

---

---

## **V. TRANSFORMATIONS IN SCHOOL EDUCATION IN THE COUNTRIES OF THE EU AND USA**

Research work of the Comparative Education Department of the Institute of Pedagogy of the NAES of Ukraine in 2015-2017

State Registration Number 0115U003080

### **ТРАНСФОРМАЦІЙНІ ПРОЦЕСИ У ШКІЛЬНІЙ ОСВІТІ КРАЇН ЄВРОПЕЙСЬКОГО СОЮЗУ ТА США**

НДР відділу порівняльної педагогіки Інституту педагогіки НАПН України (2015 — 2017)

Державний реєстраційний номер 0115U003080

### **TRANSFORMĂRILE EDUCAȚIEI ȘCOLARE ÎN ȚĂRILE DIN UE ȘI SUA**

Cercetarea Departamentului de Educație Comparată al Institutului de Pedagogie al Academiei Naționale de Științele Educației din Ucraina în perioada 2015-2017

Număr de înregistrare de stat 0115U003080

### **MAIN GOALS OF EDUCATIONAL DECENTRALIZATION: WORLD EXPERIENCE**

**Alina Dzhurylo, Candidate of Sciences in Education**

*Institute of Pedagogy of NAES of Ukraine*

*Kyiv, Ukraine*

Decentralization of education has been implemented in the countries all over the world besides its complexities in conceptualizing the terminology. Numerous studies have appraised the implementation of the decentralization and school based management with different frameworks. While there are different techniques for implementing decentralization, corresponding numbers of goals for education decentralization are characterized [2]. By its nature decentralization has numerous motives yet interrelated at different levels in different countries. Goals are at the core of decentralization initiative and subsequently form strategies to implement decentralization at different levels. In public schools goals of decentralization are equally more important for stakeholders to be conscious of the operations. Accordingly, subsequent sections highlight these major motives (political, administrative and financial) in relation to education decentralization.

### ***Political Goal***

It was documented a comprehensive detail regarding political goal of educational decentralization and provided four reasons for education being political. The reasons are: education is an embodiment of national values, a source of political power, a source for exercising political power and education systems are political weapons. Thus, political decentralization or democratic decentralization encompasses allocating power to make decisions about education to local stakeholders or their representative lower levels of administration [2]. Whether symbolic or real, this shift of authority is predetermined to include stakeholders outside the institutions such as schools. It comprises either an extensive shift or at minimum stakeholders' awareness of reform on decision making power. On the other hand, by its nature decentralization of education is an outcome of the process of political democratization. Education is the largest industry and critical source of political support in many nations in terms of annual government budget and expenditure [2]. Therefore, decentralization of education institutions is as well and to a great extent political process, of which institutions are used as instruments for "enhancing political influence and for carrying out programme and objectives of those in power" [2]. In many cases one will find political power residing at the higher level of government institutions, but the accountability and power for planning, finance and other activities are assigned to lower levels such as schools. To american researcher Fiske, this circumstance brings to mind two consequence; failure or success of programme and projects related to education and schools decentralization. Either of the attributions is, therefore, directly connected to "politics" rather than "technical" designs [2]. Although on the surface, the argument seems to consider and suggest political motive of education decentralization as significant to school achievement or adversity, but practically the technical part in implementing education programmes and project is equally important. Because, over emphasis of political motives on education decentralization can create a tension or fail to adhere to what some researchers termed as emphasis on knowledge, skills, aptitude and experience relevant to implementation of education decentralization. These qualities are the underpinnings of "technical design" and are critical at determining how successful implementation of school decentralization programmes are [3].

### ***Administrative Goal***

Administrative goal of educationl decentralization has its origin in 1980s and 1990s which was the foundation for decentralization of education. The fundamental assumption behind education decentralization is that administration in a centralized system which unnecessary, extensive, elaborate and slow working [4]. Yet again, argument for decentralization of education is founded on the bureaucratic and wastefulness of centralized systems [2]. The administrative goal from this position is seen as an effort to escape from weaknesses of centralized mode of administration. Another argument consistent with aim decentralization is that empowering lower levels such as local authorities and schools will lead to a more close well-organized and effective systems of education. It, therefore, reduces and eventually eradicates delays of bureaucratic procedure and makes education

system more dynamic. Additionally, there are other perspectives that look at administrative decentralization from public administration point of view. Such perspectives argue that success in education decentralization is evaluated by the degree to which education services is more effective as a result of decentralization of authority and power [4]. It is maintained that getting the administration closer to school communities, through administrative decentralization will speed up adaptation to demographic and social transformation and deliver a more open environment for the introduction and improvements in methods of teaching and administrative practices. However, a number of authors are unconvinced and discontented as to whether decentralization stimulates an actual and existent handover of power to respective levels. For instance, recent studies in six Asian countries reveal variations in strategies towards administrative decentralization of education and many countries have been relaxed and in some circumstances very little have changed at local level. In developing countries including Tanzania there has been shortage of data regarding the size, efficiency and performance for administrative system responsible for management of education. Moreover, while there is little substantiation to support the efficiency disagreement, the sign for empowerment and democratization is often partial, weak and dependent on the appropriateness of the methodology rather than on proof of outcomes. All together, administrative decentralization can function efficiently when there is practical existence of reasonable and efficient machinery in education institutions.

### ***Financial Goal***

One of the special characteristic and procedure to education decentralization is management of school funds or school financial management. It is a conventional model for education decentralization to include the transfer of financial resources to subnational, governments or schools. As such, this strategy of devolution is assumed to have a robust consequence on both efficiency and equity. Positive outcomes can only be materialized with a condition that everything is put in place as planned or to put it in economist's terminology — everything is constant.

There might be different levels of government formula funding; but the most appropriate is public school funding as part of decentralization processes and arrangements. Public school funding is an effort to guarantee every public primary school in a country gets an equal amount of money to serve specific purposes in local schools. It is an established rule to allocate finance resources to functioning units such as schools and apply to all schools in a specified education local authority.

A review of literature shows that there are a number of formulas funding that exists and have been applied in different countries [1]. Although there might be a number of comparative studies, in most cases debate on formula funding is contextual, relative and country specific. For example, in Europe, countries such as Finland, Hungary and Netherlands funding formula has been applied in different methods. While the experience in Asian countries has been a combination of methods of which basic education is financed and provided by central government on the one hand, but, on the other hand, a system of privately funded and managed schools exists.

Nevertheless, there is a general agreement that the importance of headteachers has increased with financial delegation. Therefore, it implies that the headteachers have more power and authority on financial decision making or to use school funds. For example, study of 11 schools in a local authority in England revealed that each individual school was observed to have opposing decisions about different aspects of expenditure such as maintenance and improvement of school premises as well as acquisition of teaching and learning materials. It was also revealed that these variations were caused by factors such as the personality and the value of the principals[1].

**Keywords:** educational decentralization, political, administrative and financial goals of educational decentralization.

### References

1. Fazekas, M. (2012). School Funding Formulas: Review of Main Characteristics and Impacts OECD Education Working Papers, No. 74, OECD.
2. Fiske, E. B. (1996). Decentralization of Education: Politics and Consensus. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
3. Grubb, W.N. and Allen, R. (2011) 'Rethinking school funding, resources, incentives, and outcomes, Journal of Educational Change. Vol. 12, 1, pp. 121-130.
4. Karlsten, Gustav. (2000). Decentralized centralism: Framework for a better understanding of governance in the field of education. Journal of Education Policy. Vol. 15, No 5, pp. 525-538.

## **TRANSFORMATION PROCESSES IN UKRAINIAN PRIMARY SCHOOL IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALISATION TENDENCIES**

**Oksana Glushko**

*Institute of Pedagogy of NAES of Ukraine  
Kyiv, Ukraine*

Entry into the European Community encourages our country to active reform movements, including changing in education. According to the new Law of Ukraine "On Education" (which was approved by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine in the first reading in 2016) complete secondary education consists of primary, secondary and subject oriented educational.

In 2016 Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MES) developed the strategical paper on school reform "New Ukrainian School. Concept for reforming secondary education". It represents systematic implementation of educational reform 2018-2027 [2].

The reform was started with modernization of primary education curriculum (from 1<sup>th</sup> to 4<sup>th</sup> forms). Renew of primary education curriculum in 2016-2017 was organizing within