Abstract. This paper deals with the transformation of the teaching profession in Slovenia from a profession of centrally-controlled public employees to autonomous, self-evaluating public employees. We discuss the role of central bureaucratic pedagogical control in socialism and elements of conceptualisation of post-socialist teachers’ autonomy already during the ancien regime. Further, we present the removal of inspection from the classroom in the early years of representative democracy and the process that accompanied the end of state control of teaching and learning. We conclude our reconsiderations of the shift from dispositive control to dispositive security by presenting data signifying the persistence of the administrative burden: even the inauguration of a light quality assurance system in education must consider the possible accumulation of an additional bureaucratic workload.

1. Introduction

Employing Weber’s concepts of rationalisation and role of bureaucracy in modern democratic societies as well as Foucault’s conceptualisations of norms, normation and normalisation and his concept of security and population as a conceptual background, in this paper we present the transformation of the teaching profession in Slovenia from a profession of centrally-controlled public employees to autonomous, self-evaluating public employees taking care of their personal and professional security and of the security of the population.

Reconsidering some decisive moments and elements of the abovementioned transformation we:

a) discuss the role of central bureaucratic pedagogical control in socialism, inner tensions in the perception of teachers’ jobs, and elements of conceptualisation of post-socialist teachers’ autonomy already during the ancien regime;

b) present the removal of inspection from the classroom in the early years of representative democracy and the process that accompanied the end of state (bureaucratic) control of teaching, as well as the inauguration of an external examination at the end of primary and general upper-secondary education; and

c) conclude our reconsiderations of the abovementioned shift from mechanisms (dispositive) of control to the mechanisms (dispositive) of security (FOUCAULT 2009) by presenting data signifying the persistence of an administrative (documentation) burden and by warning that even the recently planned inauguration of a light quality assurance (QA) system in education in Slovenia must consider the possible accumulation of an additional bureaucratic workload.
For the purpose of our presentation, we will accommodate Bourdieu’s argument against Crozier’s subsumption of the education system under state bureaucracy (BOURDIEU 1990, 189). We will treat the teaching profession as a special type of public service which by its vocation, position and power should not be defined as part of bureaucracy. Thereby, we wish to avoid the frequent generalising fallacy: “to dissolve into undifferentiatedness the differential functions the different systems perform in their relations with different social classes” (IBID., 191). Against this background, we classify as educational bureaucracy only those officials “governing” education from the outside, such as inspections, local administration, Ministry of Education officials etc., and not teachers or their superiors in schools.

2. Back to value rationality – back to the fear of control

Trying to present elements of the change in the relationship between autonomy, bureaucratic control and administrative burden in education in Slovenia over the last few decades, one should be aware that the autonomy of educational institutions and teachers was one of the focal expectations and demands for education beyond socialism. Demand was articulated by numerous and influential professional groups that wanted autonomy beyond the autonomy of other public employees; namely, “pedagogic autonomy inherited from the medieval ‘corporation’” (IBID.). From that perspective, the White Paper on Education in the Republic of Slovenia (KREK 1996) written after the change of the system stated that “schools should be autonomous in their relation to the state and authorities” and in “their relation to ‘extra-curricular’ forms and kinds of knowledge or belief” (IBID. 43). Further, the autonomy of kindergartens and schools should be guaranteed by “the funding system and the manner of recruiting teachers, educational professionals, and administrators” (IBID.). Selection criteria should be “publicly known and controlled by [the] public” (IBID.). The conceptualisation of autonomy was clearly connected to the demand for competent teachers who are able to choose their own teaching methods and even to the autonomy of all individuals included in education “equally to teachers throughout the education system and to pupils and students” (IBID., 44. Cf. RAZDEVŠEK/PUČKO 1992; ZGAGA 1992).

One of the central and immediate impulses for such a bold formulation of the importance of autonomy stems from the last two decades of conflicts over the regulation, structure and teaching methods in socialist Slovenia. Regular and “exceptional” inspections of the Board of Education (Zavod za šolstvo) became a widely discussed topic during the last attempt by the socialist government to regain the legitimacy of socialism in the country. After the conflict of the early 1970s between pro-democratic (also nationalist) republic governments and central authorities in Belgrade, authorities strengthened the already strict control in education – above all, ideological control. Only a few years prior, the Board of Education was established as a “pedagogical service controlling, giving advice and professionally investigating in the field of education and instruction” (ZPS 1974/1989, Art. 1). If its initial intention was to centralise an overly fragmented and inefficient body of experts trying to support the attainment of “social educational goals and level[s] of educational activities in all educational institutions” (LP ZŠ 1970, 1), it is clear that, in the end, it really strengthened ideological inspection.

After the fall of the pro-democratic republic government (Kavčič’s government) in the autumn of 1972, the Board’s report from 1973 stated that the “pedagogical service issued 611 instructions
related to the exercise of public Act regulations” and “2,445 instructions related to pedagogical and content deficiencies which were detected primarily as negligence of social educational goals, self-management rights and duties, and growing technocratic tendencies” (LP ZŠ 1969-1973, 6). The so-called “conscious socialist moral and value orientation, Marxist world view” and careful avoidance of the “different ideal orientations of education” (as an idea of ideologically neutral education, “positivism and functionalism”) came to the forefront of the control of educational bureaucracy (Cf. IBID., 4, 5). The abovementioned “value rational” activities confronted the idea of “instrumental rationality” (Cf. WEBER 1978, 24-26), aiming at the formation of a modern public service that would facilitate expert support for teachers and provide national and local authorities with analytically supported insights into the state of education in the nation. Although the structure and qualifications of the institution grew in the direction of potentially efficient (instrumentally rational) pedagogical support (Cf. LP ZŠ 1982, 2), for a certain period of time hard liners in the League of Communists prevailed and “socialist forces,” trying to re-establish ideological control over education, slowed down the changes that had already begun. Instead of continuing the shift from juridical and disciplinary mechanisms of management in education toward a security or bio-power mechanism, they decided to step back and strengthen direct interventions, control, discipline and punishment (Cf. FOUCAULT 2009, 4-27). That is why the Board of Education (with a new deputy director) was eager to report: “The pedagogical service proposed disciplinary measures against 26 teachers, 3 headmasters and proposed the removal of 7 teachers and 10 heads of schools” (LP ZŠ 1969-1973).

Combining ideological pressure with a damaging orientation of education towards vocational and science education – the so-called career-oriented education (usmerjeno izobraževanje) – after the domestic political clashes as well as world economic crises of the 1970s, educational authorities in Slovenia went far in confronting intellectuals and other citizens in the nation (Cf. MILHARČIČ/ŠUŠTERŠIČ 1986). Abolishing the Gymnasium (gimnazija – a grammar school with a long tradition and high reputation) in the first half of the 1980s and inaugurating new terminology as denominators for schools (organisations of associated labour) and teachers (workers associating their labour in education), they produced a structured opposition in the field of education (MILHARČIČ/ŠUŠTERŠIČ 1986; ŽGAGA 2007, 68-77). Doubts and opposition even grew inside the Board of Education. That is why already in its 1982 report we cannot find the ideological eagerness that is so obvious in the 1973 report (LP ZŠ 1969-1973 and LP ZŠ 1982). A few years later, in the 1987 report, we already read the Board’s proposal for a new definition of its work:

Inside [the] Board we are trying to develop […] such a concept of our work that would in the first place be directed to the development of education, to the support to the teacher in his work and to inform him and qualify him to use novelties in education. The function of control that is allocated to the Board of Education should focus primarily on the protection of the rights of pupils and first and foremost on the protection of their right to quality education (LP ZŠ 1987, 1).

The report is in line with the perception of the state pedagogical bureaucracy’s perception of their future role and also in line with instrumental rationality. On the doorstep of a market economy, independence and a representative democracy, the Board of Education was already fully involved in advising, informing and organising inset education for teachers (Cf. IBID., 25-33). In addition, they were involved in educational policy research. Probably, it is their work in these fields that
even more clearly exposes the conflict between their role of a qualified counselling national educational bureaucracy intended to support the development of teachers and heads of schools’ ability to cope with education on one hand and, on the other, their role to control and, if necessary, punish them.

Nationwide discussion during the second half of the 1980s (LEŠNIK 1987; VALENTIČIČ 1987) demonstrated it would be hard to reach a consensus about the future role of the nation’s largest pedagogical bureaucratic machinery (Cf. LP 1987). It was even more difficult while Slovenia was already on its way to radical change – to a “breakthrough”. The strict supervision of teaching, such as examinations of teachers’ preparations for lessons, examination of the execution of lessons etc., was too closely linked to the idea of old-fashioned control. Instead of the security that came with the advice, information and demonstration of new methods by advisers, control of the teacher brought threat back – one more risk in a teacher’s career. The same risk that was in the air during the 1970s had returned. The Board of Education struggled for the image of an expert institution but ended with an image of bureaucratic inspection. Frequent controls by the Board’s inspectors destroyed an important part of the painstakingly established trust between teachers and the Board’s advisers. The damage was even greater for the same person “knocking at teachers’ doors” previously as an adviser had come back as an inspector. This inner tension and even conflict in the two-headed institution and, at worst, in two-headed experts called for resolution.

3. Independence, autonomy, external examination and risk in education

A new arrangement came with the education reform in the 1990s (RESMAN 1991; GABER 1992a and 1992b). Two changes were crucial; the first was the separation of pedagogical support from the inspection. The second change came with the reduction of inspections to the “assurance of the respect of law and through it the protection of the rights” (ZSOLL 1996, Art. 1) of the population enrolled in institutions from pre-primary education to adult education.

From 1996 onward, inspectors in Slovenia were forbidden by law to “give advice or suggestions” to teachers “or in any other way disturb the process of education” (Ibid., Art. 13). At that very moment, teachers in Slovenia enjoyed a high degree of teaching autonomy. With this rearrangement, the Board of Education ceased to be a bureaucratic organisation in the position to intervene in the education process. Yet, to understand what actually happened we should add that Slovenia, during the education reform process, and parallel to the withdrawal of inspection from the classroom, inaugurated an external examination in education. The first step was taken at the very end of the ancien regime at the end of primary education (8th grade). Then, the external Matura was inaugurated in the Gymnasium, and external examinations after each cycle in primary education (3x3 grades) received a new logic and a new function.

As we can see, a more complex rationality than just autonomy became the new norm. It was a combination of teaching autonomy and insight into the basic standards of education in each school that became the guiding principle. The educational attainment results of each generation – at the disposal of teachers and the school leadership – were meant to be an incentive for a reconsideration of the quality of the teaching and learning process at the classroom level and at the school level. Instead of a national educational bureaucracy controlling the process of teaching
and learning, the system of external examinations should provide valid data, enabling teachers and schools to reflect on the students’ attainment and on their own attainment. Ideas written down in the White Paper concerning the “demands for reaching the internationally verifiable standards of knowledge” (Krek 1996, 34) were closely linked with care for personally and nationally secure education. Supposedly a neo-liberal mechanism (Apple 2006; Stronach 2010), external examination was perceived and tested in Slovenia as a mechanism enabling teacher autonomy and securing the attainment of “internationally comparable standards”.

Fierce expert discussion led to a combination of internal grading as the first test of the knowledge acquired, with external examination in selected subjects being an external indicator of national validity of the internal judgment and comparative international studies. They were supposed to be the ultimate test of the safety (benefit) of participating and investing in education. Trying to avoid evident dangers of the misuse of external examinations (league tables, efficiency-linked salary schemes, teacher control via the external examination etc.), regulations were put in place promising that none of them should have any formal effect on the teacher’s position in the school, nor in terms of his or her job or in terms of salaries. The results should serve only as information for teachers, parents and schools to support the appropriate (high) quality of education. Comparative studies (TIMSS since 1991; PIRLS; and later PISA) were to serve as indicators of the level of attainment. They should present an orientation to policymakers, subject experts and citizens to enable them to form opinions on the standard attained by the nation’s schools.

Teachers’ positions changed by virtue of the presented mechanisms. The change from control of the process of teaching and learning resulted in a new curricular structure. Instead of curricula that prescribed content, the curricula reform during the 1996-1999 period put in place curricula determined by standards. This reorientation brought far more freedom for teachers. In relation to the ancien regime of obligatory and prescribed forms of written preparations for lessons, obligatory content and obligatory textbooks, the new standards-oriented curriculum, free from inspections to verify adherence to the prescription and control of content and form of teaching preparations and lessons, offered relief from the bureaucratic burden. Yet, here too, the removal of bureaucratic control and prescribed process-oriented curricula was only part of the picture. With the freedom to choose came the responsibility for what was chosen. In the times of a neo-liberal, competitive society only “the best” content, textbooks, methods of teaching, pacing etc. were now good enough when taking over the responsibility to properly educate pupils. The process of change brought uneasiness as questions were raised regarding where such undefined curricula would lead and demands appeared for more detailed descriptions of the aims and standards, as well as examples of good practice (cf. Nolimal 2006, 103-106).

While the combination of autonomy, better qualified teachers (with study prolonged from 2 to 4 years, and today to 4+1 years) and external examination ultimately prevailed, it struggled through the encounter with two opposed lines of perception and conceptualisation. One group was against external examination, whereas the second saw external examination as the only fair measure of school attainment (cf. Piciga 1992; Šetinc 1992). Although it seems that we were only witnessing pedagogical disputes, it is obvious that much more was at stake. In the discussion regarding autonomy, risk, security and external examination, we faced the formation of new power relations and new points of struggle for hegemony in Slovenia (Gaber 2007).
In Slovenia, an important part of the new middle class that had formed in the socialist and post-socialist welfare state was opposed to the external examination and saw QA as interference in education by the state (BERNSTEIN 2009). The situation remains the same today. The partially productive warning of the danger of the eventual subsuming of the learning process to external examination (APPLE 2006) was developed in opposition to any kind of external quality assessment as a sign of intrusion by economic competitiveness thinking in education.

As a “compromise” (a temporary winner), a third rationale for external examination and international comparative analyses appeared. Its basic idea was that teachers’ internal evaluations should remain central to education. External examination is only added as a system of mirrors for teachers, students and parents to compare their judgments with external ones. According to the regulation, this system integrated external grades only at the end of primary education. At the end of general upper-secondary education, an external Matura became an important factor both as a final Gymnasium exam and as an entrance exam in the case of a selection procedure in the higher education enrolment process. As mentioned, simultaneously the use of an external examination for ranking schools, accommodating salaries or any other financial transfers in relation to the results was prohibited by law.

4. Quality assurance: wanted and feared?

The “third way” survived while QA became one of the central demands of society counting on education. QA has helped maintain high standards as the number of students enrolled in upper-secondary education has exploded: the share of the population enrolling in Gymnasiums rose from 21% to 41% while the number of students in the country grew from 33,000 in 1992 to 100,000 in 2010. The demand came from three sides. Strange as it may seem from the relation to external examination discussed above, teachers were the first to demand the preservation of standards. The second demand for QA was voiced by industry leaders whose desire was for competent graduates (the current one were supposedly insufficiently practically-oriented). One could also understand their claim as pressure for the more efficient use of public money or for lower taxation. The third request came from the state and citizens. The state felt the abovementioned pressure of industry for the efficient use of public money on one hand and, on the other, was aware of the genuine need for the high quality, or security, of education. The demand for high quality education was, and still is, also a personal expectation of parents and students.

As a result, the first systemic approach to QA in education appeared with the Ogledalo (Mirror) project in 1996. Next, the nationally co-ordinated Modro oko (Blue eye) followed in 2000 (ZORMAN 2001). A few years later, in 2006, the legal obligation of each school to carry out QA came into effect. With the described development Slovenia is to a large degree part of the neo-liberal and beyond neo-liberal attempt to cope with the post-1973 risk society (BECK 1992). What we have seen in Europe and North America during the last two decades is a change “in the organizational patterns of schooling” with either conservative neo-liberal strategies of marketisation “or left efforts to decentralize bureaucracies and move towards local and community involvement”; all the changes, including the one of self-evaluation, embody a “new sense of displacement and the new calculus of intervention” (POPKEWITZ 2002, 123). Teachers’ responsibilities have grown parallel to the withdrawal of state educational bureaucracy and
engagement of teachers in decision-making. With its inclusive curricula reforms (Cf. SVETLIK/BARLE 2000), Slovenia is one of the prime examples of such a development. The new rationality of efficient high quality education combining external examination and self-evaluation have brought to the forefront “teachers with a sense of autonomy and responsibility in identifying the appropriate strategies to improve teaching” (POPKIEWITZ 1998, 553).

Reconsidering the fundamental question regarding the relationship between autonomy, bureaucracy and transition, it seems obvious that teachers have achieved a lot. The cessation of inspections in classrooms, the transition from prescribed curricula to a standards-oriented one, and the inclusion of teachers in preparation of the national curricula are the main elements demonstrating important changes in the position of teachers in relation to power; particularly so if we understand power relations not only as oppressive but also as productive (FOUCAULT 2001, 418-428). Yet, there is the third element in the title of our reconsiderations: the teacher’s administrative burden. Has Slovenia also managed to reduce the teacher’s administrative burden?

One finds mixed messages (evidence and opinions) in this respect. First of all, autonomy and administrative burden are not directly connected. If we understand autonomy as one’s right to determine his or her aims (duties) and rules to follow to achieve those aims, then the professional community of teachers and educational experts in professional bodies, such as the Expert Council for General Education, decide the standards of knowledge and skills that education is supposed to reach in Slovenia. Expert bodies that prepare standards consult with teachers about the selection. After the Council’s approval of the curricula, teachers decide how, and with how much paper work, they are going to achieve the best results. They and the heads of their schools actually decide how many meetings etc., they will organise to deliver the best possible results.

5. Does autonomy bring even more documentation?

Autonomy does not mean there is a school without administration of teaching and learning. From the very start of public education one sees evidence of:
- pupils in each group;
- their (non)attendance of classes;
- evaluation of pupils’ progress; and
- special care for those challenged by the rules of education etc.

With all the possible autonomy, teachers do some “paperwork” related to evidence of the process of teaching and learning. The more complex society is, the more likely it is that evidence of the process of education is going to grow. It seems that it is legitimate to use, in an accommodated meaning, Weber’s old claim that there is only one choice in a complex system like modern education, namely the choice “between bureaucracy and dilettantism in the field of administration” (WEBER 1978, 223). Today there are many reasons for the growth of administrative work. First of all, evidence is needed for informed decision-making in the education process, e.g.:
- successful integration of special needs pupils into common class work needs expert planning of content and strategies, additional and specific evaluation of progress etc.;
- socially and ethnically inclusive education is also supposed to be additionally planned and evaluated; and
- new methods are supposed to be evaluated and the “teacher as an expert” is becoming a kind of a researcher with their research plans (VOGRINC/VALENČIČ/ZULJAN 2009).
Second, parallel to the growing education sector, public spending is increasing; thus evidence of the efficient use of funds is also growing. Another interesting example of the expanding administration is the strengthened element of the protection of the rights of children and citizens in education and raising awareness among the population of such rights. Moreover, teachers and schools are more and more part of international co-operation, which is also burdened with planning, evidence and reports.

Along with the outlined growing complexity in education in Slovenia, it is legitimate to claim that administrative demands are increasing, despite the deregulation and reduction of bureaucratic control from the side of public authorities. Demand for QA, for standards, for inclusive education, respect and enabling realisation of pupils’ rights, the internationalisation of education etc. together form a new rationality confronting teachers as the normative framework for the way of teaching.

Demands for pedagogical documentation in Slovenia in 1996 and the requirements in place today illustrate some of our above claims. As Table 1 shows, teachers face a rising number of administrative tasks. In addition, the complexity of these tasks is growing, too. For example, the Regulations on Documentation in Primary Education (PDOŠ 1996, 2008) contained 17 articles directing the way schools or teachers should handle school documentation in 1996, compared to 24 articles in 2008. The Ministry of Education used 6,568 letters to codify regulations in 1996 and almost twice as many (12,640 letters) in 2008. In attempting to determine the source of these new obligations, we find the following areas in which it was decided to “document” more:
- the education plan (vzgojni načrt);
- rights and duties of children;
- special needs; and
- additional differentiation of teaching and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Pedagogical documentation in numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of letters used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of files regulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of files prescribed by the minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting with the education plan, as a newly prescribed obligation of the school (Art. 60.d of the Primary Education Act – (ZOSn 2007) states it is the school’s obligation to determine ways to attain the aims and values set out in Article 2 of the same Act), we are confronted with an example of the growing and politically structured demand of society in relation to the school. In addition, this particular regulation includes conflicting ideas. While it asks teachers to help educate children whose families have problems properly educating them, while communicating a lack of trust in teachers and schools it is at the same time suggesting they are not good enough. In addition to general uneasiness related to educational (value) problems, there is distinct dissatisfaction among the right-wing parties that voted for such an explicit regulation with a
prevalent, supposedly too liberal, value orientation in the nation and among the young generation in particular (for value orientation Cf. LAVRIČ ET AL. 2011, and for education plan KOVAC ŠEBART/KREK 2010). “Combined demand” for education produced a significant additional administrative burden and the calculated cost of such an operation is approximately EUR 3.5 million per year, which is a 6 percent rise in total calculated costs of the administrative burden resulting from the application of pedagogical documentation (OAS 2010, 43).

Another important administrative burden results from advanced care for pupils’ rights in the education process. Rigorous procedures in relation to educational measures have resulted in new regulations and demands, e.g. written invitations to parents and pupils to attend consultations. Minutes of the meetings are collected in special folders to document each measure taken by the school against any pupil, teacher etc. More complaints by parents concerning decisions of schools and the use of legal experts to represent parents are being reported. As the offense increases in severity, stricter procedures must be followed and more documentation must be completed. It seems that part of this is due to the sensibilisation regarding rights combined with the greater formalisation of the relations between the school and the family.

Inclusive education is the next process in education causing extra administrative burdens. Of the abovementioned additional files of documentation, five of them (excluding those for pupils attending school in hospitals) are explicitly related to the inclusion of the population with special needs in standard schools, such as personal folders for pupils who need help or advice, special year and daily teaching plans for them and two types of concluding certificates for those who did not meet the required standards of a standard school. While it is obvious that inclusive education is a positive development of the last two decades of education in Slovenia, it is also evident that it brings new administrative tasks for teachers and schools.

The last major area increasing administration is the structuring (differentiation) and enrichment of education. Optional subjects (second foreign language, drama, astronomy etc.); elective levels at which pupils learn their mother tongue, mathematics, or foreign languages; morning and afternoon care and teaching hours; voluntary and obligatory external examination; schooling at home etc., are all connected with additional lists of presence, plans of activities, and reporting – in one word, bureaucracy or administration.

Finally, a recent decision to evaluate the non-teaching burden of teachers, to calculate its costs, and to prepare proposals to reduce both (cf. JOSEVSKI 2009) is one of the many signals of the growing administrative burden of education in Slovenia. A group of experts evaluating the administrative burden and costs (KPMG 2010) claims that one Act alone produced “57 information demands for legal or private personalities and 5 information demands for the public sector” (IBID., 5). The total costs of the administrative burden were calculated at EUR 57 million per year. In the same document, the authors propose a possible reduction of the burden and total cost in the field of primary education in Slovenia. Although they do not address the question of which documentation or collection and flow of information is actually needed, they propose a 26 percent reduction of costs – EUR 8.5 million per year (IBID., 53). Their idea is to reduce the administrative burden mainly via unified electronic support for data collection and manipulation (IBID., 52).
Slovenia’s farewell to bureaucratic interventions in education at the end of the era of socialism shifted fields of power and, above all, power relations. Teachers were set free from direct bureaucratic intervention in their teaching. In addition, democracy with the strong role of teachers’ unions (and new concepts regarding the role of teachers) enabled them to participate in curricula rearrangements for their respective fields. Thereby, important elements of autonomy (their dream in the times of socialism) came true. However, the field of education was not freed from the administrative burden. After some attempts to abolish pedagogical inspection and to reduce pedagogical documentation, its precise regulation and the number of files to be documented in Slovenia has continued to grow from 1996 till today.

In times of competitive risk societies, education is being pressed to take over new tasks in the spheres of instruction and education. More just, more inclusive and more efficient education in practice brings demands for transparent, expert-supported and just procedures to the forefront. In addition to common challenges, schools and teachers are constantly confronted with new ones. The orderly and transparent consideration of ethnic, social and gender equality, as well as special needs education, brings extra teaching demands and additional administrative work. Special needs education, the education plan, care for the rights of pupils to be protected, differentiation of teaching and learning, international exchange, co-operation, QA etc. are also administratively demanding. There is a relatively clear presupposition that, together with substantial public investments, external examination etc., accurate documentation and administration is an important element of caring for the quality of education in Slovenia.

The quality of education is the main normative corpus – the main normative rationality – standing for the fear and hope of parents, teachers, the economy and society that education should but cannot bring security to each and every one of us. If the counterdemand for security is more administration, more paperwork, then it seems sometimes that we do not really care. Inside the modern concepts of autonomous teachers and schools, bureaucratic expertise and rigor in exercising what is planned is internalised. Internalisation goes hand in hand with reports (documented ones), and is seen as an important moment of the security mechanism.

What is described above also applies to the recently proposed upgraded system of QA (GABER/KECOJEVIĆ-KOS ET AL. 2010). The question that remains is namely not only whether we are going to use sufficiently elaborated measures for QA when we realise that we are not good enough, but also are we not, in counting on self-evaluation as the central aspect of security mechanisms in education, in danger of putting too much pressure on teachers’ shoulders for constant reconsiderations of the quality of their work? It would certainly be damaging for education to suffocate teachers with self-evaluations.
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