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Abstract. The article reveals the authorities of Faculty Boards of Ukrainian Universities at the second half of the XIXth century on ensuring teaching and educational process, in particular the organization of students’ knowledge control; the attention is focused on the factors of effective work of Faculty Boards in the conditions of operation the Charters (1863-1884 years); the characteristics of types and forms of the control during the researched period is given.
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Introduction. The integration of Ukraine into European educational space requires improvement of specialists training’s quality into all spheres of life, ensuring the high level professionalism of the higher school graduates. It is declared in standard and legislative documents, in particular “Law of Ukraine on Higher Education”, National Doctrine of Education Development in Ukraine at the XXI century, National Strategy of Education Development within the period 2012-2021 years. The solution of this task will be considerably promoted by pedagogically reasonable organization control of students’ educational cognitive activity which in the conditions of delegated academic autonomy of the National Higher School is regulated by decisions of Faculty Boards at Universities in general.

The above mentioned statement predetermines necessity of study, reconsideration and constructive use of historical experience; in particular the activities of Faculty Boards of Ukrainian Universities at the second half of the XIXth century included the organization of students’ study control, identification of their effective work factors in a certain direction.

The analysis of scientific development level of a mentioned problem has revealed that some aspects of Faculty Boards activity (e.g. composition of curriculums; carrying out procedures of scientific degrees conferral; turnover rate and so forth) are reflected in researches of O. Adamenko, A. Aleksyuk, L. Vovk, O. Gluzman, N. Demyanenko, L. Zelenskaya, S. Zolotukhina, M. Evtkh, V. Kuril, I. Kurylyak, V. Mayboroda, O. Mykytiuk, N. Pobirchenko, I. Prokopenko, N. Terentyeva, O. Sukhomlinska and others in the context of exposure the genesis of University Education in Ukraine.

The purpose of the article is to characterize Faculty Boards activity of Ukrainian Universities at the second half of the XIXth century included the organization of students study control.

Statement of the main material. Studying of historical and pedagogical sources [3; 4; 5; 6] confirms that according to the General Charter of Imperial Russian Universities (1863) Faculty Boards received the right to be “the first” authority to examine all educational affairs, to make decisions which were previously exclusively in competence of Academic Board of University.

The major part of educational affairs concerned discussion of exams and final exams results, and also establishment of the unique requirements and rules of the organization and carrying out exams. In particular, Faculty Boards considerably used the Charter right (1863, § 85) to carry out entrance exams, considering them important for determination of applicants common development as well as applicants knowledge.

For example, Historical and Philological Faculty Board of Novorossiyskiy University has made the decision to admit students only after entrance exams results, because a lot of applicants interested to enter on Historical and Philological Faculty of this University had demonstrated unsatisfactory knowledge of the Classic Languages. This decision has got support at the session of Academic Board on February 7th, 1866 [6, p. 701].

At the same time, members of Historical and Philological Faculty Board of Kharkiv University during the session on March 3, 1873 were against the offer expressed by Scientific Committee of Ministry of National Education concerning replacement of entrance exams with written works for those persons who had the corresponding certificate [5, p. 122].

It should be noted that according to the Charter (1863) students passed exams at the end of every academic year and passed final exam before graduation. However the marks received by students during the academic year exams could be considered as final exams marks in agreeing with Faculty Board. The exams must take place once a year in May. It’s significant that Faculty Board acquired the right to compose the additional test commissions for those students who couldn't pass exams at the scheduled time by reason of illness. The dean and certain members of faculty were included in the structure of such commissions. The level of knowledge was estimated in points from 1 to 5 which identified knowledge as "unsatisfied ", "satisfied", "good" and "excellent".

The exams which allowed students transition from one academic year to another, as a rule, were carried out at the faculties both at the beginning and to end of vacation. In relation to the latter the term of carrying out exams was not later than on August 31 unless someone of professors didn't come back from a vacation to a certain term. The results of exams and final exams were reported at the session of Faculty Board, which adopted the relevant resolution on the basis of that report. The re-examination was resolved only in a year. At the same time students marks received on the previous exams were ignored. If such student didn't pass examination for the second time, he was given an opportunity to try once again, but already on receiving the candidate’s degree [3, p. 165].

We will analyze the work of Faculty Boards on the example of Law Department Board of Novorossiysk Uni-
The last at the session on October 21, 1867 has adopted the following resolution on the basis of the exam marks received by students on additional subjects: "To transfer student Honsky to the 2nd academic year, Velezhinsky – to the 3rd, Tiktin, Hagri-Stomatov and Pavlovsky, – on the 4th, and not to give the student Lyubarsky his remove, cause he hasn't received satisfactory marks from all objects" [6]. The above-mentioned resolution has been submitted for the approval of Academic Board of University.

However the results of the conducted research testified that relevant resolution was often broken in practice. It was negatively reflected on the organization of academic progress control and induced Faculty Boards to prepare more accurate rules for exams and final exams. Consequently in 1870 Law Department Board of St. Vladimir University formally proposed to Academic Board the petition for modification of the existing rules of caring out exams with the following arguments: "The significant amount of students, especially final-year students try to evade passing final exams in May by all means (in 1867 – 73 students in 148, in 1868 – 88 students in 149). The faculty was forced to allow these students to retake exams in spite of the provided references had doubtful character for the most part. Such method was not only immoral, but also restricted students’ ability to conscientious training for exams throughout studying period and students in such a manner got an opportunity to prepare for passing final exams during the prolonged term (from May to December)" [7, p. 949]. In view of above-mentioned, members of Law Department Board recognized necessary to establish the following order of carrying out exams:

- to carry out final exams: before vacation – in May, after vacation – from September 1st to October 1st; - semi-year exams: before vacation – in May, after vacation – from August 15th to September 1st;
- to oblige students to take all exams before vacation or to take them after vacation having reasonable excuse (partially or in full);
- do not allow students to pass exams if they haven't come at the scheduled time [7, p. 950-951].

The Academic Board of St. Vladimir University has agreed with arguments of Law Department Board, having approved above mentioned formally propositions. As a result the new draft of rules of carrying out student’s exams and the candidate's degree exams has been prepared.

In the aspect of the declared problem the interest is attracted also by activity of Historical and Philological Faculty Board of Kharkiv University concerning rationing of rules of carrying out exams which were quickly coordinated with certain changes in the structure of the faculty. Thus, two departments have been created as a result of Historical and Philological Faculty reorganization of the above mentioned University which has taken place at the session on October 19, 1871. The first department included first two academic years during which students studied general subjects; second department included two last academic years during which students studied special disciplines of one of three directions: classical, Slavic- and Russian, historical. In such a way disciplines which were studied on the first or second department were different and consequently exams were also different from each other. The members of Historical and Philological Faculty Board of Kharkiv University considered very useful to carry out exams of general disciplines from all faculty subjects as final exams of first two academic years in view of a versatility and independence of disciplines of both departments, on the one hand, and wishing to give to students of 3-4 academic years an opportunity to devote themselves to study subjects of the chosen special directions on the other hand. At the same time they decided to limit final exams for final-year students only by special and additional subjects of one of three directions [5, p. 123-124]. In view of above-mentioned, Historical and Philological Faculty Board of Kharkiv University has developed the following rules of carrying out exams and final exams:

1. Do not retake exams on the fourth academic year in those subjects which are not listed as special disciplines in which students have been examined already.

2. To take exams every academic year in additional subjects to the special disciplines, without passing these exams before graduation.

3. To write down the received marks in diplomas and certificates to those students of the first or second department who would have desire to study faculty subjects which are absent at the list of special subjects and would pass exams on these subjects during the graduation year for the purpose to receive an appointment of teacher in gymnasia [5, p. 123-124].

However, as indicates results of the conducted research, with adoption of the General Charter of Imperial Russian Universities in 1884 the settled system of the organization of student’s educational cognitive activity control was changes. The Ministry of National Education received functions of a developer of the existing rules. Thus, according to the ministerial "Rules of 1887 ..." the right of carrying out entrance exams wasn’t more in competence of Faculty Boards and was delegated to gymnasiams. The exams at the end of every academic year were cancelled, and separation of students into academic years in general was also cancelled (it was replaced with separation into semesters). However the final exams came into force and special examination board graded these exams which chairman and members were appointed by the Minister. The Ministry of National Education in 1889 implemented semi-year exams at the end of the every academic year at all faculties, except medical, when the first exams carried out in the examination board certified that it was difficult to students to take exams for all studied material during four academic years, and carrying out of such exams in two time periods (at the end and at the beginning of the academic year) took a lot of time from professors [9, p.22].

The following decision was also dictated by numerous appeals of Faculty Boards of Ukrainian Universities to the Minister. These appeals declared that student’s study control by the faculties was essential for ensuring the study progress. It should be performed annually and included whether carrying out exam, or report for professors testified that the student who attended seminar and practical classes learnt the content of the studied material at an adequate level. At the same time, members of Faculty Boards noted that on the first academic years the annual exams were useful not only for control, but also for
students’ understanding what studied material was the most essential [8, p. 68-69].

In view of abovementioned, since 1890 the drawing up programs of semi-year exams has been responsibility of professors of the relevant chairs. Such programs had to be approved by Faculty Boards. Those students who haven’t passed semi-year exams weren’t allow studying lectures in the following semester. Thus, Historical and Philological Faculty Board of St. Vladimir University at the session on April 1st, 1899 has considered the project of carrying out semi-year exams which has got approval of board members and has been transferred to the statement of the Trustee [1, arc. 63].

In the aspect of the considered problem scientific interest is attracted by the fact that according to the Charter 1884 students who’s exams marks of the eights semesters were accepted by the decision of Faculty Board had to receive the graduated certificate. Since 1898 such students have received the diploma of the first or the second degree. To receive the diploma of the first degree student should write the work approved by the special examination board and to pass exams in all subjects with the mark “good”, that is to receive mark not below than "4" points. The diploma of the second degree received students who passed exams with the mark “satisfied”.

Works of Faculty Boards on this direction in the conditions of operation the Charter (1884) we will trace on the example of Physical and Mathematical Faculty Board of St. Vladimir University. So, the agenda of a session conducted by the board on January 22, 1892 included the report concerning those students who have already studied eight semesters till December 20th, 1891. Such students were: a) on department of Natural Sciences – M. Garnitsky, L. Horekevsky; b) on department of Mathematical Sciences – S. Samoroksy, G. Tveretinov. The faculty board made the decision to recognize above-mentioned students as persons who successfully studied eight semesters and to grant certificates [2, arc. 3].

At the same session the official report of the dean has been considered concerning the student of the 7th semester of Mathematical Department E. Ignatyev who hasn’t submitted the work which was required for successful finishing of the 7th semester within a certain term. The student Ignatyev on May 1891 had eight successfully finished semesters, however for improvement own knowledge has voluntarily entered on the 7th semester. In view of that fact Faculty Board has made the decision to accept him this semester, but made him to submit work during the 8th semester [2, arc. 1].

The results of the conducted research reflected that in the conditions of operation the Charter (1884) Ministry performed intervention into activities of Faculty Boards of the organization of educational students control through own developed curricula and programs. In particular, Ministry of National Education together with curricula and programs sent to Universities also the rules of carrying out exams, credits, and “exams requirements” in which not only the main points of the program were stated, but also detailed instructions for faculty teachers. Thus in curricula were determined both the sciences offered for studying by students of the each faculty and the order of their studying according to the art. 70 of the Charter. The curricula were composed in such a way that students, choosing this or that subject, could acquire all necessary knowledge without efforts to pass the final exams successfully.

The order of studying disciplines should be reflected in curricula by distribution of subjects by semesters. At the same time it was recommended to provide students more freedom in the choice of subjects throughout a semester. It was based on the fact that a) in such a way every student will be able to study interested subject in convenient time; b) it will give an opportunity of equal distribution of students between faculty teachers and available audiences.

Let’s notice that such practice generated misunderstanding between Ministry and Faculty Boards in the solution of a question of student’s educational activity control. The Faculty Boards, as a rule, offered actions which have been checked by time and were based on satisfaction of urgent requirements. The Ministry considered actions of Faculty Boards as disobedience and offered them persistently the actions which have been caused by logic of a political situation first of all [5, p. 143].

Conclusions. Therefore, the conducted research allow to confirm that questions of the organization of students’ study control during the researched period were leading activities of Faculty Boards of Ukrainian Universities. However, in the conditions of operation the Charter (1863) Faculty Boards performed functions of the “first” authority to examine questions of the organization of students’ study control which were previously exclusively in competence of Academic Board of University, then with adoption of the University Charter (1884) activities of Faculty Boards required submission of Ministry of National Education, Trustee of the educational district, rector of University. Implementation of obligatory curricula and programs, numerous ministerial “rules” and “instructions”, cancelled Faculty Boards independence in the solution of questions of the organization of students study control, reduced the speed of educational affairs, generated harmful “for live teaching” correspondences as Faculty Boards were forced to come into relations with a number of instances (from Academic Board to Minister) for review an order of subject distribution during the academic years, rules of carrying out exams, credits, appointment of examiners, chairmen of examination boards, and so forth.

The conducted research doesn’t apply for the final and exhaustive decision of the researched problem. In particular, questions of Faculty Boards’ activities on the organization of students’ study control in the conditions of the Soviet system of the Higher Education need the subsequent studying.
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Организация контроля за учебной студентов как направление деятельности факультетских советов университетов Украины второй половины XIX века

Т. О. Разуменко

Аннотация. В статье раскрыты полномочия факультетских советов университетов Украины второй половины XIX века по обеспечению учебно-воспитательного процесса, в частности организация контроля знаний студентов; акцентировано внимание на факторах эффективной работы факультетских советов по данному направлению в условиях действия уставов 1863, 1884 гг.; дана характеристика распространенных в исследуемый период видов и форм контроля.
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