The Practice of Developing Department Heads at University: Case Study in Vietnam

Thanh Van Thai[1], Nhi Thi Nguyen[2,*], Hu'o'ng Thi Nguyen[2,#] and Binh Thi Le[3]

[1]Nghe An Department of Education and Training, Vietnam
E-mail: thaivanthanhdhv@yahoo.com
[2,]Vinh University, 182 Le Duan - Vinh city, Nghe An, Vietnam*
*E-mail: *<hongnhi1076@gmail.com>, #<Nguyenhuongksu@gmail.com>*
[3]District 1 Department of Education and Training, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
E-mail: lbinh.gdq1@yahoo.com.vn

ABSTRACT The development of the team of Department Heads at universities is to build, plan, select, train, arrange, appoint, use, foster as well as create the environment and motivation for this team to work under the conditions of universities with high requirements for expertise, leadership, management and other capacities to develop human knowledge. The study of practical issues on the development of Department Heads at universities in Vietnam contributes to clarify the situation of human resource development in higher education to assess the current training quality. This study was conducted on the basis of the opinions of 281 heads of departments, administrators at faculty level, schools and lectures from 5 universities in different regions in Vietnam. The results show that the current team of Department Heads in Vietnam has many strengths but also many limitations that need to be overcome, such as the application of information technology in management, foreign language ability, and international cooperation.

INTRODUCTION

A Department is a specialized unit within a faculty of a university. The Department has the function of implementing training and scientific research; directly manage the officers of the department to ensure the professional work of the subject, of the faculty and of the University; participate in education and training students (Shaked 2021). The Department Head is the Leader of a Department appointed and dismissed by the Principal on the basis of the recommendation of the Dean (Bolden et al. 2015). The Department Head must have the qualifications of a lecturer, have experience in teaching, scientific research and management, and have a doctoral degree (Tahir et al. 2014). The Department Head plays a great and very important role in ensuring the quality of training and scientific research, developing training majors, advising faculty and universities to perform well management of majors, lecturers and students (Nguyen 2013).

Address for correspondence:
Nhi Thi Nguyen
Telephone: +84983564456
E-mail: hongnhi1076@gmail.com,
nhint@vinhuni.edu.vn
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0391-410X

University administrators in general, Department Heads in particular are appointed and transferred from lecturers to management jobs, most of them have high professional and pedagogical qualifications and experience in training, scientific research and technology transference, have strong political bravery, good ethical qualities, and have high responsibility; organizing the serious implementation of the Party's guidelines and policies, the State's policies in general and the organization and management of the training and scientific research process in universities in particular (Davies et al. 2001). Over the past years, this team has actively and effectively advised the faculty and university to develop higher education in accordance with socio-economic conditions. In recent years, in Vietnam, through international cooperation programs and projects, with the dynamism to create funding sources of universities and the support of the state, many Department Heads have been visiting, exchanging and learning experiences in training management, scientific research in countries in the region and developed countries.

However, in the face of the requirements of higher education innovation and international integration, the Department Head of University

still has shortcomings and has not yet met the new requirements and tasks, many of them are still based on experience in job handling, slow to innovate, affected by the centralized administrative mechanism. Most Department Heads are afraid of change while the new mechanism requires change and must find impetus for it. The number of Department Heads who have open-minded thoughts to new things, dare to venture, take risks, dare to think, dare to do are not many. The number of Department Heads who have the ability to negotiate, sign, and cooperate with universities of other countries in the region and internationally on training, academic exchange, scientific research and capacity building for the teaching cadre are very few. Many of them are still limited in the application of information technology to management, proficient use of foreign languages in their expertise, management and international cooperation, and have not yet met the requirements of higher education innovation (Bryman 2007; Davies et al. 2001).

In universities in Vietnam, the Head of the Department plays an important role, helping the Principal and Dean of the faculty to manage and organize the implementation of pedagogical and professional activities; at the same time take direct responsibility for the quality of teaching of the lecturers and the quality of learning of the learners in the subject under their charge.

Objectives

This study aims to assess the current situation of the quality of department heads, thereby proposing a number of contents to be implemented in the development of Department Heads to meet the requirements of international integration.

Literature Review

For the Management Team in Universities

In most countries, teachers and educational administrators are always considered as the decisive condition for the cause of education and educational development (Sarros et al. 1997b; Williams et al. 2010).

Cýõng (2001) pointed out the role of administrators in the combination of authority with responsibility. They are both the representatives of the organization; leader; contact person; information receiver; information disseminator; spokesman; entrepreneurs; people overcoming difficulties; resource distributor; negotiator (Cuong 2001).

Human resource development management and management cadre have interested many schools and authors. The school of management by process, approach through the implementation of management functions is still the backbone of management theory. Process approach requires administrators to be competent to perform the functions of planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and testing (Amey 2006). The most recent researches from different approaches have generalized into 4 management models: target model, internal process model, human relationship model, open system model (Wolverton et al. 2005; Hollenbeck et al. 2006; Seagren et al. 1993; Cuong 2001). Management cadres are required to be adaptive and should have competencies in leadership and execution, supervision and coordination, guidance and promotion, brokerage and innovation.

Position and Role of Educational Administrators

Many authors affirm that educational administrators play a great role in determining the quality of education, make an important contribution to the successful implementation of educational innovation (Duc 2010; Loc 2010; Davies et al. 2001). They have an interpersonal role, a leadership and decision-making role. They are both educators, managers, leaders, social activists, and international cooperators in education; directing the innovation of teaching methods; directing the development of training programs; make the school in order, operate effectively to meet the requirements of educational innovation (Government 2005).

The Development Orientation of the Team of Educational Administrators

Tri (2008), presented the competency factors of the training facility administrators, including professional capacity, capacity in relationships with people and general capacity.

Scholars (Cuong 2001; Tuyen 1999; Duc 2010; Hac 2001; Benoit and Graham 2005), believe that building and developing a team of educational administrators need to focus on three main issues: quantity, quality and structure. On the basis of analyzing the current state of the quality of the management team, the authors proposed four solutions to develop the team of educational administrators: All levels of education management have developed a plan for educational administrators for the unit and associated with this plan is the work to be carried out to train and foster education administrators according to the plan; build a system of standards for educational administrators at all levels; have policies to provide adequate spiritual and material support to educational administrators; reorganize the system of schools and faculties to train educational administrators.

On the basis of theoretical and practical analysis of educational management development in Vietnam through 25 years of innovation, Bao (2004) have pointed out that one of the solutions to innovate education management in the current context is to standardize and improve the quality of the team of educational administrators (Bao 2004).

Requirements and Solutions to Develop the Team of Educational Administrators

The competency requirement of the educational administrator in the current context is to define strategic vision; build organizational culture; manage and operate organization; build a collaborative relationship; mobilize resources; link politics, serve economic, cultural and social development. On that basis, many studies pointed out that it is necessary to develop the capacity of the educational administrators, such as the capacity to influence, the capacity to choose priorities, the capacity to solve problems, the capacity to create decision, vision (Bao 2004; Cuong 2001).

Department Head and a Team of Department Heads in Universities

A Department is a specialized unit within faculty at a university. Regulations on the organization and activities of the department are specified in the regulations on the organization and operation of the University (Hare 2002; Aleksandrova et al. 2019).

Thus, a Department is a professional unit of the University under the direct direction of the Dean and Principal. The Department has the function of implementing training and scientific research; directly manage the employees of the unit to ensure the professional work of the department, of the faculty and of the university; participate in education and training students (Bolton 1996; Bland et al. 2005).

The Department Head is the Leader of a Department appointed and dismissed by the Principal on the basis of the recommendation of the Dean. The Department Head must have the qualifications of a university lecturer, have experience in teaching, scientific research and management, and have a doctoral degree and above.

For a department that only teaches general education knowledge, if there is no doctoral degree, a person with a master's degree can be appointed as the Head of the Department. If being transferred from another agency or organization to be appointed to the position of Head of Department, after appointment, the Head must be a full-time lecturer of the University (Brown et al. 2002; Wise et al 1999; Shakah et al. 2019).

The Department Head has a term of 5 years and may be reappointed. The term of the Department Head may follow the term of the dean and must be specified in the charter on the organization and operation of the university. The appointment age of the Department Head must ensure the performance of the task for at least half a term. The process of introducing, appointing and dismissing the Department Head is specified in the charter. The Department Head has rights and duties to organize the implementation of the tasks of the department (Loc 2010; Tuyen 1999).

Thus, it can be seen that the Department Heads are reputable and highly qualified lecturers who participate in the implementation of management (at the department level).

The team of educational administrators is a group of officials and teachers performing the task of managing schools and managing agencies in the national education system (Tuyen 1999; Aleksandrova et al. 2019).

The team of Department Head is a group of prestigious, highly qualified professional leaders who participate in the implementation of management (at the department level) at colleges and universities, are organized into a force (organiza-

tion) with the same task of realizing the educational goals set for that group, that organization. They are an important resource in the field of higher education (Seagren et al. 1993; Clott et al. 1998; Wise 2001).

Development of the Team of University Department Heads

There are many definitions of development, stemming from different levels of consideration. Development in the philosophical sense is the transformation from a little to a lot, from narrow to wide, from low to high, from simple to complex. Trends and development paths are spiraled, forming a development trend from low to high, from less complete to more complete. Development is an internal process, creating perfection of nature and society. To be understood simply, development is "expanding, making stronger, better" (Educational Science Institute 1996). At the "most general" level, "development is understood as a change or change of progress, a mode of movement, or a process that takes place with cause, under different forms such as growth, evolution, transformation, expansion, ultimately creates qualitative change " (Educational Science Institute 1996). The development concept mentioned here is human development: physical development (living, physical, body, collectively referred to as physical energy); the development of reason and intellect (perception and logic or intellect); development of psychology, sentiment and emotions, with functions of assessing and displaying applied attitudes (mental energy), subject to the influence of value orientation, motivation, worldview. Most notable is the development of the "mental and material forces" capacity (Cuong 2001).

According to Hac (2001), the basic characteristics of comprehensive human development are harmony; balance and symmetry; integration; integrity and whole body; continuity without interruption; stability; lasting; sufficiency and completeness. Comprehensive human development in the period of national industrialization, modernization and international integration is the development of human capabilities; intellectual capability and practical ability; specialized professional qualifications; abilities of cooperation and competition; ability to move careers; capabilities

of planning and evaluation; the stress tolerance caused by the pace of life and the industrial environment; general education in technology; social understanding; understanding of administrative management; mental needs and preferences are relatively clear; discipline; independence of reason and emotion; dynamism and efficiency at work (Hac 2001). Thus, the socio-economic, scientific and technological development requires comprehensive and balanced human development at a very high level in terms of intellect, physique and metal energy.

Developing a team of Department Head is to build and develop all three factors: scale, structure and quality (Nguyen 2012; Thornton et al. 2018). In this, the scale is expressed by the number, the structure shows the reasonableness in the layout of the task, age, gender, expertise, profession, in other words, creating a synchronous, concentric team capable of supporting and compensating for each other in all aspects. Quality is the most important factor in building and developing a team of Department Heads (Davies et al. 2001; Wise 2001; Bland et al. 2005).

Development of a team of university Department Heads is to develop a team, to select, train, arrange, appoint, use, and foster as well as create the environment and motivation for this team to grow (Lindholm 2003; Winter et al. 2002). To do this well, it is necessary to carefully study the characteristics of each locality, region, current political, economic and social context, the size of the school and the psychological characteristics of the educational administrators to propose the suitable solution content (Williams et al. 2010).

The development of a team of university Department Heads must satisfy the quality, sufficient quantity, synchronous structure, at the same time develop in the right direction effectively to contribute to improving the quality of human resources (Brown and Rutherford 1998; Sarros et al. 1997a; Bolden et al. 2006).

METHODOLOGY

In order to find out and evaluate the current situation of the team of Department Heads in universities in Vietnam, the researchers conducted the study with the voluntary consent of 281 Department Heads, administrators at faculty, division and university functional departments

(hereinafter collectively referred to as University/Faculty administrators) and lecturers. Participants included: 232 Department Heads; 24 administrators at the faculty and university level; 25 lecturers from 5 universities in Vietnam. The survey was conducted from August to December 2019 in Vietnam. The researchers make it clear that the purpose of the survey is purely scientific, not for profit and the opinions of the survey participants will be kept completely confidential. For the Department Heads, the researchers used a questionnaire consisting of 35 questions in which 8 questions described themselves, 27 questions with a 4-point Likert scale, from 1 (very satisfied) to 4 (very dissatisfied). Each participant received the same questionnaire. They selected the options and filled out the questionnaire. The researchers proceeded to collect cards, synthesized and analyzed data based on teacher answers using mathematical statistics. The number of cards collected were 221. With administrators at the faculty, university and teachers level, we use in-depth interviews to obtain necessary information. The content of the above questions and the interview questions focused on issues directly related to the team of heads, including (a) political qualities, ethical ideology of the head, (b) the professional qualifications of the head, (c) management and leadership capacity, (d) capacity for social activities and international cooperation. Before implementation, the researchers tested the survey on 5 post-graduates in educational science doctoral programs; 5 experts from a major pedagogical university in Vietnam to learn about the applicability of the question into the context of actual investigation, the reasonableness and clarity of the questions. At the same time, the post-graduate, experts in the test have commented on the questionnaire and made comments on the questionnaire, as well as problems in the process of answering this questionnaire. Participants took an average of 30 minutes to complete their responses. Based on the feedback, the questionnaire was revised on a number of details, such as the order of the questions, the language used to make the question clearer, with additional explanations or removal of some unnecessary explanation, and addition of some questions to better serve the research objectives.

RESULTS

Regarding the training level, there is still a large proportion of Department Heads who only have a master's degree (34.9%), not meeting the standards as prescribed by the University Charter. Only 9.9 percent of the Department Heads in the surveyed universities have rank of professor, and associate professors. This percentage is low compared to the requirements for academic titles and degrees of heads.

Regarding Gender: relatively balanced between the proportion of women and men (48.7% of women, 51.3% of men)

Regarding Age: the majority of Department Heads are between 35-55 years old (51.7%); 14.7 percent are over 55 years old; the rate of under 35 years old accounts for 11.6 percent.

Thus, through quantitative statistics and the structure of the team, the researchers see that the biggest problem here is to ensure that all of the team meet the training standards at a doctorate or higher degree and to increase the rate of Department Heads with rank of professors and associate professors (Table 1).

Table 1: Statistics of the answers to questions about personal information

Personal information		%
The training level, the degree	Professor, and Associate Professors	9.9
	Doctor	55.2
	Master	34.9
Gender	Men	48.7
	Women	51.3
Age	Under 35 years	11.6
	Between 35-55 years	51.7
	Over 55 years	14.7

From question 9 to question 12, are issues related to the political quality, ethical ideology of the team of Department Head sat Vietnam University such as compliance with undertakings and policies of the Party and State; love of job; dedication to teaching profession; sense of responsibility in work, solidarity, cooperation with colleagues; awareness of self-study and self-training (Table 2).

The survey results show that most of the Department Heads are rated as having good political and ideological qualities. All of them are rated at a good level or above. In this criterion, most of them are considered to have well observed the Party's undertakings and guidelines; policies and laws of the State (90.5%). However, there are still some Department Heads who have not ac-

Table 2: Statistics of opinions about the political quality, ethical ideology of the team of Department Heads

The political quality, ethical ideology	Level			
	Good (%)	Above (%)	Average (%)	Weak (%)
Compliance with undertakings and policies of the Party and State	90.5	9.5	0	0
Love of job, dedication to teaching profession	74.2	25.8	0	0
Sense of responsibility in work, solidarity, cooperation with colleagues	82	18	0	0
Awareness of self-study and self-training	61	39	0	0

tively participated in the organization of social activities and movements of the school, branch and locality. In terms of criteria, love of job, dedication to teaching profession, sense of responsibility in work, solidarity, cooperation with colleagues and awareness of self-study and self-training: Overall, they are rated as good and very good. Through in-depth interviews with administrators, universities, faculties and departments of the university, it was shown that most of the Department Heads have solid political bravery, good ethical qualities, and exemplary lifestyles. Most of them have awareness of training, improving political quality, ethics, lifestyle, awareness of serving learners, and being trusted by colleagues and students. However, in addition, there are still some Department Heads who are not exemplary, are not enthusiastic about their careers, and have not actively participated in local social activities, so the management efficiency is not high, not meeting the requirements of modern higher education reform.

From questions 13 to 18 are issues related to the professional capacity of Department Heads. Professional competencies of the team of Department Heads are surveyed on 6 criteria: Understanding the training program, professional qualifications, pedagogical skills, self-study and creativity capacity, skills using foreign languages

and applying information technology, scientific research skills (Table 3).

The survey results show that the professional qualifications of the team are evaluated unevenly in the criteria, in terms of professional qualifications and pedagogical skills of the team, most of them are highly appreciated. However, there are still some Department Heads who have not met the current requirements of higher education reform, such as creativity capacity, foreign language proficiency, information technology and scientific research are still unsatisfactory. Their foreign language ability was rated the lowest: Only 20.5 percent were rated as very good; 20.11 percent of Department Heads were assessed at good level and still 12.60 percent were still unsatisfactory. This is one of the weakest points of the current team and needs to be quickly overcome to help them integrate internationally in higher education.

The survey data on self-assessment of Department Heads are higher than those of administrators, schools, faculties, departments and lecturers. For example, in terms of knowledge of training programs, the self-assessment of Department Heads is 44.14 percent while that of administrators, schools, faculties, departments and lecturers are only 40.35 percent. Although the self-assessment of the head of the department is higher than that of administrators, schools, faculties,

Table 3: Statistics of opinions about the professional capacity of department heads

The professional capacity	Level			
	Good (%)	Above (%)	Average (%)	Weak (%)
Understanding the training program	44.14	57.5	1.64	0
Professional qualifications	74.2	25.8	0	0
Pedagogical skills	83.7	16.3	0	0
Creativity capacity	50.67	31.67	10.86	6.79
Skills using foreign languages and applying information technology	20.50	20.11	46.79	12.60
Scientific research skills	46.15	29.86	19.45	4.54

departments and lecturers, but in general, it is not much different from each other.

From question 19 to 31 are issues related to managerial and leadership competencies. In terms of department management capacity, 8 criteria are surveyed on foster and develop the team of lecturers; manage teaching activities; department property management; develop the educational environment; administration; manage emulation and commendation; build management information system; check and evaluate. For the leadership capacity, 5 criteria are surveyed on analysis and prediction; strategic vision; design and implementation orientation; assertiveness and bravery to innovate, adapt to new jobs; planning activities (Table 4).

The survey results show that, in general, the department management capacity of the Department Headsis not highly appreciated; 30-40 percent very good rated criteria, 65 percent highest rated; Most of the criteria have the proportion of reviews that are not yet satisfactory. The results of evaluating the criteria for training and development of the team of lecturers; the management of teaching activities at average and bad level accounts for a high rate from 20 percent to 30 percent. The self-assessment results of the head of the department and the assessment of administrators, schools, faculties, departments and lecturers are similar. The results of surveys and in-depth interviews with a number of administrators, schools, faculties and departments of the university show that the management level of a

Department Head is still very limited. Most of them perform management tasks based on experience, have not been properly trained and fostered, especially have not updated modern management skills; still confused in directing and operating. Quite a lot of Department Heads in handling work are still experienced, slow to innovate, affected by centralized administrative mechanisms. Most Department Heads are afraid of change while the new mechanism requires change and must find impetus for change. Some Department Heads also have a conservative mentality and exclusion mindset, while the new mechanism requires the Department Head to accept the new and the old, and accept competition in cooperation to have the better quality of education. Quite a lot of Department Heads are still limited in the application of information technology to management, proficient use of foreign languages in their expertise, management and international cooperation, and have not met the requirements of higher education innovation. That requires universities to focus on planning, training and fostering management capacity for the Department Heads to help them fulfill their tasks in the new context.

The survey results show that, the department leadership capacity of Department Heads is still quite inadequate and limited. Most of the criteria that are rated as very good are below 40 percent. A few criteria have the rate of assessment at the level of not meeting the requirements. There are 24.89 percent of the opinions that the Department Head does not have the skills to analyze the

Table 4: Statistics of opinions about managerial and leadership competencies

Managerial and leadership competencies	Level			
	Good (%)	Above (%)	Average (%)	Weak (%)
Foster and develop the team of lecturers	32.58	67.5	21.27	1.35
Manage teaching activities	32.13	40.29	26.24	1.35
Department property management	57	43	0	0
Develop the educational environment	45.7	38.46	14.03	1.81
Administration	65	35	0	0
Manage emulation and commendation	37.10	40.27	18.10	4.53
Build management information system	24.89	31.22	39.37	4.52
Check and evaluate	46.15	32.58	23.99	2.72
Analysis and prediction	23.07	26.24	25.80	24.89
Strategic vision	21.27	25.34	29.41	23.98
Design and implementation orientation	23.98	23.99	31.67	20.36
Assertiveness and bravery to innovate, adapt to new jobs	31.22	21.27	35.75	11.76
Planning activities	35.29	25.34	27.15	12.22

situation and forecast the trend of higher education development of the local country. There are 23.98 percent of the opinion that the Department Head has not built the vision, mission and values of the department towards the comprehensive development of each student and improving the training quality and efficiency of universities.

With the results of in-depth interviews with administrators, schools, faculties and departments of the university, in general, they do not appreciate highly the leadership capacity of the Department Head. Survey results show that a not small part of Department Heads still have many limitations in advising, making right and timely decisions and dare to take responsibility for decisions to develop the department, respond meet the requirements of fundamental and comprehensive innovation of higher education; arouse and nurture motivation and skills to influence; lead change; direct, manage conflicts, create cooperation and consensus in implementing the innovation of higher education, orient value, build the department culture, organize to develop the plan of the department in accordance with the strategic vision and action programs of the department and the school. It shows that university administrators, schools, faculties and departments have high demands on the Department Heads in the context of higher education innovation.

Thus, in general, the leadership capacity of the Department Head is still limited. The number of Department Heads who are open-minded to new things, dare to venture, take risks, dare to think, dare to do are few; do not have the skills to lead change, attract and motivate lecturers to participate actively in the innovation activities of the department and the school. Most of the Department Heads are afraid of being examined and controlled while the new mechanism needs to call for an approach to affirm, advertise and promote the reputation, brand and quality of training of the faculty and university. That requires universities to have solutions to develop Department Heads to help them meet new requirements and tasks in the context of higher education innovation and international integration.

Questions 32 to 35 are issues related to capacity for social action and international cooperation (Table 5).

The survey results show that the social action capacity of the Department Heads is the lowest rated among the survey capacity groups. A not small part of the Department Head is not skilled in establishing close and consensus relationships of socio-political organizations, individuals, and stakeholders to support the development of the branch and specialized training major of the department, the school; not actively participating and encouraging lecturers in the department to actively participate in local socio-economic development activities; do not have skills in negotiating and signing cooperation with enterprises and localities on scientific research and technology transfer; do not have skills to transfer technology, production models to the community, society and the locality. The international cooperation capacity of the Department Heads is not highly appreciated. This is one of the major obstacles to the current international integration of universities. A large part of Department Heads do not have a global educational mindset; does not have skills to advise faculties and schools to organize training association, exchange of lecturers, academic exchange with prestigious higher education institutions in advanced countries; does not have skills in negotiating, signing cooperation with universities of other countries in the region, international exchange of management experience, academic exchange, scientific research; does not have skills of training and ca-

Table 5: Statistics of opinions about capacity for social action and international cooperation

Capacity for social action and international cooperation	Level			
	Good (%)	Above Average (%)	Average (%)	Weak (%)
Social activities	25.34	28.05	26.24	20.37
Building, developing relationships and supporting the community	23.08	28.96	19.90	48.06
Understanding international cooperation in higher education	13.57	18.10	26.24	42.09
Building and developing international cooperation relationships in training, scientific research, and training of lecturers	13.57	17.19	25.34	43.9

pacity building for the faculty; for students to exchange learning and exchange experiences.

DISCUSSION

Through the survey results, it can be seen that the capacity of a team of university Department Heads in Vietnamese universities is still limited in terms of expertise and professionalism. Therefore, developing a team of university Department Heads in Vietnam in sufficient quantity, synchronous in structure, and quality assurance is very urgent in the current context. This is also consistent with the study by Nguyen (2012). That is, it is necessary to strengthen the training and retraining of Department Heads to fulfill their important role at the university (Nguyen 2012).

Developing a contingent of university Department Heads must be sufficient in quantity, synchronous in structure, meet standards and go above standards, meeting the needs of both increasing the scale and improving the quality and effectiveness of education, meet the requirements set out by the locality and the requirements of education reform in the spirit of Resolution No. 29-NQ/TW on fundamental and comprehensive renovation of education and training. This team development includes the following activities:

The Development of the Team Planning and Development Plan

This problem needs to be addressed urgently because limited capacity can contribute to inefficiencies, diminish job satisfaction and reduce quality of overall management (Scott et al. 2008). Team planning is one of the managerial activities by administrators. It has the effect of making the management unit or administrators know about the quantity, quality, age structure, qualifications and professional structure, gender structure, ... of each administrator and the whole team of administrators; at the same time, building a team development plan; to find solutions to improve the quality of each administrator and the whole team so that they can fulfill their tasks. Furthermore, the results of the planning are the main guiding basis for the application and implementation of the basic functions of management in management activities of department and the team of Department Heads. Mentioning to the man-agement in development of Department Headsis talking about team development planning and mentioning to planning is talking about a very important job in improving the quality of the team. Thus, team development planning is considered as an area in management activities and also an area in need of proposing solutions for managing the development of Department Heads.

The Appointment, Reappointment, Transfer of Department Heads

Selection, appointment, dismissal, employment and transfer of the team of cadres and civil servants in general and administrators in particular are in the field of organization and personnel work. This also agrees with Loc (2010), the correct selection and appointment of administrators with sufficient qualities and capacities for an organization is an important factor for the development of the organization in general and in fact is a prerequisite for the organization to achieve to its goal (Loc 2010). On the other hand, the standards for the selection and appointment of administrators are indispensable requirements for the implementation of plans to improve the quality of administrator team. Dismissal of administrators actually makes the management team always meet the standards, eliminate members who are not qualified. This is a form of team improvement. Transfer of administrators has the effect of making the quality of the team equal in all organizations; on the other hand, it creates conditions to satisfy the needs of administrators. The above two aspects indirectly make the quality of management team improved. The above analysis shows that the activities of selecting, appointing, dismissing and transferring administrators in general, Department Heads in particular are important activities in the development of the team of university Department Heads.

The Training and Improvement to Enhance the Quality of Department Heads

According to the literature, Department Heads must maintain their own scholarship program, stay current with their academic fields, and encourage faculty research and publications in addition to providing professional activities for themselves and faculty members in teaching (Nguyen 2013).

The training and improvement of management team to perfect and enhance the standards on the level of political theory; management theory and practice; professional qualifications for each administrator and the whole team of administrators. The nature of the training and improvement of administrators is to improve the quality and capacity of management team so that they are fully qualified to fulfill their tasks, functions and powers. The quality of cadre is formed by many influencing factors, most of which is through training and retraining. Therefore, the building and enhancing the quality of Department Heads must take care of the training and improvement. The training and improvement of Department Heads is also an indispensable and important part of the whole process of building and implementing a development plan of the team of Department Head. Training and improvement are equipping knowledge, forming skills in activities, forming political, ideological, ethical and psychological qualities, creating new acting capacity, creating new capacity for action, creating basic models of Department Heads from their labor characteristics and requirements of industrialization, modernization and educational innovation. Training and improvement is also an activity aimed at overcoming the negative side, promoting the positive side of each Department Head, making up for the shortcomings and shortages of each Department Head in the course of operation. The process of training and improvement is the process of creating new substances and comprehensive development for each Department Head. During the leadership of the revolution, the Vietnamese Party and President Ho Chi Minh were very interested in the education, practice, training and improvement of cadres. President Ho Chi Minh said: "cadre is the root of all jobs, so training cadres is the Party's root job" and Resolution 3 (Session VIII) also mentioned: "Expanding the training and improvement of cadres in the political system and social organizations of all economic sectors, paying special attention to discovering, training and improving talents, creating a source of workers and administrators at all levels from central to grassroots levels" (Duc 2010). Thanks to the importance of training and improvement for cadres of the Party, during the leadership of our country's revolution, the contingent of leading cadres and administrators in our country in general, and

the team of the university Department Heads in particular are constantly maturing and improving in quality, meeting the assigned tasks in each stage. The fundamental and comprehensive innovation of education and training and the industrialization and modernization of the country requires a renewal of thinking, intelligence, organization and management of the management team. This requirement is posed as a key issue. That is also the requirement for the training and improvement of cadre. In the conditions of integration, open exchange, transformation of the management structure, it must ensure broad and effective international cooperation, while at the same time, promoting internal resources, preserving the national cultural environment and lofty traditional values. Therefore, the training and improvement of administrators in general and Department Heads in particular can not only focus on professional knowledge, management knowledge but also political knowledge, economic knowledge, foreign languages, information technology. It is necessary to train and improvement comprehensively and attach importance to efficiency. Universities need to make the team of Department Heads fully aware that without training and improvement to improve their qualifications and competencies, they cannot fulfill the tasks of the Department Head of before the requirements of fundamental and comprehensive innovation of education and training. Managing team development is considered one of the management areas of management organizations and of all administrators for an organization. Thus, in order to develop the team of Department Heads, training and improvement activities cannot be lacking, at the same time, it is necessary to have feasible management solutions in this area.

The Use of Department Heads

To fully exploit the potential of the team of Department Heads, it is necessary to assign tasks and topics to them, request them to regularly draw experiences, report experience, and management results to the leaders, before the department, the Science and Training Council (Bland et al. 2005). Therefore, self-criticism and self-criticism should be well implemented regularly. It is necessary to regularly supervise and inspect the Department Heads according to the content of political thought,

work, relations and activities; Timely detect and stop at the beginning when the cadre shows signs of violation; Do well the cadre protection, well implement the remuneration regimes for Department Heads. The use of the Department Head must be of the right person, right job, ensuring the solidarity in the department and in the faculty. The use of the Department Head must be associated with the head manager, the inspection and supervision to properly evaluate the department head. The use of the Department Head is associated with comprehensive fostering and protection of the head. Subjective, patriarchal, narrow-minded thinking, prejudice and imposition in the use of Department Heads need to be overcome. If universities do these well, they can fully exploit the potentials and use effectively the Department Heads.

Remuneration policies for department heads. As a result, the quality of a human activity depends on many motivational factors that promote human activity. Remuneration regimes and policies for the management team also contain issues of investment in human resources in the same form as "reproduction" in economic management. It is from the matter of having an adequate remuneration policy for the team that the quality of the team is raised. In general, the remuneration policy for officers in general and administrators in particular is one of the cadre management activities of the management agency and the administrator for an organization (Loc 2010).

Policies and regimes for Department Heads are a factor that directly determines the quality of cadre. Proper and reasonable policies and regimes are the driving force behind the team's activeness, talent, creativity, enthusiasm and responsibility. That driving force is created by a harmonious combination between material and spiritual benefits, consistent with the human nature of the regime and general conditions of social development, bringing more equity and equality; clearly demonstrating the concern of the Party and the State for administrators in general, Department Heads in particular. Therefore, the development of the team of Department Heads must be associated with the implementation of reasonable regimes and policies to achieve the goal of material encouragement coupled with the ideal construction and revolutionary ambitions, to motivate the spirit suitable to the country's economic develop-

ment and ensure social justice, encourage people to work with productivity, quality and efficiency, promoting the talents of Department Heads.

Assess the Head of the Department at the University

Assessment is one of the functions of management at the university (Duc 2010). Assessment of the quality of administrators is one of the indispensable jobs in the management of the management agency and the management subjects in general, of the organization and personnel in particular. Team assessment not only to know the status of all aspects of the team, but thereby forecasts about the team's quality situation as well as outlines possible plans for team quality improvement activities. On the other hand, accurate administrator assessment results will be the basis for each individual to self-adjust to adapt to team standards. The assessment of the team of administrators is closely related to the improvement of the quality of the team. Thus, in order to improve the quality of the team of administrators in general and the Department Heads in particular, it is impossible not to accurately recognize the quality of the team through team assessment; from which to establish feasible management solutions in the field.

CONCLUSION

A university department is a specialized unit in training, scientific and technological research of universities, responsible for academics, training activities, science and technology. The Department Head who is a leader of the department must have the qualifications of a university lecturer, have experience in teaching, scientific research and management, and have a doctoral degree and above. Therefore, the Department Head has a great and very important role in ensuring the quality of higher education, contributing to the successful implementation of the Resolution of the 8th Conference, the XI Central Executive Committee on fundamental and comprehensive innovation in education and training. Based on the current state of the subject as surveyed, we see that developing a contingent of Department Heads with sufficient quantity, uniformity in structure, and quality assurance is very urgent in the

current context in order to meet the requirements: Development of higher education human resources in the period of accelerating industrialization and modernization; Fundamental and comprehensive innovation of higher education; Direction, management and development of training programs oriented to capacity development of learners; Improvement of the quality and efficiency of science and technology research and application in the current context and the need for international integration in higher education. Development of a team of university department heads, first of all, must help this team promote its active role, create, exploit at the highest level the capacity and potential of the team, so that they can contribute the most to the realization of educational goals. Development of a team of university Department Headsmust be oriented to serve the interests of the organization, the community and society, and at the same time must ensure adequate spiritual and material benefits for them. Development of a team of university Department Headsmust aim at meeting the immediate and long-term development goals of the organization, and at the same time must be implemented according to a unified statute and regulations on the basis of the Law of the State.

REFERENCES

Aleksandrova Y, Parusheva S 2019. Social media usage patterns in higher education institutions - An empirical study. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 14(5): 108–121. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i05.9720

Amey M 2006. Leadership in Higher Education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 38(6): 55–58. https://doi.org/10.3200/chng.38.6.55-58

Benoit P, Graham S 2005. Leadership excellence: Constructing the role of department chair. *Academic Leadership (The Online Journal)*, 3(1): Article 3.

Bland C, Center B, Finstad D, Risbey K, Staples J 2005. A theoretical, practical, predictive model of faculty and department research productivity. *Academic Medicine*, 80(3): 225–237. https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-200503000-00006

Bolden R, Jones S, Davis H, Gentle P 2015. Developing and sustaining shared leadership in higher education. In: *Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.* Stimulus Paper Series. London, United Kingdom: Published by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education, pp. 7-15.

Bolden Richard, Wood M, Gosling J 2006. Is the NHS leadership qualities framework missing the wood for the trees? *Innovations in Health Care: A Reality Check*, 17–29.

Bolton A 1996. The leadership challenge in universities: The case of business schools. *Higher Education*, 31(4): 491–506. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00137128

Brown F, Moshavi D 2002. Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3): 79–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200800307

Brown M, Rutherford D 1998. Changing roles and raising standards: New challenges for heads of department. *School Leadership and Management*, 18(1): 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632439869781

Bryman A 2007. Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32(6): 693–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070701685114

Clott Ch, Fjortoft N 1998. Culture and strategy in business schools/ : Links to organizational effectiveness. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher,* 13: 27-33.

Cuong D 2001. *Developing Human Resources for Higher Education in Vietnam*. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.

Bao D 2004. *Vietnamese Education Towards Future Problems and Solutions*. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.

Davies J, Hides M, Casey S 2001. Leadership in higher education. *Total Quality Management*, 12(7): 1025–1030. https://doi.org/10.1080/09544120120096197

Duc T 2010. *Education and Human Resource Development in the Twenty-First Century*. Hanoi, Vietnam: Vietnam Education Publishing House.

Educational Science Institute 1996. *New Elements of Education in Innovation*. Hanoi: Education Publishing House.

Government 2005. *A Project on "Building and Improving the Quality of the Contingent of Teachers and Educational Administrators in the 2005-2010 Period" Together with Decision No. 09/2005 / QD-TTg,* dated 11 January 2005.

Hac PM 2001. *Comprehensive Human Development in the Period of Industrialization and Modernization*. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.

Hare P, Hare L 2002. The evolving role of head of department in UK universities. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 6(2): 33–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603100120125942

Hollenbeck G, McCall M, Silzer R 2006. Leadership competency models. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(4): 398–413. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.04.003

Lindholm J 2003. Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, 27(1): 125–149. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2003.0040

Loc N 2010. *Management Theory*. Hanoi, Vietnam: Publishing House of Pedagogical University.

Nguyen H 2012. Identifying the training needs of heads of department in a newly established university in Vietnam. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34(3): 309–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080 X.2012.678730

Nguyen H 2013. Middle-level academic management: A case study on the roles of the Heads of Department at a Vietnamese university. *Tertiary Education and Management*,

19(1): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883. 2012. 724704

Sarros J, Gmelch W, Tanewski G 1997a. The role of Department Head in Australian universities: Changes and challenges. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 21(1): 9–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/0729436970 160102

Sarros J, Gmelch W, Tanewski G 1997b. The role of Department Head in Australian universities: Tasks and stresses. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 21(1): 283–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294369 70160303

Scott G, Coates H, Anderson M 2008. *Learning Leaders in Times of Change: Academic Leadership Capabilities for Australian Higher Education.* Melbourne: ACER.

Seagren A, Creswell J, Wheele D 1993. The Department Chair/: New Roles, Responsabilities and Challenges. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No.* 1. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

Shakah G, Al-Oqaily A, Alqudah F 2019. Motivation path between the difficulties and attitudes of using the e-learning systems in the Jordanian Universities: Aajloun University as a case study. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 14(19): 26–48. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v14i19.10551

Shaked H 2021. Instructional leadership in higher education: The case of Israel. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 75(2): 212–226. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12274

Tahir L, Abdullah T, Ali F, Daud K 2014. Academics transformational leadership: An investigation of heads of department leadership behaviours in Malaysian public universities. *Educational Studies*, 40(5): 473–495. https://doi.org/10.1080/03055698.2014.932272

Thornton K, Walton J, Wilson M, Jones L 2018. Middle leadership roles in universities: Holy Grail or poisoned chalice. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(3): 208–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 1360080X.2018.1462435

Tri D 2008. Some issues about capacity building for managers of training institutions. *Education Journal*, 193: 25-30.

Tuyen D 1999. *Modern Education Basics*. Hanoi: Educational Publishing House.

Williams J, Blackwell C, Bailey L 2010. The conceptualization and investment of leadership development by Department Headsin Colleges of Agriculture at Land Grant Universities. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 51(2): 81–89. https://doi.org/10.5032/jae.2010.02081

Winter R, Sarros J 2002. The academic work environment in Australian universities: A motivating place to work? *Higher Education Research and Development*, 21(3): 241–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360 22000020751

Wise C 2001. The monitoring role of the academic middle manager in secondary schools. *Educational Management & Administration*, 29(3): 333–341. https:// doi.org/10.1177/0263211x010293007

Wise C, Bush T 1999. From teacher to manager: The role of the academic middle manager in secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 41(2): 183–195. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/0013188990410206

Wolverton M, Ackerman R, Holt S 2005. Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2): 227–238. https://doi.org/10.1080/ 13600800500120126