

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**GOVERNANCE and MANAGEMENT
UNDER *TOMORROW'S SCHOOLS*:
DUALISM or SEPARATISM?**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters
in
Educational Administration
Department of Social and Policy Studies in Education
at Massey University, Palmerston North
New Zealand**

Annette May Taylor

2001

ABSTRACT

The thesis aimed to determine the following:

- (i) How boards of trustees and principals in state secondary schools determine their respective roles and responsibilities of governance and management.
- (ii) Can the principal be seen as standing apart from the board of trustees of which they are a member?
- (iii) If conflicts between governance and management arise, how are these solved?

The researcher was concerned to learn in educational readings that governance and management and the governance-management interface is a sorely neglected area of research, and that since the inception of *Tomorrow's Schools* there had been an exponential growth in the number of court proceedings involving conflicts of governance and management between principals and boards of trustees. The researcher wanted to determine the views of principals and board chairpersons on governance and management and undertake an in-depth study of a sample of secondary schools' governance-management interface.

A considerable body of quantitative and qualitative research literature has examined the background to the educational reforms and the delivery and implementation of the 'self-management' model. Of particular relevance to this study is the fact that New Zealand followed the 'New-Right' philosophy that was sweeping other westernised countries and devolved the responsibility and accountability for the provision of education to local communities. Empowerment of local communities was seen to be an essential ingredient in ensuring that the 'self-management' model succeeded.

Evidence in this study suggests that the roles of governance and management are not truly split as was envisaged by the initiators of the educational reforms. There appears to be a merging of the two roles and negotiation of the two roles is needed between the principal and the board of trustees. The governance-management interface that has been developed over the last decade has done so owing to each school's interpretation of *Tomorrow's Schools* guidelines and the relevant sections of the *Education Act 1989*. While the participants in this study indicate a satisfaction with their governance-management interface, there are dissatisfactions with the current model and these have been recorded. The majority of the participants in this study see the principal as an integral part of the board, despite the fact that he/she is both an employee of the board and an employer of staff. Conflict between the two roles had occurred and the schools were able to deal with these in-house or by providing professional development in the areas of concern.

In the researcher's opinion, if schools wish to ensure that the governance and management of their school is run in such a way that the board governs and the principal manages, then aspects of John Carver's (1997) Policy Governance model provides them with a vehicle to do so. This model sharpens the board's focus on governance and the ends they wish to achieve, and provides the principal with empowerment to develop and implement the means needed to achieve the prescribed ends.

The current model of governance and management is working for the majority of schools. However, the "one glove fits all approach" is not appropriate for all schools. Evidence in this study shows that there does need to be a reappraisal of some issues that surround the 'self-management' model. Because schools exist to promote teaching and learning and the board of trustees and principals are charged with the responsibility for showing gains in student learning, ways must be found to further enhance the governance and management functions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although I am the writer of this document, I would like to express my sincere thanks to many people. Some started me on this journey, some supported me through it and some continue to support me in my life. They are:

- The Principals' and Board of Trustees Chairpersons' who were the subjects in the study. Without their willing participation, this research could not have been undertaken.
- Associate Professor Dr Wayne L Edwards, my supervisor, for his wise advice and continuing encouragement. Wayne challenged me past my level of comfort and his direction was invaluable.
- Jeremy Ballantyne, Principal of Central Hawke's Bay College, Waipukurau, who challenged me to start this journey and continued his support throughout the process.
- Mark Farnsworth of Farnsworth Bishop and Associates. His knowledge and understanding of the governance and management interface is phenomenal. His assistance and provision of resources was invaluable.
- Patrick Walsh, Deputy Principal of De La Salle College, Auckland, who aided me in understanding the legal issues that schools face and in interpreting educational case law.
- To Glenys Wallbution of Massey University's Computing Services. Her help with the processing of Phase I data was invaluable.
- Rosemary Carpenter, for her friendship, advice and encouragement throughout this course of study.
- Karen Eggers, for her proof reading.
- Cyndi Greep, for her word processing skills.
- Finally, I am indebted to my parents, Janice and William Taylor, for their love and unconditional support.

To my friends and colleagues who encouraged me and kept me on the journey, my deepest appreciation to you all.

CONTENTS	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
GLOSSARY	xv
 CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the study	1
What the thesis did	2
The nature of the study	5
A brief outline of the methods and techniques used	6
Limitations identified in the study	6
Organisation of the thesis	7
 CHAPTER TWO	
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Introduction	10
<u>Part One: International Research</u>	11
<i>Australia</i>	
Historical background of the provision of education	11
Educational reforms and the impact on governance and management	12
Governance and management structures in place today	13
<i>Canada</i>	
Historical background of the provision of education	15

Educational reforms and the impact on governance and management	16
Governance and management structures in place today	16
 <i>England and Wales</i>	
Historical background of the provision of education	17
Educational reforms and the impact on governance and management	19
Governance and management structures in place today	19
 <i>South Africa</i>	
Historical background of the provision of education	21
Educational reforms and the impact on governance and management	21
Governance and management structures in place today	21
 <i>United States of America</i>	
Historical background of the provision of education	22
Educational reforms and the impact on governance and management	23
Governance and management structures in place today	24
Common International themes on governance and management	26
 <u>Part Two: The New Zealand Perspective</u>	
Historical background of the provision of education	27
Educational reforms and the impact on governance and management	30
Governance and management structures in place today	35
Two key Educational Case Law Cases	43
Summary	44
Conclusion	45

CHAPTER THREE

PROCEDURES and RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Background Information	46
Research questions	46

Ethics	47
Research Methodology	50
Phase I of data collection	54
Phase II of data collection	62
Triangulation	67
Reliability and Validity	68
Summary	72

CHAPTER FOUR

PHASE I RESULTS

Introduction	73
Background	73
Overall responses to the questionnaire – Part A and B	75
Responses to the questionnaire by position held – Part A and B	79
Responses to the questionnaire by decile rating – Part A and B	84
What is indicated by the results from the questionnaire	88
Common themes in the results from Phase I	95
Summary	98

CHAPTER FIVE

PHASE II RESULTS

Introduction	100
<u>Part One: On-Site Interviews with Principals</u>	101
Background	101
Responses to questions 1-4, 6, 8-10	103
 <u>Part Two: On-Site Interviews with Board Chairpersons</u>	 112
Background	113
Responses to questions 1-4, 6, 8-10	113

<u>Part Three: Farnsworth Bishop and Associates Governance Exercise</u>	120
Background	120
The results	123
Summary	129
 <u>Part Four: Policy Governance</u>	131
Background	131
What is Policy Governance?	135
 <u>Part Five: Responses to Scenarios</u>	137
Background	137
Scenarios 1-4	137
Summary	141

CHAPTER SIX

A BROADER DISCUSSION

Introduction	143
<i>Question 1</i>	
Is there clear demarcation of roles or is there a spectrum or continuum of shared power?	143
<i>Question 2</i>	
What is the principal's role and relationship with the board	147
<i>Question 3</i>	
If conflicts of governance and management arise, how are these solved?	149
Summary	150

CHAPTER SEVEN

DISCUSSION and ANALYSIS

Introduction	152
<u>Part One: The 'Meshing' Together of the Results</u>	153
Summary	167

<u>Part Two: The Three Key Research Questions</u>	168
<i>Question 1</i>	
Is there clear demarcation of roles or is there a spectrum or continuum of shared power?	168
The respective roles of governance and management	168
Summary	170
<i>Question 2</i>	
What is the principal's role and relationship with the board?	171
The role of the principal	171
The principal's accountability and responsibility	172
The principal's paradoxical relationship	172
Is there the possibility of role confusion under the current regime?	173
The importance of the principal-board of trustees relationship	174
Summary	177
<i>Question 3</i>	
If conflicts of governance and management arise, how are these solved?	
Background	178
The structural framework of <i>Tomorrow's Schools</i>	179
Sections 75 and 76 of the <i>Education Act 1989</i>	180
The governance-management interface currently in operation	182
The rise of educational case law	184
Dealing with conflict successfully	185
Summary	186
<u>Part Three: Policy Governance</u>	187
Policy governance offers boards of trustees flexibility	189
Policies and policy governance	190
Is policy governance a workable model for <i>Tomorrow's Schools</i> ?	190
The board's responsibility for itself	191

Disadvantages of the policy governance model	192
 <u>Part Four: The Researcher's Views</u>	193
The researcher's principles for a successful governance-management interface	193
Conclusion	196
 CHAPTER EIGHT	
CONCLUSIONS	
Introduction	198
<u>Part One: Governance and Management in <i>Tomorrow's Schools</i></u>	200
The educational reforms	200
The second decade of <i>Tomorrow's Schools</i>	200
The governance-management interface in schools	201
The dual role of the principal	201
Issues of conflict between governance and management	202
 <u>Part Two: The Researcher's Conclusions on improving the roles of governance and management</u>	203
Recommendations	204
Topics requiring further discussion	207
Reflection on the methodology used	208
Concluding remarks	211
 REFERENCES	214
APPENDICES	

LIST OF TABLES

Tables:	Page
3.1 Geographical regions of schools involved in Phase I sample	55
3.2 Positive responses for involvement in Phase I	59
3.3 Geographical regions of schools involved in Phase II sample	63
4.1 Details of participants in Phase I	74
4.2 Means and standard deviations for responses to Part A of questionnaire	76
4.3 Means and standard deviations for responses to Part B of questionnaire	78
4.4 Means and standard deviations for responses to Part A of questionnaire by position held	80
4.5 Means and standard deviations for responses to Part B of questionnaire by position held	82
4.6 Means and standard deviations for responses to Part A of questionnaire by decile rating	85
4.7 Means and standard deviations for responses to Part B of questionnaire by decile rating	86
4.8 Statements where differences of opinion were identified in Part A	96

Tables:	Page
4.9 Statements where differences of opinion were identified in Part B	97
5.1 Details of participants in Phase II	101
5.2 Background information on the board of trustees involved in Phase II	102
5.3 Background information on the principals involved in Phase II	104
5.4 Background information on the board chairpersons involved in Phase II	113
5.5 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0110	123
5.6 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0201	124
5.7 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0208	125
5.8 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0305	126
5.9 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0306	127
5.10 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0401	128

Tables:	Page
5.11 Differences in perceptions between principal and board chairperson on current and desired governance position – School 0402	129
5.12 Number of schools with different perceptions on current governing positions	129
5.13 Number of schools with difference perceptions on desired governing positions	130
6.1 Combined results of data collection in Phase I and Phase II ...	155

LIST OF FIGURES

Figures:	Page
1.1 Governance Structures	4
2.1 <i>Tomorrow's Schools</i> and Governance	34
3.1 Sources of data	70
3.2 Timeline of the study	71

LIST OF APPENDICES

- I Educational Case Law Cases that have pertinence
 - II Letter to Principals/Board Chairpersons inviting them to take part in Phase I
 - III Covering letter to Principals/Board Chairpersons wishing to be involved in Phase I
 - IV Information sheet for Phase I
 - V Questionnaire
 - VI Consent form
 - VII Covering letter to Principals/Board Chairperson wishing to be involved in Phase II
 - VIII Information sheet for Phase II
 - IX On-site interview questions
 - X Scenarios on conflict over governance and management
 - XI Farnsworth Bishop and Associates Governance-Management Perception Exercise
 - XII Consent form
 - XIII Copies of data analysis from Phase II
 - XIV Results of the individual schools Farnsworth Bishop and Associates Governance-Management Perception Exercise
-

XV ERO's factors characterised as being associated with Schools that exhibit sound governance procedures.

GLOSSARY

BOT

Board of Trustees

A group legally constituted as a corporate body under the *Education Act 1989*. They have the responsibility of governing the school.

Charter

Each school in New Zealand has a charter that is a signed contract between the school (BOT) and the Minister of Education (MOE). It outlines the school's mission statement, includes how the school will incorporate the *NEG's* and the school's goals for the education of its students.

Decile

All state schools in New Zealand are ranked into deciles (10% groupings), ranging from 1 (the lowest) to 10 (the highest). This is calculated by assessing the socio-economic status of a sample of students in the school. The lower the decile rating, the more targeted funding for educational achievement a school receives.

ERO

Education Review Office

This is an independent body which reports directly to the Minister of Education. Education Review Officers review the performance of educational institutions on a three yearly cycle and their written reports are available for public scrutiny.

Governance/Management

In the discourse of *Tomorrow's Schools*, these two terms differentiate between the respective roles and responsibilities of the BOT (governance) and the Principal and teaching professionals (management). The *Education Act 1989* states that the BOT will govern (section 75) and the Principal will manage (section 76). However, there is often a lack of understanding of the boundaries between these two roles and often conflict arises.

LEA's**Local Education Authorities**

Corporate bodies in England and Wales who are responsible for the funding and resourcing of schools within their geographical boundaries.

LMS**Local Management of Schools**

In England and Wales, funding and resource management is devolved to governing bodies and school staff. In schools becoming locally managed, they limit the powers of the LEA's.

MOE**Ministry of Education**

This is the statutory body who controls education in New Zealand.

NAG's**National Administration Guidelines**

These were gazetted in April 1993. They provide the statutory basis for boards of trustees to deliver on their governance and management functions. Central government through the Ministry of Education, determines the NAG's and it is a mandatory requirement for all schools to implement these guidelines in their policies and practices.

NEG's**National Education Goals**

These were gazetted in April 1993. They are deemed to be part of every school's charter. Central government through the Ministry of Education, determines the NEG's and it is a mandatory requirement for all schools to be achieving these goals through the delivery of their academic, pastoral care, and sporting and cultural programmes.

NZCER**New Zealand Council of Education Research**

NZCER is a not-for-profit organisation with a bicultural focus whose mission is to support educators through quality research, resources and information.

NZEI**New Zealand Educational Institute**

Union for Early Childhood, Primary and Intermediate Teachers’.

NZPPTA**New Zealand Post Primary Teachers’ Association**

Union for Secondary Teachers’.

NZQA**New Zealand Qualifications Authority**

A specialised agency of the Ministry of Education, responsible for the assessment of curriculum and qualifications.

NZSTA**New Zealand Schools Trustees’ Association**

This is the national body that represents boards of trustees of all state and integrated schools who pay a membership fee to belong. Often referred to as STA (Star).

OECD**Organisation for Economic and Co-Operative Development**

A group of countries that are grouped together for international statistical comparison.

OFSTED**Office for Standards in Education**

The English and Welsh equivalent of *ERO*.

Tomorrow's Schools

The umbrella term used to characterize the changes that occurred to educational administration in New Zealand in the late 1980's. Namely, the decentralization of management from central government to local communities.

Trustees

In a New Zealand Secondary School, the board of trustees comprises of the following people –

- The Principal

- An elected Staff representative.

- An elected Student representative (optional – Mandatory since September 2000).

- Between three and seven elected trustees.

- Between two and six co-opted trustees (optional).

A board would have a minimum of five trustees and a maximum of sixteen. Each of the individuals is a trustee and has equal voting votes. However, the chairperson does have the casting vote.
