

**THE PERIODIZATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL AND
PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITY OF THE FACULTY COUNCILS
OF UKRAINE UNIVERSITIES
(THE SECOND HALF OF THE XIX CENTURY)**

T. O. Razumenko

*H.S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University
(Kharkiv, Ukraine)*

**ПЕРІОДИЗАЦІЯ ОРГАНІЗАЦІЙНО-ПЕДАГОГІЧНОЇ
ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ ФАКУЛЬТЕТСЬКИХ РАД УНІВЕРСИТЕТІВ
УКРАЇНИ (ДРУГА ПОЛОВИНА ХІХ СТОЛІТТЯ)**

Т. О. Разуменко

*Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені
Г. С. Сковороди (Харків, Україна)*

In the article on the basis of certain criteria (political shifts which determined parameters of the government policy in the branch of the higher (university) education; the features of the university reforms which were reflected in regulatory legal documents concerning the higher education; the provision of the university charters which regulated the contents, the directions and the working arrangements of the faculty boards) is established such stages of organizational and pedagogical activity of the faculty councils of Ukraine universities during the studied period:

I stage (1863–1883) – is the differentiation of the faculty councils powers in the context of the legitimization of the universities autonomy and delegation to the professorial boards the right for self-management.

The II stage (1884–1901) – is redistribution the sphere of the competence of the solution of the academician and scientific questions between the scientific and the faculty councils on the background the general restriction of the academic self-government and increasing the control of their activity by the rector, board, the trustee of the educational district.

Key words: faculty council, Ukraine universities, stages, tendencies, organizational and pedagogical activity

Statement of the problem. The change of the educational paradigm at the present stage of the higher school development in Ukraine requires essential revision of the leading conceptual principles of the higher educational institutions management. First of all, it is referred to providing the transition from the authoritative model of the higher education organization (which is imperiously focused) to democratic one (which is personally focused); the broad powers of autonomy of the higher educational institutions in the questions of granting the scientific degrees, higher degrees, the choice of the development strategy, the contents and activity tasks; the consolidation of role the representative self-administration boards in the course of making the administrative decisions.

The thoroughgoing modernization of the higher school management system causes completely rightful interest to studying and generalization of the theoretical knowledge and practical researches of the past which give the substantial, culturological and predictive information for definition the leading directions of the creative use of the gained experience at the present stage of the higher school reforming in Ukraine. The important place in this context is taken by the period of the second half of the XIX century throughout which different approaches to the solution of the problem the higher school autonomy were approved, providing its functioning based on the principles of the self-administration boards which was carried out through the activity of representative bodies — the faculty councils.

The analysis of the topical research. The historiographical analysis of the problem testified that separate aspects of the faculty councils activity (drafting of the curriculum; carrying out the conferment procedure; filling the vacancies and so forth) was reflected in the research works of O. Adamenko, A. Aleksyuk, L. Volk, O. Gluzman, N. Dem'yanenko, L. Zelenskaya, S. Zolotukhina, M. Evtukh, V. Mayboroda, O. Mikityuk, N. Pobirchenko, I. Prokopenko, N. Terentyeva, O. Sukhomlinskaya and others in the context of treatment the genesis of the university education in Ukraine.

The special value for verification the problem has the pre-revolutionary historical and pedagogical monographs by edition of D. Bagaliy, V. Buzeskul, M. Vladimirskiy-Budanov, A. Markevich, I. Osipov, I. Skvortsov, M. Sumtsov, V. Shulgin, M. Chubinskiy, M. Halanskiy, F. Fortinskiy which reflects the

activity of the faculty councils of Kharkov, Kiev and Novorossiysk universities throughout the XIX century based on the various factual material.

The profound theoretical understanding of the certain problem is reflected into the works of A. Andreyev, G. Eymontova, O. Ivanov, V. Leykina-Svirskaya, E. Lyakhovich, S. Posokhova, E. Chernyak, G. Shchetinina and others which illustrates the general characteristic of government reforms into the branches of the higher education during the certain chronological period. However, the noted works are limited by temporary and territorial frames and don't contain the complete retrospective analysis of the organizational and pedagogical activity of the faculty councils throughout the second half of the XIX century.

The purpose of the article. The purpose of the article is to prove the stages and to find the leading tendencies of the organizational and pedagogical activity of the faculty councils of Ukraine universities throughout the second half of the XIX century.

The main material presentation. In the course of studying the historical and pedagogical sources it is established that activity of the faculty boards at Ukraine universities during the second half of the XIX century wasn't a constant and was characterized by certain features. On the basis of the selected criteria, for example: political changes which determined parameters of the government policy in the branch of the higher (university) education; features of the university reforms which were reflected in regulatory documents concerning the higher education; the provisions of university charters which regulated the contents, the directions and the working arrangements of the faculty boards, we selected two stages of the organizational and pedagogical activity of the faculty councils of Ukraine universities during the studied period: The I stage (1863-1883) – is the stage of differentiation the faculty councils powers; The II stage (1884–1901) – is a stage of the broad powers of the faculty councils and the strengthening of control of their activity by the rector, the administrative board, the trustee of the educational district.

It is known that the middle of the XIX century, which coincides with the beginning of the reign of Alexander II, was commemorated by the development and the implementation of the reforms which were called “the great” because allowed to create new public forms, to start the qualitatively new stage of the country development, including university education. On June 18, 1863 the next charter of the Russian Empire universities came into force. It was general for five universities of the Russian Empire, including Kharkov, Kiev and

Novorossiysk (in 1865) which functioned within Ukraine. Each of the mentioned universities established four faculties: the Historical and Philological, the Physical and Mathematical, the Juridical and The Medical [5]. At the same time, within the faculties the number of chairs increased. According to the charter of 1835 universities have 34 chairs, but after reform their quantity increased to 53 and oscillated from 9-12 at the Historical and Philological faculty till 17 at the Medical one [7, p. 299].

In aspect of the studied problem the attention is paid to the fact that qualitative changes took place at the level of the university and faculty management. In particular, the reform limited influence of the trustees on the universities though the last ones continued to remain the chief managers in the district. Their duty was to take all necessary measures in order to the university and staff performed the assigned duties with special diligence and care. And only in emergency conditions the trustees got the right to use own discretion, reporting to the ministry about measures taken by them [2, p. 719].

The direct supervision of the university was attached to the rector who was elected for four years by the university academic council among the ordinary professors and was approved by the emperor [7, p. 298]. The charter of 1863 charged "the comprehensive supervision over the faculty subjects teaching" to the deans whose elections was carried out once in a three years at the faculty council meeting. In case if the faculty had less than three ordinary professors, the extraordinary professors had the right to be elected to the dean's post. The candidature of the elected dean required to be approved by the minister [5, p. 4]. It is indicative that procedure of the dean elections had to be carried out in the presence of members of the university academic council and in the case of blackball candidates, the elections transferred to the academic council [5, p. 4].

It should be emphasized that famous and respected scientists who has authority at the faculty, as a rule, were elected to the dean's post during the outlined historical period. For example, duties of the dean of the Historical and Philological faculty of the Kharkov University during 1862–1866 and 1868-1874 years were executed by the prof. M. Lavrovsky, from 1875 till 1884 this post was held by prof. V. Nadler [3, p. 34].

However, the charter proclaimed the academic council of university as "the highest authority" for the solution of all educational, scientific, financial, economic, judicial, public and educational cases; that was the return to the first university charter of 1804 which was based on the principles of self-

administration boards. This situation required the power differentiation of the faculty boards which since the time of convening the first independent meetings in 1805 have received the status of “special collective parts of the whole self-administration board” [3, p. 100]. Taking this into consideration, the faculty council’s powers were subject of the division into two categories. The first category (group A) consisted of those which provided making the final decisions for the faculty cases, the second category (group B) consisted of those which demanded the subsequent consideration and the approval by the university academic council. The faculty councils got the right to make final decisions on such questions as: 1) the definition of the ways of stimulation the students educational activity; 2) the program preparation of the competition to fill the vacancy; 3) the approval of the scientific works which were offered for the issue at the expense of university; 4) development of the curriculum [5, p. 11].

The decisions of the faculty boards, which were transferred to the university academic council for the consideration and the approval, concerned the follows:

- the election of the dean and the secretary of the faculty;
- the temporary and constant fill the professorial and other vacancies;
- the division of the subjects and order of their teaching;
- the subdivision of the faculty into the departments; union and division of the chairs, replacement one others, and also the selection of the obligatory subjects for the students;
- the election of persons as professorial scholars at the university;
- the choice of the candidates for receiving the scientific business trip in order to preparation for the professor degree;
- the approval or the rejection of thesis for scientific degree;
- the selection of the themes for competitive works which were offered to teachers on behalf of the university and stipulated the financial reward for its successful solving, and also the annual competitive tasks for the students;
- giving the grants and awarding the medals for educational and scientific achievements;
- the distribution of the funds for the manuals provided by the cost sheet;
- and also the decision of cases which were offered by the university academic council for the previous discussion at the faculties [5, p. 11–12].

Therefore, the charter of 1863 within the autonomy delegated to the universities, for the first time formulated and in details concretized those rights and obligations of the faculty councils which become established during

semicentennial activity and were recognized as necessary and essential to the normal life and fruitful work of the university.

In the course of the scientific search it is revealed that introduction on the basis of the charter of 1863 the differentiation of the faculty councils powers caused modifications at the form of the annual report of the educational district and the university.

Since that time the separate section of the report had to contain the information about the activity of university faculty councils, for example:

1. How many the faculty meetings took place during the reporting period?
2. What changes were made into the subjects division and the order of their teaching with the permission of the university academic council?
3. What actions were taken for filling the vacant chairs?
4. What was made for increasing the educational activity of the students and what ways of the control were established?
5. Who among the students of the faculty were awarded by medals with the permission of the academic council and for which scientific works?
6. Who from the faculty staff with no scientific degree, gained it and who continued to fulfill duties on preliminary conditions?
7. If scientific works were approved for the issue on behalf of the university, who were their authors and which works it were?
8. Who from members of the faculty issued scientific works or articles in periodicals?
9. Who from the faculty staff gave public lectures and on which subjects?
10. How many persons were subject to pass examinations on master degree; whose master and doctoral thesis were discussed and approved or rejected; which of them passed the procedure of public defense and how successful they were? [4, p. 604–605].

It should be noticed that the above-mentioned list demanded rather effective participation of the faculty councils in the solution of educational and scientific questions and consequently need enough frequent convocation of their meetings. On the basis of the statistical data analysis is established that, for example, the juridical department of the Kharkov university during 1863 held 35 meetings of the council, in 1864 – 48, in 1869 – 43, in 1874 – 45, in 1880 – 26, in 1882 – 29 [8, p. 86]. The number of the council meetings of the Historical and Philological faculty of the mentioned university was in 1864 – 30, in 1868 – 27, in 1871 – 35, in 1880 – 23 [3, p. 34].

The studying of the historical and pedagogical sources allows claiming that with adoption of the charter in 1863 the essential changes happened not only with powers of the faculty councils, but also with their structure and the working arrangements. The 6th paragraph of the charter defined that the dean, professors (ordinary and extraordinary), associate professors and lecturers are part of the faculty according to the staff. Besides, for providing the appropriate study of the faculty subjects it was allowed to employ private-docents without any restrictions.

However, the structure of the faculty council had to be formed only of ordinary and extraordinary professors (§ 10). Concerning other members of the faculty it was noted that they can be invited at the faculty meetings, but get the vote right under certain conditions: associate professors – if their length of service isn't less than two years in this post, other teachers – one-time: a) during the solution of questions which concern directly that science which they teach; b) during the examinations for candidate degree or student degree [5, p. 4–5].

In the course of scientific search it is established that acquisition by the faculty councils the right of the legislative initiative of study and scientific questions in the conditions of self-management delegated by the charter in 1863 considerably increased the council's responsibility for its solutions. It demanded more accurate rationing of the order their work organization. Therefore rules concerning its convocation, carrying out, the implementation of the faculty councils decisions, were brought into conformity with those which the university boards (the scientific councils) were guided in their work.

However, as is well-known, in the early seventies the XIX century to the existing charter began to add certain amendments for the purpose of reinforcement “the centralized beginning”, the state control of the course and the content of teaching and the approval of the necessary order and discipline among the students. In the periodicals were issued publications of M. Lyubimov, M. Katkov, D. Tolstoy with the criticism of “the university self-management”, and in 1874 there was convoked the special meeting under the chairmanship of the secretary P. Valuyev who made the decision about the revision of the existing charter. Participants of the meeting made offers concerning the restriction of the professorial boards autonomy, the replacement of professors elections by their appointment, increasing of the government supervision on the university teaching, restrictions of increasing the quantity of “the financially poor students” and so forth. Such reform had to finish with the opposition of the faculty staff and the students [7, p. 335].

It is known in August 1884 the new university charter came into force. According to P. Vinogradov, the professor of the Moscow university, it became “the expression of mistrust to integrity and reliability of the professorial boards” because it delegated the right of the final vote of all internal university cases not to the academic council, but to the highest administration board – the rector and the trustee [8, p. 18].

The analysis of the charter provisions [6] testified that despite of the essential restriction of “the board power” in the university management § 23 preserved the right of the faculties to convoke the faculty council. However, unlike the previous period, its structure had to be formed only of the ordinary professors. With the right of the advisory vote at the council meeting could be invited a) the persons who temporarily fill the vacancies of the staff teachers, – for the participation in discussion of subjects which they taught; b) the lecturers – for carrying out the examinations.

As the charter 1884 gave much more independence to the faculties, the part of cases which previously demanded the consideration and the approval of the academic council fell within competence of the faculty boards. To the list of the cases which need the final approval of the faculty councils, belonged the follows:

- the carrying out examinations on scientific degrees, semi-course and annual student's tests, and also any other that aimed at checking the students study progress;
- transfer to the students of half-year study subjects and granting the persons who finished the full university course with the final certificates;
- granting the master's students with the certificates of passing examinations on the master's degree, and also certificates which given them the right to give lectures as the private-docents;
- the discussion of the scientific works which applied for the issue at the expense of the university and with its permission;
- the approval of the annual tasks for writing the competitive works of scientific character by the students and foreign listeners;
- award the medals and certificates of honour to the students and foreign listeners for the written scientific works;
- award of the rewards for the scientific investigations carried out by scientists on the basis of the stated themes of the competitive tasks, but only in case if such right was reserved for the faculties by the special resolution;

– the discussion of the rector offers on the actions for increasing the completeness and sequence of the university teaching and the approval of the special orders on the basis of these offers;

– granting the permission to the professors to give lectures and to give practical training in those disciplines which belong to the list of chairs subjects;

– listen to the teachers reports on the results of carrying out the practical training with the students;

– in some cases, granting the permission to the doctors of the foreign universities to pass examinations for the master's degree, without carrying out the previous tests of knowledge of the full course of the faculty sciences [6, p. 13–14].

However, the decision of the faculty councils for some questions demanded coordination with the university academic council, for example: the offers of individuals concerning fill the professorial and lecturing vacancies; the conclusions about granting to the persons who passed examinations and successfully defended the thesis, the corresponding scientific degree; the petition for granting the doctor's degree to the persons who got recognition by their scientific works without passing the established examinations on the master degree and submission of the thesis; the petition for admit the persons which got recognition by their the scientific works to the defense of the doctoral thesis; the petition for approval the doctor's degree for masters who submitted the thesis which are characterized by special scientific advantages; the drafts of the curriculum and reviews of the teaching, with division of the lectures and the practical training by days and hours; offers about union and subdivision the chairs, replacement with one others, opening new ones, transferring the chair from one faculty to another; requirements concerning carrying out the examinations and the condition of admit to them; used measures for temporary supply the teaching on the vacant chairs; plans for probable reward of the private-docents work; the offers concerning distribution of the funds for educational and auxiliary establishments of the faculty and improvement of their work; decisions the cases which were presented by the board and the university academic council for the previous discussion [6, p. 14–15].

It will be noticed that loosing the influence of the academic council on the board, caused the necessity to establishment the direct connections of the faculties with this university structure. Considering this fact, the cases which decisions demanded coordination of the university board began to be subject of the faculty councils, namely: 1) the offers concerning division of the university

rooms between educational and auxiliary establishments and changes in such division; 2) the petition for granting the students and give them the single monetary support [6, p. 15].

In aspect of the studied problem the attention is paid to the fact that increasing the trustee power according to the charter of 1884 brought to life the practice of the direct connections with the faculties. It was stipulated by the provisions of the existing charter which selected the number of cases, which decisions of the faculty councils were transferred directly to the trustee approval, and the university academic council was been only informed on its course. The cases which belonged to this category was follows: the elections of laboratory workers and their assistants, chiefs of the offices and the museums, anatomists and their assistants, the astronomer observer, the gardener, the mechanic and the laboratory assistant on the physics chair which were carried out on the basis of the professors representations who headed the relevant chairs; the elections of the clinics interns at the medical faculty on the basis of the chiefs recommendation and the pharmacist – on the basis of the dean recommendation; stay the persons at the university as professorial scholars, and also election of those persons who intended to receive foreign business trip with the scientific goal; the admit of the persons who had the right to fulfill responsibilities of the private-docents to lecturing at the university, with gaining to these persons the corresponding degree; the questions offered by the trustee for discussion at the faculty council meetings [6, p. 15–16].

In the course of scientific research it is revealed that despite expansion of the competence sphere of the faculty councils with the solution of educational and scientific cases, the general tendency concerning restriction of the professorial boards independence, submission of their activity to the rector, the trustee, the minister power, in the conditions of the existing charter 1884, had more notable influence on the professorial boards organization work. Besides, the chapter V of the existing charter defined the common requirements to the working arrangements and fulfillment the paperwork in the academic and the faculty councils. In general they were: the faculty council meeting were recommended to be held only in case of need (§32), their appointment was the competence of the dean; during the vacation period the presence at the council meetings less than $2/3$ from their general quantity was allowed (§35); was attributed to solve all cases by the majority of votes of the present members of the council; to the cases which decisions were subject to the approval by the highest authorities, it was required to add opinion of the minority; the closed

voting or balloting were allowed only during election of the officials which elections were in competence of the faculty council; the secretary of the council was appointed by the dean and was approved at the post by the trustee of the educational district [6, p. 19–20].

The studying of the faculty councils meetings protocols allowed to establish the frequency of holding the faculty boards meetings during the outlined historical period as this criterion serves as one of indicators of the intensity of their activity. As a rule, it ranged within 18–24 meetings for a year. For example, the council of juridical department of the Kharkov university had 19 meetings during 1886, in 1888 – 24, in 1896 – 18, 1901 – 23 [8, p. 131]. The council of historical and philological faculty of this university held 22 meetings during 1885, in 1890 – 13, in 1892 – 32, in 1895 – 15, in 1900 – 17 [3, p. 34].

The provided data testify the essential reduction of the frequency of holding the meetings by the faculty councils in the conditions of the charter 1884, in comparison with the previous period though the sphere of the competence of the last one experienced the essential expansion. In our opinion it could be explained as the faculty councils didn't receive the independence in the decision on educational and scientific, and staff questions. Therefore the decision from the majority of the faculty cases which were subject of discuss at the faculty boards meetings, came to the end with the formulation “to take into consideration”, “to give the petition”, “to make the offer” that made possible the formalism in their work.

Conclusions. Thus, on the basis of the carried-out historical and pedagogical analysis, proceeding from the concrete historical situation, the leading educational tendencies and the priorities of the state policy, it is proved that organizational and pedagogical activity of the university faculty councils of Ukraine throughout the second half of the XIX century has two stages. The first stage (1863–1883) was characterized by introduction of strict powers differentiation of the faculty councils that stipulated the legitimization of the universities autonomy and delegation to the professorial boards the right for self-management according to the provisions of the charter 1863. The second stage (1884–1901), was marked by redistribution the sphere of the competence with the solution of the educational and scientific questions between the academic and faculty councils and increasing the control of its activity by the rector, the board, the trustee of the educational district that was predetermined by the general restriction policy of the academic self-management in the conditions of existing charter 1884.

The conducted research doesn't take out all aspects of the problem. The specifics of the organizational and pedagogical activity of the faculty councils at Ukraine universities at the beginning of the XX century can be the subject of the subsequent research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Бортник Л. А. Сторінки історії Харківського університету: статут 1884 р. та його наслідки / Л. А. Бортник // Вісник Харк. нац. ун-ту ім. В.Н. Каразіна. — 2003. — №603. — С. 17–23.
2. Глинский Б. Б. Университетские уставы (1755–1884 гг.) / Б. Б. Глинский // Исторический вестник. — 1900. — №21. — С. 719–742.
3. Историко-филологический факультет Харьковского университета за первые сто лет его существования (1805–1905) / под ред. М. Г. Халанского и Д. И. Багалея ; вступ. ст. Т. Г. Павловой. — Х. : Изд-во САГА, 2007. — С. 45, 168, 390, XII, 15 л, портр. 91 с.
4. Новые формы годовых отчетов по Учебным Округам и Университетам // Сборник распоряжений по Министерству Народного Просвещения. — 1864. — Т.3 : (1850–1864). — С. 599–604.
5. Общий Устав Императорских Российских университетов 1863 г. — СПб., 1863. — 43 с.
6. Общий Устав Императорских Российских университетов 1884 г. — СПб., 1884. — 51 с.
7. Прокопенко Л. Л. Генеза та розвиток державної освітньої політики в Україні (IX–початок XX ст.) : монографія / Л. Л. Прокопенко. — Дніпропетровськ : ДРІДУ НАДУ, 2008. — 488 с.
8. Юридический факультет Харьковского университета за первые сто лет его существования (1805–1905) / под ред. М. П. Чубинского и Д. И. Багалея ; вступ. ст. Т. Г. Павловой. — Х. : Изд-во САГА, 2007. — С. 15, VIII, 378, 10 л.

Разуменко Т. О. Періодизація організаційно-педагогічної діяльності факультетських рад університетів України (друга половина XIX століття)

У статті на основі визначених критеріїв (суспільно-політичні зрушення, що визначали параметри урядової політики в галузі вищої (університетської) освіти; особливості університетських реформ, що знаходили відображення в нормативно-правових документах з питань вищої освіти; положення університетських статутів, що регламентували зміст, напрями та порядок роботи факультетських колегіальних органів) встановлено такі етапи організаційно-педагогічної діяльності факультетських рад університетів України протягом досліджуваного періоду:

I етап (1863–1883 рр.) — диференціації повноважень факультетських рад у контексті легітимізації автономії університетів й делегування професорським колегіям права на самоврядування.

II етап (1884–1901 рр.) — перерозподілу сфери компетенції з вирішення навчальних і наукових питань між ученою й факультетськими радами на користь останніх на тлі загального обмеження академічного самоврядування та посилення контролю за їх діяльністю з боку ректора, правління, попечителя навчального округу.

Ключові слова: рада факультету, університети України, етапи, тенденції, організаційно-педагогічна діяльність.

Разуменко Т. О. Периодизация организационно-педагогической деятельности факультетских советов университетов Украины (вторая половина XIX века)

В статье на основе определённых критериев (общественно-политические изменения, определившие параметры правительственной политики в области высшего (университетского) образования; особенности университетских реформ, находивших отображение в нормативно-правовых документах по вопросам высшего образования; положения университетских уставов, регламентировавшие содержание направления и порядок работы факультетских коллегиальных органов) установлены такие этапы организационно-педагогической деятельности факультетских советов университетов Украины исследуемого периода:

I этап (1863–1883 гг.) — дифференциации полномочий университетских советов в контексте легитимации автономии университетов и делегирования профессорским коллегиям права на самоуправление;

II этап (1884–1901 гг.) — перераспределения сферы компетенции с решения учебных и научных вопросов между учёным и факультетскими советами в пользу последних на фоне общего ограничения академического самоуправления и усиления контроля за их деятельностью со стороны ректора, правления, попечителя учебного округа.

Ключевые слова: совет факультета, университеты Украины, этапы, тенденции, организационно-педагогическая деятельность.

REFERENCES

1. Bortnik L. A. Storinki istoriï Harkivs'kogo universitetu: statut 1884 r. ta jogo naslidki [The pages of the Kharkov university history: the charter 1884 and its consequences] / L. A. Bortnik // Visnik Hark. nac. un-tu im. V.N. Karazina. — 2003. — №603. — S. 17–23.
2. Glinskij B. B. Universitetskie ustavy (1755–1884 gg.) [The University charters (1755–1884)] / B. B. Glinskij // Istoricheskij vestnik. — 1900. — №21. — S. 719–742.
3. Istoriko-filologicheskij fakul'tet Har'kovskogo universiteta za pervye sto let ego sushhestvovanija (1805–1905) [The Historical and Philological faculty of the Kharkov university for the first hundred years of its existence (1805-1905)] / Pod red. M. G. Halanskogo i D. I. Bagaleja; Vstup. st. T. G. Pavlovoj. — Kh. : Izd-vo SAGA, 2007. — 45, 168, 390, XII, 15 l, portr. 91 p.
4. Novye formy godovyh otchetov po Uchebnym Okrugam i Universitetam [The new forms of the annual reports on educational districts and universities [New forms of annual reports on Educational Districts and Universities//the Collection of orders on the Ministry of National Education]// the Collection of orders on the Ministry of National Education] // Sbornik rasporyazhenij po Ministerstvu Narodnogo Prosveshhenija. — 1864. — V.3 : (1850–1864). — P. 599–604.
5. Obshhij Ustav Imperatorskih Rossijskih universitetov 1863 g [The general Charter of Russian Imperial universities of 1863]. — SPb., 1863. — 43 p.
6. Obshhij Ustav Imperatorskih Rossijskih universitetov 1884 g [[The general Charter of Russian Imperial universities of 1884]]. — SPb., 1884. — 51 p.
7. Prokopenko L. L. Geneza ta rozvitok derzhavnoi osvith'oï politiki v Ukraïni (IX – pochatok XX st.) [The genesis and development of the state educational policy in Ukraine (IX – the beginning of the XX century)] : monografija / L. L. Prokopenko. — Dnipropetrovs'k : DRIDU NADU, 2008. — 488 p.
8. Juridicheskij fakul'tet Har'kovskogo universiteta za pervye sto let ego sushhestvovanija (1805–1905) [The Juridical department of the Kharkov University for the first hundred years of its existence] / Pod red. M. P. Chubinskogo i D. I. Bagaleja ; Vstup. st. T. G. Pavlovoj. — Kh. : Izd-vo SAGA, 2007. — 15, VIII, 378, 10 l. portr.