

Research seminar *Methodological Problems of Education Reform Management* was held in Samara, Russia at the end of March 2002. It was sponsored by:

INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SOCIAL  
CHANGE

OPEN SOCIETY INSTITUTE

MEGAPROJECT DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

SAMARA REGION TEAM

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

SCHOOL DIRECTOR MAGAZINE

SAMARA STATE PEDAGOGICAL UNIVERSITY

SAMARA IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTE

The topic of the seminar was decided because of the challenges of modern Russian education: educational reform (named education modernization) has been started in the country. Well-known Russian experts Ushakov, Moiseev, Pudenko (Moscow), Bogoslavskiy, Scherbova (St.-Petersburg), Kogan, Fishman, Postaluk (Samara), Tregubova (Kazan), Finogenko (Krasoyarsk) and others participated in the seminar. Group work and discussions occupied the biggest part of the seminar though there were some presentations.

Major discussion was devoted to the following issues:

- managerial goals of education reform;
- management and educational management: peculiarities of management of different educational systems (federal, regional, municipal, school); and
- mechanisms of change management in different educational systems.

## **Summary of the discussions**

Educational reform in Russia (implemented sometimes regardless of decision-makers' wishes) is determined by a variety of reasons. We witness some revolutionary changes in views on education. For a long time education was being considered a goal, but now it has impetuously become the means. Some years ago the main aim of education was to form certain personal features considered desirable by the society. Today the aims focus on meeting personal educational needs. On the other hand, changes in the social-economic conditions and functioning of education institutions within those conditions strictly prescribe the reform mechanisms of their interaction with the environment.

Education reform goals form some kind of hierarchy. Conceptualizing education as the means of meeting educational needs (or solving problems) of individual, community and state we should proceed from the point that the main goals of education reformation are social-economic ones. In other words education should give, allow, provide people with something.

At the next level we can suppose education-reforming goals that ensure implementation of the main (social-economic) goals. These goals can be divided into the following main types:

- pedagogical (content of education, methods used and so on which relate to educational processes as such but not to conditions providing for it);
- economic;
- organizational; and
- personnel.

The last three groups of goals provide for the implementation of the pedagogical goals (by producing the conditions or resources mentioned), and can affect them too. For example, creating an organizational mechanism allowing the community to influence school decision-making processes leads to education content changes.

*Managerial* goals of education reforming are equal (in the opinion of some seminar participants) to goals of education reform. According to this view non-managerial goals do not exist. Other experts stated that the educational community considers “goals” and “managerial goals” to be different terms. This is explained by the fact that “managerial goal” (in contrast to traditional education understanding of the term “goal”) is apprehended as something stricter: it should meet the requirements of being concrete, realizable and measurable. It was suggested that managerial goals relate just to the managerial subsystem, which ensure education outcomes by providing definite conditions or resources.

Great debate occurred when discussing the issues of specificity of management/leadership in *education*, as this specificity should be taken into account while conceptualizing educational reform management. In the West, educational management, educational administration, educational leadership relate to the field of education and not to the field of management. The question arises: what specific features of management in *education* should we take into consideration (in particular, in educational systems of different levels) when dealing with the issues of change management? The reason of for this question is in fact that the management of (organizational) change is a well-developed part of management and its ideas should be used in theorizing as well as in practical reforming of Russian education. At the

same time the specificity mentioned may lead to some restrictions in the use of these ideas.

Some seminar participants suggested that the specificity of education management should first of all consist in sufficiently more uncertainty of external order, (in comparison with other organizational systems) which is explained by a non-totalitarian understanding of education and a natural overall evaluation of the power of institutional education. Another specific feature of education management (according to suggestions mentioned at the seminar) is the variety of “managers” (“decision-makers”) in educational systems. Teachers and students can be considered among this group, as can principals and superintendents.

All these should be taken into consideration when examining education reform management. The only question is, to what extent? As a result of hot debate the general consensus of all participants was that at all levels management is first of all management (if not speaking of teacher-student interaction) and only then school management, district management, regional education system management and so on. In other words school management, restaurant management, etcetera is a specific kind of activity, which possesses its own rationality.<sup>1</sup> We must take into consideration the specificity of schooling, cooking, and so on at production management level only. That is why ideas of change management should be fully utilized while conceptualizing education reform management and projecting the practical steps of modernization.

That is why principals should be first of all trained to interact with community and other representatives of social environment and assistant principals should

---

<sup>1</sup> We should note that according to Russian legislation the school principal is an employer: He or she

consider classroom observation and “methodic work”<sup>2</sup> as the ways of personnel management. And the fact that education management belongs to the field of education in the West could be explained through understanding that education is a huge sphere and not by the specificity of management in education. Western experts in education management/leadership deal with the ideas of management/leadership by only operating with educational examples. Russian traditions allow consideration of any pedagogical publication to be in the field of education management.

Interesting discussions also occurred while considering other issues. For example, various points of view were expressed on the tasks of education reform on federal, regional, municipal, school levels. It has become evident that experts had different positions concerning the significance of organizational, economic and personnel aims at different levels of management as well as the usage of specific managerial mechanisms.

Real brainstorming was focused on managerial mechanisms of education reform. Its results can't be described in this brief publication. We should only mention that this discussion as well as others at the seminar was of great importance for academicians' theoretical understanding of educational reform management and for practitioners who needed a starting point to implement the reform.

**Lev Fishman, Regional Editor for Russia**

---

<sup>2</sup> A Russian term, which means different activities, related to the assistant principal–teacher and