ORGANIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGIC SYSTEM AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Nurieva Umida Buribayevna,
Alfira Sofia
Tashkent State University of Economics, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia
Corresponding author: nurievaumida62@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Main Purpose - The main objective of the research is to identify the qualitative characteristics of the education system and its typical problems, and to identify promising areas for the support and development of public schools in Uzbekistan.

Method - The research methodology involves a questionnaire survey conducted among 123 directors of educational institutions from eight city districts in Uzbekistan. It allowed for the identification of qualitative characteristics of the education system and its typical problems.

Main Findings - The study identified typical problems in the education system in Uzbekistan and provided valuable insights into promising areas for the support and development of public schools. The study facilitated the practice of public assessment of the school's activities, ensuring transparency and accountability in the educational sector.

Theory and Practical Implications - The study recommends further research to investigate the causes of the non-adoption of strategic management in Uzbekistan. The study also recommends incorporating strategic management principles into the curricula of entrepreneurial centers and schools to boost the performance and competitiveness of education.

Novelty - The research provides valuable insights into the qualitative aspects of the education system in Uzbekistan and identifies promising areas for the support and development of public schools, contributing to the knowledge base of education management in the region.

Keywords: Educational institutions, State-public education management, Strategic system, Transparency and accountability, Uzbekistan

INTRODUCTION

The management of education by the state and public is examined within the context of the challenges of school and social interaction. This scientific problem involves studying schools' historical and social role, recognizing the effects of public involvement on educational development, and establishing the legal basis for public participation in school governance (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). The analysis of the transition to state-public management highlights various factors that make it necessary, including promoting civil society and enhancing public engagement, empowering the public to participate in decision-making processes, and increasing the impact of parents and social organizations on educational changes

(Kalinina, 2017). The importance of studying public evaluation issues is evident, as it is relevant for understanding the current state of the education system.

Assessing the success of education and determining its social effectiveness is a challenging task, as reflected in conference materials, public debates, dissertation papers, and scientific publications. It is widely acknowledged by philosophers, sociologists, educators, and public figures that evaluating the social effects of education is problematic. The social and systemic aspects of education and the standards for its effectiveness are challenging to study. The specific criteria for the social effects of education should be guided by modern pedagogical theory and practice, yet there is ambiguity surrounding them. It is also unclear how these criteria should be incorporated into pedagogical technologies and didactic principles. To address this issue, it is imperative to intensify efforts in designing systems for state-public assessment of education quality and determining goals and forms for public school reports (Pugacheva et al., 2016). A modern system of public assessment needs to be developed to ensure that the social effectiveness of education is evaluated accurately and comprehensively.

To effectively manage state public education, the state-public education management system must be researched to determine how heads of public educational institutions are prepared to utilize its potential (Djurayev et al., 2022). This includes identifying the role of the public in school management and assessing the quality of educational activities. Research tasks should focus on (1) Examining the attitudes of educational institution leaders toward public participation in education modernization processes; (2) Identifying the functions of public organizations and individuals in education management; and (3) Evaluating satisfaction levels with the results of implementing public education systems and practices, such as public reporting.

The attitudes of educational institution leaders toward public participation in education modernization processes have to do with several aspects, including their perception of the role of the public in decision-making, their assessment of the public's knowledge and expertise in education, their beliefs about the benefits and risks of public participation, and their willingness to share power and control over the educational system (Pedaste et al., 2021). Some leaders may view public participation as a threat to their authority and expertise, while others may welcome it to engage diverse stakeholders and improve educational outcomes. Ultimately, the success of education modernization efforts depends on the ability of leaders to navigate these complex attitudes and engage the public in meaningful ways.

The functions of public organizations and individuals in education management must be identified clearly (Kokhanovskaya et al., 2019). It is crucial to have a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of both public organizations and individuals when it comes to education management. This is essential in ensuring effective collaboration, coordination, and partnership among all stakeholders involved in the education system (Ismailova, 2020). Therefore, it is important to identify and define these functions to promote a more efficient and effective education system. An educational management system is a system for the collection, integration, processing, maintenance and dissemination of data and information to support decision-making, policy-analysis and formulation, planning, monitoring and management at all levels of an education system (IIEP-UNESCO, 2010).

Any school stakeholders, including teachers, students, parents, and administrators can reflect satisfaction levels with the results of implementing public education systems and practices (Üstündağ et al., 2022). It is important to gather feedback from all stakeholders in order to identify areas of success and areas in need of improvement (Widowati et al., 2020). By doing so, education systems and practices can be continually refined to better serve the needs of all those involved in the educational process. In fact, it is important to continually evaluate and improve education systems to ensure that they are effective and efficient. Evaluating an education system can be done by defining terms, gathering data, pruning, planning to evaluate everything on the list, and completing the evaluation plan. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has developed an evaluation and assessment framework for improving school outcomes. The framework includes a thorough analysis of the evidence on evaluation and assessment policies in a range of countries and a synthesis report comparing country experience and drawing out general lessons for policy development.

State-public management of education refers to government or state agencies' governance and administration of education systems (Rogach et al., 2017). In this type of management, the government plays a central role in providing, financing, and regulating education services. State-public education management can take different forms in different countries and regions, depending on the political and cultural context. However, it typically involves the following elements: (1) Centralized decision-making: In state-public management, decisions regarding education policies, curriculum, funding, and other critical aspects of education are made by the government or state agencies rather than individual schools or local communities; (2) Public funding: Education services are typically financed through public funds, such as government budgets or taxes. This means that the government significantly influences the allocation of resources to different education programs and initiatives; and (3) Accountability: The government or state agencies are responsible for ensuring that education services meet specific standards of quality and effectiveness. This may involve monitoring and evaluating schools, teachers, and students and establishing policies and regulations to improve education outcomes. Overall, state-public education management is designed to provide equitable access to education services for all citizens and promote social and economic development through education. While it has advantages, such as providing a solid framework for accountability and ensuring that education is available to all, it can also face challenges, such as potential bureaucracy, limited flexibility, and difficulty adapting to changing needs and demands.

METHODS

To implement the tasks set, providing a qualitative analysis of regional problems in the development of the system, and the practice of public assessment of the school's activities, in 2012, a questionnaire survey was conducted among the heads of educational institutions in Uzbekistan. There were 123 directors of educational institutions from eight city districts who took part in the survey. The study made it possible to identify the qualitative characteristics of the development system and its typical problems; identify promising areas of support for the development of public schools in the educational institution of Uzbekistan. The results of the study provided valuable insights into the qualitative aspects of the education system, highlighting typical problems and identifying promising areas for support and development of

public schools in Uzbekistan. Additionally, the study facilitated the practice of public assessment of the school's activities, ensuring transparency and accountability in the educational sector.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As the results from questionnaire survey, the study established the following findings. First, it was about the attitude of the heads of educational institutions to the participation of members of the public in the processes of modernization of education. The heads of educational institutions generally support public participation in the modernization of Uzbekistan education. At the same time, 35% of respondents were undecided or supported the idea of including the public in the process of modernization of education. Approximately half of the respondents (49%) believe that the public should take an active position in the management of the educational institution, a third consider it reasonable to involve the public in solving private problems, 11% of the respondents see the function of the public in attracting sponsorship funds for the needs of an educational institution.

Second, in terms of functions of public organizations and the public in education management, the heads of educational institutions consider the most important tasks of the public and public organizations to be: There is 43% of the public participates in an independent examination of the quality of education. Implementation of public control over the observance of the legal rights and interests of students and employees of educational institutions is at 39%, while public control over the financial resources of the education development fund is at 37%. However, the public's role in the management of the regional system is less significant in the following functions: participation in the formation of development programs at 19%, facilitating the financing of network programs at 11%, and formation of proposals for changing the network of educational institutions at 9%. Thus, it can be said that educational institution leaders consider the participation of the public and public organizations crucial in managing education. The public's involvement in conducting independent evaluations of education quality, overseeing students' and employees' rights, and monitoring financial resources for education development are deemed essential tasks. However, the public's role in creating development programs and suggesting changes to the educational institution network is viewed as less significant.

Third, the implementation of the public education system and the practice of public reporting in educational institutions were evaluated for their level of satisfaction with the results. Uzbekistan's public administration system is currently in a developmental stage, as indicated by the survey findings. According to the survey, 50% of the heads of educational institutions rated the implementation of public education management models and public reporting at the regional level as good, while 31% rated it as satisfactory. About 16% of respondents found it rather unsatisfactory and completely unsatisfactory, while 3% of respondents did not express their position. At the district level, 50% of the heads of educational institutions rated the implementation of state-public management of education and public reporting as good, 31% as satisfactory, 14% as rather unsatisfactory and completely unsatisfactory, and 5% of respondents did not express their position.

The fourth aspect to consider is the potential risks and opportunities for enhancing the state-public education management system. According to educational institution leaders, the primary

obstacles hindering the development of the system include a lack of public motivation (49%), administrative issues (21%), inadequate teaching staff (17%), and other school employees (13%). Insufficient opportunities for training school administrators in public administration and reporting (35%), a lack of training opportunities for school managers (31%), and limited access to qualified consulting assistance (51%) were identified as significant challenges to the system's growth. Additionally, the regulatory framework for organizing the state-public education management system remains a significant obstacle, with 29% of managers citing a lack of regulatory support. Implementing personnel training and counseling programs can effectively address these challenges and promote the system's development.

The fifth aspect to be considered is the development of the public administration system, public assessment procedures, and involvement of schools in the public administration system's implementation. The main risks of introducing the public education system in educational institutions and public reporting practices include a formal approach, provoking conflict between professionals and the public. The main concern regarding the introduction of state public among the heads of educational institutions is that the lack of professionalism of public managers can lead to the adoption of decisions that harm educational institutions. When public managers lack professionalism, it can have negative consequences for educational institutions (Noordegraaf, 2017). Suppose they do not possess the knowledge, skills, and experience needed to make informed decisions regarding education management. In that case, they may make choices that do not serve the best interests of the institutions or their students. Furthermore, if public managers prioritize personal or political interests over the needs of educational institutions, this can also result in detrimental decisions. Therefore, public managers must maintain high professionalism and be dedicated to making decisions supporting educational institutions.

Finally, the development of state public education management in educational institutions is crucial and requires a qualitative assessment. As per the leaders, one of the state public education management bodies' primary roles is coordinating the development program. This fact was acknowledged by 97% of survey participants. The inclusion of various public participation forms in the development program is a significant indicator of the state public education management's progress. In Uzbekistan, public reporting on educational, financial, and economic activities and a website are crucial elements of state public education management. Around 91% of respondents acknowledged the presence of public reporting, and 98% recognized the importance of having a website for educational institutions.

For the full development of the bodies of the state public education management, the leaders of the schools would like to have more information about the degree of public interest in educational management. The leaders have certain ideas about the necessary qualities of public members involved in the educational institution's management. The significant qualities of public administrators include mobility (52%), legal literacy (19%), and activity (29%) among leaders of educational institutions. The heads of guardians and parents' councils consider the most suitable forms of state public education management in educational institutions. The practicality of implementing the functions of public administration by these bodies was mentioned by 39% and 27% of respondents, respectively. Based on the study's results, the

following generalized portrait was compiled, reflecting the development trends of the state public education management system in the educational institution of the republic.

Specific characteristics are common when it comes to state public education management in the EI of the republic. These include a combination of state governing bodies of an EI and public governing bodies, as 51% of survey participants reported. Additionally, 45% of participants noted the availability of legal documents in EI regulating the activities of state and public authorities. Coordination and interaction of state and public administration bodies are also important, with 37% of participants reporting that managerial decisions of public administration bodies of an EI hold predominance over management decisions of public administration bodies. Management rights are realized primarily through participation in the activities of the Council of the EI, according to 43% of participants. Lastly, there is a focus on harmonizing relations between participants in the educational process, which is facilitated by the functioning of a conflict resolution system between teachers, students, and parents (49%).

Based on the study, the following findings can be drawn. The heads of educational institutions generally support public participation in the modernization of education. The notion of engaging the public in education management is not widely embraced and may prove challenging to grasp. Despite this, there exist a considerable number of educational leaders who do not endorse this approach, underscoring the crucial need for effective methods to stimulate public education development. This can be accomplished through competitive initiatives, widespread dissemination of information, and comprehensive training programs.

Educational institutions' leaders have an idea about the role of public organizations and the public in managing the regional educational system. The participants believe that public participation in independent quality examination and exercising control over the legitimate rights and interests of students and employees of educational institutions are the most significant functions of state and public administration bodies. However, it is unclear whether the leaders of educational institutions prioritize the public's controlling function over the support and development of the system. This attitude conflicts with the ideology of state public education management (SPEM). Hence, innovative practices of public participation in the formation of development programs need to be developed, and the experience of public discourse should be expanded.

A significant result of the study is the identification of a lack of motivation in the development of the SPEM system both among leaders, in the pedagogical community, and among the public itself. One of the possible ways to solve this problem is to disseminate the successful experience of organizing a SPEM in the educational institution of the city. Moreover, an obstacle in the development of the SPEM is the low assessment by the leaders of the educational institution of their competence in this issue. As the experience of implementing professional development programs on the subject of SPEM has shown, it is advisable to include this area as a modular element of the programs. Only under such conditions the compressed time resources of the heads of the educational institution of Uzbekistan will allow them to master this area of activity. Targeted coursework on the issues of SPEM does not attract managers precisely because of the high employment.

A significant problem in the organization of SPEM remains the regulatory framework. This obstacle is likely to be partially removed with the introduction of new educational legislation.

The results of the study indicate a certain wariness of the heads of educational institutions concerning the system of SPEM, highlighting significant risks of public participation in education management (Ernazarov, 2020). For a significant part of the heads of educational institutions (21%), the ideas of SPEM appear to be unpromising. The improvement of the regulatory framework of the SPEM, which will prevent the growth of conflict relations between the subjects of the educational process, the presence in the regulatory documents of the requirements for the competence and professionalism of public managers.

The leaders of educational institutions also associate the formation of the SPEM system with the expansion of the study of the social order for education, with the study of the satisfaction of students and their parents with the quality of education. In demand for the introduction of forms of SPEM are methods for identifying a social order intended for educational institutions, analytical and methodological materials on the organization of SPEM, risks, and existing fears. Popular forms of public administration at the district level are public observation, public expertise and public accreditation of educational institutions, participation of public members in the certification and licensing of educational institutions, and certification of teaching staff (Jurabaevich & Bulturbayevich, 2021). This setting can be supported by expanding the innovative practice of public expertise to choose the best forms of its implementation.

The idea of public reporting is also supported by the administrative staff of the educational institution at all levels of management of the educational system, which actualizes the solution of tasks to determine the formats of public reports to compare, compare and analyze them. The last is that attention is drawn to the low percentage of representation of students, representatives of public organizations, and the business community in the structures of the State Educational Institution, which indirectly indicates the lack of implementation of the principles of public administration in the regional educational policy. The regional educational policy should be in a certain way, consistent with the expectations of the leaders of the educational institutions of the republic to expand the circle of social partners of the education system.

CONCLUSION

State-public education management pertains to the governance and administration of education systems by government or state agencies. This type of administration involves the government's significant role in providing, financing and regulating education services. Depending on the political and cultural context, state-public education management can take various forms in different countries and regions. Nonetheless, it commonly comprises centralized decision-making, wherein the government or state agencies make decisions regarding education policies, curriculum, funding, and other vital aspects of education instead of individual schools or local communities. Public funding is typically used to finance education services, such as government budgets or taxes. As a result, the government has a significant influence on the allocation of resources to various education programs and initiatives. Finally, accountability is key, with the government or state agencies being responsible for ensuring effective education management.

The study recommended that further studies be carried out in our country to investigate the causes of the non-adoption of strategic management in Uzbekistan in particular. When known

and curved, small and medium-scale industries might become more competitive in boosting the development of an economy. The entrepreneurial center and schools should incorporate strategic management principles into their curricula. This will engender sound managerial know-how and boost the performance and competitiveness of education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

REFERENCES

1. Djurayev, R. K., Karakhanova, L. M., & Karimov, K. A. (2022). A systemic factor of increasing the quality of higher education. ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 12(6), 205–214. https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7137.2022.00645.0

2. Ernazarov, D. (2020). ED problems and aspirations of Uzbekistan on the way to Global Civil Society. Архив Научных Исследований, 1(4).

3. IIEP-UNESCO. (2010). Educational Management Information System (EMIS) | Unesco IIEP Learning Portal. https://learningportal.iiep.unesco.org/en/glossary/educational-management-information-system-emis

4. Ismailova, N. (2020). Positive Aspects of the Development of Public-Private Partnership in Uzbekistan. Архив Научных Исследований, 33(1).

5. Jurabaevich, S. N., & Bulturbayevich, M. B. (2021). Possibilities of using foreign experience to increase the quality of education in reforming the education system of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal, 1(01), 11–21.

6. Kalinina, G. (2017). State-public management of education as object of scientific discourse. ББК 74в4 (4+ 4Укр) Я43 У 45 Рекомендовано До Друку Вченою Радою Інституту Педагогіки НАПН України (Протокол № 4 Від 27 Квітня 2017 р.) Редакційна Колегія, 68.

7. Kokhanovskaya, I. I., Abdullina, L. B., Akhmerova, N. M., Suleymanova, F. M., & Fatykhova, A. L. (2019). Efficiency Improvement for Public Administration of Education. 203–206. https://doi.org/10.2991/tphd-18.2019.40

8. Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2015). Public participation for 21st century democracy. John Wiley & Sons.

9. Noordegraaf, M. (2017). Public management: Performance, professionalism and politics. Bloomsbury Publishing.

10. Pedaste, M., Leijen, Ä., Kivirand, T., Nelis, P., & Malva, L. (2021). School leaders' vision is the strongest predictor of their attitudes towards inclusive education practice. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 0(0), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1994661

11. Pugacheva, N. B., Kirillova, T. V., Ovchinnikova, I. G., Kudyashev, N. K., Lunev, A. N., Pavlova, O. A., Kashina, S. G., & Valeyev, A. S. (2016). The mechanism of state-public management of vocational education in the region. International Review of Management and Marketing, 6(2), 6–11.

12. Rogach, O. V., Frolova, E. V., Medvedeva, N. V., Ryabova, T. M., & Kozyrev, M. S. (2017). State and public management of education: Myth or reality. Revista ESPACIOS, 38(25). https://www.revistaespacios.com/a17v38n25/17382515.html

13. Üstündağ, M. T., Solmaz, E., & Özcan, S. (2022). Developing and implementing a student satisfaction scale for the emergency remote teaching in higher education. Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning, 5(4), 916–935.

14. Widowati, E., Koesyanto, H., Sugiharto, S., Wahyuningsih, A., & Harjanto, E. (2020, September 29). Satisfaction Level of School Residents in Implementing A Child Safety System in School. Proceedings of the 5th International Seminar of Public Health and Education, ISPHE 2020, 22 July 2020, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia. https://eudl.eu/doi/10.4108/eai.22-7-2020.2300271