



THE EFFECTIVENESS AND RESPONSIVENESS OF THE GOVERNANCE BODIES – PERSPECTIVES OF THE MANAGING STAFF, TEACHING STAFF, PARENTS OF STUDENTS, AND STUDENTS OF GENERAL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF VIETNAM

Nguyen The Thang

Senior researcher, The Vietnam National Institute of Educational Sciences, Viet Nam

Email address: thangvcl@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51453/2354-1431/2022/710>

Article info

Received: 5/1/2022

Revised: 15/2/2022

Accepted: 5/3/2022

Keywords:

*governing body,
secondary educational
institution, responsiveness,
effectiveness*

Abstract:

Over the past three decades, there has been a dramatic increase in educational governance generally and school governance particularly, especially as Vietnam education is undergoing its critical and comprehensive renovation. This study was exploratory and interpretative in nature in regards to the effectiveness and responsiveness of governing bodies at all levels and in the school as well, which was based on the information collected from managing staff (MS), teaching staff (TS), parents of students (PS), and students (S). The findings show that the governing bodies have been progressive and that these bodies have been developed both in terms of effectiveness and responsiveness. Taken together, these results suggest that governing bodies are becoming more important than ever, and schools have to take up the rapid change and importance of school governance and education governance.



HIỆU LỰC VÀ ĐÁP ỨNG CỦA CÁC TỔ CHỨC QUẢN TRỊ - QUAN ĐIỂM CỦA CÁN BỘ QUẢN LÝ, GIÁO VIÊN, PHỤ HUYNH VÀ HỌC SINH CÁC CƠ SỞ GIÁO DỤC PHỔ THÔNG Ở VIỆT NAM

Nguyễn Thế Thắng

Viện Khoa học giáo dục Việt Nam, Việt Nam

Địa chỉ Email: thangvcl@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51453/2354-1431/2022/710>

Thông tin bài viết

Tóm tắt

Ngày nhận bài: 5/1/2022

Ngày sửa bài: 15/2/2022

Ngày duyệt đăng: 5/3/2022

Từ khóa:

bộ phận quản trị, cơ sở giáo dục phổ thông, đáp ứng, hiệu quả

Trong ba thập kỷ qua, quản trị giáo dục nói chung và quản trị nhà trường nói riêng đã phát triển mạnh mẽ, đặc biệt khi giáo dục Việt Nam đang trong quá trình đổi mới căn bản toàn diện. Nghiên cứu này giải thích tính chất đáp ứng và hiệu quả của các tổ chức quản trị ở các cấp và ở nhà trường, căn cứ theo các thông tin thu thập từ cán bộ quản lý, giáo viên, phụ huynh và học sinh các cơ sở giáo dục phổ thông. Các phát hiện chỉ ra các tổ chức quản trị đang phát triển cả về mức độ đáp ứng và hiệu quả. Kết quả nghiên cứu cũng chỉ ra rằng các bộ phận quản trị ngày càng quan trọng và các trường phổ thông nên bắt kịp sự thay đổi nhanh chóng và quan trọng của quản trị nhà trường và quản trị giáo dục.

1. Introduction

Social activities and educational ones are alike; the changing social context makes policy operations at the macro level as well as in the operation of general education institutions change, which leads to the continuous development of the educational system. It is a conceptual system that governs the study and practice of educational administration. The terms “administration”, “management”, and “governance” are often used with overlapping meanings, and quite a few possible definitions and interpretations have been published in educational literature.

There are quite a few studies by foreign scholars related to school governance that can be generalized to major research trends, including governance in general, school governance in terms of principles and characteristics. For studies of governance in general, it is common to see a progression of large

international organizations of countries, then to localities or schools of countries. Governance is the decision-making process where decisions are made or not take. This is the basis of identifying the elements and structures involved in the decision and its implementation [10], Good governance is the exercise of power in the management of economic and social resources for the development of a country [3]. These researches show the common perspectives are participation, transparency, accountability, and compliance with the law. In terms of school governance, school governance should be classified into groups [4] including (1) student representative activities management (parent-student association), (2) team management – teaching and supporting teachers, (3) community administration – community interest representatives, (4) school fund management,

(4) partnership management, and (5) funding management- individuals and businesses supporting the school. Each area of England has its ways of school governance [12], and common problems of school governance [11] or policies and how to carry out the policies [8]

With regard to local research, school governance was written in Clause 8 Article 3 of Circular 14/2018/TT-BGDĐT regulates 6 governing tasks that school principals have to do, or the decentralization and autonomy in educational institutions [7], school-based management [9], [2] accountability [1],[9]. Thus, domestic studies have focused on the issue of school autonomy and associated with it the separation of school accountability, considering it a key factor of the innovation of school management. general education geared towards improving the system's management effectiveness and educational quality

Governance always exists, albeit on varying degrees at the state management and school levels, as evidenced not only by the names of specific governing agencies but also by the level of service or public service delivery attitude of the aforementioned organizations of the article is: how effective and responsive are the governing bodies in the educational system generally *and in a school sett in particular?*

2. Methods

This study was conducted by combining the results

Results and discussion

Table 1 *The opinions of managing staff about the effectiveness and responsiveness of the governing bodies*

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard Deviation</i>
1) Central Governing body	3.55	.862
2) Provincial Governing body	3.69	.739
3) District Governing body	3.65	.818
4) School Governing body	3.85	.734
5) A combination of all governing bodies	3.70	.716
6) Governing component knows its role and the role of others	3.66	.896
7) Governance implementation plan from central to local level	3.64	.823

The table above provides managing staff's comments on the effectiveness of the ruling governing bodies at all levels. In general, the effectiveness and response from the governing bodies are pretty good, including the governing bodies of central to school level and component or implementation plans at all levels. However, opinions gained from interviews

of qualitative and quantitative research on general education institution governance of the service-based approach. Qualitative research generalizes and identifies the effectiveness and responsiveness of the key players in the governance bodies of secondary educational institutions. The survey used questionnaires with a 5-level scale from "Level 1 - Strongly Disagree" to "Level 5 - Strongly Agree".

General characteristics of four groups of the participants. *In terms of gender*, women show more than men. There is no difference among managers, but not much, but for teachers, parents, and students, women are the majority. *Education*: the majority of administrators, teachers, and parents have university and post-graduate degrees; high school students make up the majority. *The position of employment*: administrators, vice principals have a higher rate of employment than principals. Teachers are mainly teachers of grades III and II. *Type of school*: most of these schools are upper secondary, and only seven schools are multi-level schools. *Working experience*, most managers and teachers have working time from more than 5 years to 20 years. Managers mostly have seniority of more than 20 years, and teachers mainly have seniority of about 11-20 years. *Managing experience*: managers in the group have a period of 5-10 years, with teachers, the owner has 11-20 years of experience. Areas: urban is mainly, and the locality is mainly Hanoi. (See Appendix 1.)

still have remarkable points. That is, the coordination/ cooperation between the governing bodies of different levels is sometimes only one way, for example, using the training or the job handling process to be trained as required, but when problems arise, it is still difficult to promptly handle them.

Table 2 The opinions of the effectiveness of the school governing bodies

School governing bodies	MS		TS		PS		S		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1) School governing council	3.86	0.98	4.42	0.75	4.26	0.82	4.40	0.76	4.24	0.83
2) School board	4.27	0.73	4.52	0.72	4.23	0.89	4.17	0.61	4.30	0.74
3) Unions (Trade union, the Youth Union....)	3.86	0.80	4.25	0.85	3.96	1.02	4.34	0.74	4.10	0.85
4) Academic bodies	3.96	0.78	4.35	0.90	3.86	1.07	4.14	0.64	4.08	0.85
5) Administrative body	3.84	0.83	4.09	0.96	3.58	1.24	3.83	0.83	3.84	0.96
6) Student representative	3.51	0.88	4.10	0.99	3.66	1.13	3.58	1.09	3.71	1.02
7) Student bodies	3.43	0.97	3.87	1.15	4.26	0.82	3.54	1.16	3.78	1.02

The table above provides information on the effectiveness of the school-level governing bodies, in which organizations including school councils, governors, mass organizations, and professional groups are highly appreciated (around 4-4.24). The remaining organizations have a lower average but also a high rating. The interview information showed many notable points; One is that the role of the school governing body is decisive and if you want to implement an effective governance model,

it is necessary to clarify and enhance the role of this organization; the second is that a committee of students' parents is dependent on their representatives; - that is, if a committee is composed of people who are competent and enthusiastic about activities to support the school, it will be very effective and will reduce governing effectiveness; third, the student team, if implemented too rigidly, will cause psychological stress on students; if implemented too loosely, it will lose the ability to supervise among students.

Table 3 The opinions of the responsiveness of the school governing bodies

School governing bodies	MS		TS		PS		S		Total	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1) School governing council	3.72	0.99	4.33	0.80	3.95	1.05	4.40	0.75	4.10	0.90
2) School board	4.15	0.75	4.46	0.69	3.95	1.27	4.66	0.73	4.31	0.86
3) Unions (Trade union, the Youth Union....)	3.70	0.89	4.19	0.83	3.64	1.29	4.32	0.87	3.96	0.97
4) Academic bodies	3.82	0.87	4.25	0.86	3.68	1.25	4.42	0.75	4.04	0.93
5) Administrative body	3.68	0.89	4.09	0.94	3.53	1.31	4.35	0.79	3.91	0.98
6) Student representative	3.41	0.86	4.07	1.00	3.43	1.30	4.08	1.01	3.75	1.04
7) Student bodies	3.34	0.96	3.70	1.12	3.95	1.05	3.77	1.35	3.69	1.12

The table above provides information on the assessment of administrators, teachers, parents, and students on the responsiveness of the school-level governance bodies, which shows that these organizations are generally rated well. Specifically, the governors have the highest rating (4.31), the school board and the professional team (about 4 to 4.10), and the student team is at the lowest level (but also at 3.69). Information on the interview shows the same trend as the data in into the table above, but there are some differences. One is the opinion that the interviewees think that the role of the school council and the board of representatives should be respected. In addition, there are opinions that it is necessary to enhance the role of the professional team and to make it notable for students in high school education. There

should be many activities associated with the needs of students, for example, those who need career-oriented activities or those who need self-study instruction, etc. In short, school governing bodies needed to change both the content and the organization of activities and to implement them in order to respond to new requests from students, parents, and society.

There are some more rooms to discuss the school's governance, which consists of governing issues, governing bodies, and governing functions.

Governing issues: The school is a social organization of specific purposes; the main task is to create quality education for students. A school has its own features such as human resources, finance, facilities, etc. School governance includes two

aspects if it is based on internal and external factors. Internal governance is all activities that take place within the internal elements of the school, such as admissions, libraries, laboratories, facilities and other equipment, finance, testing and assessment, relationships to colleagues and students, and others. Outside governance encompasses all relationships with community, provincial, and district agencies, as well as others, in order to establish and maintain the school's functions. Besides the functions, the content of school governance is also quite complex and challenging. It is expressed through the duties and powers of the school council and the principal, with specific content such as building and organizing the school apparatus; formulating plans and organizing the implementation of the school year's tasks; human resource management; professional management; work assignment, examination, evaluation, and classification of teachers and staff; performing the work of rewarding, disciplining, and managing recruitment records for teachers and employees. Student governance and student activities organized by the school; reviewing and approving student assessment results; financial and property management of the school; implementation of policies for teachers, students, etc.

Governing bodies: participating in school governance includes all components as prescribed by current law, from primary school to high school level, reflected in each individual and organizational component inside and outside influences on the general education institutions. School governance can be based on governance or hierarchical organizational structures such as the governance board, teacher collectives, subject groups, and students based on blocks, classes, etc. group or often conceived as a small system such as a party organization, trade union, youth, etc. At the same time, it can be managed according to activities such as teaching, learning in class, outside of class time, fostering, learning, and more. Governance by activity or organizational structure must be aimed at achieving the goals and objectives that the school must perform and adhere to. Therefore, implementing good school governance must first understand the functions and contents of school governance.

Governing functions: With the current regulations, which have completely fulfilled the functions of the governance of a general education institution, the problem that needs to be determined is whether the school is an organization providing public services or educational services, and the people working in schools are service-creating service providers or educational service-values, not places and providers of social welfare. In order for the activities to take

place according to the correct process and to be effective, in addition to the capabilities of individuals, school leaders need to understand the basic functions of school governance. School leaders must take into account the conditions of the school to clearly plan problems, organize people and resources, guide staff, coordinate and monitor activities, and evaluate progress, development, and achievements. Although the scope of school governance is quite broad, it can include the following functions: planning, financing, organizing, coordinating, evaluating, activities and programs.

3. Conclusions

General education institutions are shown in many different aspects and degrees, from perceptions of educational services, from the content of payment for education in general education institutions to the participants, governance, operating mechanisms, and relationships. *The governance components* of the general education institutions shown in each school have not fully demonstrated the roles and functions codified in the legal documents and the dynamism or adaptability of the governance component, which depends on individuals. *The functions* of the components have not been determined in the direction of governance but are mainly ensured at least at the level prescribed by the state according to the available functions and tasks. The operating *mechanism* does not clearly show the governance nature of each component in school governance as well as the relationships between them, ensuring the interaction between components in the system. *The implementation principle* has been well performed but is fragmented due to the lack of cohesive properties, such as consensus, which expresses consensus quickly when defining a problem or possible solution but has inadequate commitment or responsibility to perform.

The governance of general education institutions is experiencing favorable development opportunities because local educational management agencies have been aware of the problem of general education institution governance of economic conditions and society; directed and supported the general education institutions in the area to gradually realize the issues of educational service governance according to the approach to public service governance; and regularly examined and evaluated aspects related to educational service governance of school-related stakeholders (parents, community, etc.) and also for school stakeholders (internal regulations, regulations on emulation and commendation, etc.). Teaching staff and administrative staff of general education institutions have gradually become aware of the

necessary changes in educational service governance: changing perceptions of the social welfare nature of education and the nature of education; educational services are both market-oriented as well as guaranteed by the state's management; and gradually adapting to internal assessment requirements at the request for the state, as well as forms or content of assessment according to capacity and ability/effectiveness to perform assigned work according to job requirements at school.

Acknowledgments

This work is funded by Ministry of Education and Training's Project: "Model of K-12 school governance from the lens of educational services" (Mô hình quản trị cơ sở giáo dục phổ thông theo tiếp cận quản trị dịch vụ giáo dục). Code B2019-VKG-02

This work is funded by Ministry of Education and Training's Project: "Model of K-12 school governance from the lens of educational services" (Mô hình quản trị cơ sở giáo dục phổ thông theo tiếp cận quản trị dịch vụ giáo dục). Code B2019-VKG-02

REFERENCES

- [1] Huyen D.T.T. (2017). *The school autonomy and accountability in systematic approach towards to the better educational achievements.*
- [2] Huong. T.H; C. C. T. (2017). *The autonomy and accountability of the school in a systematic approach to better educational achievements are the autonomy and accountability of the school.*
- [3] International Fund for Agricultural Development. (1999). *Good governance: An Overview.*
- [4] Maria Balarin, Steve Brammer, Chris James, M. M. (2008). *The School Governance Study.*
- [5] McCrone, T., & George, C. S. N. (2011). *Governance models in schools.*
- [6] National Association of Independent Schools. (n.d.). *Governance Models.*
- [7] Hung N.T (2016). *Decentralization of general education*
- [8] OECD. (2013). *School Governance, Assessments and Accountability: Vol. IV.*
- [9] Tien P.Đ.N (2017). *The right of autonomy of school governance: present and things to do.*
- [10] Sheng, Y. K. (2009). What is Good Governance? *United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific.*
- [11] The World Bank. (n.d.). *School good governance—Frequently Asked Questions.* 7–8.
- [12] Wilkinson, B. N. (2017). *School Governance.* 08072, 1–10.
- [13] Yap Kioe Sheng. (n.d.). *What is Good Governance ?*