

中文摘要

本研究旨在瞭解臺北市優質學校評鑑指標—以行政管理向度為例之內涵。研究方法為文獻分析、問卷調查與專家訪談，其中問卷調查之樣本為臺北市公私立國民中小學學校行政人員共 630 位，可用問卷 471 份，可用率為 74.76%；專家訪談對象為臺北市參與優質學校評選，並已獲獎之學校校長共 4 位。研究工具包含自編之「臺北市優質學校評鑑指標之研究—以行政管理向度為例調查問卷」及「臺北市優質學校評鑑指標之研究—以行政管理向度為例訪談大綱」。本研究之統計方法為描述性統計、t 考驗、單因子變異數分析與 Scheffé 事後比較、Pearson 積差相關、線性結構關係分析(SEM)等方式。根據研究結果與分析後歸納之研究結論如下：

壹、優質學校行政管理向度中的知識管理、e 化管理、品質管理、績效管理四項指標之現況

- 一、臺北市公私立國民中小學學校行政人員在知識管理指標量表及其分向度的現況得分程度中上，並以「建置利於知識管理的校園環境」及「建立學校知識庫及分享應用平台」分向度得分最高。
- 二、臺北市公私立國民中小學學校行政人員在 e 化管理指標量表及其分向度的現況得分程度中上，並以「達成具體的 e 化管理的層級廣度」分向度得分最高。
- 三、臺北市公私立國民中小學學校行政人員在品質管理指標量表及其分向度的現況得分程度中上，並以「建立以需求與滿意為導向的服務」分向度得分最高。
- 四、臺北市公私立國民中小學學校行政人員在績效管理指標量表及其分向度的現況得分程度中上，並以「建立績效管理制度落實績效管理執行」分向度得分最高。

貳、不同背景變項在知識管理、e 化管理、品質管理、績效管理四項指標得分之差異情形

- 一、學校行政人員背景變項中，年齡、現任職務、服務年資、學校類別於知識管理指標得分之差異達顯著水準，但性別、最高學歷、學校屬性、學校規模則未達顯著差異。
- 二、學校行政人員背景變項中，性別、年齡、現任職務、服務年資、學校類別於 e 化管理指標得分之差異達顯著水準，但最高學歷、學校屬性、學校規模則未達顯著差異。
- 三、學校行政人員背景變項中，年齡、現任職務、服務年資於品質管理指標得分之差異達顯著水準，但性別、最高學歷、學校屬性、學校類別、學校規模則未達顯著差異。
- 四、學校行政人員背景變項中，性別、年齡、現任職務、服務年資、學校類別於績效管理指標得分之差異達顯著水準，但最高學歷、學校屬性、學校規模則未達顯著差異。

參、知識管理、e 化管理、品質管理、績效管理四項指標量表及其分向度得分之相關分析

- 一、整體知識管理指標量表與整體 e 化管理指標量表間呈顯著正相關，且在 e 化管理

指標量表各分向度中，以「建立學校 e 化管理的組織制度」與知識管理指標量表之相關程度最高。

- 二、整體知識管理指標量表與整體品質管理指標量表間呈顯著正相關，且在品質管理指標量表各分向度中，以「建立學校全面品質管理的計畫或方案」與知識管理指標量表之相關程度最高。
- 三、整體知識管理指標量表與整體績效管理指標量表間呈顯著正相關，且在績效管理指標量表各分向度中，以「規劃績效管理程序訂定相關管理辦法」與知識管理指標量表之相關程度最高。
- 四、整體 e 化管理指標量表與整體品質管理指標量表間呈顯著正相關，且在品質管理指標量表各分向度中，以「建立學校全面品質管理的計畫或方案」與 e 化管理指標量表之相關程度最高。
- 五、整體 e 化管理指標量表與整體績效管理指標量表間呈顯著正相關，且在績效管理指標量表各分向度中，以「建立績效管理制度落實績效管理執行」與 e 化管理指標量表之相關程度最高。
- 六、整體品質管理指標量表與整體績效管理指標量表間呈顯著正相關，且在績效管理指標量表各分向度中，以「建立績效管理制度落實績效管理執行」與品質管理指標量表之相關程度最高。

肆、驗證知識管理、e 化管理、品質管理、績效管理四項指標之適配度

- 一、本研究具有良好的整體適配度，符合判斷值 < 0.05 的規準。
- 二、本研究具有良好的比較適配度，符合判斷規準。
- 三、本研究具有良好的精簡適配度，符合可能值域為 0~1 之判斷規準。
- 四、本研究具有良好的基本適配度，符合判斷規準。
- 五、本研究具有良好的內在適配度，符合判斷值須為正的實數之規準。

最後，本研究根據研究結果分別提出以下建議：

壹、對主管教育行政機關之建議

- 一、透過學校現場資訊瞭解，改進優質學校行政管理的評選歷程。
- 二、依據評選實際情況及各校建議與需求，不斷充實及修正評鑑指標。
- 三、學校行政管理之課程應嵌入知識分享的理論與實務。
- 四、挹注足夠的經費與資源，以充實優質的 e 化管理基礎環境。
- 五、落實統計資料庫之建置與參賽成果之匯整的績效管理。

貳、對學校行政人員之建議

- 一、擬定彈性的品質管理計畫及標準作業流程。
- 二、優質學校行政管理之運作須結合各校願景。
- 三、領導者須整合行政團隊之共識與向心力。
- 四、善用激勵原則，提高參與評選之動機及意願。
- 五、資料呈現與方案撰寫須以創意取勝。

關鍵字：優質學校、評鑑指標、行政管理向度、知識管理指標、e 化管理指標、品質管理指標、績效管理指標

A Study on the Indicators of Evaluating the Quality School in Taipei City: An Example of the Dimension for Administration Management

Yang, Nien Hsiang

Abstract

The main purpose of this research is to study the indicators of evaluating the quality school in Taipei city: an example of the dimension for administration management. The research methods included literature analysis, questionnaires investigation, and interviews. The research instrument was distributed to 630 school administrative personnel of public or private elementary and middle schools in Taipei city. There are 471 valid samples which were used in this study. The purpose of survey method with 4 specialists was aimed to explore the opinions of specialists. The data obtained was interpreted using descriptive statistics, t-test, one-way ANOVA, Scheffé posteriori comparison, Pearson's product-moment correlation, and SEM through the use of LISREL 8.71. The conclusions drawn from the study were as follows :

A. The existing situation in the dimension for administration management of quality school

1. The perception of school administrative personnel were above average agreement of the knowledge management indicators. For them, the best items are “establish the campus environment which favors knowledge management” and “establish the school knowledge base and the shared or applied platform.”
2. The perception of school administrative personnel were above average agreement of the e-management indicators. For them, the best item is “achieve the concrete level and breadth of e-management.”
3. The perception of school administrative personnel were above average agreement of the quality management indicators. For them, the best item is “establish the services which take the demand and satisfaction as the guidance.”
4. The perception of school administrative personnel were above average agreement of the performance management indicators. For them, the best item is “establish the system of performance management and carry out the execution of performance management.”

B. The difference of each examinee in different background variable of making scores of knowledge management, e-management, quality management, and performance management indicators

1. School administrative personnel's age, position of service, years of service, and school category have significant influences on knowledge management indicators. But School administrative personnel's sex, highest educational degree, school attribute, and school size do not have any significant influences.
2. School administrative personnel's sex, age, position of service, years of service, and school category have significant influences on e-management indicators. But School

administrative personnel's highest educational degree, school attribute, and school size do not have any significant influences.

3. School administrative personnel's age, position of service, and years of service have significant influences on quality management indicators. But School administrative personnel's sex, highest educational degree, school attribute, school category and school size do not have any significant influences.
4. School administrative personnel's sex, age, position of service, years of service, and school category have significant influences on performance management indicators. But School administrative personnel's highest educational degree, school attribute, and school size do not have any significant influences.

C. In the aspect of relationships among the indicators and items of knowledge management, e-management, quality management, and performance management

1. There are positively correlation existed among knowledge management indicators, e-management indicators, quality management indicators, and performance management indicators.
2. There are positively correlation existed among items of knowledge management indicators, e-management indicators, quality management indicators, and performance management indicators, too.

D. Confirm the model of the dimension for administration management of quality school

1. The dimension for administration management of quality school contains four indicators : knowledge management indicators, e-management indicators, quality management indicators, and performance management indicators.
2. The model of the dimension for administration management of quality school for school administrative personnel of public or private elementary and middle schools in Taipei city is proper.

In the last part, based on the research results, the researcher proposed some suggestions for “educational administrative agencies”, “school administrative personnel”, and “other researchers”, hoping to benefit the improvement of indicators of evaluating the quality school in Taipei, especially in the dimension for administration management in the future.

Key word : quality school ; indicators of evaluating ; the dimension for administration management ; knowledge management indicators ; e-management indicators ; quality management indicators ; performance management indicators