

<https://doi.org/10.28925/2518-7635.2021.610>

MODERNISATION OF THE EDUCATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM IN KYIV UNDER THE CONDITIONS OF IMPLEMENTING SCHOOL AUTONOMY

Liliia Hrynevych

ORCID iD 0000-0002-5818-8259

PhD in Pedagogy, Associate Professor,
Vice-Rector for Academic and International Affairs,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University,
18/2 Bulvarno-Kudryavska Str., 04053 Kyiv, Ukraine,
l.hrynevych@kubg.edu.ua

Kostiantyn Lynov

ORCID iD 0000-0002-3162-3900

PhD in Public Administration, Associate Professor,
Head of the Chair of Educational Leadership Department,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University,
18/2 Bulvarno-Kudryavska Str., 04053 Kyiv, Ukraine,
k.lynov@kubg.edu.ua

Ivan Shemelynets

ORCID iD 0000-0003-4021-1366

PhD in Law, Associate Professor,
Director of the think tank «OsvitAnalityka»,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University,
18/2 Bulvarno-Kudryavska Str., 04053 Kyiv, Ukraine,
shemelynets2016@gmail.com

Gryhoriy Riy

ORCID iD 0000-0002-1608-0960

PhD, Deputy director of the think tank «OsvitAnalityka»,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University,
18/2 Bulvarno-Kudryavska Str., 04053 Kyiv, Ukraine,
h.rii@kubg.edu.ua

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to the problem of the functional effectiveness of the system of educational governance in Kyiv, detection of the problems

related to the establishing of the schools' autonomy, and developing the ways of the system's transformation. The authors have analyzed international experience in constructing an effective system of educational governance on the territorial level. In the vast majority of countries, schools are granted partial autonomy, the granting of which is accompanied by the establishment of bodies, such as, councils with supervisory and control functions consisting of representatives of the school administration, local management bodies and parents. The article demonstrated that such experience can be partly implemented in Kyiv.

Several models of creating service centers for secondary schools are considered. For instance, a rational model with full financial autonomy, a balanced model with partial autonomy and outsourcing and a transitional model with the preservation of district education departments with a small staff and the establishment of separate service centers within the district or district of Kyiv.

Kyiv has a two-level education governance system, in which the district educational administrations are an intermediary link between the Kyiv Educational & Research Department and the schools. In this respect, the article also analyzes legislation that grants the district education departments their mandate, regulates their functional tasks and relationships with the schools. The authors of the article propose several models of transforming the educational governance system in which the district educational administrations will take on the role of service centers.

Key words: *educational governance; secondary school; service center; schools' autonomy, Ukrainian educational system.*

© Liliia Hrynevych, Kostiantyn Lynov, Ivan Shemelynets, Gryhoriy Riy, 2021

INTRODUCTION

Reform of general secondary education in Ukraine continues and necessary changes are gradually being implemented as a result of the European vector of education development and the adopted laws «On Education» and «On General Secondary Education» (Law of Ukraine «On Complete General Secondary Education», 2020). At the same time a number of necessary changes are taking place at a slower pace than would be desirable. In particular, it concerns the implementation of autonomy in educational institutions. The Law of Ukraine «On Education» adopted in 2017 defines the concept of autonomy as «the right of an entity of educational activity to self-management, which consists of its independence, autonomy and responsibility in decision-making regarding academic (educational), organisational, financial, personnel and other issues of activity, carried out in the manner and within the limits defined by law» (Law of Ukraine «On Education», 2017). This law also defines the types of autonomy of educational institutions (financial, academic, personnel and organisational).

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Changes in education were implemented alongside the process of decentralisation, so granting more powers to local authorities also initiated «educational decentralisation». As a result, territorial communities saw an increase in revenues and a change in inter-budgetary relations. The process of changes was consolidated by the reform of the New Ukrainian School, which began with changes in the provision of educational services in primary schools.

As a consequence of the reform, the issue of effective management of the education system has arisen. In accordance with the current legislation, the responsibility for the formation of this system lies with the local self-management bodies, which are to be guided by efficiency in their decision-making. They also have the opportunity to create or transform the management bodies of the education system in their community.

BACKGROUND

It is worth noting that education systems in other countries have undergone significant changes and transformations since the 1980s. First and foremost, this has involved a general change in the process of managing the state as such and new trends in public administration (Saguin, 2019). The modern model of education management has components such as educational decentralisation, school management, parental involvement and privatisation of education. Management in the education sector is therefore defined as a specific type of relationship between state and non-state entities, which also includes a hybrid model of legal, market, network and comparative approaches (Saguin, 2019).

This notion is quite accurately characterised by the definition of autonomy provided in the Law of Ukraine «On Education». Thus, in accordance with Article 6 of the said Law, one of the foundations of state policy in education is financial, academic, personnel and organisational autonomy of educational institutions within the limits defined by the Law (Seitosmanov et al., 2019). However, it is unlikely that only one type of autonomy can be implemented in a single institution. Therefore, schools in the EU countries are endowed with all certain types of autonomy, but they may have varying degrees of its implementation — conditional, full or partial autonomy. Schools with full autonomy refer to those institutions that can make their own decisions within the limits defined by legal regulations and for some decisions they have to consult with local management bodies.

The aim of the scientific article is to substantiate the necessary and possible changes in the education management system of the Ukrainian capital and to implement the best foreign practices in transformational changes.

ANALYSIS OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCHES

A number of publications and researches are fully or partially devoted to this issue. N. Volkova's monograph «Local self-management as an entity of education management: a cluster approach» (2014) deals with the change in the education management system through the creation of cluster educational districts. The analytical research «Education management and school autonomy: a view from the school» (2013) analyses the problems associated with the functioning of schools. The analytical report «Secondary education management system at the district and regional levels: quality, transparency and interaction» (2014) is devoted to the analysis of the scope and limits of responsibility of education management bodies in the sphere of general secondary education. At the same time, a number of important issues related to the transformation of the education management system at the municipal level remain unresolved.

MAIN RESULTS

In December 2020 — January 2021, an analytical research «Educational institutions' autonomy and its impact on the quality of education management in the capital» (Lynov, Redko, 2021) was carried out by the Analytical Centre of Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University Analytical Centre «OsvitAnalityka» in order to identify the views of school heads, employees of education departments and the Department of Education and Science of the Kyiv City Council Executive Body (Kyiv City State Administration) (hereinafter referred to as Kyiv Department of Education and Science) to changes in the education management system in Kyiv.

The results of the analytical research lead to the conclusion that the majority of respondents support changes in the activities of education departments of district state administrations (DSA) (hereinafter referred to as district education departments, DEDs) in Kyiv. Specifically, 68% of school heads, 49% of employees of Kyiv Department of Education and Science and 29% of employees of DEDs gave positive answers to the question as to whether changes in activities of DEDs are necessary. In addition, 62% of school heads indicated that the greatest degree of control powers are exercised in the activity of education departments.

Thus, the analysis of regulations on district education departments shows that they have quite a few control and supervisory powers, in particular, to manage educational institutions, which belong to the sphere of their management. For example, the Regulation on Education and Innovative Development Department of Pechersk DSA (2015) stipulates that the education department organises implementation of the Constitution and laws of Ukraine, acts of the President of Ukraine, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, orders of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, other central executive authorities in the sphere of education and innovations, supervises their

implementation, supervises the compliance with legislation on education, implementation by educational institutions of state requirements to the content, level and scope of preschool, extracurricular, general secondary education, as well as compliance with legislation in the sphere of innovation activity, supervises the activities of schools for children and youth, monitors children's health and recreational activities in cooperation with the health care authorities etc (Regulation on Education and Innovative Development Department, 2015). Regulation on Education Department of Sviatoshyhnsk DSA, in addition to the above supervisory powers, also includes the power to monitor compliance with safety rules, fire safety and sanitary regime in educational institutions and provide practical assistance in carrying out their work, the implementation of operational control over maintaining the current system of educational institutions, providing them with furniture, equipment, teaching materials, textbooks etc. (Regulation on Education Department of Sviatoshyhnsk District, 2020).

At the same time, the reorganisation of DEDs into service centres is fully supported by 35% of school heads, 24% of employees of Kyiv Department of Education and Science and only 6% of DEDs employees.

These data, the authors of the research conclude, indicate that school heads are very cautious about establishing service centres due to a lack of full understanding of such a structure or fear of uncertainty. On the other hand, representatives of Kyiv Department of Education and Science are rather in favour of redistribution of functions, but they do not want the middle level of education management — a kind of intermediary between the Department and educational institutions — to disappear.

The research did not demonstrate unanimous understanding of the possible functions of future service centres. For example, school heads would like to transfer to service centres the functions of high-quality legal support, accounting support, security of educational institutions, major and current repairs of premises of educational institutions, maintenance of adjacent territory and holding tenders. On the other hand, representatives of Kyiv Department of Education and Science see information, analytical and strategic functions in service centres, as well as methodological and personnel support of school activities. The majority of respondents also believe that the service centres can be based on the autonomy of an educational institution with the transfer of some powers to the service centre for outsourcing.

The proposal for the establishment of service centres is a direct consequence of implementing autonomy in general secondary education institutions (GSEIs) with its four components: academic, organisational, personnel and financial. It is believed that the rights of GSEIs are best exercised precisely in terms of personnel autonomy, as the institutions have been given the right to hire and fire their staff, they have been given employment records to keep, but the school has no right to form its own staffing schedule (there is a typical staffing schedule approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine;

district education departments actually create staffing schedules for GSEIs and the principal of the institution formally approves them). Similarly, the GSEI does not have the right to create a tariff list etc. School heads of some districts of the city are restricted in their ability to make business trips or determine the amount of bonus payments. Thus, implementation of personnel autonomy for schools is significantly limited by the current legislation, which also forms the need for school heads to provide legal support for their activities.

Significant problems are related to the implementation of academic autonomy, including the unwillingness of teaching staff to take initiative and responsibility. Therefore, a service to provide methodological assistance to teachers is relevant and would be much needed. Part of this need would be met by professional development centres and postgraduate education institutes.

Principles of the GSEIs complain the least about the development of organisational autonomy. The biggest problems are related to the implementation of financial autonomy. The idea of formula-based funding of schools has long been discussed, the implementation of which would significantly accelerate the pace of implementing educational institution autonomy. There is also a demand among GSEIs heads for school building security services and meal arrangement for children in schools, so these issues could also be considered.

In the complex issue of autonomy, it is important to analyse international experience. The vast majority of schools in EU countries have partial autonomy, i.e. they can decide on their own about personnel policy or financial costs. For example, educational institutions in Poland and Romania have partial financial autonomy, and are financed by a state grant. In Poland, the Ministry of Education determines the algorithm for the distribution of funds, and it is up to the local authorities to decide how to use them. Local authorities have the power to set the level of teachers' salaries, investments in educational institutions and the receipt or use of private funds by schools (Experience in the regulation of educational institutions' activities providing secondary education in Poland, Romania, Hungary).

In Hungary, education is also financed from national and local budgets, but the system itself is centrally organised. In 2013, the Klebelsberg Institution Maintenance Center was established. The schools are directly financed through this structure and have to agree with it on all material costs (Experience in the regulation of educational institutions' activities providing secondary education in Poland, Romania, Hungary).

Schools in Belgium, Latvia, Denmark and Sweden have full financial autonomy. The state allocates funds through an educational grant and it is up to the schools to decide how to use them (Seitosmanov, 2019, p. 9).

Researchers distinguish three forms of management in education:

- 1) a market form with a decentralised decision-making structure and a clear coordination mechanism;

- 2) state form with a hierarchical decision-making structure;
- 3) a network form with an extensive structure of approvals and negotiations.

According to these forms, there are six types of education management based on the historical and cultural experience of the countries:

- 1) Nordic (Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland);
- 2) private (Belgium and the Netherlands);
- 3) public (France, Turkey, Ireland, Mexico, Austria, Switzerland and Germany);
- 4) southern European (Italy, Portugal, Spain, Greece, Australia);
- 5) Anglo-Saxon-Eastern European (Great Britain, the USA, Hungary, New Zealand, Czech Republic);
- 6) East Asian (Japan and South Korea) (Seitosmanov et al., 2019, p. 9).

Of course, these types are not perfect and may be similar in many ways. For example, the financial education systems of East Asian and Southern European countries are similar: in both types of education management, private sector participation is moderate or insignificant and subsidies to the private sector are low.

The Anglo-Saxon-Eastern European type, on the other hand, is characterised by significant state involvement in education financing and a high level of institutional autonomy (Seitosmanov, 2019, p. 9).

In general, most education systems are a combination of different models (deconcentration, decentralisation and delegation) (Herbst, Gerchynskiy, 2015).

Poland.

The Polish model of education management can be defined as a decentralised education system dominated by territorial self-management. That is, the model represents a kind of hybrid, where the key element is the transfer of responsibility for schools to local management bodies or other management bodies, which manage the network of schools at the local level (Herbst, Gerchynskiy, 2015).

Reform of Poland's education system began in the 1990s. At that time, after the collapse of the Socialist Bloc, the country underwent a rapid transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy. In 1999 an education reform started, and the reform process is still ongoing. The main goal was to improve the quality of education and raise the level of educational opportunities for Polish pupils. In 2008, school curricula were changed, and in 2009–2015 primary schools were reformed (Jakubowski, 2018).

In Poland, education reform took place alongside administrative reform. In 1999, the education management and financing systems were changed. A three-tiered structure of local administration was introduced, with delegated responsibility for schools at different levels: primary and lower secondary schools operated at the municipal level, upper secondary schools at the powiat level, and higher vocational schools at the gmina level. Ownership of schools was transferred to local management bodies, and a new formula for allocating resources per pupil was introduced (Wisniewski, Zahorska, 2020).

Today, all public education in Poland is accountable to the executive bodies of the gminas and powiats. Management control over most administrative decisions of gminas and powiats was replaced by legal control, which is carried out by reorganised curators of education (kuratoria oświaty), which is part of voivodeship administrations (there are currently 16 education curators) (Kuratoria oświaty). Their responsibilities include control over the budgetary process, which is carried out locally by regional Auditing Chambers, as well as monitoring of schools' performance. It is worth noting that prior to the reform, the curators of education were part of the central administration, entrusted with administrative functions in the field of education (Herbst, Gerchynskyi, 2015).

In total, three branches have an influence on Poland's modern education system:

- local government (provides the material conditions);
- curators of education (control functions concerning compliance with the curricula);
- the principals (coordination of the educational process) (Wisniewski, Zahorska, 2015).

Financially, the local government is only partly responsible for this area, as the payment of teachers' salaries remains under the control of the central government. Academic autonomy also applies: schools and teachers have the freedom to decide on school programmes, which are determined by the ministry. Pursuant to the provisions of Article 47 of the Polish Law «On Education» of December 14, 2016, the Minister of Education determines by decree the curricular basis, the framework plans for each type of school, the content of the curriculum and the organisation of the school year (Experience in the regulation of educational institutions' activities providing secondary education in Poland, Romania, Hungary).

Finland.

Finland has a decentralised educational system, and local authorities and institutions have a considerable level of autonomy. Several levels of educational management can be distinguished. In this country, there is a certain consistency between different branches of government that does not depend on changes in the political situation in the country. At the national level, the government builds a four-year education strategy, setting common goals and objectives for the whole system. The Finnish Parliament drafts and adopts the necessary legislation, and the Ministry implements these decisions. This is the central authority's responsibility for education.

The middle level is made up of independent education agencies:

- The Finnish National Education Agency, which implements policy at the level of general secondary education and is also responsible for creating curricula, establishing requirements for qualification levels, supporting and developing teachers and educational monitoring;
- The Finnish Centre for Educational Assessment, which carries out the assessment of learning achievements;

- Six regional administrative state agencies with local responsibility for the overall control of access to public services, including access to quality education. The regional agencies work in cooperation with local public authorities and have management and supervisory functions.

At a lower level, local authorities (municipalities) in cooperation with schools allocate funds, hire staff, develop detailed curricula, and may also delegate some of their decision-making powers directly to schools, especially in cities. This model of education is an internationally recognised example of a highly effective system (Education policy outlook: Finland, 2020).

In addition, Finnish schools have considerable autonomy. In particular, five components of school autonomy are distinguished:

- 1) autonomy in budgeting;
- 2) personnel autonomy;
- 3) participation of the school council in the budgeting process;
- 4) assessment of school and student performance;
- 5) accountability to stakeholders (Finland: school autonomy and accountability, 2012).

Finnish schools rely on local management bodies for budget and personnel management processes (Finland: school autonomy and accountability, 2012).

Thus, when considering the reorganisation of district education departments into service centres, it is worth bearing in mind that there are issues that need to be addressed at the very beginning. Firstly, the competence of district education departments in Kyiv includes management of not only general, but also pre-school and extracurricular educational institutions. According to some empirical evidence, it appears that heads of pre-school educational institutions (PSEIs) are not as prepared for the implementation of autonomy as their colleagues in the GSEIs. Therefore, the issue arises regarding the different rate of autonomy implementation (the Law of Ukraine «On Education» provides for the right to autonomy for all educational institutions) by both different GSEIs directly and the PSEIs in comparison to the GSEIs.

The following options are seen as possible in order to maintain manageability of local processes:

1. Service centres are established in the districts due to the reorganisation of the district education departments.
2. Service centres will be established and district education departments will operate alongside them until all educational institutions become autonomous.
3. Service centres are being established at the neighbourhood level. For example, in the dormitory suburbs on the left bank of the city, there are three schools and four kindergartens in one block. Consequently, a service centre servicing two or three such neighbourhoods will work for 6–9 schools and 8–12 kindergartens, which means 14 to 21 educational institutions, respectively. Such a service centre will promptly solve problems of educational institutions in its territory and will have sufficient financial resources.

4. The functions of the district education departments are concentrated by Kyiv Department of Education and Science, which establishes its representative offices in the districts, which will continue to manage the activities of PSEIs and extracurricular educational institutions, as well as those GSEIs that will introduce autonomy gradually.
5. The service centres are set up as communal enterprises. Kyiv Department of Education and Science takes over the management of the educational institutions.

In this aspect, we consider several models for the possible establishment of service centres. *The rational model* implies that general secondary education institutions acquire full financial autonomy and set up their own accounting departments. Management of current activities and control is concentrated at the level of Kyiv Department of Education and Science. Schools regulate relations with service centres at their own will on a contractual basis.

The balanced model provides for schools to acquire partial autonomy with the transfer of some of their functions to outsourced service centres, which are reorganised from district education departments. The management of current activities is also concentrated at the level of Kyiv Department of Education and Science.

The transitional model provides for the preservation of district education departments (or representative offices of the Department in districts) with a small staff and the establishment of separate service centres either within the district or within the neighbourhoods.

It is proposed to create «cluster» accounting departments that would provide financial and economic support for the activities of educational institutions, or for schools to open their own accounting departments. This includes provision of services for maintenance of material and technical facilities of schools, tender purchases, repairs etc.

Considering all of the above and making use of the results of the analytical research, we propose that service centres be provided with the functions of:

- 1) legal support of the activities of GSEIs;
- 2) accounting support of the GSEIs activities, which provides for the work of «cluster» accounting departments;
- 3) personnel support, which provides for consultations on personnel issues to the heads of GSEIs;
- 4) economic support of the activities of GSEIs, providing services for repair works, maintenance of economic groups, maintenance of the material and technical facilities of educational institutions, organisation and carrying out of tenders, etc.

Several options can be offered as to the organisational form of the service centre: either the formation of a unified service centre or the joining of several entities to provide services. For instance, the service centre can, based on the capabilities of current district education departments, provide accounting, personnel support, maintenance of economic groups, tendering

procedures etc. directly; specialised organisations can be engaged for repair works; and legal services can be provided by a private law firm, which will service all educational institutions of the district on contractual basis.

One of the options is to grant the service centres the status of a communal enterprise, which will make it possible to recruit qualified staff and provide more quality services to educational institutions.

CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

As the experience of Poland, Finland and other European countries shows, the autonomy of general secondary education institutions has had an overall positive effect on the entire education system: in education systems with greater school autonomy, students receive better PISA test results than in educational institutions with less autonomy (Finland: school autonomy and accountability, 2012).

In the vast majority of countries, schools are granted partial autonomy, the granting of which is accompanied by the establishment of bodies involved in school management (Seitosmanov et al., 2019). These are various kinds of councils with supervisory and control functions consisting of representatives of the school administration, local management bodies and parents. In addition to these advisory bodies, there are also state supervisory bodies that oversee the activities of educational institutions together with the central authority. These are, for example, the curators of education in Poland: their heads are appointed by the Minister of National Education in Poland, and their employees carry out school inspections. In Scandinavian countries, local authorities play a similar role. In Romania, schools gain autonomy after a contract is signed between the district inspector and the school principal.

Thus, the main objective of service centres should be to create conditions for safe and effective operation of educational institutions and to free up the time of school heads for proper coordination of teaching staff activities to ensure quality of education. It is important to pay attention to the development of a legal and regulatory basis for the work of the service centres, their functions, personnel, building management interaction with Kyiv Department of Education and Science and educational institutions. In this process, it is important to change the philosophy, in particular, to transfer from controlling and managing functions to providing services to schools in the capital on the principles of equal partnership. Moreover, this should be a fundamentally different relationship between schools and newly-formed service centres, which are based on the principles of voluntariness, freedom of choice and economic benefit.

The three models proposed in the article are only substantiated theoretical ideal types that could be implemented in the management of secondary education in Kyiv. However, in the future, it may be worth considering in more detail each of the proposed models and prospects for their implementation in other regions of Ukraine.

REFERENCES

- Education policy outlook: Finland* (2020). OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/education/policy-outlook/>
- Finland: School Autonomy and Accountability. Systems Approach for Better Education Results. SABER country report* (2012). World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/17510>
- Jakubowski, M. (2021). Poland: Polish Education Reforms and Evidence from International Assessments. *Improving a Country's Education*, Springer. 137–158. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59031-4_7
- Kuratoria oświaty*. <https://www.gov.pl/web/edukacja-i-nauka/kuratoria-oswiaty>
- Saguin, K. (2019). Designing effective governance of education. *Policy design and practice*, 2 (2), 182–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25741292.2019.1621034>
- Wiśniewski, J., Zahorska, M. (2020). Reforming Education in Poland. *Audacious Education Purposes*, Springer. 181–208. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-41882-3_7
- Volkova, N. (2014). *Misceve samovryaduvannya yak sub'jekt upravlinnya osvityu: klasternij pidhid: monografiya [Local self-management as an entity of education management: a cluster approach: monograph]*. Dnipropetrovsk State Academy of Finance. 124 — 128.
- Gerbst, M., Gerchinskiy, Ya. (2015). *Decentralizaciya osviti u Polshi: Dosvid 25 rokiv [Decentralisation of education in Poland: 25 years of experience]*. Institut osvitnih doslidzhen. <https://inlnk.ru/8440mo>
- Dosvid reguluvannya diyalnosti navchalnih zakladiv, sho nadayut zagalnu serednyu osvitu v Polshi, Rumuniyi, Ugorshini. Informacijna dovidka, pidgotovlena Yevropejskim informacijno-doslidnickim centrom na zapit narodnogo deputata Ukrayini [Experience in the regulation of educational institutions' activities providing secondary education in Poland, Romania, Hungary. Information note prepared by the European Information and Research Centre at the request of the People's Deputy of Ukraine]*.
- European Information and Research Center. <http://euinfocenter.rada.gov.ua/uploads/documents/29279.pdf>
- Zakon Ukrainy «Pro osvitu» [The Law of Ukraine «On Education»]* (2017). <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19>
- Zakon Ukrainy «Pro povnu zahalnu serednyu osvitu» [The Law of Ukraine «On complete general secondary education»]* (2020). <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/463-20#Text>
- Lynov, K., Redko, S. (2021). *Avtonomija zakladiv osvity ta jiji vplyv na jakist upravlinnja osvitovu stolyci: zvit za rezultaty analitychnogho doslidzhennja [Autonomy of educational institutions and its influence on the quality of education management in the capital: a report on the results of analytical research]*. Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University.
- Regulation on Education and Innovative Development Department of Pechersk District State Administration in Kyiv, approved by Order No. 327-k of 05/06/2015*

- (2015). https://drive.google.com/file/d/1WT_6mAJ8D12br6sHt2D-tn7NG6zl0hA9/view.
- Regulation on Education Department of Sviatoshynsk District State Administration in Kyiv, approved by Order No. 497 of 31/07/2020 (2020)*. <https://svyatr.uo.org.ua/polozhennya-pro-upravlinnya/>
- Seitosmanov, A., Fasolia, O., Markhlevski, V. (2019). *Avtonomija jak shljakh do efektyvnogho menedzhmentu shkoly. Metodychni rekomendaciji [Autonomy as a way to effective school management. Guidelines]*. Ministerstvo osvity i nauky Ukrainy.
- Parashhenko, L. I. (2014). *Sistema upravlinnya zagalnoyu serednoyu osvitoju v Ukraini na rivni rajonu ta oblasti: yakist, prozorist, vzayemodiya. Analitichnij zvit [Secondary education management system at the district and regional levels: quality, transparency and interaction. Analytical report]*. https://issuu.com/irf_ua/docs/dp-2014-9
- Parashhenko, L. I. (2013). *Upravlinnja osvitoju ta shkiljna avtonomija: poghljad zi shkoly: analitychna dopovid [Education management and school autonomy: a view from school: an analytical report]*. 2UP.

МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЯ СИСТЕМИ УПРАВЛІННЯ ОСВІТОЮ У МІСТІ КИЄВІ В УМОВАХ ЗАПРОВАДЖЕННЯ АВТОНОМІЇ ШКІЛ

Гриневиц Лілія, кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент, проректор з науково-педагогічної та міжнародної діяльності, Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка, вул. Бульварно-Кудрявська, 18/2, 04053 Київ, Україна, l.hrynevych@kubg.edu.ua

Линьов Костянтин, кандидат наук з державного управління, доцент, завідувач кафедри освітнього лідерства, Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка, вул. Бульварно-Кудрявська, 18/2, 04053 Київ, Україна, k.lynov@kubg.edu.ua

Шемелинець Іван, кандидат юридичних наук, доцент, директор аналітичного центру «ОсвітАналітика», Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка, вул. Бульварно-Кудрявська, 18/2, 04053 Київ, Україна, shemelynets2016@gmail.com

Рій Григорій, PhD, заступник директора аналітичного центру «ОсвітАналітика», Київський університет імені Бориса Грінченка, вул. Бульварно-Кудрявська, 18/2, 04053 Київ, Україна, h.rii@kubg.edu.ua

Статтю присвячено проблемі ефективності функціонування системи управління освітою в місті Києві, виявленню проблем, пов'язаних із запровадженням автономії шкіл, а також пошуку шляхів трансформації

цієї системи. У статті проаналізовано іноземний досвід побудови ефективних систем управління освітою на рівні окремої території. У переважній більшості країн школи наділено частковою автономією, надання якої супроводжується створенням органів, зазвичай це різного роду ради при школах з наглядовими та контрольними функціями, до складу яких входять представники шкільної адміністрації, органів місцевого самоврядування та батьків. У статті зроблено висновки щодо можливості часткового врахування такого досвіду.

Розглянуто декілька моделей створення сервісних центрів для закладів середньої освіти. Зокрема, раціональну модель із повною фінансовою автономією, збалансовану модель із частковою автономією та передачею частини функцій на аутсорсинг та перехідну модель із збереженням районних управлінь освіти з невеликим штатом та утворення окремих сервісних центрів у межах району або мікрорайону Києва.

Система управління освітою в м. Києві нині є дворівневою, районні управління освіти є своєрідною проміжною управлінською ланкою між Департаментом освіти і науки Київської міської державної адміністрації і школами. У цьому зв'язку в статті досліджуються нормативно-правові акти, що закріплюють повноваження районних управлінь освіти, їхні функціональні завдання і взаємовідносини із закладами загальної середньої освіти. Пропонується декілька моделей трансформації мережі та функцій районних управлінь освіти на основі сервісного підходу.

Ключові слова: автономія закладів середньої освіти; сервісний центр; середня школа; українська система освіти; управління освітою.

Received: 30.09.2021

Accepted: 23.12.2021