The process of the organization of effective management at one taken educational establishment was improved. It is in distinguishing those parameters of the internal environment which will be improved during this process and will ensure the achievements of the determined goals. We got further development of scientific understanding of the nature and structure of the strategic management of the development of higher educational establishment.

Conclusion. Thus the modeling of strategic management in the development of higher educational establishment which practices in university education is an objective necessity. However the main task of the effectiveness of the management process is solved at one taken educational establishment and is in distinguishing those parameters of the internal environment which will be improved during this process and will ensure the achievements of the determined goals. The research of the organizational and pedagogical conditions of strategic management of innovative development of higher education and the working out of the model of the process will be seen in the future.

DOVHOPOLOVA Hanna Hennadiivna,
Ph D, senior teacher of the chair of educational management and professional training, Sumy State Teachers' Training University named after A. S. Makarenko, Ukraine,

THE SCHOOL-LEVEL FACTORS OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLING

Анотація. Проаналізовано основні роботи англомовних дослідників у галузі освітнього менеджменту і теорії освіти (Р. Едмондз, Д. Левін, Р. Марзано, П. Саммонс, Дж. Ширинс) у контексті визначення чинників шкільного рівня, що зумовлюють наявність високих навчальних досягнень учнів.Доведено, що попри наявні відмінності в переліку чинників шкільного рівня у працях різних науковців, серед них можна виокремити п'ять основних. Визначено, що цими чинниками є такі: колегіальність і професіоналізм, складні цілі та ефективний зворотний зв'язок, участь батьків і спільноти, безпечне і впорядковане середовище, обґрунтований і життєздатний навчальний план.

Ключові слова: освітній менеджмент; управління; шкільний рівень; ефективність навчання; навчальні досягнення; професіоналізм; колегіальність; навчальні цілі; шкільне середовище; навчальний план.

Introduction. The history of Ukrainian public education, particularly during the 21st century, is rife with criticisms. Indeed, the century began with a massive effort to improve secondary school. One significant aspect of that reform effort was the establishment of the uniform standards for defining pupils' academic achievements. In this context we should stress that schools can have a tremendous impact on students' achievements if they consider a few factors. Understanding the problem is the key to understanding how these factors can actually support the position that schools do make a difference.

Secondary school as the object of study is of considerable interest to scientists which is evidenced by a significant number of works of Ukrainian and foreign researchers. It should be noted that a significant contribution to the development of the problem of school effectiveness made by such American theorists of education, as G. Evans, B. King, K. Louis, F. Neumann,

K. Petersen, P. Senge, N. Fullan, E. Hargreaves, D. Hopkins, K. Chapman. Among the factors which influence the effective work of school and students' achievements they mention school culture, school climate, school leadership, school based management, resources (administrative, human, intellectual, informational, technological, time, financial etc.) and even the school district.

However in the studies, which are mentioned above the causes of failure of specific schools are given or some successful projects are described. However, in our opinion they lack a comprehensive analysis of the factors which define the success of the schools. In particular, the factors of school level need to be studied and systematized, because educational institutions have the opportunity to influence them, whereas the factors of regional or state level are not their prerogative.

The purpose of the article is to identify the most significant school-level factors that influence successful learning of students.

Results. In order to define the most significant school-level factors it is necessary to make a comparison across researchers. The most famous list of school-level factors came out of the school effectiveness research from the 1970s [2; 4; 6]. Some of the well-known researchers of that era were Ron Edmonds, Michael Rutter and Wilbur Brookover. Of this list, Edmonds is the figurehead of the school effectiveness movement. As H. Good and noted, Edmonds «had been one of the key figures in the school effectiveness movement... Edmonds, more than anyone, had been responsible for communication of the belief that schools can and do make a difference» [2, p. 522].

So, these school-level factors were associated with the school effectiveness movement of the 1970s:
– strong administrative leadership,
– an emphasis on basic skill acquisition,
– high expectations for student achievement,
– a safe and orderly atmosphere conducive to learning,
– frequent monitoring of student progress [7; 8].

Although there is some variation from researcher to researcher [5; 9], these five «correlates» of effective schools (so named because of their strong correlation with student achievement) became the focal point of reform in the 1970s and early 1980s. It is probably more accurate to credit these correlates to the entire school effectiveness movement.

Another list of school-level factors that has been widely used is one developed by Daniel Levine and Lawrence Lezotte [3]. In their review of the research literature, they relied heavily on case studies using what might be thought of as an outlier design, for example, focusing on the characteristics of the top 25 percent of schools as opposed to the bottom 25 percent. Their analysis produced the following factors:
– productive climate and culture,
– focus on central learning skills,
– appropriate monitoring,
– practice-oriented staff development,
– strong leadership,
– salient parent involvement,
– high expectations and requirements.

We have to note that this list includes effective instructional arrangement and implementation. They can be classified as teacher-level factors.

P. Sammons [6] performed an analysis similar to that by D. Levine and L. Lezotte. However, it relied less on case study evidence and included more quantitative studies such as the British Junior School Project [6]. This review produced the following school-level factors:
– purposeful teaching,
– professional leadership,

- concentration on teaching and learning,
- shared vision and goals,
- a learning environment,
- high expectations,
- positive reinforcement,
- monitoring progress,
- pupil rights and expectations,
- home-school partnership,
- a learning organization.

From a quantitative perspective, one of the most rigorous reviews of the research on school-level factors was conducted by Jaap Scheerens and Roel Bosker [1]. They identified eight school-level factors. It should be stressed that their major contribution to the previous work was that they sat these factors order which illustrate the terms of their impact on students' achievement (see Table 1):

Table 1

Ranking of School-Level Factors [1]

Rank	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Factor	Time	Monitoring	Pressure to Achieve	Parental Involvement	School Climate	Content Coverage	School Leadership	Cooperation

This ranking was the first of its kind and significantly increased our understanding of the school-level factors associated with enhanced academic achievement.

In spite of the differences between the lists a deeper analysis can prove that most researchers address the same five basic factors. R. Marzano notes that different researchers use slightly different terms to describe the same factors [4]. For example, instead of the terms «challenging goals» and «effective feedback» such terms are used:

- «high expectation for student achievement» and «frequent monitoring of student progress» [2],
- «appropriate monitoring» and «high expectations and requirements» [3],
- «high expectations» and «monitoring progress» [6],
- «monitoring» and «pressure to achieve» [1],
- «monitoring» and «pressure to achieve» [4].

All these examples address setting academic goals for all students that do not underestimate their potential and that provide feedback as to progress. Therefore, all these factors can be organized into these five school-level factors:

1. *Guaranteed and viable curriculum*: opportunity to learn and time by R. Marzano, content coverage and time by J. Scheerens, concentration on teaching and learning by P. Sammons, focus on central learning skills by D. Levine, emphasis on basic skill acquisition by R. Edmonds.

2. *Challenging goals and effective feedback*: monitoring and pressure to achieve by R. Marzano and J. Scheerens, high expectations and monitoring progress by P. Sammons, high expectations and requirements and appropriate monitoring by D. Levine, high expectations for student success and frequent monitoring of student progress by R. Edmonds.

3. *Parent and community involvement*: parental involvement by R. Marzano and J. Scheerens, home-school partnership by P. Sammons, salient parental involvement by D. Levine.

4. *Safe and orderly environment*: school climate by R. Marzano and J. Scheerens, a learning environment, positive reinforcement and pupil rights and expectations by P. Sammons, productive climate and culture by D. Levine, safe and orderly atmosphere conducive to learning by R. Edmonds.

5. *Collegiality and professionalism*: leadership and cooperation by R. Marzano and J. Scheeren, professional leadership, shared vision and goals and a learning organization by P. Sammons, strong leadership and practice-oriented staff development by D. Levine, strong administrative leadership by R. Edmonds.

According to the research of R. Marzano these factors are listed in rank order in terms of their impact on students' achievement, although it does not mean that the factors with lower rank are not critical to the effective running of a school. Those factors positively impact students' achievement up to a certain point only. Such relationships are typically referred to as nonlinear [4].

For example, as H. Good explains, establishing an atmosphere of collegiality and professionalism is not critically important to student achievement. However, if it has a nonlinear relationship with achievement, it could mean that it is highly important to student achievement up to a point where the relationship tapers off. This hypothesis not only makes good statistical sense, but it also makes good common sense. An atmosphere of collegiality and professionalism among teachers and administrators in a school might be a necessary condition for student achievement.

But after a certain level of collegiality and professionalism has been attained, an increase in this factor has no further effect on achievement [2, p. 532].

In our opinion the factor of «leadership» is of great importance for successful schooling too. Among the reasons why direct external control may interfere with the development of an effective school, perhaps the most important is the potentially debilitating influence of external control over personnel. If principals have little or no control over who teaches in their schools, they are likely to be saddled with a number of teachers, perhaps even many teachers, whom they regard as bad fits. In an organization that works best through shared decision making and delegated authority, a staff that is in conflict with the leader and with itself is a serious problem.

Nevertheless the absence of the factor "leadership" in the list of school-level factors is explained by the fact that all its descriptions were either very narrow or too broad. For example, in the R. Bosker's review, leadership was rather narrowly focused on what might be referred to as quality control [1]. In contrast, D. Levine defines leadership as encompassing the following elements: high expenditure of time and energy for school improvement; superior instructional leadership; frequent, personal monitoring of school activities and «sense-making»; acquisition of resources [3, p. 36]. That is why we agree with the position of R. Marzano who has chosen to exclude leadership from the list of school-level factors and to set it among the teacher-level and the student-level factors [4].

Guaranteed and viable curriculum, challenging goals and effective feedback, parent and community involvement, safe and orderly environment, collegiality and professionalism are defined as school-level factors because, for the most part, they are under the jurisdiction of the school as a whole. That is, changes in these factors are usually a result of formal or informal policy decisions. These categories represent the most current thinking on school-level factors, and the order in which I list them represents their order of impact on students' achievement.

In constructing these five school-level factors, we have considered only those that can be addressed without a drastic addition of resources. For instance, the interventions that require a drastic increase in the time spent in school (lengthening the school year or implementing after-school programs), additional personnel work (tutoring for every student) or equipment not readily available at the present time (personal computers for every student) are not considered in this list. Although these interventions would probably have a significant

impact on students' achievement, the emphasis was made on the efforts which can be implemented within the general boundaries of the available resources.

Conclusion. The schools that are highly effective produce results that almost entirely overcome the effects of student background. As a rule a student in an effectively organized school achieves more than a student in an ineffectively organized one. Comparative analysis of the researches in the field of theory of education end educational management allowed defining the most significant school-level factors that influence successful learning of students. These factors are: guaranteed and viable curriculum, collegiality and professionalism, parent and community involvement, safe and orderly environment, challenging goals and effective feedback.

References

1. Bosker, R. J., Creemers, B. P., & Scheerens, J. (1994). Alternative models of school effectiveness put to the test. International Journal of Educational Research, 21, 159–180 (in Engl.)
2. Good, H. & Teller, J. (1973). A History of American Education. New York : Basic Books (in Engl.)
3. Levine, D. U. & Lezotte, L W. (1990). Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice. Madison, WI : The National Center for Effective (in Engl.)
4. Marzano, R. (2003) Schools Research & Development. Alexandria, VA : ASCD (in Engl.)
5. Purkey, S. C. & Smith, M. S. (1985). School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. Elementary School Journal, 85, 3, 354–389 (in Engl.)
6. Sammons, P., Mujtaba, T., Earl, L. & Gu, Q. (2007). Participation in network learning community programmes and standards of pupil achievement: does it make a difference? School Leadership and Management, 27, 3, 213–238 (in Engl.)
7. Sarros, J., Cooper, B. & Santora, J. (2008). Building a climate for innovation through transformational leadership and organizational culture. Journal of leadership & Organizational studies, 15, 2, 145–158 (in Engl.)
8. Schein, E. (2004). Organizational Culture and Leadership. San Francisco: Wiley (in Engl.)
9. Thompson, S. (2005). Reculturing for All Means All. Strategies, 11, 1, 1–16 (in Engl.)
10. Van Velsen, W. G., Miles, M. B., Ekholm, M. & Hameyer, U. (1985) Making school improvement work. Leuven (Netherlands): ACCO (in Engl.)

Abstract. Dovhopolova H. H. The school-level factors of effective schooling.

Introduction. The 21st century began with a massive effort to improve Ukrainian secondary school and pupils' academic achievements. Schools can have a tremendous impact on students' achievements if they consider a few factors that can actually support the position that schools do make a difference.

In particular, the factors of school level need to be studied and systematized, because educational institutions have the opportunity to influence them, whereas the factors of regional or state level are not their prerogative.

The purpose of the article is to identify the most significant school-level factors that influence successful learning of students.

Results. In spite of the differences between the lists a deeper analysis can prove that most researchers address the same five basic factors. Most of them address setting academic goals for all students that do not underestimate their potential and that provide feedback as to progress. Therefore, all these factors can be organized into these five school-level factors:

1. Guaranteed and viable curriculum: opportunity to learn and time by R. Marzano, content coverage and time by J. Scheerens, concentration on teaching and learning by P. Sammons, focus on central learning skills by D. Levine, emphasis on basic skill acquisition by R. Edmonds.

2. Challenging goals and effective feedback: monitoring and pressure to achieve by R. Marzano and J. Scheerens, high expectations and monitoring progress by P. Sammons, high expectations and requirements and appropriate monitoring by D. Levine, high expectations for student success and frequent monitoring of student progress by R. Edmonds.

3. Parent and community involvement: parental involvement by R. Marzano and J. Scheerens, home-school partnership by P. Sammons, salient parental involvement by D. Levine.

4. Safe and orderly environment: school climate by R. Marzano and J. Scheerens, a learning environment, positive reinforcement and pupil rights and expectations by P. Sammons, productive climate and culture by D. Levine, safe and orderly atmosphere conducive to learning by R. Edmonds.

5. Collegiality and professionalism: leadership and cooperation by R. Marzano and J. Scheeren, professional leadership, shared vision and goals and a learning organization by P. Sammons, strong leadership and practice-oriented staff development by D. Levine, strong administrative leadership by R. Edmonds.

These factors are listed in rank order in terms of their impact on students' achievement, although it does not mean that the factors with lower rank are not critical to the effective running of a school. Those factors positively impact students' achievement up to a certain point only. Such relationships are typically referred to as nonlinear.

Conclusion. *Comparative analysis of the researches in the field of theory of education end educational management allowed defining the most significant school-level factors that influence successful learning of students. These factors are: guaranteed and viable curriculum, collegiality and professionalism, parent and community involvement, safe and orderly environment, challenging goals and effective feedback.*

УДК 378.1

ЗОБЕНЬКО Наталія Анатоліївна,
кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри початкової освіти, Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького, Україна

ДЕЯКІ АСПЕКТИ ОСВІТНЬО-ВИХОВНОГО ПРОЦЕСУ У ЗМІСТІ ПІДГОТОВКИ МАЙБУТНІХ ПЕДАГОГІВ

Анотація. *Обґрунтовано важливість гуманістично-громадянської спрямованості освітньо-виховного процесу у змісті підготовки майбутніх педагогів. Наголошується на значному підсилення їхньої культурологічної підготовки у ВНЗ. Гуманістично-громадянську спрямованість виховання майбутніх педагогів представлено як гуманізацію, олюднення педагогічної взаємодії. Саме через гуманізацію відносин як найважливіший чинник цілісного формування особистості, умову освіти, виховання й спілкування, основу соціально-педагогічної взаємодії і виявлення конкретного змісту людських відносин, педагогічна наука здатна визначити шляхи формування моральної зрілості особистості з високою патріотичною свідомістю і міцною громадянською позицією.*

Ключові слова: *гуманістичне виховання; підготовка майбутніх фахівців в умовах навчання у вищих навчальних закладів; концептуальні підходи до підготовки фахівців педагогічної сфери; гуманістична спрямованість педагогічного процесу; єдність процесуально-змістових і мотиваційно-ціннісних сторін підготовки; громадянськість; національне виховання; професійна підготовка педагога; культурологічна підготовка.*

Постановка проблеми. Перехід України до ринкових відносин, утвердження рівноправності всіх форм власності, кризові процеси в багатьох сферах суспільного життя при зростанні різноманітних матеріальних і духовних потреб людини в силу розширення її цивілізованого соціуму вимагають подальшої трансформації освітньо-виховної політики. Вона, будучи спрямованою на створення передумов для всебічного і гармонійного розвитку творчої особистості, покликана забезпечити водночас надійні мости єдності