

THE REFORMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: HISTORICAL RETROSPECTION IN MODERN REFLECTION

The article deals with the process of the development and introduction of higher education reforms in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the territory of the Russian Empire. Considering the fact that Naddniprianska Ukraine was a part of the empire, all the reform processes of that time had an effect on its higher educational institutions. The introduction of university charters in 1863, 1884 and attempts to establish the reforms in 1905 are examined. At present, historical retrospection is extremely important, as the current course of education reforms in Ukraine reflects the same problems that the generation of reformers of the past faced. In the middle of the 19th century as well as even today there are three issues that remain urgent: the level of state intervention in education; rights and opportunities of students and their participation in decision-making; the level of adopting European practices and management principles. Modern reformers are actively trying to solve them. Therefore, the paper presents their analysis, taking into account above all the evaluation of participants of the reform process of the specified period, the then professors, politicians and the public. The mistakes made by officials are analysed and the depth of the acquired experience is discussed. Special attention is given to the struggle for the concept of reforms between government representatives of liberal and conservative views. The recommendations for modern authors and initiators of education reforms in Ukraine are presented.

Keywords: *the Russian empire, Naddniprianska Ukraine, higher education reforms, government officials of the conservative camp, government officials of the liberal camp, studentship, professorate, the public.*

Now Ukraine is in a state of systemic reforming of all levels of education, and higher school is no exception. Our society is lively discussing the measures proposed by the government, and educators are sometimes faced with the need to implement a predefined resolution in the form of by-laws and orders. Considering the hyperactivity of modern transformation processes, one should directly turn to historical experience, since previous generations of educators had already solved the similar problems, in particular, they tried to discuss: 1. the level of state intervention in the administrating of educational institutions with reference to real autonomy of universities; 2. the right of students to self-government; 3. the acceptable level of adopting foreign practices during the higher school reforms. We can not reject the accumulated experience of previous generations of reformers during the second half of the 19th and early 20th centuries and what is more we can not ignore the mistakes of those times. In view of active struggle of modern universities for broad powers of autonomy, we can overlook the reforms of higher education in the 1860s, as the level of evaluation of the higher education reforms by foreign authors of different times and of modern researchers is striking. Taking into account this the retrospection of the problem is indisputably the issue of the day.

The first significant attempts to understand the reforms of that time were made by foreign educators, since they advocated the idea of continuing education. They believed that the reforms of higher education to be carried out only in close connection with the modernization of secondary level of education. Professor Rudolf-von-Raumer insisted on the continuation of classical education in universities, pointing out that large European nations developed classical education [29, p. 5]. L. Shmidt shared this view and insisted not on a form, but on a concept of the reform of higher education «because spiritual development is no less important than accurate knowledge» [35, p. 191, p. 333]. In our opinion, the issue of teaching the humanitarian disciplines in specialized universities is still quite important today

and the problem is being discussed. The state has not clearly made its own decision, leaving the problem to be solved to the discretion of modern universities themselves. Another German scientist E. Schmidt examined the role of state intervention in the regulation of a number of educational institutions. He proved that the maintenance of educational institutions at the expense of local administration was a wrong move and a way to nowhere, because demand for training had to be determined by society [36].

Thus, today in Ukraine this problem is also being solved. Secondary level of education has already been transferred to local authorities for maintaining. Its connection with higher school has not been provided. In view of this, secondary education has been placed in a difficult financial situation.

American researcher Patrick L. Alston devoted his thoughtful work to the higher school reforms of the Russian Empire «Education and State in Tsarist Russia», had analyzed all the changes happened during two hundred years. He wrote that «the impression of heavy Soviet bureaucracy at higher school had forced him to turn to the tsar model of education» [37, p. 9], or rather long-term study of the author in the USSR. The researcher called the period of 1870–1905s «the crisis of monolithic control», emphasizing the powerful state formalism. The scholar also proved that the youth, studentship, the public were motive powers of the reforms, as opposed to ruling circles, whose actions had become only a reaction to the demands of society, and had not advanced the needs of the time [37, p. 139]. Professor of Columbian University Methes W. in his thesis studied the period of splitting of reforms of higher school, in particular the charter of 1863 [39]. At the same time, McClelland J. increased focus on the analysis of tsar officials, who, in his opinion, had overapplied the German model of management, with the aim of strict control over higher education [38]. Other European scholars emphasized positive achievements of the reforms of higher school, pointing at new opportunities for creating scientific societies, professional growth for professors, and certain freedom to confer scientific degrees. They also stressed that any self-government or autonomy, promised by any reforms, was fundamentally incompatible with autocratic regime and strict control over the system of administration of higher educational institutions [40; 42]. In the work «University charter of 1863: a new point of view» American researcher S. Kessou expressed a creative view on the reforms, mentioning that all universities in Russia had been a creation of the state that seemed mistrustful of them. «During the period of the Russian Empire there was not any power (the church, private persons, municipality) that could autonomously, without any state support, open universities» [16, p. 318]. Private universities at that time could improve the situation in regards to domination of bureaucracy [16]. It seems that this issue is acute for our state in times of the struggle between private and state universities for equal opportunities. This problem really lies deep and has not been solved yet. The well-known representative of Moscow historical school O. Donin [10] devoted his thesis to this problem, however, he completely rejects the critics of the above mentioned foreign and contemporary Ukrainian scholars [34] regarding the days of counter reforms (1870–1880s) in education and the critical evaluation of the charter of 1884. In the context of constant reforms of higher school, modern educators [41] raise the issue of qualification criteria of selecting of managerial personnel of higher school. It should be stressed, that thousands of publications are devoted to this problem. They are both generalizing and narrow problematic. It only emphasizes its urgency and relevance in the context of the modern reflection of the authorities that are trying to reform higher school.

Thus, the paper aims to analyse the features of the course of the higher school reforms in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the territory of the Russian Empire in the context of solving the problems of the governing function of the state, opportunities and rights of students, adopting European practices. We also believe it is practical to give accurate evaluation of the issues, published by educators, historians, state officials.

In order to solve the problems successfully we have used the general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis and the method of scientific induction, because only a very thoughtful analysis of the various stages and the components of the reforms affords grounds for drawing conclusions. Special research method is the method of historical retrospection, on the basis of which we have used the method of comparative analysis that can show the existing problems in Ukraine in the field of education.

By the middle of the XIX century, the policy of imperial government in the field of education had exhausted itself, sending all its levels into ruin. The development gap between European countries and the Russian Empire had its impact on Naddnyprianska Ukraine that was a part of the Empire. The effects of scientific and technical progress resulted in rapid and radical changes of orientations and they raised the necessity to reform higher school before the state in order to provide the country with highly qualified personnel. The Ukrainian officials have absolutely the same problems now.

It should be stressed that recognizing the need for reforms is a first step on the path to recovery of state mechanism, however a person, who authorized to reform, plays an important role too. Famous censor O. Nikitenko wrote that on the eve of the higher school reform, that had begun with the development and implementing the university charter of 1863, administration of the Ministry of Public Education (MPE) was given to A. Norov, «an inactive leader with lacking ideology» [21, p. 46]. The well-known professors opposed his policy but supported reforms: D. Pysarev in the article «Our University study» [25] and other famous educator and liberal P. Redkin. At one of the lectures, the latter proclaimed science as «a shield for those who are defenseless and a weapon for those who are not free» [27, p. 27]. So, in the early 1860s the battle of scholars and officials became stronger.

Positive changes in the domestic policy of the state came with the appointment O. Holovnin to a post of the Minister of Public Education. The Minister himself, in the «The notes for the few» [8 p. 246], was the first one among government representatives who brought up the two problems for public discussion: the first – professorate rotation in the administration of universities; the second – extreme intervention of officials in administering the universities. He also often invited professors of St. Petersburg University in order to work at the concept of the reform in 1856–1858s.

The problem of European methods and new adoption in the system of administration remained acute.

In order to study this problem K. Kavelin was sent abroad. He wrote a comprehensive report on the trip and described the principles of university administration, and actually he traveled in search of a «sample of administrating» and the authority took into account his assessments [14].

Thus, the first real step was made – the Minister with progressive views was appointed, K. Kavelin's report was examined, the new charter draft was developed for higher school.

In fact, practice showed that the charter concept with large powers of academic boards of universities and their broad powers of autonomy, that was publicly supported by the educator, historian and academician F. Ustrialov [31], had already been edited by officials in such a way that the educators began to develop remarks on it.

Professor of Kharkiv University D. Kachenovskiy criticized «the domination of bureaucracy that had changed the university into inactive institutions» [12, p. 322]. The scientists collected two volumes of remarks on the draft charter of 1863, the professors insisted on reducing the regulatory authority and expanding university autonomy.

Thus, at the second stage – during the discussion of the concept of the reform, the problem of tighten control by officials over higher school was not solved.

At the same time, conservative educators proposed to take the German education system as a model, pointing out that the state had the absolute freedom to meddle in

internal affairs of the universities. The aim of the latter was not a science, but training of responsible subordinates.

A group of scientists and representatives of the public K. Kavelin [14], P. Kapterov [15], P. Miliukov [19] harshly criticized the German university administration and proposed to introduce the education of democratic and French variant, but providing centralized control system of educational institutions. They recognized that the concept of the reform of 1863 came down to transformation of universities into organizations for «the wealthy and trustworthy people», since it was the proposal of Count S. Stroganov that the Emperor Alexander II supported. Finally, in June-October in 1862, 18 meetings of the committee were held that developed the final text of the charter. During 1863 the government was examining it, and on the 18th of June in 1863 the Emperor, who was at Tsarskoye Selo at that time, sighed the charter. It covered five universities: St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kazan, Kharkiv and Kyiv [9].

The next stage was implementation of the reform in real life. It was entrusted to the new Minister, Admiral E. Putiatin, whose educational policy was criticized by historians and the public.

In particular, the social activist, socialist according to political views B. Frommet [32] was one of the first persons who raised the key problem – government pressure on student organizations, whose rights were clipped in obedience to the charter.

The scientists responded to the reform in two ways: they publicly supported the broad autonomy of universities and the well-known physician, author of many works on pedagogics M. Pirogov [24] headed this movement; on their own initiative, they went abroad and took an unbiased look at the process of local education reforms.

I. Babst in the work «From Moscow to Leipzig» [1] delivered a strict verdict of the reform. He wrote that after the adoption of the charter of 1863 the government had not exactly made a decision on the concept of the university, that is, the universities had to become a school for future officials «for trustworthy people» or educational institutions «for all»? Thus, by 1863 the government authorities did not take into account the challenges of the progress in science and technology; they were more concerned about elitism of higher educational establishments where the nobility would study.

Progressive educators were solidly for extensive self-government, the expansion of rectors' authorities and university academic boards, the shortening of a direct care of government officials, as the post of the university guardian (the intermediary between a higher educational establishment and the government) was not cancelled. At that time, considering the compromise nature of the University charter, a large number of proposals of then professors were not taken into account.

The two principles were the positive results of the reform of 1863, which were embodied due to strong public pressure. The first – thanks to the borrowed European experience – was that universities should become only the centers of science, for which a great future is reserved. The second consisted in cancelling of moral censorship introduced by the charter of 1835. The thesis «Universities exist for science and should be aside from lures, that is, «ranks» [22] obviously became victorious. The argument of this was the approving public assessments in the well-known special anniversary publications on the history of St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kyiv and Kharkiv universities in the early 20th century, which contain the analysis of the reforms in 1863 and 1884. In general, representatives of intellectuals justly recognized the charter of 1863 as the most progressive document that had introduced the elements of democracy into the educational environment [20, p. 93].

The pressing and unsolved problem of the Ukrainian universities, which attracted Ukrainian intellectuals, was the right to teach in their native language. In expectation of the reform the movement for teaching in the native language covered primary school and spread around Ukraine. However, the reform coincided with the publication of the Valuiev

Circular in 1863, which banned Ukrainian, and Ukrainian educators lost any hope of national education. The Ukrainian historian and social activist M. Kostomarov voiced keen criticism of the situation in his work «About teaching in the native language in Southern Russia» [17] stressing that at the time of the reform in 1863 Kyiv university lost the right to individuality. Public activists V. Ikonnikov [13], M.K. Rennenkamf [28] and many others supported him and came out for Ukrainian at higher school. Despite the fact that Chapter II of the charter provided for a flexible attitude to «local conditions», most of the decisions of universities were made by the MPE. Thus, issues related to national peculiarities in the educational field were clearly corrected. This charter remained unchanged for several years.

In early 1870s, government officials began to put pressure on society and persuaded the need to continue the reform. Thus, a new period in the life of higher school started. Professor of Moscow University M. Liubimov, a supporter of the government position [18], stressed the need to subordinate universities to the state authorities and to restrict any of their autonomy. Authorities relied on such public ideas, as this would exonerate from responsibility for the steps taken to attack on the autonomy of universities. A commission on educational reform headed by the new Minister I.D. Delianov was formed at the MPE. The Commission on the development of the new charter faced opposition from universities and came under loud criticism in the publications of P. Vynohradov [3], V. Vorobiov [4], B. Hlinskyi [7] and many others.

The liberal movement to a certain extent had won, and therefore, in 1879 government officials resorted only to restriction of rectors' rights by expansion of authorities of university guardians. In late 1870s, students became active advocating the rights to self-government and their own student court of honour. The reaction of authorities was the appointment of the new Minister of Education A.O. Saburova, a supporter of the «spirit of Dorpat». At this stage the content of the March «Note» (1881) of the count M.P. Ignatiev to the Minister of Internal Affairs M.T. Loris-Melikov speaks volume about that authorities related the opposition resistance to students and prosperous liberalism at universities. «Three quarters of state criminals and almost all regicides had been at universities», M.P. Ignatiev wrote [11, p. 12]. Gradually conservative officials succeeded. A new charter was discussed in pro-government circles within M.P. Ignatiev's ideas. In early 1880s I. Delianov and D. Tolstoi developed a draft of a new charter, which was being discussed in the state council during 1882–1884, and on August 23, 1884 Oleksandr III signed the charter. D. Tolstoy's participation in the reform processes was especially painful for society, since in the days of Oleksandr II he was known as an active reformer, and the charter of 1884 in the days of Oleksandr III was developed by him as the main gendarme of the country, that is, the head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, with the publicly declared counter-reformation views on higher school.

Thus, another stage in reforming higher school began. The growing crisis in relations between the ruling circles and the intellectuals in the person of teachers of educational institutions was inevitable. Professor of St. Petersburg University P.I. Heorhiievskyi called the charter «an attempt to use the German orders in Russia» [6, p. 2] and voiced against guardians' supervision. This is the position, the professor wrote, «that has not been typical for European countries for a long time, since «intermediaries» between universities and the ministry are absolutely unnecessary. The power of guardians downgrades the role of rectors, and their party membership, in general, harms the objective approaches to the business» [6, p. 3]. It is the scientist, who dared to raise the problem of lack of unified programs, requirements, rules, instructions regarding to activities of guardians and publicly called the government policy – counter-reform. B.I. Chycherin wrote that the charter of 1884 was «the repetition of the policy of pre-reform time» [33, p. 161], and the reason for inadequate government policy was student movements, which officials were afraid of [30], [33]. Politicians of that time didn't analyse the true deep-rooted causes of the intensification of student protests yet ignoring the youth struggle for education without elitism, the right to political convictions, the formation

of self-government, participation in the management of universities, etc. In particular, students strived for participation in the discussion of candidates of fellow students for expulsion defending their own right to the student court.

The next stage of reforming higher school began when the Emperor Mykola II came to power. The government proposing changes to the charter of 1884 acted more democratically and applied to universities for proposals. Boards of universities gave free responses. Kharkiv professors were more active, their idea of «responses» [23] was to protest against the bureaucratic order established by the charter of 1884. Kharkiv educators expressed the revolutionary idea at that time – the collegial autonomy of universities – which would enable to improve the university level of science and destroy bureaucracy. The focus on collegiality became a powerful step in understanding the role in the society that did not have the Constitution. Scientists emphasized that universities were institutions of science, and they must be run only by academic boards, as they were aware of needs.

After the assassination of the Minister M. Boholievov, and till 1904, the education sector was disorganized by permanent changes of ministers: P.S. Vannovskiy, H.Ye. Zenher, V.H. Hlazov. At this stage educators, spoke for full cancellation of the charter of 1884. The historian P. Vynohradov [3] emphasized that the educational problem in Russia in early 20th century had still remained unsolved. In his opinion, the reason for all conflicts was the desire of authorities to bring universities under a strong control.

At this stage special attention should be paid to the views of academician V. Vernadskyi [2], who advocated the unification of university professors for the protection of higher educational establishments and encouraged scientists to organise professorial congresses. Today congresses of rectors have been already working in Ukraine, but more than 100 years ago, in our opinion, V. Vernadskyi's idea was more progressive. He believed that only independent professors were able to win the rights of higher school educators, and this idea is a pressing issue to us.

Professors of St. Petersburg University published [26] proposals for amendments to the charter in columns of «Vestnik Evropy» insisting on the return of autonomy, the election of academic teaching staff and the abolition of state examinations of students by ministerial programs. We see that then regular resignations of ministers, discussions of professors showed that authorities had been in a state of crisis with the absence of the concrete program for higher school modernization.

The revolutionary events of 1905 in the empire got priorities straight in favour of the demands of universities, and on August 27, 1905, «Temporary Rules for University Administration» were adopted, by which government officials renewed the election of rectors, deans, the autonomy of university academic councils, university inspections were canceled, women's recruitment was authorized, and the student court of honor was restored. The Minister of Education I.I. Tolstoi started preparing a new reform, called a meeting of professors, that worked directly at the MPE [5], and noted that he personally made efforts for developing a new charter draft. But when the Prime Minister P. Stolypin and conservatives: M.P. von Kaufman, O.M. Schwartz, L.A. Kasso came to power, the new statute draft was not approved, because they believed that it was not necessary to change charters every twenty years and the amended charter of 1884 could be in force. Thus, the epoch of a deep modernization of higher school came to the end.

The education system reformation in the latter half of the 19th and early 20th century on the territory of the empire caused diverse views on this problem, and the picture of public life was determined by the opposition of representatives of two ideological directions: conservative and liberal. The reformation process was facilitated by social upsurge, broad publicity, public activity, which created the impression of a significant influence on this by liberal ideas, especially in early 1860s and 1905. Educators and officials evaluated university reforms in different ways. The discussions concerned the sense of copying European models

of reforms and making them real in Russia. Government-favoured circles insisted on the German model of higher school reform, professors – on the French one. The government advocated elitism of higher school and supported the idea «university – an institution for trustworthy people». Proposals for autonomy, self-government, academic freedoms, corporate student associations, protests against bureaucratic care, expressed in press columns and in the prepared remarks on the reform draft, determined the nature of its putting in place and accompanied educational reforms throughout the period. Progressive intellectuals opposed the «blind» copying of the Western European model of the reform.

Ukrainian intellectuals were skeptical to all governmental activities in the area of reforms, since they lost the right to develop a national school through the introduction of the Valuiev Circular and the Ems Ukase.

The charter of 1884 was evaluated mainly negatively by educators. Positive aspects of this document were noted by very few. Educators of that time found the causes of the counter-reform government measures in the activity of student movements without emphasizing their root motives. Changes in the attitude of government officials to the educational problem consisted in the desire to revise the charter of 1884, an active work of the commission on the new charter drafting and the adoption of «Temporary Rules», which had returned certain previous democratic norms. The typical mistakes of the state officials of this period were: the desire for tight and centralized control over universities, the support of the idea of elitism, distrust of leadership, lack of understanding of the causes of student protests, lack of awareness of the person's role in introduction of reforms, that resulted in the appointment of conservatives as leaders of the MPE.

Since modern processes of higher school reformation are close to the processes of those days, we are going to propose the following. In particular, modern officials should take into account the mistakes of predecessors. First of all, European experience is subject to comprehensive study but not blind copying. Demands put forward to the personnel of universities should be adapted in Ukrainian realities, as first they create opportunities, and then put forward demands. The most progressive can be considered the idea of V. Vernadskyi about the organization of professorial collegial congresses as a form of gaining experience and decision-making in universities, as a form of higher school advocacy. This idea is more progressive than the current boards of rectors, because the latter are still dependent on the line ministry. The expansion of the autonomy of higher education institutions and student self-government should not be restricted; it must continue to receive extensive support from government circles. Any changes in the regulation of activities of modern universities are possible only through a public dialogue. Hereafter it is necessary to study the content and stages of the reformation of specialized higher education institutions, military, medical, technical ones, etc. as well as the role and evaluation of educators in relation to the innovations introduced by the officials of that time at specialized higher education institutions.

ДЖЕРЕЛА ТА ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Бабст И.К. От Москвы до Лейпцига. Пер. Санкт-Петербург, 1870. 144 с.
2. Вернадский В.И. Об основаниях университетской реформы. Москва, 1901.
3. Виноградов П.Г. Учебное дело в наших университетах // Вестник Европы. 1901. № 10. С. 537–573.
4. Воробьев В.А. К истории наших университетских уставов // Русская мысль. 1905. № 12. С. 1–11.
5. Воспоминания Министра народного просвещения, графа И.И. Толстого: с 31 октября 1905 – 24 апреля 1906. [передрук. Москва, 1997].
6. Георгиевский П.И. О реформе университетов в России. Санкт-Петербург, 1909. 49 с.
7. Глинский Б.Б. Университетские уставы (1755–1884 гг.) // Исторический вестник. 1900. № 1–2.

8. Головнин А.В. Записки для немногих // Вопросы истории. 1997. № 1–2. С. 102–108. [Передрук].
9. Джаншиев Г. Эпоха реформ. Реформа образования. Санкт-Петербург. 256 с.
10. Донин А.Н. Реформы университетов и средней школы России: общественная мысль и практика второй половины XIX века. Дисс. ... доктора исторических наук: 07.00.02. Москва, 2003. 527 с.
11. Записка графа Н.П. Игнатьева министру внутренних дел М.Т. Лорис-Меликову. Санкт-Петербург. Т. 1. 1881.
12. Записка профессора императорского Харьковского университета Каченовского // Замечания на проект общего устава университетов 1863 г. Ч. 1. С. 322–325.
13. Иконников В.С. Русские университеты в связи с ходом общественного развития // Вестник Европы. 1876. № 9–11.
14. Кавелин К.Д. Наука и университеты на Западе и у нас // Собр. соч. Т. 3. СПб. 1899. 1255 с.
15. Каптеров П.Ф. История русской педагогики. Санкт-Петербург. 1910. 187 с.
16. Кессоу С.Д. Университетский устав 1863 г.: новая точка зрения // Великие реформы в России. 1856–1874. Москва, 1993. С. 317–334.
17. Костомаров Н.О преподавании на родном языке в Южной России // Голос. 1863. 20 апр. С. 365.
18. Любимов Н.А. Университетские письма [Оттиск из «Московских ведомостей» за 1874 г. С. 1.]
19. Милуков П.Н. Университеты в России // Брокгауз Ф.А., Ефрон Й.А. Энциклопедический словарь. Санкт-Петербург. 1902. Т. XXXIV. С. 788–800.
20. Нелидов Н.К. Наука о государстве как предмет высшего специального образования // Временник Демидовского лицея. 1872. Кн. 3. 107 с.
21. Никитенко А.В. Дневник / в 3-х кн. Т. 2. Москва, 1904. С. 46.
22. Объяснительная записка к проекту устава императорских российских университетов. Санкт-Петербург, 1863 [передрук 1910 р.]
23. Ответ совета императорского Харьковского университета на вопросы, предложенные Министерством народного просвещения об изменении устава 1884 г. [Рукопись]. Харьков, 1901. 13 с.
24. Пирогов Н.И. Взгляд на общий устав наших университетов. Сочинения. Т. 2. Санкт-Петербург, 1887.
25. Писарев Д.И. Наша университетская наука. Сочинения. Т. 2. Санкт-Петербург, 1863 [Передрук. Москва, 1955 р.]
26. Предложения Комиссии СПУ об изменениях в уставе // Вестник Европы. 1901. № 10.
27. Редькин П.Г. Лекции. Санкт-Петербург, 1889. Т. 1. С. 27.
28. Ренненкамф М.К. Киевская университетская старина // Русская старина. 1899. Ч. 7. С. 34–49.
29. Рудольф-фон-Раумер. Классическое образование // Замечания иностранных педагогов на проекты уставов. Санкт-Петербург, 1863. 396 с.
30. Трубецкой С.Н. Университет и студенчество // Русская мысль. 1897. № 4. С. 181–203.
31. Устрялов Ф.Н. Воспоминания о Санкт-Петербургском университете в 1852–1856 гг. // Исторический вестник. 1884. Т. 6. № 8. С. 297.
32. Фроммет Б.Р. Очерки по истории студенчества в России. Санкт-Петербург; М., 1912. 134 с.
33. Чичерин Б.И. Россия накануне XX столетия. Берлин, 1900. 33 с.
34. Шаравара Т.О. Реформи і контрреформи другої половини XIX – початку XX ст. в Російській імперії: історіографія: Дис. ... доктора іст. наук. Київ, 2011. 541 с.
35. Шмидт Л. Замечания иностранных педагогов на проекты уставов. Санкт-Петербург, 1863. 396 с.
36. Шмидт Е. История средних учебных заведений в России. Санкт-Петербург, 1878.
37. Alston P. Education and the State in tsarist Russia. Stanford, 1969.
38. McClelland J. Autocrats and Academics. Chicago, 1970.
39. Methes W. The Struggle for University Autonomy in Russia during the First Decade of Reign of Alexandr II (1855–1866): Ph.D. dissertation. Columbia university, 1966.

40. Meyer K. L'history de la guesstion universittate au XIX siècle // Cahiers du Monde Russe et Sovietige. 1978. № 3. P. 301–303.
41. Stepashko V.O. Technology of Competitive Selection of Candidates For The Position of A Rector of A Higher Educational Intuition // Освіта і наука. 2017. № 8. С. 5–14.
42. Vichnich A. Science in Russian Culture. Vol. II. Stanford, 1970. P. 66–104.

REFERENCES

1. Babst, I.K. (1870). *Ot Moskvy do Leiptsiga [From Moscow to Leipzig]*. St. Petersburg [in Russian].
2. Vernadskii, V.I. (1901). *Ob osnovaniakh universitetskoï reformy [About fundamentals of the university reform]*. Moscow [in Russian].
3. Vinogradov, P.G. (1901). Uchebnoe delo v nashikh universitetakh [Training at our universities]. *Vestnik Evropy*, 10, 537–573 [in Russian].
4. Vorobev, V.A. (1905). K istorii nashikh universitetskikh ustavov [The background of our university charters]. *Russkaia mysl*, 12, 1–11 [in Russian].
5. *Vospominaniia Ministra narodnogo prosveshcheniia, grafa I.I. Tolstogo. S 31 oktiabria 1905 – 24 apreliia 1906 [Memoirs of the Ministry of Public Education, count I.I. Tolstogo. From October 31, 1905 till April 24, 1906]*, (1997). Moscow [in Russian].
6. Georgievskii, P.I. (1909). *O reforme universitetov v Rossii [About the reform of universities in Russia]*. St. Petersburg [in Russian].
7. Glinskii, B.B. (1900). Universitetskie ustavy (1755–1884 gg.) [University charters]. *Istoricheskii vestnik*, 1–2 [in Russian].
8. Golovnin, A.V. (1997). Zapiski dlia nemnogikh [Notes for few people]. *Voprosy istorii*, 1–2, 102 [in Russian].
9. Dzhanshiev, G. *Epokha reform. Reforma obrazovaniia [The epoch of reforms. Education reform]*. St. Petersburg [in Russian].
10. Donin, A.N. (2003). Reformy universitetov i srednei shkoly Rossii: obshchestvennaia mysl i praktika vtoroi poloviny XIX veka [Reforms of universities and secondary school in Russia: social thought and practice of the latter half of 20th century]. *Doctor's thesis*. Moscow [in Russian].
11. *Zapiska grafa N.P. Ignateva ministru vnutrennikh del M.T. Loris-Melikovu [The note of count N.P. Ignatev to the minister of internal affairs to M.T. Loris-Melikov]*, (1881). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
12. Zapiska professora imperatorskogo Kharkovskogo universiteta Kachenovskogo [The note of professor of imperial Kharkiv university Kachnovskiy]. *Zamechaniia na proekt obshchego ustava universitetov 1863 g.* (Part 1), (pp. 322–325) [in Russian].
13. Ikonnikov, V.S. (1876). Russkie universitety v sviazi s khodom obshchestvennogo razvitiia [Russian universities in connection with the process of social development]. *Vestnik Evropy*, 9–11 [in Russian].
14. Kavelin, K.D. (1899). Nauka i universitety na Zapade i u nas [Science and universities in the Western world and here at home]. *Sobranie sochinenii*. (Vol. 3). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
15. Kapterov, P.F. (1910). *Istoriia russkoi pedagogiki [History of Russian pedagogics]*. St. Petersburg [in Russian].
16. Kessou, S.D. (1993). Universitetskii ustav 1863 g.: novaia tochka zreniia [University charter of 1863: a new point of view]. *Velikie reformy v Rossii. 1856–1874*, 317–334. Moscow [in Russian].
17. Kostomarov, N. (1863). O prepodavanii na rodnom iazyke v Iuzhnoi Rossii [About teaching in the native language in South Russia]. *Golos*, April 20, 365 [in Russian].
18. Liubimov, N.A. (1876). *Universitetskie pisma [University letters]*. Moscow [in Russian].
19. Miliukov, P.N., Yefron Yo.A. & Brokhauz F.A. (1902). *Universitety v Rossii [Universities in Russia]*. *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar – Encyclopaedical dictionary*. St. Petersburg. (Vol. XXXIV), (pp. 788–800) [in Russian].
20. Nelidov, N.K. (1872). *Nauka o hosudarstve kak predmet vyssheho spetsialnogo obrazovaniia [The Science of the State as a Subject of Higher Special Education]*. *Vremennik Demidovskoho litseya – Chronicle of Demidov lyceum* (3) (p. 107) [in Russian].
21. Nikitenko, A.V. (1904). *Dnevnik [Dairy]*. Moscow. (Vol. 2) (p. 46) [in Russian].

22. *Obiasnitelnaia zapiska k proektu ustava imperatorskikh rossiiskikh universitetov* [Explanatory note to draft regulation of the empire Russian universities]. (1863) (peredruk 1910 r. – reedited of 1910) St. Petersburg [in Russian].
23. *Otvet soveta imperatorskoho Kharkovskoho universiteta na voprosy, predlozhennyye Ministerstvom narodnogo porsveshcheniia ob izmenenii ustava 1884 g.* [The answer of the board of the Imperial Kharkov University to the questions proposed by the Ministry of Public Education about the change of the 1884 charter] (1901) (X) (p. 13). Rukopys – Manuscript [in Russian].
24. Pirogov, N.I. (1887). *Vzhiad na obshchii ustav dlia nasikh universitetov. Sochineniia.* [A view at the general charter for our universities. Thesis]. (Vol. 2.). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
25. Pisarev, D.I. (1863). *Nasha universitetskaia nauka. Sochineniia* [Our university study. Thesis]. (Vol. 2.). (peredruk M. of 1955 r. – reedited Moscow of 1955). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
26. *Predlozheniia Komisii SPU ob izmeneniiakh b ustave* [The Recommendations of the Board of SPU on the changes in the charter]. *Vestnik Evropy – gazette of Europe* (1901). 10 [in Russian].
27. Redkin, P.G. (1889). *Lektsii* [Lectures]. (Vol. 1.), (p. 27) St. Petersburg [in Russian].
28. Rennenkamf, M.K. (1899). *Kievskaiia universitetskaia starina* [Kiev university old times]. *Russkaia starina 1899 – Russian old times of 1899 –* (part 7), (pp. 34–49), (p. 5) [in Russian].
29. Rudolf-fon-Raumer. (1863). *Klassicheskoe obrazovanie* [Classical education] *Zamechaniia innostrannykh pedahohov na proekty ustavov – The remarks of foreign educators on the project of the charters.* (p. 396), (p. 5). St. Petersburg [in Russian].
30. Trubetskoy, S.N. *Universitet i studenchestvo (1897).* [University and studentship]. *Ruskaia mysl. – Russian idea.* (4), (pp. 181–203) [in Russian].
31. Ustrialov, F.N. (1884). *Vospominaniia o Sankt-Peterburhskom universitete in 1852–1856 gg.* [The memories about St. Petersburg University in 1852–1856s] *Istoricheskii vestnik – Historic gazette,* 6–8 [in Russian].
32. Frommet, B.R. (1912). *Ocherki po istorii studenchestva v Rosii* [Stories on history of studentship in Russia] *St. Petersburg, Moscow* [in Russian].
33. Chicherin, B.I. (1900) *Rossiiia na kanune XX stoletiiia* [Russia on the eve of XXth century] Berlin [in Russian].
34. Sharavara, T.O. (2011.) *Reformy i kontrreformy drugoi polovyny XIX–XX stolittia v Rosiiskii imperii: istoriografiia* [Reforms and counter reforms in the second half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the territory of the Russian Empire: historiography]. *Doctor's thesis.* Kyiv [In Ukrainian].
35. Shmidt, L. (1863) *Zamechaniia innostrannykh pedahohov na proekty ustavov* [The remarks of foreign teachers on the charter draft] (p. 396), (p. 191), (p. 133) *St. Petersburg* [in Russian].
36. Shmidt, E. (1878) *Istoriai srednikh uchebnykh zavedenii v Rosii* [History of secondary institutions in Russia] St. Petersburg [in Russian].
37. Alston, P. (1969). *Education and the State in tsarist Russia.* Stanford.
38. McClelland, J. (1970). *Autocrats and Academics.* Chicago.
39. Methes, W. (1966). *The Struggle for University Autonomy in Russia during the First Decade of Reigh of Alexandr II (1855–1866).* *Candidate's thesis.* Columbia university.
40. Meyer, K. (1978). *L'history de la guestion universittate au XIX siècle.* *Cahiers du Monde Russe et Sovietige,* 3, 301–303.
41. Stepashko, V.O. (2017). *Technology of Competitive Selection of Candidates For The Position of A Rector of A Higher Educational Institution.* *Osvita i nauka,* 8, 5–14.
42. Vichnich, A. (1970). *Science in Russian Culture.* (Vol. II), (pp. 66–104). Stanford.

Шаравара Т., Шаравара Р. Реформи вищої школи: історична ретроспекція в сучасній рефлексії.

Враховуючи процеси трансформації вищої школи в Україні, слід звернутися до історичного досвіду, оскільки попередні покоління освітян уже намагалися врегулювати: рівень втручання держави в управління навчальними закладами в контексті реальної автономії вишів; право студентства на самоврядування; допустимий рівень запозичення зарубіжного досвіду під час реформ вищої школи. Рівень і глибина оцінок, наданих проведеним реформам у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. авторами різних епох вражає, тож ретроспекція проблеми є актуальною.

Метою статті є аналіз особливостей перебігу реформ вищої школи у другій половині XIX – на початку XX ст. на теренах Російської імперії у контексті розв'язання питань керівної функції держави,

можливостей і прав студентства, запозичення європейського досвіду. Для успішного вирішення завдань були дібрані методи аналізу й синтезу, метод наукової індукції, метод історичної ретроспекції.

Реформування вищої школи в означений період визначалося протистоянням представників з консервативними й ліберальними поглядами. Провладні кола наполягали на німецькій моделі реформи вишів, обстоючи жорсткий контроль і становість вищої школи, а професура – французької, з позицією проти абсолютного копіювання моделі реформ. Позитивну реакцію суспільства одержали статут 1863 р. та «Тимчасові правила» 1905 р. Статут 1884 р. освітяни оцінили переважно негативно. Типовими помилками означеного періоду були: бажання жорсткого й централізованого контролю над вишами, підтримка ідеї становості, недовіра до керівництва, незрозуміння причин студентських протестів, не усвідомлення ролі особи у впровадженні реформ, призначення очільниками МНО осіб із консервативними поглядами.

Висловлюємо пропозиції врахувати помилки попередників. Зокрема, європейський досвід підлягає усебічному вивченню, а не копіюванню. Вимоги, висунуті до кадрового складу вишів, мають бути адаптовані в українських реаліях, адже спочатку – можливості, а потім – вимоги. Найпрогресивнішою слід вважати ідею В. Вернадського про організацію професорських колективних з'їздів, як форми захисту вишів та напрацювання й прийняття рішень, адже сучасні ради ректорів все ж є залежними від МОН. Розширення автономії вишів та студентського самоврядування не має обмежуватися. Будь-які зміни в регламентації діяльності сучасних вишів можливі лише за публічного діалогу.

Ключові слова: Російська імперія, Наддніпрянська Україна, реформи вищої школи, урядовці консервативного табору, урядовці ліберального табору, студентство, професура, громадськість.

Одержано 5.03.2018.