGLU***

**Suggested Citation:**
Katipoglu I. (2016). Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based ınspection model and the consideration of its applicability at schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,* 66, 407-428
http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.66.23

**Abstract**

*Problem Statement:* The new regulations for the last ten years in terms of educational inspection in the Ministry of National Education reveal the requirement of setting up a new inspection model that will focus on compliance with statutory regulations and improving the quality of education. In this context, this study is significant, assuming that the risk-based inspection model implemented by the Netherlands in 2007 should contribute to the studies conducted by the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection and in the field.

*Purpose of the Study:* This study aimed to determine the Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of a risk-based inspection model and their consideration of its applicability at schools. The model consisted of elements necessary to establish a risk-based inspection model with risk analysis and quality improvement subdimensions. The subdimensions of the model were examined according to the subjects' level of adoption and of its applicability together with the variables of gender, the school they graduated, degree, seniority in the position, age and subject taught at school in order to see if there were differences.

*Method:* The population of the study consisted of 319 assistant inspectors, inspectors and chief inspectors. No sample was chosen because the population was accessible within the framework of this study. The response rate of the survey was 50,15%, and the data collected from 160 Ministry of National Education Inspectors was analyzed with mean, standard deviation, frequency, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis H tests.

* Corresponding author: Ministry of Education, İzmir. e-mail: ilkekatip@gmail.com

*Findings:* The inspectors completely adopted the ideas in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model and found them highly applicable at schools. The inspectors completely adopted the ideas in the subdimension of risk analysis and found them highly applicable at schools. The inspectors completely adopted the ideas in the subdimension of quality improvement and found them highly applicable at schools.

*Conclusions and Recommendations:* The risk-based inspection model was generally adopted by Ministry of National Education Inspectors and was found applicable at schools. However, in order to put this model into practice, the quality standards according to each school type should be set with the participation of the representatives from educational institutions and the e-inspection system should be established by specialist inspectors as a priority. On the other hand, since inspectors should take a significant role in the application stage of this model, the inspectors' competencies should be developed in areas such as risk analysis, the use of information and communication technologies, etc.

*Keywords:* Risk-based inspection model, risk analysis, quality improvement.

## Introduction

Recently, many countries in Europe have re-examined their inspection systems in order to improve the quality of evaluation in education and under the influence of New Public Management (Wilcox, 2000). In this context, school inspection practices are frequently on the agendas for and at the centre of nearly all education quality improvement policies and strategies in most countries (De Grauwe & Naidoo, 2004; Whitby, 2010; Remi, 2011).

In European countries such as England, Ireland, Scotland, Belgium, the Netherlands and the Czech Republic, two approaches to evaluation at schools—internal and external—are put into practice (Eurydice, 2004). Internal evaluation is especially at the centre of quality improvements at the school level. In this context, school self-evaluation and quality assurance have become important themes in educational policy-making and they have been given increased attention in research (Janssens & Van Amelsvoort, 2008). In ınternal evaluation, schools are responsible for monitoring, evaluating and improving the quality of education they provide and they are required to give an account to all stakeholders concerning the quality of education they provide (Scheerens, Van Amelsvoort & Donoughue, 1999). In external evaluation, schools are monitored to improve the quality of education they provide and policy-makers or governments provide a public account of the quality of education at the school level and education in general by providing reliable information to related units (Janssens & Van Amelsvoort, 2008).

In the light of improvements in educational inspection in parallel to New Public Management, the Educational Inspection Act (WOT) in the Netherlands came into force in 2002. This act underlined a new approach to school inspections and redefined the tasks, responsibilities and roles of the Inspectorate (SICI, 2012). With this new act proportional inspection in which the amount and frequency of inspection varies according to the performance of schools came to agenda. In parallel to the proportional inspection approach to improving the quality of education provided by the schools, the Inspectorate developed and implemented a risk-based inspection model in 2007 (Ehren, Leeuw & Scheerens, 2005; Blok, Sleegers & Karsten, 2008; Ehren & Honingh, 2011). This model also was implemented in England, Portugal, Flanders, in some regions of Spain and to a certain extent in Scotland, Wales and some regions of Germany, although it has similarities and differences in terms of practices (SICI, 2009; Remi, 2011; Ofsted, 2011).

The risk-based inspection model starts with a risk analysis conducted by the Dutch Inspectorate of Education between certain dates every year. The school boards are obliged to prepare results and annual documents in accordance with statutory regulations and school signals are analyzed between certain dates after the students' exam results are published (Eurydice, 2009; Inspectorate of Education The Netherlands, 2010; Ehren & Honingh, 2011; SICI, 2012; Ehren & Swanborn, 2012; Ehren, Altrichter, McNamara & O'hara, 2013). Results consist of the students' academic performances on the subjects at school exams and the results on the central national examinations or tests set by the CEVO (The National Commission for the Examinations in Secondary Education and set by CITO (the National Institute for Educational Measurement) plus vocational exams or tests (Ehren & Honingh, 2011; SICI, 2012; Ehren & Swanborn, 2012). Annual documents the legally required school plan, school guide, special needs provision plan, financial report and the school's internal quality evaluation report (self-evaluation report). These documents are called accountability documents because the school boards are required to give an account to the Inspectorate concerning the quality of education offered at schools by these documents (SICI, 2012). Lastly, signals consist of complaints by students, teachers, parents and other stakeholders, articles or news in newspapers (print media) or on the internet (visual/internet media) and the findings of thematic inspections (Inspectorate of Education The Netherlands, 2010; SICI, 2012).

At the end of the risk analysis phase, quality inspections are conducted in high-risk schools to investigate the quality standards and indicators that may be at risk at the school. Therefore, the focus of the quality inspection is determined by the nature and gravity of the risks detected. According to the results of the risk analysis and quality inspections, schools are judged with regard to the quality of the education they provide and their compliance with the statutory regulations. That way, the next year's inspection programme is arranged in which the amount and frequency of inspection varies according to the school's performance (Inspectorate of Education The Netherlands, 2010; Van Bruggen, 2010; SICI, 2012). In other words, schools that have no risks or shortcomings are judged as "sufficient/good" with regard to the quality of the education they provide and their compliance with the statutory

regulations and are not included into the next year's inspection programme. However, these schools are placed in the basic inspection programme and they are visited at least once every four years, even though no risks may have been detected. These short visits focus on a selection of quality standards that is relevant given the previous results of risk-analysis of the schools or the agenda of the Inspectorate (Eurydice, 2009; Inspectorate of Education The Netherlands, 2010; Van Bruggen 2010; Ehren & Honingh, 2011; SICI, 2012; Ehren et al., 2013).

On the other hand, schools that have high-risks are judged as "unsatisfactory/weak" with regard to the quality of the education they provide and their compliance with the statutory regulations. These schools are included in the next year's inspection programme and tailored inspections are conducted for no more than two years based on risks or shortcomings called "quality improvement inspection" [QII]. The intensity of the inspection is proportional to the gravity of the risks or shortcomings (Inspectorate of Education The Netherlands, 2010; SICI, 2012).

Within the reconstructing process in the field of education in Turkey, the law-amending ordinance entitled No: 652, Organization and Duties of Ministry of National Education published in 14.09.2011 redefined the duties of the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection.Therefore, the Directorate is obliged to fulfill inspection services considering not only the legislation but also the predetermined goals, objectives, performance criteria and quality standards (Ministry of National Education [MoNE], 2011). The 2010-2014 Strategic Plan of the Ministry of National Education aimed to establish a more effective counseling and inspection system and carry out studies ensuring the quality, efficiency and productivity (MoNE, 2009). Article 602 related to enhancing the educational system of Ninth Development Plan (2007-2013) approved by Turkish Grand National Assembly on 28.06.2006 with Law No: 877 emphasized that with the aim of spreading opportunities for a quality education, quality assurance systems will be set up in education institutions and quality standards will be determined and made widespread (DPT, 2006).

These regulations reveal the requirement for a new inspection model to focus on compliance with statutory regulations and improving the quality of education. In this context, the stages of case analysis (diagnosis), evaluation, correction and improvement (Basar, 2000; Aydin, 2008) should be reviewed within the framework of contemporary educational inspection. Indeed when the previous school inspection system was evaluated, it was found that the criteria upon which schools were evaluated was not clear, the main focus of those inspections was compliance with the statutory regulations and the inspection monitoring for quality improvement was insufficient. Therefore, the new inspection model is expected to increase the quality in accordance with the predetermined quality standards using case analysis and fullfilling inspection services that focus on the risks detected. Also when the amount and frequency of inspection practices is determined in the light of objective criteria and evaluation, inspectors will be able to focus on rapid improvement of "unsatisfactory/weak" schools. This will ensure the quality, efficiency and productivity of inspection services.In this context, this study is significant, assuming that the risk-based inspection model implemented by the Netherlands in 2007 will

contribute to the studies conducted by the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection and in the field. As a result, this study aimed to determine the MoNE Inspectors' adoption level of the risk-based inspection model and their consideration of its applicability at schools. The model consisted of elements necessary to establish risk-based inspection model, risk analysis and quality improvement subdimensions. The subdimensions of the model were examined according to subjects' level of adoption and their applicability together with the variables of gender, the school they graduated, degree, seniority in the position, age and subject taught at school in order to see if there were differences or not.

## Method

*Research Design*

This study used a survey (descriptive) model. According to Karasar (2005), survey models aim at describing and explaining a past or present case as it is. The case, individual or thing is explained within its own conditions and as it is.

*Research Sample*

The population of the study consisted of 319 assistant inspectors, inspectors and chief inspectors working in the MoNE, Directorate of Counseling and Inspection at the time of the survey. No sample was dchosen because the population was accessible within the framework of this study. Responding was voluntary and the response rate of the survey was 50,15%. The data collected from 160 Ministry of National Education Inspectors were analyzed in this study. The data were collected in the in-service training seminar of the MoNE, Directorate of Counseling and Inspection in February 2013 by the researcher. Eighty-five percent of the MoNE Inspectors who participated in the study were male and 11,9% were female, while 20,9% were assistant inspectors, 58,8% were inspectors and 20,6% were chief inspectors. Nearly 37% (36,3%) of inspectors were between the ages of 30-40, 44,4% were between the ages of 41-50 and 17,5% were 51 and over. According to the school from which they graduated, 70% of the Ministry of National Education Inspectors had graduate degrees and28,8% had post-graduate degrees. According to the seniority in the position, 83,1% of the Ministry of National Education Inspectors had between 1-15 years of seniority, 10% had between 16-25 and only 6,3% had 26 or more years of seniority.

*Research Instrument and Procedure*

The researcher developed a data collection tool based on the risk-based inspection model implemented by the Netherlands, with three subdimensions— "Necessary Elements to Establish Risk-based Inspection Model," "Risk Analysis" and "Quality Improvement." Six academicians checked the draft tool and seven questions on demographic variables and 33 statements about the model were included in the final version of the tool, in accordance with the academicians' opinions.

The data collection tool was developed in the form of a Likert scale. In the tool, the options for the adoption level of the statements about the risk-based inspection model were placed on the left and the options about its applicability level at schools was on the right. Agreement ratings were designed as a 5-point scale including (5) completely agree, (4) mostly agree, (3) moderately agree, (2) slightly agree and (1) completely disagree.

*Validity and Reliability*

160 Ministry of National Education Inspectors involved in this study answered the scale considering the adoption and applicability of the risk-based inspection model. For this reason, the applicability level was taken into consideration in the validity-reliability analysis, because no sample was chosen and the whole data collected from 160 Ministry of National Education Inspectors were analyzed. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to validate the construct of the risk-based inspection model scale. Additionally, Cronbach's Alpha coefficient and item-total correlations were used for the reliability of the scale.

The risk-based inspection model scale consisted of three subdimensions: necessary elements to establish the risk-based inspection model with 12 items, risk analysis with 13 items and quality improvement with 12 items. Based on the results of EFA, the first subdimension (necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model) explained 22.30, the second subdimension (risk analysis) explained 20.12 and the third dimension (quality improvement) explained 17.11 percent of the total variance. Finally, the EFA result with the scale explained 59.29 of the total variance. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the first subdimension (necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model) was 89 and Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the second subdimension (risk analysis) and third subdimension (quality improvement) was .92. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient for the total scale was.96. According to these results, it is possible to say that a valid and reliable scale was developed in terms of applicability.

*Data Analysis*

The data were collected during the in-service training seminar of MoNE, Directorate of Counseling and Inspection arranged for MoNE Inspectors in February 2013. Permission was obtained from MoNE, Directorate of Counseling and Inspection. The personal information of 160 MoNE Inspectors was analyzed by percentage and frequency. Mean and standard deviation were used in the analysis of subdimensions of the risk-based inspection model in terms of adoption level and consideration of its applicability. The assessment of the participants' responses in terms of mean was based on these agreement ratings: (1,00-1,79) completely disagree, (1,80-2,59) slightly agree, (2,60-3,39) moderately agree, (3,40-4,19) mostly agree, and (4,20-5,00) completely agree.

## Results

The mean, standard deviation and relative rank values for the MoNE Inspectors' adoption level of the subdimension necessary elements to establish risk-based

inspection model and their consideration of its applicability at schools are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.**
*Responses of Inspectors on "Necessary Elements to Establish Risk-Based Inspection Model" Subdimension*

| *Adoption* | | | *Questionnaire Statements* | *Applicable* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* | | *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* |
| 4,67 | ,62 | 1 | U_1. The quality standards according to all levels of education (preschool, elementary, middle, high, vocational and technical schools should be set down by MoNE. | 3,99 | 1,00 | 4 |
| 4,54 | ,78 | 4 | U_2. MoNE should cooperate with the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection while setting down the indicators for each quality standard. | 4,15 | 1,02 | 3 |
| 4,56 | ,71 | 2 | U_4. "e-Inspection System" providing continuous and fast data slow between the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection and the provinces, districts and schools should be established. | 4,16 | ,94 | 2 |
| 4,55 | ,76 | 3 | U_5. "Monitoring and Evaluation Unit" should be set up in order to monitor the performances of the schools. | 4,29 | ,92 | 1 |
| 4,55 | ,74 | 3 | U_3. While the indicators are set up by MoNE and the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection, there should be a cooperation with the representatives of educational institutions. | 3,94 | ,95 | 5 |
| 4,50 | ,70 | 5 | U_6. In schools, the establishment of quality assurance systems to monitor the quality of education continuously and give an account to all stakeholders of education should be provided by MoNE. | 3,87 | 1,05 | 7 |
| 4,32 | ,93 | 6 | U_7. Schools should be obliged to prepare "quality monitoring and evaluation report" at the end of each academic year. | 3,73 | 1,05 | 8 |
| 4,12 | ,89 | 7 | U_22. At the end of risk analysis and quality inspection, according to their performance on the basis of quality standards, schools should be judged as ***"unsatisfactory/weak/sufficient/good"*** | 3,90 | ,96 | 6 |
| *Total* | | | | *Total* | | |
| 35,81 | | 6,13 | | 32,0 | 7,89 | |

As seen in Table 1, the inspectors completely ($\overline{X}$ = 4,48 / 35,81) adopted the ideas in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model and found them highly ($\overline{X}$ = 4,48 / 35,81) applicable at schools.

The mean, standard deviation and relative rank values for the Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of the subdimension risk analysis and their consideration of its applicability at schools are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.**

*Responses of Inspectors on "Risk Anaylsis" Subdimension*

| *Adoption* | | | *Questionnaire Statements* | *Applicable* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* | | *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank I* |
| 3,77 | ,94 | 11 | U_9. In risk analysis phase, national and international examinations/tests results of the students should be analyzed as primary indicators. | 3,58 | ,99 | 10 |
| 3,80 | 1,06 | 10 | U_12. In risk analysis phase, articles or news in newspapers (print media) or on the internet (visual/internet media) about schools should be analyzed | 3,36 | 1,02 | 12 |
| 4,23 | ,90 | 7 | U_15. In risk analysis phase, the findings taken from "Performance Management System" which will be established by MoNE should be analyzed. | 3,79 | 1,00 | 9 |
| 4,38 | ,84 | 4 | U_13. In risk analysis phase, the findings of "*thematic inspections*" should be analyzed. | 3,96 | ,95 | 2 |
| 4,21 | ,80 | 8 | U_10. In risk analysis phase, "quality monitoring and evaluation report" which will be prepared by schools at the end of each academic year should be analyzed. | 3,80 | ,95 | 8 |
| 4,45 | ,79 | 1 | U_14. In risk analysis phase, the findings of "*basic inspections*" should be analyzed. | 4,07 | ,90 | 1 |
| 4,35 | 4,23 | 5 | U_11. In risk analysis phase, all complaints by different groups should be analyzed. | 3,55 | 1,27 | 11 |
| 4,44 | ,72 | 2 | U_19. In "quality inspection" phase, the quality standards and indicators which may be at high risk should be investigated in detail and within school. | 3,94 | ,98 | 3 |
| 4,35 | ,88 | 5 | U_17. In risk analysis phase, the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection should cooperate with measurement and evaluation specialists. | 3,85 | ,92 | 4 |

Table 2 Continue

| *Adoption* | | | *Questionnaire Statements* | | *Applicable* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* | | | *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* |
| 4,12 | ,96 | 9 | U_21. At the end of "quality inspection", the inspectors should prepare the inspection report in cooperation with the school. | 3,85 | 1,03 | 4 | |
| 4,39 | ,74 | 3 | U_20. In *"quality inspection"* phase, high-risk areas of the schools should be closely evaluated by interviews with stakeholders such as students, parents, teachers etc. and observations. | 3,84 | ,93 | 5 | |
| 4,35 | ,79 | 5 | U_8. Every year the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection Monitoring and Evaluation Unit should conduct risk-analysis in cooperation with the inspectors in order to indentify the areas at risk and evaluate the performances of the schools. | 3,82 | ,98 | 7 | |

As seen in Table 2, the inspectors completely ($\overline{X}$ = 4,23 / 55,11) adopted the ideas the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model and found them highly ($\overline{X}$ = 3,78 / 49,24) applicable at schools.

The mean, standard deviation and relative rank values for the Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of the subdimension quality improvement and their consideration of its applicability at schools are shown in Table 3.

**Table 3.**

*Responses of Inspectors on "Quality Improvement" Subdimension*

| *Adoption* | | | *Questionnaire Statements* | *Applicable* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* | | *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* |
| 4,21 | 0,90 | 10 | U_26. "Quality improvement inspection" should be conducted in order to improve ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools in a maximum two years period. | 3,74 | 0,97 | 6 |

Table 3 Continue

| *Adoption* | | | *Questionnaire Statements* | *Applicable* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* | | *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* |
| 4,33 | 0,89 | 6 | U_30. "Quality inspection" should be conducted in ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools in order to evaluate the *"quality improvement inspection"* phase by the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection. | 3,71 | 1,10 | 7 |
| 4,45 | 0,87 | 3 | U_29. The Directorate of Counseling and Inspection should monitor the ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools continuosly by interim inspections. | 3,86 | 1,05 | 4 |
| 4,26 | 0,92 | 8 | U_25. In ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools tailored inspections based on areas at high risk called "quality improvement inspection" should be conducted. | 3,76 | 1,06 | 5 |
| 4,22 | 1,04 | 9 | U_24. Only ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools should be included into that year's inspection programme by the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection. | 3,96 | 1,05 | 3 |
| 4,35 | 1,07 | 5 | U_23. At the beginning of each academic year "annual inspection programme" for school inspections should be prepared by the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection. | 3,98 | 1,12 | 2 |
| 4,58 | 0,79 | 1 | J_31. At the end of *"Quality inspection"*, the inspection proposal for the desired measures prepared by the inspectors of Directorate of Counseling and Inspecti sent to Minister of Education and related directorate | 4,31 | 0,90 | 1 |
| 4,31 | 0,92 | 7 | J_16.During the inspection phase, Directorate of Counseling and Inspection Monitoring and Evaluation Unit should be in constant communication with the schools to exchange data. | 3,68 | 1,08 | 8 |
| 4,41 | 0,82 | 4 | U_27. At the beginning of *"Quality improvement inspection"* phase ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools should be obliged to formulate a " quality improvement plan" in high-risk areas. | 3,96 | 0,94 | 3 |
| 4,17 | 1,02 | 11 | U_32. If ***"unsatisfactory/weak"*** schools can't increase their performance as ***sufficient/good""*** in a maximum two years period MoNE should impose sanctions. | 3,65 | 1,18 | 9 |

Table 3 Continue

| *Adoption* | | | *Questionnaire Statements* | *Applicable* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* | | *M* | *S* | *Imp. Rank* |
| 4,48 | 0,82 | 2 | U_28. "*Unsatisfactory/weak*" schools should be obliged to put the " quality improvement plan" in high-risk areas into practice. | 3,98 | 1,00 | 2 |
| 4,10 | 1.12 | 12 | U_33. The inspection reports prepared by the group of inspectors of Directorate of Counseling and Inspection should be published both in writing and electronic form on the website to public. | 3,58 | 1,19 | 10 |
| | | | *Total* | | *Total* | |
| 51,87 | 11,18 | | | 46,17 | 12,64 | |

As seen in Table 3, the inspectors completely ($\overline{X}$ = 4,32 / 51,87) adopted the ideas in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model and found them highly ($\overline{X}$ = 3,84 / 49,24) applicable at schools.

*Findings about the Independent Variables*

Independent Mann Whitney-U test was used to see if there were significant differences according to gender and the school from which they graduated. Kruskal Wallis H was used to see if there were significant differences according to degree, seniority in the position, age and subject taught at school. Non-parametric tests were used because the p-value was less than 0,005 according to Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. This means that the distribution of points differ significantly.

The results of Mann Whitney-U test were used to see if there were significant differences in MoNE Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model and their consideration of its applicability at schools according to gender are shown in Table 4.

**Table 4.**

*Comparison of MoNE Inspectors' Adoption Level of Risk-Based Inspection Model and Their Consideration of Its Applicability at Schools According to Gender*

| *The Subdimensions of Risk-based Inspection Model According to Adoption Level* | *Group* | *n* | *Mean Rank* | *Sum of Ranks* | *U* | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Necessary Elements to Establish Risk-based Inspection Model* | Female | 19 | 103,29 | 1962,50 | 792,5 | .00 |
| | Male | 136 | 73,87 | 9972,50 | | |
| *Risk Analysis* | Female | 19 | 95,95 | 1823,00 | 932 | .054 |
| | Male | 136 | 74,90 | 10112,00 | | |
| *Quality Improvement* | Female | 19 | 98,34 | 1868,50 | 886,5 | .02 |
| | Male | 136 | 74,57 | 10066,50 | | |
| *The Subdimensions of Risk-based Inspection Model According to Applicability Level at Schools* | Group | n | *Mean Rank* | *Sum of Ranks* | U | p |
| *Necessary Elements to Establish Risk-based Inspection Model* | Female | 19 | 96,03 | 1824,50 | 949,5 | .06 |
| | Male | 136 | 75,48 | 10265,50 | | |
| *Risk Analysis* | Female | 19 | 99,45 | 1889,50 | 884,5 | .02 |
| | Male | 136 | 75,00 | 10250,00 | | |
| *Quality Improvement* | Female | 19 | 99,55 | 1891,50 | 882,5 | .02 |
| | Male | 136 | 74,57 | 10066,50 | | |

As seen in Table 4, in MoNE Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model according to gender there was significant difference in the subdimensions of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model (U=792,5, p<.05) and quality improvement (U=886,5, p<.05). On the other hand, there was no significant difference in the subdimension risk analysis (U=932, p>.05). In both necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model and quality improvement, female inspectors reported more positive views than male inspectors. In MoNE Inspectors' consideration of its applicability at schools of risk-based inspection model according to gender there was significant difference in the subdimensions of risk analysis (U=

884,5, p<.05) and quality improvement (U=882,5, p<.05). On the other hand, there was no significant difference in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model (U=949,5, p>.05). In both subdimensions, risk analysis and quality improvement, female inspectors reported more positive views than male inspectors.

The results of Kruskal Wallis H test used to see if there were significant differences in Ministry of National Education Inspectors' consideration of risk-based inspection model's applicability at schools according to degree are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5.**

*Kruskal Wallis H test*

| *The Subdimensions of Risk-based Inspection Model According to Applicability Level at Schools* | *Group* | *n* | *Mean Rank* | *sd* | $x^2$ | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Necessary Elements to Establish Risk-based Inspection Model | Assistant Inspector | 33 | 100,45 | 2 | 9,353 | .00 |
| | Inspector | 94 | 78,39 | | | |
| | Chief Inspector | 33 | 66,55 | | | |
| Risk Analysis | Assistant Inspector | 33 | 85,61 | 2 | 0,943 | .62 |
| | Inspector | 94 | 80,78 | | | |
| | Chief Inspector | 33 | 74,59 | | | |
| Quality Improvement | Assistant Inspector | 33 | 95,73 | 2 | 4,506 | .10 |
| | Inspector | 94 | 76,69 | | | |
| | Chief Inspector | 33 | 76,12 | | | |

As seen in Table 5, there was no significant difference in the subdimensions of risk analysis [$x^2$ (2)=0,943, p>.05] and quality improvement [$x^2$(2)= 4,506, p>.05]. On the other hand, there was a significant difference in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2$ (2) =9,353, p<.05]. Considering the rank mean of the groups, assistant inspectors reported more positive views than inspectors and chief inspectors. In MoNE Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model according to seniority in the position there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2$

(2)=3,545, p>.05], risk analysis [$x^2$ (2)=0,081, p>.05] or quality improvement [$x^2$(2)=1,369, p>.05] .

The results of Kruskal Wallis H test used to see if there were significant differences in MoNE Inspectors' consideration of risk-based inspection model's applicability at schools according to seniority in the position are shown in Table 6.

**Table 6.**

*Kruskal Wallis H test*

| *The Subdimensions of Risk-based Inspection Model According to Applicability Level at Schools* | *Group* | *n* | *Mean Rank* | *Sd* | $x^2$ | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Necessary Elements to Establish Risk-based Inspection Model* | 1-15 Years | 133 | 83,29 | 2 | 7,245 | |
| | 16-25 Years | 16 | 50,69 | | | |
| | 26 Years and Above | 10 | 83,15 | | | |
| *Risk Analysis* | 1-15 Years | 133 | 82,12 | 2 | 4,079 | |
| | 16-25 Years | 16 | 58,22 | | | |
| | 26 Years and Above | 10 | 86,65 | | | |
| *Quality Improvement* | 1-15 Years | 133 | 80,09 | 2 | 1,776 | |
| | 16-25 Years | 16 | 70,06 | | | |
| | 26 Years and Above | 10 | 94,75 | | | |

As seen in Table 6, there was no significant difference in the subdimensions of risk analysis [$x^2_{(2)}$=4,079, p>,05] and quality improvement [$x^2_{(2)}$= 1,776, p>,05], while there was a significant difference in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2_{(2)}$=7,245, p<.05].Inspectors with 1-15 years working experience reported more positive views than the inspectors with 16-25 years and 26 years or more working experience. In Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model according to seniority in the position there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2_{(2)}$ =4,659, p>.05], risk analysis [$x^2_{(2)}$=1,296, p>.05] or quality improvement [$x^2_{(2)}$=0,906, p>.05].

In Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model and their consideration of its applicability at schools according to the school they graduated there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model (U=2558,5, p>0,05), risk analysis (U=2055, p>.05) or quality improvement (U=2478, p>.05).

Similarly, in Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model according to age, there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2_{(2)}$=3,299, p>.05], risk analysis [$x^2_{(2)}$=0,271, p>.05] or quality improvement [$x^2_{(2)}$=1,471, p>,05]. In Ministry of National Education Inspectors' consideration of its applicability at schools according to age, there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2_{(2)}$=1,719, p>.05], risk analysis [$x^2$=0,409, p>.05] or quality improvement [$x^2_{(2)}$=0,228, p>.05].

Finally, in Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based inspection model according to subject taught at school, there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2_{(2)}$=0,431, p>.05], risk analysis [$x^2_{(2)}$=0,152, p>.05] or quality improvement [$x^2_{(2)}$=1,675, p>.05]. In Ministry of National Education Inspectors' consideration of its applicability at schools according to age there was no significant difference in necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model [$x^2$ (2)=1,803, p>.05], risk analysis [$x^2$=1,117, p>.05] or quality improvement [$x^2$(2)=3,033, p>.05].

## Discussion and Conclusion

Considering the research findings, the Ministry of National Education Inspectors highly adopted the establishment of an e-inspection system to provide continuous and fast data slow between the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection and the provinces, districts and schools and setting up a monitoring and evaluation unit to monitor the schools' performances and found applicable. At this point, in February 2013 when the data was collected, within the reconstructing process in the field of education in Turkey,setting up a monitoring and evaluation unit within the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection was on the agenda and studies were being carried out about the establishment of an e-inspection system. Therefore, these studies may be effective for the view of the Ministry of National Education Inspectors. Similarly, by the units of risk assessment in England and preliminary enquiry in Flanders (the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium) where the risk-based inspection model was implemented, information and documents from the databank have been analyzed and the school's performances have been monitored. In Holland, England, Flanders, Scotland, the Czech Republic, and Ireland databanks were established by different units of Inspectorares and those databanks have been constantly updated with new information. By these databanks, necessary documents have been taken from schools in the electronic forms and a set of reports have been prepared for inspectors and schools (Standaert, 2000).

Also, in light of the research findings, the Ministry of National Education Inspectors highly adopted setting down quality standards according to all levels of education (preschool, elementary, middle, high, vocational and technical schools) by MoNE and cooperating with the Directorate of Counseling and Inspection while setting down the indicators for each quality standard. A common framework consisting of predetermined inspection areas and a set of indicators according to every educational stage and school type has been used in England, Ireland, Flanders (the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium), the Czech Republic, etc., related with their educational systems (Van Bruggen, 2010). Considering the researches in Turkey, the research findings of Bilir (1993), Kayikci and Sarlak (2009) showed that the current inspection model is insufficient and there is a need to implement a new model in order to improve the the quality of education. As a result, the views of Ministry of National Education Inspectors can be said to be supportive and parallel to the literature and related research.

Risk analysis has been found highly adopted and applicable at schools by Ministry of National Education Inspectors in general. Indeed in Holland, Flanders and England where the risk-based inspection model was implemented, it can be said that risk-analysis is one of the most important phases of the model. Risk-analysis plays a key role in determining the amount and frequency of inspection carried out at schools. The views of the Ministry of National Education Inspectors are similar to Aydin's views (2009). Aydin (2009) said that in the current inspection model the focus is on standard evaluation, not on needs. The schools' and teachers' performances are evaluated in a standard way and time whether their performances are adequate or not, while the inspectors can have the chance to allow more time to schools and teachers that need more help, they have been spending more time and resources to inspect the schools and teachers that have been above a level of performance.

On the other hand, considering the research findings, the statements, iIn risk analysis phase, all complaints by different groups and in risk analysis phase, national and international examinations/tests results of the students should be analyzed as primary indicator found adopted and applicable at schools by the inspectors the least. According to Dutch Inspectorate of Education, signals consisting of articles or news in newspapers (print media) or on the internet (visual/internet media) and complaints about schools are seen as an indicator of the decline in the quality of education offered by the schools. These signals reveal more current information about the problems at schools(Inspectorate of Education The Netherlands, 2010; SICI, 2012). As inquiry is considered to be one of the tasks of Ministry of National Education Inspectors, the results of the inquires may be analyzed within the databank. An analysis of exam results in the risk-analysis phase is on agenda and has been frequently discussed in Europe. In this context, the findings of Ehren and Swarborn (2012) showed that both before and after the introduction of the risk-based school inspections, schools exhibited limited strategic behaviours about the exams, like cheating and reshaping the test pool. There was no significant difference between "*sufficient/good*" schools and "*unsatisfactory/weak*" schools in this context.

Since there were no interviews with the school management, teachers or students during the research, the factors under the strategic behaviours could not be found and this fact was one of the shortcomings of the research. Therefore, it is not possible to generalize the findings of this research since the model is new and this is the first research according to Ehren and Swanborn (2012). Thus additional research may shed more light on this issue. In the general assembly of SICI (The Standing International Conference of Inspectorates) held in 2007 in Belgium, it was pointed out that exam results are important indicators. However, inspectors should not only focus on the outcome indicators such as exam results but also look at processes and input. Inspection should be a part of quality improvement. İt is needed to know where schools stand and about the learning outcome of students in amore general framework (Schatteman, 2008).

Lastly, "The inspection reports prepared by the group of inspectors of Directorate of Counseling and Inspection should be published both in writing and electronic form on the website to public," was found adopted and applicable at schools by the inspectors the least. Although the research findings put forward that parents make only very limited use of inspection reports in order to motivate schools to improve the quality of education they have offered (Ehren et al., 2013), according to Schatteman (2008) and Rijcke (2008), inspection reports should be published whether they are positive or critical toward the schools involved. In many countries there is hesitation with regard to public reporting, but school reports are critical documents that create pressure on schools and inspectors. Public reporting should bring about positive practices in the long term. Public reporting should improve the inspectors since they should be more responsible for wiriting a balanced inspection report, presenting tested evidence and careful analysis. Thus this will result in an improvement of the quality of the documents used in the long term (Schatteman, 2008; Rijcke, 2008). In light of the discussions in the general assembly of SICI (The Standing International Conference of Inspectorates) in 2007, the publication of reports has been mostly considered positive although it is still sensitive in many countries. It is expected that school management will react better in the future. This will also result in a positive effect on the position of inspectors since Inspectorates will base their judgments more on observation and investigation (Schatteman, 2008). Discussions about public reporting are on agenda, in recent years not only in Holland in Europe, but also in England, Ireland, Flanders and in the Czech Republic where inspection reports have been started to be published both in writing and electronic form on the website.

The inspectors completely adopted the ideas in the subdimension of necessary elements to establish risk-based inspection model but found them highly applicable at schools. The inspectors completely adopted the ideas in the subdimension of risk analysis but found them highly applicable at schools. The inspectors completely adopted the ideas in the subdimension of quality improvement and found them highly applicable at schools.

As a result, it can be said that risk-based inspection model was generally adopted by MoNE Inspectors and was found applicable at schools. However, in order to put

this model into practice, the quality standards according to each school type should be set down with the participation of the representatives from educational institutions and an e-inspection system should be established by specialist inspectors as a priority. Also, since the inspectors should take a significant role in the application stage of this model, the inspectors' competencies should be developed in the areas such as risk analysis, the use of information and communication technologies, etc.

## References

Aydin, I. (2008). O*gretimde denetim durum saptama, degerlendirme ve gelistirme.* (Ikinci Baski*).* Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Aydin, I. (2009). Eğitim denetiminde değişim ihtiyacı ve yeni paradigmalar. [Need for Change in Educational Inspection and New Paradigms.] *I. Uluslararası Katılımlı Eğitim Denetimi Kongresi* (221-224). Ankara: Temsen

Basar, H. (2000). *Egitim denetcisi*. (Besinci Baski). Ankara: PegemA Yayincilik.

Bilir, M. (1993). Turk Milli Egitim Sisteminde teftis alt sisteminin yapi ve isleyisine iliskin bir arastirma ozeti. [A research summary on the structure and functioning of the ınspection subsystem in Turkish National Education System.]. *A.U. Egitim Bilimleri Fakultesi Dergisi,* 25 (1), 251-284.

Blok, H., Sleegers, P., & Karsten, S. (2008). Looking for a balance between ınternal and external evaluation of school quality: Evaluation of the SVI Model. *Journal of Educational Policy,* 23(4), 379-395.

De Grauwe, A., & Naidoo, J. (2004). *School evaluation for quality ımprovement.* Retrieved January, 14, 2012 from http://unescdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/00139804e.pdf

De Wolf, I. F., & Verkroost, J. (2007). Effects and side effects of ınspections and accountability in education: An overview of empirical studies. O*xford Review of Education,* 33(3), 379-396.

Ehren, M. C., Leeuw, F. L., & Scheerens, J. (2005). On the ımpact of Dutch educational supervision act. *American Journal of Evaluation,* 26 (1), *60-76.*

Ehren, M. C., & Visscher, A. (2008). The relationships between school ınspections, school characteristics and school ımprovement. *Britsh Journal of Educational Studies, 5*6(2), 205-227.

Ehren, M. C., & Honingh, M. (2011). Risk-based school ınspections in the Netherlands: A critical reflection on ıntended effects and causal mechanisms. *Studies in Educational Evaluation,* 37, 239-248.

Ehren, M. C., & Swanborn, M. S. (2012). Strategic data use of schools in accountability systems. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 23(2), 257-280.

Ehren, M. C., Altrichter, H., McNamara, G., & O'hara, J. (2013). Impact of school ınspections on ımprovement of schools – describing assumptions on causal mechanisms in six countries. *Educ Asse Eval Acc.,* 25, 3-43.

Elmore, R. F., & Fuhrman, S. H. (2004). Research finds the first assumption of accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 67(4), 9-14.

Eurydice (2004). Evaluation of Schools Providing Compulsory Education in Europe. Brussells: European Commission Directorate – General for Education and Culture.

Eurydice (2009). Organization of the education system in the Netherlands 2008/09. Retrieved April, 12, 2013 fromhttp://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/eurybase/_ full_reports/NL_EN.pdf.

Faubert, V. (2009). *School Evaluation: Current practices in OECD countries and a literature review.* OECD Working Papers, No. 42. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Inspectorate of Education the Netherlands. (2010). *Risk-based Inspection as of Primary and Secondary Education 2009.* Utrecht: Inspectorate of Education the Netherlands.

Janssens, F. J. K., & Van Amelsvoort, G. H. (2008). School self-evaluations and school ınspections in Europe: An exploratory study. *Studies in Educational Evaluation,* 34, 15-23.

Janssens, F. J. K., & De Wolf, I. F. (2009). Analyzing the assumptions of a policy program an ex-ante evaluation of "educational governance" in the Netherlands. *American Journal of Evaluation,* 30 (2), 411-425.

Karasar, N. (2005). *Bilimsel arastirma yontemi.* Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim

Kayikci, K., & Sarlak, S. (2009). Ogretmen ve yoneticilerin ortaogretim kurumlarindaki denetimin fonksiyonlarini gerceklestirme duzeyine iliskin gorus ve onerileri. [The opinions and suggestions of teachers and administrators on the level of functioning of inspection systems in secondary schools.] *I. Uluslararası Katilimli Egitim Denetimi Kongresi* (pp. 289-296). Ankara: Temsen.

Malen, B. (1999). On rewards, punishments and possibilities: teacher compensation as an ınstrument for educational reform. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education,* (12) 4, 387-394.

Matthews, P., & Sammons, P. (2004). *Improvement through inspection.* London: Ofsted.

Nichols, S. L., Glass, G. V., & Berliner, D. C. (2006). High-stakes testing and student achievement: does accountability pressure ıncrease student learning? *Education Policy Analysis Archives,* 14 (1).

Ofsted. (2011). *Risk assessment of maintained schools and academies.* Manchester: Ofsted.

Remi, T. (2011). School inspections: From control and regulation to support and counselling*? Current Literature Review in Education,* 1-16.

Rijcke, F. D. (2008). Inspection and schools – development and challenges in a european perspective. *SICI Review,* 12-15.

Scheerens, J., Van Amelsvoort, H. C., & Donoughue, C. (1999). Aspects of the organisational and political context of school evaluation in four european countries. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 25, 79-108.

SICI (2009). *Flanders profile.* Breda: SICI.

SICI (2012). *The Netherlands profile.* Breda: SICI

Standaert, R. (2000). *Inspectorates of education in Europe: A critical analysis. Utrecht:* Department for Educational Development, Ministry of Education, Flanders.

Van Bruggen, J.C. (2000). *Inspection of schools as an engine for sustainable Change.* Breda: SICI.

Van Bruggen, J. C. (2010). *Inspectorates of education in Europe: Some comparative remarks about their tasks and work.* Breda: SICI.

Whitby, K. (2010). *School inspection: Recent experiences in high performing education systems.* Berkshire: CFBT Education Trust.

Wilcox, B. (2000). *Making school ınspection visits more effective.* Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning.

## Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin Risk Odaklı Denetim Modelini Benimseme ve Uygulanabilir Bulma Düzeyleri

**Atıf:**

Katipoglu I. (2016). Ministry of National Education Inspectors' adoption level of risk-based ınspection model and the consideration of its applicability at schools. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,* 66, 407-428
http://dx.doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2016.66.23

## Özet

*Problem Durumu:* Yeni kamu yönetimi anlayışına paralel olarak eğitim denetiminde yaşanan gelişmeler ışığında Hollanda'da 2002 yılında yürürlüğe giren eğitim denetimi yasası (WOT) ile birlikte, yeni bir denetim yaklaşımının altı çizilmiş ve Hollanda Eğitim Denetimi Kurulu'nun görev, rol ve sorumlulukları yeniden tanımlanmıştır (SICI, 2012, 9). Bu yasayla birlikte, Hollanda'da standart süre ve şekilde yürütülen okul denetimi uygulamaları yerine okulların performanslarıyla orantılı olarak farklı sıklık ve ağırlıkta denetim uygulamalarını işaret eden orantılı denetim yaklaşımı gündeme gelmiştir. Bu bağlamda, okullarda sunulan eğitimin "kalitesinin geliştirilmesi" amacıyla "orantılı denetim" yaklaşımı çerçevesinde de

2007 yılından beri "risk odaklı denetim modeli" adı altında bir model uygulamaya konmuştur (Ehren, Leeuw ve Scheerens, 2005, 64; Blok, Sleegers ve Karsten, 2008, 380; Ehren ve Honingh, 2011, 239). Ayrıca, bu denetim türü, uygulanış şekli açısından ülkeden ülkeye benzerlik ve farklılıklar taşımakla birlikte, bugün İngiltere, Portekiz, Belçika Flaman Bölgesi, İspanya'nın bazı bölgeleri ve belli bir düzeyde İskoçya, Galler ile Almanya'nın bazı eyaletlerinde uygulanmaktadır (SICI; 2009, 1; Remi, 2011, 11; Ofsted, 2011, 4).

Türkiye'de eğitim alanında yeniden yapılanma süreci içinde, "652 sayılı Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının Teşkilat ve Görevleri Hakkında Kanun Hükmünde Kararname" ile birlikte Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığının görevleri yasal olarak yeniden düzenlenmiş, bu bağlamda başkanlık denetim hizmetlerini mevzuatla birlikte önceden belirlenmiş amaç, hedef, performans ölçütleri ve kalite standartlarını göz önünde bulundurarak yerine getirmekle yükümlü kılınmıştır (MEB, 2011). Bu amaçla, Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı'nın "2010-2014 Stratejik Planı"nda daha etkin bir rehberlik ve denetim sisteminin oluşturulması ve bu bağlamda denetim hizmetlerinde kalite, etkinlik ve verimliliği sağlamaya yönelik çalışmalar yapılması amaçlanmıştır (MEB, 2009). Diğer yandan, Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi'nin 28.06.2006 tarih ve 877 sayılı kararı ile kabul edilen "Dokuzuncu Kalkınma Planı (2007-2013)"nın eğitim sisteminin güçlendirilmesine ilişkin 602. maddesinde; kaliteli eğitim olanaklarının yaygınlaştırılması amacıyla eğitim kurumlarında kalite güvence sisteminin oluşturulması ve kalite standartlarının belirlenerek yaygınlaştırılmasına vurgu yapılmaktadır (DPT, 2006).

Tüm bu düzenlemelerin Türkiye'de okul denetimlerinde özellikle çağdaş denetim yaklaşımı çerçevesinde, durum saptama, değerlendirme ile düzeltme ve geliştirme aşamalarının (Basar, 2000, 41; Aydin, 2008) yeniden gözden geçirilerek, okul denetimlerinde sadece yasal düzenlemelere uyum düzeyinde değil, aynı zamanda sunulan eğitimin kalitesini geliştirmeye odaklanacak yeni bir denetim modelinin oluşturulması gerekliliğini ortaya koyduğunu söylemek mümkündür. Nitekim eğitim alanında yeni yapılanma süreci öncesindeki denetim sistemi incelendiğinde; denetlenen okulların hangi ölçütlere göre saptandığına ilişkin belirsizliğin bulunduğu, gerçekleştirilen denetimlerin ağırlıklı olarak okulların yasal düzenlemeleri yerine getirip getirmediklerini kontrol etmeye odaklandığı ve bu bağlamda gerekli önlemlerin alınması yoluna gidildiği, denetim sonrasında ise okullarda geliştirmeye yönelik izlemenin eksik olduğu görülmektedir. Dolayısıyla, önceden belirlenecek kalite standartları doğrultusunda okulların mevcut durumunun saptanarak performanslarının değerlendirilmesi ve eksiklik görülen alanlarda geliştirme odaklı denetimlerin gerçekleştirilmesi yoluyla eğitimde kalitenin geliştirilebileceği düşünülmektedir. Bununla birlikte, nesnel değerlendirmeler ışığında okullarda yürütülecek denetim uygulamalarının sıklık ve ağırlık düzeyi saptandığı takdirde, denetçiler özellikle zayıf veya yetersiz performans gösteren okulların daha hızlı bir şekilde gelişimine odaklanabilir. Bu şekilde de, denetim hizmetlerinde kalite, etkinlik ve verimlilik sağlanabilir. Bu bağlamda, Hollanda'da 2007 yılından beri uygulanmakta olan risk odaklı denetim modelinin gerek Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığının yürüteceği çalışmalara, gerekse eğitim denetimi alanına katkı sağlayacağı varsayımından hareketle, bu araştırma önemli görülmektedir.

*Araştırmanın Amacı:* Bu araştırmada Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin risk odaklı kurum denetim modelini benimseme ve okullarda uygulanabilir bulma düzeylerinin saptanması amaçlanmıştır. Ayrıca Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin bu modeli benimseme ve okullarda uygulanabilir bulma düzeyleri cinsiyet, öğrenim durumu, unvan, kıdem, yaş ve branş değişkenlerine göre incelenmiştir.

*Araştırmanın Yöntemi:* Bu araştırmada tarama modeli (betimsel) kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın evrenini veri toplama aracının uygulanması aşamasında Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığında görev yapan toplam 319 Başdenetçi, Denetçi ve Denetçi Yardımcısı oluşturmuştur. Bu araştırma çerçevesinde evrenin tamamı ulaşılabilir olduğu için tüm evrene ulaşılması hedeflenmiş, bu bağlamda örneklem seçimine gidilmemiştir. Ancak, gönüllülük ilkesine dayalı olarak tüm evrene uygulanan veri toplama aracının geri dönüş oranı %50,15 olmuştur. Dolayısıyla, bu araştırmada istatistikî analizler toplam 160 Başdenetçi, Denetçi ve Denetçi Yardımcısı görüşüne dayalı olarak yapılmıştır. Araştırmanın verileri, 2013 yılı şubat ayında Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Rehberlik ve Denetim Başkanlığı tarafından tüm Milli Eğitim Denetçilerine yönelik düzenlenen hizmet içi eğitim seminerinde toplanmıştır. Araştırmaya katılan Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin %85'i erkek, %11,9'u kadındır. Ünvanlara göre % 20,9'u Denetçi Yardımcısı, % 58,8'i Denetçi ve % 20,6'sı Başdenetçidir. Araştırmaya katılan Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin %36,3'ü 30-40, %44,4'ü 41-50 yaşları arasında olup; %17,5'i de 51 yaş ve üstü yaşa sahiptir. Öğrenim durumları değerlendirildiğinde; Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin %70'i lisans eğitimine sahipken, %28,8'i lisans üstü eğitime sahiptir. Kıdemlerine göre de %83,1'i 1-15 yıl kıdeme sahipken, 16-25 yıl kıdeme sahip Milli Eğitim Denetçisinin oranı %10, 26 yıl ve üstü kıdeme sahip Milli Eğitim Denetçisinin oranı ise sadece %6,3'tür. Araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen ölçme aracıyla toplanan veriler, SPSS kullanılarak aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma, frekans, ilişkisiz Mann Whitney U ve Kruskal Wallis H testleri ile analiz edilmiştir.

*Araştırmanın Bulguları:* Risk odaklı kurum denetim modelinin kurulması için gerekli unsurlar alt boyutunu Milli Eğitim Denetçileri "tamamen" benimsemekteyken; "büyük ölçüde" okullarda uygulanabilir bulmuşlardır. Risk analizi alt boyutunu Milli Eğitim Denetçileri "tamamen" benimsemekteyken; "büyük ölçüde" okullarda uygulanabilir bulmuşlardır. Kalite geliştirme alt boyutunu Milli Eğitim Denetçileri "tamamen" benimsemekteyken; "büyük ölçüde" okullarda uygulanabilir bulmuşlardır.

*Araştırmanın Sonuçları ve Önerileri:* Sonuç olarak, Milli Eğitim Denetçilerinin genel olarak risk odaklı kurum denetim modelini benimsediği ve okullarda uygulanabilir bulduğu söylenebilir. Ancak, bu modelin uygulamaya konması için öncelikle eğitim kurumlarının temsilcilerinin de katılımıyla her okul türüne göre kalite standartları belirlenmeli, uzman denetçilerden oluşan bir "e-denetim sistemi" kurulmalıdır. Diğer yandan, modelin uygulanma sürecinde denetçilerin başrolde olduğu düşünüldüğünde; risk analizi, bilgi ve iletişim teknolojileri kullanımı gibi alanlarda denetçi yeterliklerinin geliştirilmesi gerekmektedir.

*Anahtar Kelimeler:* Risk odaklı denetim modeli, risk analizi, kalite geliştirme.