

For information on
19 February 2001

Paper No. CB(2)880/00-01(01)

LegCo Panel on Education

Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on School-based Management

PURPOSE

This paper informs Members of the recommendations of the Advisory Committee on School-based Management (ACSBM) submitted to the Director of Education (DE) on 12 January 2001.

BACKGROUND

2. The Education Department briefed the LegCo Panel on Education on 20 November 2000 on the outcome of the public consultation exercise on the proposals for school-based management (SBM) and the latest developments. The Panel subsequently arranged another meeting on 11 December to receive deputations from school sponsoring bodies (SSBs), teachers' associations and parents' groups.

ACSBM'S RECOMMENDATIONS

3. Taking into account views received during public consultation, and subsequent consultation with the LegCo Panel on Education, ACSBM finalised and submitted its proposals to DE in early January 2001. In coming up with its proposals, ACSBM endeavoured to balance the interests and aspirations of all stakeholders (including SSBs, parents and teachers), whilst upholding the fundamental principles of SBM. A summary of ACSBM's proposals is at Annex.

4. In deliberating the proposals, ACSBM had an in-depth discussion on two issues which were more controversial, namely the structure and composition of a school management committee (SMC).

5. During public consultation, some SSBs considered that they be allowed to adopt a two-tier management structure. ACSBM considers that whether a school has a one-tier or multi-tier governance structure is not the issue. Schools may, depending on their own circumstances, set up advisory bodies to advise on aspects of school operations or policies. Rather, the issue is how all key stakeholders, i.e. SSBs, parents, teachers and community members, would have meaningful participation at the decision-making level. The spirit of SBM is that all stakeholders should participate in important decisions of school management. Hence, ACSBM maintained its original proposal, which is that each school should have an SMC in which representatives of all key stakeholders are able to take part meaningfully in the making of decisions which are important to the running of a school.

6. As regards the composition of SMC, ACSBM's original proposal is that the committee should comprise managers nominated by the SSB, the principal, two or more teacher managers, two or more parent managers, one or more alumni managers, plus one or more independent managers appointed from amongst community members. Managers nominated by the SSB may constitute up to 60% of the total SMC membership. Many SSBs are concerned that if SSBs were to fully utilize the "quota" for their managers (i.e. 60% of the SMC), the size of the SMCs would become unwieldy (at least 17 members). Major SSBs with a large number of sponsored schools also expressed difficulty in finding sufficient school managers who share the SSBs' vision, or religious affiliation, to sit on the SMCs.

7. ACSBM recognises the practical difficulties faced by large SSBs in finding sufficient number of school managers to serve on SMCs. A large SMC may also not be conducive to constructive discussion and exchange of ideas. At the same time, ACSBM acknowledges that it is desirable for an SMC to have more than one parent and one teacher representatives for better collegial support and continuity.

8. ACSBM's recommendation is therefore that each SMC will have one or more teacher managers, and one or more parent managers. Where there is only one teacher manager and/or one parent manager, there will be,

in addition, one alternate teacher manager and/or one alternate parent manager. These alternate members may attend SMC meetings and have the same rights and responsibilities as the full members, save the voting right. They will take the place of the full members (and be entitled to vote) when the latter cannot attend SMC meetings. The maximum proportion of managers nominated by an SSB to serve on the SMC is kept at 60% of the total SMC membership. In arriving at this recommendation, ACSBM is mindful that the spirit of SBM calls for partnership and collaboration amongst SSBs, parents and teachers, and that decisions of SMCs should be reached through constructive discussion and consensus building.

9. To provide more time for SSBs to put in place the whole SBM framework, and for parents and teachers to be fully prepared for the new governance environment, ACSBM proposes to extend the transition period from three years to five years. Schools, however, will be encouraged to move faster if they are ready to implement the framework.

10. ACSBM recommends that the Administration makes legislative amendments to give the proposals legal backing and puts in place the proposed SBM framework as soon as possible.

LATEST DEVELOPMENTS

11. The Board of Education was briefed on ACSBM's proposals in January 2001 and agreed to the proposals in broad terms.

ADVICE SOUGHT

12. Views from the LegCo Panel on Education and other bodies on the ACSBM's proposals are welcome.

**ACSBM's Proposals for School-based Management
Submitted to the Director of Education on 12 January 2001**

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
<p><i>Structure and Composition of SMC</i></p> <p>Each school should have an SMC which will be responsible for making decisions on major school policies. The SMC should comprise the following –</p> <p>(a) managers nominated by the SSB (up to 60% of the total SMC membership);</p> <p>(b) the principal: an ex-officio member;</p> <p>(c) two or more teacher managers to be elected from the teaching staff;</p> <p>(d) two or more parent managers to be elected by members of the parent-teacher association;</p> <p>(e) one or more alumni managers to be elected by an alumni association recognised by the SMC; and</p> <p>(f) one or more independent managers to be nominated by the SMC from amongst community members and relevant professionals.</p>	<p>The original proposal is adopted except that –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • each SMC will have one or more teacher managers and one or more parent managers. Where there is only one teacher manager and/or one parent manager, there will be, in addition, one alternate teacher manager and/or one alternate parent manager. These alternate members may attend SMC meetings and have the same rights and responsibilities as the full members, save the voting right. They will take the place of the full members (and be entitled to vote) when the latter cannot attend SMC meetings; and • DE will be given discretionary power to exempt the requirement of having 	<p>The spirit of SBM is that all stakeholders should participate in important decisions. Hence, ACSBM maintained its original proposal of requiring each school to have an SMC with all key stakeholders making important decisions concerning a school.</p> <p>ACSBM recognises the practical difficulties faced by large SSBs in finding sufficient number of school managers to serve on SMCs. A large SMC may also not be conducive to constructive discussion and exchange of ideas. At the same time, ACSBM acknowledges that it is desirable for an SMC to have more than one parent and one teacher representatives for better collegial support and continuity.</p>

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
	an alumni manager.	
<i>The SMC will be incorporated under the Education Ordinance</i>	The original proposal is adopted.	----
<i>SMC constitution</i> Each SMC has to draw up its own constitution.	The original proposal is adopted.	----
<i>Disclosure of personal data and declaration of interests</i> ED will register school managers (their names, tenure and the sector they represent) and make the information available to the public. Managers will be required to declare to the SMC any personal interests that may conflict with their managerial responsibilities.	The original proposal is adopted.	

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
<i>Each school manager cannot serve on more than five SMCs</i>	The revised proposal is that generally a school manager may not serve on more than five SMCs, but that DE should be given the discretionary power to lift the ceiling on a case by case basis.	This allows more flexibility for schools which have genuine difficulties in complying with the requirement, and allows full-time staff employed specifically to manage schools under the SSBs' sponsorship to sit on more than five SMCs.
<p><i>Qualifications of school managers</i></p> <p>There is no need to stipulate a minimum level of academic qualifications for managers. However, we could consider requiring new managers to have received secondary education or its equivalent.</p>	No minimum level of academic qualifications will be imposed on managers.	The original proposal may discourage parents and community members who are devoted to education but have not received secondary education from serving on SMCs.
<p><i>Age of school managers</i></p> <p>All school managers should be aged between 21 to 70.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No upper age limit on school managers will be set. However, those who are 70 or above should be able to prove their medical fitness by producing a medical certificate before they could serve on SMCs. • SMCs may introduce a new category of “Honorary Managers”. This 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers over the age of 70 may still be fit to serve on SMCs. • The new category of “Honorary

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
	category of managers is not subject to the requirements of school managers but will not have any voting rights.	Managers'' is to give recognition to people who have in the past contributed to the school, and to provide an alternative venue for people who wish to contribute to education but for various reasons do not satisfy all the requirements of school managers.
<p><i>Attendance at SMC meetings</i></p> <p>Managers who are absent from three consecutive meetings without leave should be required from the SMC to resign from office. If resignation is not received, the SMC can seek cancellation of the manager's registration from DE.</p>	The original proposal is adopted.	----
<p><i>Representatives of DE at SMC meetings</i></p> <p>DE's delegated representatives will be able to attend SMC meetings. They will not be members of the SMC and will not have voting rights.</p>	The original proposal is adopted.	----

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
<p><i>Roles of SSBs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • setting the vision for their sponsored schools • maintaining full control of the use of their private funds and assets • taking part in the selection of the principal • nominating SSB managers • requesting cancellation of the registration of managers appointed by SSBs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original proposal is adopted but SSBs will be allowed to set the mission for their sponsored schools as well. • The power of SSBs to set the vision and mission for their sponsored schools and to have full control of their private funds and assets will be stipulated clearly in the Education Ordinance and the SMCs' constitutions. 	<p>In view of contributions of SSBs to their sponsored schools and the importance of SSBs' role, ACSBM suggest that SSBs be allowed to set both the vision and mission for their sponsored schools.</p>

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
<p><i>Roles of SMCs</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring that the Education Ordinance is complied with and the vision of the SSB is fulfilled • setting the mission and goals of the school • determining policies on teaching and learning • planning and budgeting as well as managing human resources (including staff development and performance management) • establishing a community network and support system 	<p>The original proposal is adopted but the mission for a school will be set by the SSB.</p>	<p>In view of contributions of SSBs to their sponsored schools and the importance of SSBs' role, ACSBM suggest that SSBs be allowed to set both the vision and mission for their sponsored schools.</p>

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
<p><i>Roles of ED</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enforcing relevant legislation • developing policies and educational guidelines • setting system-wide educational priorities • setting and monitoring education standards • providing schools with necessary public funds 	<p>The original proposal is adopted. ED should also strengthen its training for school managers.</p>	<p>----</p>
<p><i>Transition period</i></p> <p>A transition period of three years is allowed so that schools could make appropriate plans to introduce a participatory school management mechanism.</p>	<p>The transition period will be extended to five years. Schools, however, will be encouraged to move faster if they are ready to implement the proposed SBM framework.</p>	<p>Extension of the transition period is to allow more time for SSBs to put in place the whole SBM framework, and for parents and teachers to be fully prepared for the new governance environment.</p>
<p><i>Post of supervisor</i></p>	<p>SMCs may, depending on the circumstances of their schools, retain the post of “supervisor”. The roles and powers of these “supervisors” will be determined by the SMCs and will be set out in their constitutions. However, it</p>	<p>The spirit of SBM is to have important decisions made by SMCs collectively. It is thus not necessary to retain the post of supervisor. However, ACSBM recognises that some schools may, for operational reasons, wish to</p>

Original Proposals in the Consultation Document	ACSBM's Proposals	Remarks
	should be the entire SMC instead of the "supervisor" who will be accountable for the important policies, procedures or practices of the school.	appoint representative(s) to discharge duties on behalf of the SMCs, for example, serving as an official contact with ED and other outside bodies.