

ОСОБЕННОСТИ СОЦИАЛИЗАЦИИ ДЕТЕЙ-СИРОТ

И. А. ЧАЙКА, аспирант Национального университета биоресурсов и природопользования Украины

***Аннотация.** В статье рассмотрены основные подходы к трактовке сущности социализации, рассмотрены ее основные аспекты, факторы, влияющие на ее формирование, особое внимание уделено специфике процесса социализации и ряда трудностей, возникающих в ходе социализации, у детей-сирот, находящихся на воспитании в детском доме.*

***Ключевые слова:** социализация; агенты социализации; макро-факторы, мезо-факторы и микро-факторы социализации; социальные роли; ребенок-сирота; детский дом; методы воспитания*

FEATURES OF SOCIALIZATION OF ORPHANS

I. O. CHAYKA, postgraduate of National University of Life and Environmental Resources

***Summary.** In the article the main approaches to the interpretation of the essence of socialization, considered its main aspects, factors affecting it, special attention is paid to the specifics of the socialization process and a number of difficulties arising in the course of socialization of orphans who are brought up in children house.*

***Keywords:** socialization; agents of socialization; makrofaktors, mezo-faktors and micro-factors of socialization; social roles; orphan; orphanage; methods of education*

УДК 37.011.3(73) – 051

TEACHER EDUCATION REFORM IN THE USA

S. SHANDRUK, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,
Kirovohrad Volodymyr Vynnychenko State Pedagogical University,

***Summary.** The US higher teacher education system reform; problems in the preparation process of undergraduate prospective teachers; key components of teacher preparation; the role of teacher preparation programs in elementary and secondary education system of the USA are studied in the article. Recent efforts and initiatives of the Obama Administration to form a comprehensive agenda to recruit, prepare, place, support, develop, and advance teachers to promote effective teaching at every stage of the career pipeline are identified.*

***Keywords:** The US higher teacher education system reform, preparation process, prospective teachers, teacher preparation programs*

***Introduction.** Supporting a strong teaching force and school leadership is a top priority for the Obama administration. "From the moment students enter a school, the most important factor in their success is not the color of their skin or the income*

© С. Шандрук, 2016

of their parents, it's the person standing at the front of the classroom... America's future depends on its teachers. That is why we are taking steps to prepare teachers for their difficult responsibilities and encouraging them to stay in the profession. That is why we are creating new pathways to teaching and new incentives to bring teachers to schools where they are needed most." [14].

The reform of education has been a major focus of policymakers at the local, state and federal levels since the publication in 1983 of *A Nation at Risk*. Reform efforts have targeted all stages of education, from pre-school to school-to-work transition, and have addressed nearly every aspect of the public elementary and secondary education system: curriculum and assessment, teachers' preparation and their professional lives, school organization and management, technology, and parental and community involvement [11, P.3].

Problem. Higher teacher education in the United States has received much scrutiny in the recent past from the federal and state governments, the press and the general public. In response to this scrutiny, a number of blue ribbon panels have been formed to examine how effectively higher teacher education is serving American society. The 21st century finds the attention paid to higher teacher education in the United States at record levels. This first decade of the 21st century has seen a number of calls for reform and changes to higher teacher education and how it serves American society.

Purpose. The purpose of this paper is to understand reforming challenges in the US higher teacher education system and elaborate on the factors affecting those challenges.

Research methods. The core of our work is Content Analysis which is used for the objective, systematic and quantitative description of teacher education reform in the USA. Books, essays, interviews, discussions, articles, historical documents etc on the problem of US higher teacher education reform are involved to cover the purpose of the article.

American researchers study the problem of systemic reform (N. Anderson W.H. Clune, J.L. David, H.D. Gideonse, C.Y. Levinson, J.W. Little, F.B. Murray etc), teacher learning (D.L. Ball, G.W. McDiarmid, D.K. Cohen, M.W. McLaughlin, J.E. Talbert etc), professional communities (M.W. McLaughlin, I. Oberman etc), school organization and change (L. Darling-Hammond, M. Fullan, E.E. Lawler, S.A. Mohrman etc) [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 9; 11; 12].

Systemic reform is a concept that has emerged in education policy in 1990-th. As with most general concepts, it is defined and used in different ways by different people and in different contexts. Systemic reform embodies three integral components: (1) the promotion of ambitious student outcomes for all students; (2) alignment of policy approaches and the actions of various policy institutions to promote such outcomes; and (3) restructuring the governance system to support improved achievement. This conceptualization is based on the writings of M.S. Smith and J. O'Day, who argue that neither the top-down reforms nor their antithesis, the bottom-up reforms, of the 1980s will improve schools or learning. What is needed is a coherent systemic strategy that takes advantage of the resources of each level of the education system, that adds content to the restructuring movement, and that establishes expectations that all students will acquire deep understanding of subject matter and complex thinking skills. M.S. Smith and J. O'Day argue that state leadership can yield generalized, rather than merely piecemeal, improvement, that it can ensure broad equity, and, above all, that it can influence policies related to curriculum, materials, teacher preparation and development, and student assess-

ment. Preservice professional programs would shift from an emphasis on credit collection in subject areas to an emphasis on preparing teachers to teach the content expected of students, while inservice professional development opportunities would enable instructional staff to develop and refine their expertise in the content of the state frameworks and in effective pedagogical approaches. School-level personnel would develop specific curricula, programs and pedagogies designed to achieve the statewide goals. To do this job, schools must be given sufficient autonomy and resources to shape their programs to meet local conditions and the needs of their students [11, P.21-22].

Some researchers have drawn attention to the difficult extended learning required by recent instructional reforms. Yet, most professional development strategies and programs do not adequately address the learning needs of teachers [12, P.129-151]. Problems begin early in the preparation process. A basic problem, according to several authors (D.K. Cohen, S. Feiman-Nemser, G.W. McDiarmid, M.B. Parker, J.P. Spillane etc), is that undergraduate prospective teachers do not know the content of the subject areas they are expecting and are expected to teach. Equally important, they do not comprehend the concepts and methods of their fields – the understandings that are necessary if they are to help their future students construct knowledge. Even if prospective and beginning teachers were receiving adequate preparation in the content and methods of their teaching fields, however, this condition alone would not prepare them to be adequate teachers in a coherently organized school system. Teachers also need to be steeped in the content and the pedagogical underpinnings of their particular state's curriculum frameworks. A framework that is suffused with and conveys a central organizing principle demands teachers who are prepared in both the knowledge and pedagogy of both the subject-matter and the frameworks. Another key component of systemic reform in which teachers need extensive training is student assessment, particularly as performance-based approaches take hold [3; 8; 10; 11, P.25-27].

H.D. Gideonse identified several obstacles in bringing the governance of teacher education into productive alignment with the press for system reform. These include (1) the fragmented structure for developing teacher education policy (e.g., establishing entrance qualifications, nature of the preparation program, exit standards, and teacher licensure), (2) the shared responsibility but diffused authority for the education of prospective teachers between school, colleges and departments of education (SCDEs) and schools of liberal arts and education, (3) the lack of a consensus within the teacher education, teaching and policy communities on what we mean by teaching, teacher preparation or advancing the profession, (4) limited resources in teacher preparation programs and limited incentives for entering teaching, and (5) jaded views of past state regulatory effort [9, P.395-426]. He argues that teacher education policy should rest on the metamodeling of constructivist theory. Instead of prescribing the content of teacher preparation programs, policy makers, in close collaboration with the profession, should seek to define what constitutes professionalism in teaching and then encourage and support programs committed to professionalism, whatever their approach [11, P.25-27].

J.W. Little addresses the lack of a fit between the nature of the task of reform and the prevailing models of professional development – in particular, the dominance of a training paradigm built on “knowledge consumption,” and the lesser support for an inquiry and problem-solving paradigm built around “knowledge production.” [12, P.129-151]. Other issues in the design of professional development also center around the sheer complexity of the reform tasks being proposed, and

the relative absence of tested principles, policies and practices together with the contradiction across policies and the propensity to seize upon early stage experiments as “models;” and the relative inattention to teachers’ “opportunity to learn” within the salaried work day and work year. She offers six principles for professional development that would stand up to the complexity of current reforms and argues that teacher collaboratives and other networks, subject matter associations, school university collaborations targeted at school reform, and special institutes and centers are approaches that incorporate some of these principles. While J.W. Little views district-sponsored staff development and union-initiated projects as more problematic, they deserve policy attention because they are so central to teachers’ lives and employment [12, P.129-151].

Teacher preparation programs play an essential role in elementary and secondary education system of the USA, which relies on them to recruit, select, and prepare approximately 200,000 future teachers every year. Strong programs recruit, select, and prepare teachers who have or learn the skills and knowledge they need to be hired into teaching positions, be retained in them, and lead their students to strong learning gains. Weak programs set minimal standards for entry and graduation. They produce inadequately trained teachers whose students do not make sufficient academic progress [14].

A broader effort by the Obama Administration is to ensure an effective, well-supported teacher for every child. They build on work currently being advanced through the Race to the Top and enabled by the Administration’s reform of the No Child Left Behind Act. These existing initiatives form a comprehensive agenda to recruit, prepare, place, support, develop, and advance teachers to promote effective teaching at every stage of the career pipeline:

1. *Recruitment.* Through the TEACH recruitment campaign, launched in October 2010 and accessible at www.TEACH.gov the Administration has worked to promote the teaching profession and recruit high-potential, diverse individuals, including recent graduates and mid-career professionals, into teaching.

2. *Preparation.* In addition to the proposals outlined in the document *Our Future, Our Teachers: The Obama Administration’s Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement*, the Administration has already invested over \$140 million in innovative programs that provide intensive clinical training to prepare the next generation of teachers. With funds made available from Congress through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Obama Administration was able to offer 5 years of support for 40 projects under the Teacher Quality Partnership program. These grants will prepare teachers, based on the model of effective teaching residency programs, supporting partnerships between colleges, universities, and high-need schools to provide novice teachers with comprehensive induction in their first years of teaching and to support new pathways for those entering the profession from other fields.

3. *In-service development and support.* Through Race to the Top and the Administration’s ESEA Flexibility plans, new state systems of teacher evaluation and support will ensure that all teachers – both veteran teachers and recent graduates of preparation programs – receive professional development and career advancement opportunities that are aligned with their identified strengths and needs. To inform these decisions, states and districts must work with their teachers to set a clear and meaningful definition of teacher effectiveness, one that considers both a teacher’s success in achieving student growth, a teacher’s demonstrated contribution to a school’s or district’s success, and a teacher’s instructional skills as meas-

ured by multiple measures of professional practices, such as observations by trained observers against a rubric that is based on clear standards and a shared understanding of what effective teaching looks like and what effective teachers should be able to do. This shared understanding of effectiveness will support collaborative learning environments in schools where teachers can learn from each other and benefit from professional development that is aligned with their needs, and can allow districts to reward, retain, and advance effective teachers in a way that promotes the effectiveness of all adults in a school building and ensures that every child has access to effective teaching [13; 14].

Conclusion.

The goal of American education reform is that every teacher should receive the high-quality preparation and support they need, so that every student can have the effective teachers they deserve. Obama's administration looks forward to working with Congress, with leaders in the fields of teacher preparation and development, and with all who share this vision to bring this plan to life. The goals of the reform may need to strike a balance between current and desired practice, between old and new ways. One reason is that it takes time to change and teachers will inevitably mix old and new approaches and models, whether or not such mixture is encouraged. The system as a whole is still gaining experience and learning about new approaches. Because both teachers and the system are learning as they are reforming, the balance between old and new may shift as the reform evolves and practice changes.

Prospects for further research. The future research directions include but not limited to a comparative study on higher education reforms in Ukraine and USA, and evaluation project on institutionalization of education reforms in Ukraine.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, N. Most Schools Could Face Failing Label Under No Child Left Behind, Duncan Says. – Accessed on June 1, 2011 at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/09/AR2011030905748.html>
2. Clune, W. H. "The best path to systemic educational policy: Standard/centralized or differentiated/decentralized?" / W.H. Clune // Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1993. – Vol. 15 (3). – P.233-254.
3. Cohen, D. K. "A revolution in one classroom: The case of Mrs. Oublier." / D.K. Cohen // Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1990. – Vol. 12(3). – P. 311-329.
4. Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). "Instructional policy into practice: 'The power of the bottom over the top'." / L. Darling-Hammond // Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1990. – Vol. 12 (3). – P. 339-347.
5. Darling-Hammond, Linda. The Service of Democratic Education. .” / L. Darling-Hammond. – Accessed on June 1, 2011 at <http://www.thenation.com/article/160850/service-democratic-education>.
6. Darling-Hammond, L., and McLaughlin, M. W. "Policies that support professional development in an era of reform." / L. Darling-Hammond, and M. W. McLaughlin // Phi Delta Kappan, 1995. – P. 597-604.
7. David, J. L. (1991). "What it takes to restructure education." / J.L. David // Educational Leadership, 1991. – Vol. 48(8). – P.11-15.
8. ESEA Reauthorization: A Blueprint for Reform. (2010). – Accessed on June 25, 2011 at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/index.html>.
9. Gideonse, H. D. (1993). "The governance of teacher education and systemic reform." / H.D. Gideonse // Educational Policy, 1993. – Vol. 7 (4). – P. 395-426.

10. Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994. – Accessed on June 1, 2011 at <http://www.ed.gov/legislation/GOALS2000/TheAct/intro.html>.
11. Goertz, M. Studies of Education Reform: Systemic Reform. Volume I: Findings and Conclusions / M.E.Goertz, R.E.Floden, J.O'Day. – U. S. Department of Education, 1995. – 184 p.
12. Little, J. W. (1993). "Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform." / J.W. Little // Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1993. – Vol. 13 (2). P. 129-151.
13. The No Child Left Behind Act. – Accessed on June 1, 2011 at <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>.
14. U.S. Department of Education, *Our Future, Our Teachers: The Obama Administration's Plan for Teacher Education Reform and Improvement*, Washington, D.C., 2011. available at the Department's website at <http://www.2ed.gov/inits/ed/index/html>.

РЕФОРМА ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ ОСВІТИ У США

**С. ШАНДРУК, доктор педагогічних наук, професор Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету
Володимира Винниченка**

Анотація. У цій статті висвітлюються питання реформи системи вищої педагогічної освіти США, проблеми процесу підготовки майбутніх вчителів, основні компоненти підготовки вчителів, роль програм підготовки вчителів у початковій і середній системи освіти США. У статті проаналізовано ініціативи адміністрації Обами з формування комплексної програми по набору, підготовці, працевлаштування, підтримки, розвитку та мотивації вчителів до ефективного викладання на кожному етапі кар'єри.

Ключові слова: Реформа системи вищої педагогічної освіти США, процес підготовки, майбутні вчителі, програми підготовки вчителів

РЕФОРМА ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ В США

**С. ШАНДРУК, доктор педагогических наук, профессор
Кировоградского государственного педагогического
университета Владимира Винниченка**

Аннотация. Эта статья освещает вопросы реформы системы высшего педагогического образования США, проблемы процесса подготовки будущих учителей, основные компоненты подготовки учителей, роль программ подготовки учителей в начальной и средней системы образования США. В статье проанализированы инициативы администрации Обамы по формированию комплексной программы по набору, подготовке, трудоустройству, поддержке, развития и мотивации учителей к эффективному преподаванию на каждом этапе карьеры.

Ключевые слова: реформа системы высшего педагогического образования США, процесс подготовки, будущие учителя, программы подготовки учителей