

2. Study on Education Policy and Education Administration in Cities

Leader: Masato Honda (Senior Researcher, Department for Educational Policy and Evaluation Research)

(1) Diversity of big cities

After Chiba City became a designated city in 1992, the number of designated cities remained at 12 for a long time. However, the number has increased following the relaxation of standards for designated cities, which was implemented as part of the recent consolidation of municipalities. Newly designated cities are required to be able to execute education policies and education paperwork as competently as older designated cities.

There is a diversity of ways to organize a secretariat to handle the huge amount of education paperwork in big cities. Since the revision of the Local Autonomy Act in 1991, a city mayor's authority to form autonomous organizations within the city government has come to be respected and another revision of the Act in 2003 has further expanded the authority. The establishment of a board of education secretariat is subject to board of education regulations, unlike city government organizations that are subject to ordinances. However, as in the case of the establishment of city government organizations, the establishment of board of education secretariats is also affected by external factors, such as the reduction in the number of public servants. The organization of a board of education secretariat is commonly made up of administrative functions (consisting of a general affairs department, facilities department, school personnel department, etc.) and guidance functions (consisting of a guidance department, school education department, etc.). However, some secretariats adopt a department system while others do not, and some secretariats have a social education department while others do not. Therefore, we have to examine individual secretariats by taking into account their historical background and other factors, including previously-described policy environments (See "Organization of Board of Education Secretariat <Designated Cities/Core Cities> – 1970 to 2008 –"). At present, Fukuoka City has the most complex secretariat organization.

(2) Mobilization to education policy process and long-term education policy leadership

For instance, one of the characteristics of the education policy environment of Chiba City is the emergence of a long-term education policy leader. Although the superintendents of Chiba City, which became a designated city in 1992, changed at two-to-three year intervals until 2000 (for details, see "Past Board of Education Members: Designated Cities"), Mr. Yukihiro Iimori, a former teacher who became superintendent in FY2001, remained as the education policy leader of the city for two terms (eight years), until FY2009. Chiba City is one of the few designated cities where the same person served as superintendent for eight years during the period from the

late 1990s to 2000s. Other cities were Kyoto (Daisaku Kadokawa: 2000-2007) and Hamamatsu (Isamu Tsuchiya: 1999-2006). They are followed by Shizuoka City (Motoyasu Oda: 1998-2003; Mitsuhiro Saijo: 2004-2009). Other than Mr. Kadokawa, they are all former teachers. Mr. Kadokawa had consistently served as an official in the city's board of education secretariat [Kadokawa, 2008]. It can be said that they were in an advantageous position in exerting their influence on professional communities within education policy communities (for information on the leadership of the Hamamatsu City superintendent, see "Interview with Mr. Kitawaki" in the "Analytical Frameworks and Case Studies in Research on Education Policy in Cities").

Meanwhile, when we consider factors for successful education reform in big cities, we focus on the city government's function to mobilize outside actors, such as citizens and businessmen, to the policy community composed of only educators (Stone, C. N., Henig, J. R., Jones, B. D., & Pierannunzi, C. (2001). *Building Civic Capacity : The Politics of Reforming Urban Schools*. University Press of Kansas. Fung, A. (2004); *Empowered Participation : Reinventing Urban Democracy*. Princeton University Press). The "Chiba City School Education Reform Council" (FY2000/2001) is one of such mobilization organizations for education reform (the following are from the "Interim Report of the Chiba City School Education Reform Council" (March 2001)). The Council formed four working committees under a headquarters led by then Deputy Superintendent Iimori. The counselor for the Lifelong Learning Department and the head of the Guidance Department served as deputy directors of the headquarters.

The four working committees were: education content examination project team (8 persons; leader: deputy head of the Guidance Division; deputy leader: deputy head of the School Personnel Division), curriculum examination project team (9 persons; leader: chief of the Planning Division; deputy leader: unit chief of the School Facilities Division), tripartite cooperation examination project team (8 persons; leader: chief of the School Affairs Division; deputy leader: consultant for the Guidance Division) and five-day school week examination project team (10 persons; leader: deputy head of the Lifelong Learning Division; deputy leader: chief of the Library Opening Preparation Office). As the committees were called "all board-of-education member committees" ("Interim Report of the Chiba City School Education Reform Council"), the project teams consisted of representatives from all divisions of the board of education, including divisions of the Lifelong Learning Department, but were rather internal examination committees without any citizen representatives.

In 2007, a forum to deliberate programs for the promotion of school education in Chiba City was established ahead of the formulation of "Chiba City School Education Promotion Program," which constitutes a part of Chiba City's comprehensive program. The forum included two persons chosen from the public. It was not an internal study body, unlike the one described above, but a deliberative council similar to affiliated organizations, although established only

for discussing the outline of the program. This was a sharp contrast to city education policy research in the United States, where emphasis is placed on whether or not citizens can be mobilized even for formulating a basic local education program.

(3) Board of education and city government

The Japanese board of education system is based on two principles: layman control, in which decisions are made by board of education members, and professional leadership, under which education is administered by the superintendent. This form of governance closely resembles the city manager system that drew attention in the city administration reform movement in the United States from the late 19th century to the early 20th century. Such education governance in Japan, which tries to separate politics from the administration of government, connects with politics in that the mayor and city council are involved in the nomination of board of education members and the superintendent so as to ensure consistency with the local government system. In short, the Japanese board of education is an independent administrative commission but its members are appointed by the mayor. The framework for research on “mayoral takeover” in the United States does not apply to Japan.

In the case of Japan, therefore, it can be treated as a problem of administrative authority of executive agencies or a problem of paperwork allocation among secretariats. The problem becomes conspicuous if the mayor is eager to take initiative in the field of lifelong learning and social education (on this point, see the essay by Sato in “Essays on Educational Policy and Educational Administration in Cities”). The Act on the Organization and Operation of Local Educational Administration enumerates mayor’s administrative authorities with regard to education and stipulates, as an exception, that the mayor may administer and execute matters related to sports and culture under an ordinance (revision in 2007). In reality, there are many cases where city governments have implemented social education-related measures by making use of the subsidiary execution stipulated in the Local Autonomy Act. Sato’s essay on “education policy in cities” classifies the patterns of big city governments’ moves to delegate lifelong learning-related matters to city governments.

(4) Political leadership of superintendent

The main theme of research on education policies in U.S. cities is the emergence of mayoral centralism. There are two types. One is mayoral control, in which the mayor exerts control even by altering the rules of the game of governance, and the other is activist mayors who add education to their policy agenda without changing the rules of the game (Henig, J. R., & Fraser, E. T. (2009), *Correlates of Mayoral Takeovers in City School Systems*. In N. Pindus, H. Wial, & H. Wolman (Eds.), *Urban and regional policy and its effects*. Brookings Institution Press. p.81).

The character of leadership is determined by the leader's personality, behavior, status, and environment (Portz, Stein, & Jones, 1999, p. 32). The importance of charismatic factors also should not be ignored (Portz, J., Stein, L., & Jones, R. R. (1999). *City Schools and City Politics : Institutions and Leadership in Pittsburgh, Boston, and St. Louis*. University Press of Kansas). However, this research focused on institutional leadership and studied what status the leader is given in the whole local government organization.

Before the revision of the Local Autonomy Act in 2006, cities with a population of more than 100,000 had a special government post called "*shunyuyaku*" (city controller) and every prefectural government had a similar post called "*suitocho*." In those days, mayor, deputy mayor, and *shunyuyaku* constituted the top three posts of city government. Some boards of education had a "top four" setup by adding superintendent to the top three. The revision of the Local Autonomy Act abolished *shunyuyaku*, and instead "*kaikei kanrisha*" (city treasurer), a regular government post, was established. Since then, some city governments have begun to call mayor, deputy mayor, and superintendent the top three posts and others refer to two posts of mayor and deputy mayor as the same.

The position of superintendent in city government leadership varies depending on local governments. For instance, Chiba City treats superintendent as one of the top three when dealing with the city council. The top three, including superintendent, answer questions from party representatives at city council sessions. However, when it comes to answering to general questions from city council members, the board of education is represented by deputy superintendent, as director-general level officials are required to answer to such questions.

The attendance of superintendents at important city meetings also varies depending on local governments. In the case of Chiba City, the "Platform concerning Chiba City Leadership Meetings, etc." stipulates that members attending meetings to decide basic policies for municipal government administration and important measurers be the "mayor, deputy mayor, suprintendent, board members, city treasurer, bureau chiefs, ward mayors, secretary general of the city assembly, and deputy bureau chiefs of the Mayor's Office and Planning and Coordination Bureau" (Article 5).

In the case of Shizuoka City, the organization to discuss basic policies and matters of importance for municipal government administration is called the "management council." Its members consist of the mayor, deputy mayor, director-general of the Management and Planning Bureau, director-general of the General Affairs Bureau and director-general of the Finance Bureau. The position of suprintendent is the same as those of directors-general and the suprintendent attends the "management council" only as the need arises.

(5) Decentralization within organization/city

(i) Decentralization and schools

In a door-to-door survey, we asked to what extent schools are authorized with regard to school budgets. As a reference, we offered some examples, including Central Council for Education's report entitled, "Modalities for Local Educational Administration in the Future (1998)." In "Chapter 3: Establishment of School Autonomy," the report says that, when compiling school-related budgets, efforts should be made to reflect school intentions on budgets by conducting hearings and asking schools to submit budget requests in prescribed forms. In order to explore the feasibility of this kind of policy, it is necessary to study what type of local government has a high feasibility.

Generally speaking, the local governments whose departments, including the board of education, have expanded discretion can more easily delegate to the school level the power concerning the execution of budgets. Big cities have such an organizational structure. In Kobe City, for instance, school budgets are implemented at the school's discretion to a considerable extent. However, big city governments do not seem to think that expanding the school's discretion would lead to successful education reform. This is in sharp contrast to the situation in Chicago, where granting greater power to schools is positioned as an education reform strategy and the developments therefor have attracted people's attention.

(ii) Intra-city decentralization

The same is true with regard to intra-city decentralization. When the Great Merger of the Heisei Era was carried out to delegate powers to local governments, regional autonomous organizations (regional council, regional autonomous ward, merger special ward, etc.) were established to promote the autonomy of the citizens of former municipalities. However, it was big cities that really needed to establish decentralized administrative systems within the cities [Ushiyama 2004; Japan Center for Cities, 2003].

Since 1956, designated cities have been required to divide their areas into wards and establish a ward office in order to delegate some of the duties belonging to the mayor. A prime example of a ward office's involvement in school education is duties concerning attendance notification for elementary schools. However, there is virtually nothing within the content of school education with which a ward office can be involved; the ward office does not have adequate human resources. Under the Local Autonomy Act, each administrative district has an election administration commission, agricultural committee and city treasurer. Each ward office can also set up a regional consultative council. However, the Act on the Organization and Operation of Local Educational Administration does not assume dividing education administration duties by administrative district.

Under such circumstances, each ward office of Yokohama City has a discretionary budget,

albeit in small amounts, (“Fund for Promoting the Creation of Unique Ward”) (Ed. Masao Hirota; “*Current State and Problems Involved in Reorganization of the Big City System –the Case of Yokohama City –*” (2009) Gakubunsha), and some of the ward offices have started their own projects to get involved in school education. For example, Nishi Ward has been assisting the “support program for the operation of children’s schools,” in which former teachers, students aspiring to become teachers, and volunteers engaged in civic activities as education supporters hold after-school and holiday supplementary lessons for children according to their learning level. In FY2009, the ward office appropriated a budget of ¥500,000 for a model project (20 students) at a junior high school. Naka Ward has organized a “project to promote creation of school environments unique to each town” and appropriated ¥438,000 for four projects – “school collaboration symposium,” “school-related culture and sports promotion project,” “training program for school-support volunteers,” and “Saturday school support.” Midori Ward spent about ¥1,574,000, the largest budget of its kind, on its projects to help junior high school students explore career options and to insure school support volunteers against accidents.

Each of the 18 ward offices of Yokohama City has an office in charge of school assistance and community (though the position of the office varies depending on the organization of each ward office). At first, the Yokohama City government tried to give guidance and advice functions to each ward, but eventually they divided the whole city into four and established four “regional school education offices,” instead of delegating the functions to each of the 18 ward offices (as of April 2010).

(6) Reports on this study

“*Analytical Frameworks for Research on Educational Policy*” (March 2009)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/div02-seisaku.html

“*Organization of Board of Education Secretariat: Prefectural Edition – 1979 to 2008 –*” (March 2009)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/pdf/seisaku_05.pdf

“*Past Board of Education Members: Prefectural Edition – 1970 to 2008*” (March 2009)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/pdf/seisaku_04.pdf

“*Organization of Board of Education Secretariat: Designated Cities/Core Cities Edition – 1970 to 2008*” (October 2009)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/pdf/seisaku_10.pdf

“*Past Board of Education Members: Designated Cities/Core Cities Edition – 1970 to 2008*” (October 2009)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/pdf/seisaku_09.pdf

“Analytical Frameworks and Case Studies in Research on Educational Policy in Cities” (March 2010)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/pdf/seisaku_16.pdf

“Essays on Educational Policy and Educational Administration in Cities” (March 2010)

http://www.nier.go.jp/04_kenkyu_annai/pdf/seisaku_17.pdf