

УДК 371.255

Pedagogy of Development: a View from 2012 to 2001

Anatoly G. Kasprzhak*

*Institute of Education Development of the National Research University
«Higher School of Economics»
Room 303, 11, Pokrovsky Bulvar, Moscow, 109028 Russia ¹*

Received 04.11.2011, received in revised form 11.11.2011, accepted 23.11.2012

The author has attempted a detailed commentary to his own thoughts, shown in the reports at the conferences on pedagogy development dated 2001 from 2012. Such an approach seems to me to be the most productive. The author points to the limits of the possible predictions, which in education is an integral part of the daily work of each practitioner teacher. The scholar indicates the need for an urgent “uncovering” of school, to discuss its problems not only and not within the educational system, and to involve people, who have already attained success outside the school. Otherwise, there is a risk, on the one hand, to be faced with a denial of managers at all levels of need of any reforms in school, and, on the other – a significant degradation of the teachers associated with the adoption of the existing flawed way of life because of the impossibility of going beyond the school as an institution.

Keywords: pedagogy of development, educational technology, the traditional school, development, socialization, education management.

Interesting is life. The speech “Pedagogy of Development: What is it?” delivered in 2001 at the Eighth Conference, I thoughts to be honest, one of the most unsuccessful. I still remember the confusion of the hall, as a consequence – the friendly interest and support of colleagues. It was sick of it; still remember the feeling in detail. It took 11 years; I reread the text and ... realized that all my thoughts beginning from 2001 grew out of this text. And with respect to the mission of schools, and competence-based approach, and attempts to “see” the image of education in Russia in the very near future. This fact defined the genre of today’s work. It seemed to be interesting to me, to give comments to my own thoughts, dating

back to 2001 from 2012. Such an approach seems to me to be the most productive. It will, at least, allow myself, not just one more time “to switch on” reflection, but also to see the limits of possible foresight, which in education is an inseparable part of daily work of each practitioner teacher. I hope that this intellectual exercise is going to be interesting and useful not only to me, but to the reader as well.

Distinguished colleagues!

Very interesting, in my opinion, is the fact that only at the eighth conference, which was called the “Pedagogy of Development”, there was a conversation about a kind of meaning that the

* Corresponding author E-mail address: agkasprzhak@hse.ru

¹ © Siberian Federal University. All rights reserved

phrase has. Hypothetically, one can assume that the reason for this is the need to find the answer in our usual technological and social, rather, social and pedagogical aspects. That is that the time has come for a broader discussion of questions of not only issues of *what* and *how* do we teach school pupils, but also *who* and *for what purpose* do we teach and, finally, *who* does this job. Moreover, the authors of educational initiatives, heads of educational institutions, confirm that the image of the school is largely dependent, and at all times depended not only on the answer choices to one or another of the questions posed above, but also on the sequence of their production.

In the past dating back to the Soviet school was simple – the army of teachers (who) taught all (whom) in the same (how) manner to be ready (why) people for thinking about the meaning of life and being obedient, to be “a builder of communism.” Meanwhile all the pedagogy was oriented to answer one question – what to study¹? But still, even in those years philosophers engaged in educations were asking themselves different types of questions. The developmental education emerges, as well as author and innovative schools...

Scientists, educators – practitioners have been fifteen years on the road to freedom. Very ambitious educational projects have been carried out “in metal”. There has been spirited scientific and pedagogical debate on the threshold of the next reform of education and ... a reasonable understanding of what professionals are:

- humanitarian project does not work as long as its ideology is not assigned by the one who executes it;
- language of teaching activity and its description are almost always inadequate;
- and, most importantly, the educational reform must be prepared outside the system of education.

Perhaps that is why me, a typical representative of the teacher – practitioner, who was led by the reflection of my own teaching experience to scientific thinking, will be impudent enough to try to discuss the conference phrase “pedagogy of development” not only in the conventional for me technological aspect, but also in the social – pedagogical aspect.

Here, I find interesting two considerations. The first concerns the general problems of the school as an institution, the second – the Russian experience.

“...We teach...” – whom, why, how and what and, finally, – who. In 2001, ratings of secondary and comprehension parts of the sentence seemed more important, today, I think we should question the phrase “we teach.” “Do we actually teach?” – You want to ask a question, making, with emphasis on the pronoun we. Do we teach, or they learn, when we, with our help. Today it is clear that the information society, in which we are rapidly drawn into, questions the place of its former importance of the teacher in the educational process. “... The new school, the teacher does not claim to possess the monopoly of knowledge, he holds the position of organizer, adviser, interpreter of the “rules of the game,” “educational network administrator, only organizes the process²”. Thus, we are now talking about changing the position of the teacher and student, and as a consequence of the nature of their relationship. In other words, today’s schools – are innovative by nature. Moreover, not only post-Soviet (second argument).

Social and Pedagogical Aspect

According to Hessen education (i.e. teacher action in the educational environment of school), “involves addition and preservation of the past rather than its reproduction³”. If you agree with this idea, we should recognize that only in case of an act in which there is deliberate action of the teacher, it is educational in nature. If you

agree with the second thought of Sergei Hessen: “... the goal of education is closely linked to the objectives of life of society. Life defines education, and vice versa – affects the formation of life. To understand the educational system of the society – is to understand its structure⁴”, so that one can make a draft of a logical chain of further thoughts.

If we consider a holistic pedagogical space of a school that uses a particular technology and training to determine what kind of society, it orients its graduates (of current and/or tomorrow), then the correlation of this educational technology traditionally used, may allow us to identify a few distinctive features of the pedagogic development. And the “the angle of view” by which we conduct our research can be materially different from the traditional. For us, the subject of discussion is not physiological and psychological development of students, but the social mobility of the school graduates, their focus on changing of the existing socio-economic relations.

It should be understood that we are talking only about those schools that are geared to socializing function. After all, as you know, “pedagogical space” can in any school (its parts) have place or not. Enriching the student’s knowledge, improving his education, so the school can build a system of relations between subjects of the educational process, that what – that a particular child, for whatever reason, just do not get into this field. His personal “pedagogical space” with it “leave” from school, move to the music studio or the sports section, for example.

Consequently, school, fulfilling the function of socialization (learning), often does not claim to be a truly pedagogical activity (development), it just does not set itself such a goal. This is not good, nor bad – it’s a fact. Heterogeneity within a single school education system is a normal thing. One of them (much) focused only on reproduction – to create conditions in which the student will be

able to master a certain body of knowledge and skills, giving him a right to be called modern man. The other, a small part of the school focuses its graduates for the reconstruction of the existing society, all that genuine science is questioned, does not put a sign of equity between the terms “culture” and “civilization.” Probably, this is the last part of school and engaged in a fundamental improvement of educational technology, intended to ensure that pedagogical action develops man and society.

Probably for this reason great (researchers, reformers), more often, “were so flattered”, when they spoke about the school, which they had to attend. Personal qualities of these artists, scholars, reformers demanded liberal relations, the rights of freedom of movement in the educational environment of school, and not forced regimented exercise patterns.

Based on these considerations, we would like to somewhat change the subject of debate and dwell on school development. That is an educational institution for which the use of pedagogy is the primary means of achieving this goal.

Here, in my opinion, it’s time to make a small step aside. At a conference, Boris I. Hasan discussed the theme of “educational meetings” as a probabilistic event. How to make sure that this meeting take place? What conditions should be in a school to make its probability higher? If we add to this that the reflection of their own teaching and administrative experience suggests that to determine who needs these meetings more – the student or teacher, it becomes clear that the discussion about creating an environment in which the teacher is transformed into a traditional school teacher development, is the subject of a separate discussion. I think that this topic has several layers. This is the preparation and retraining of teachers, teaching and discussion of the nature of the meeting, which

“seeks,” school teacher development, etc. etc. Today, I want to mention one thing: closure of the education system, and as a consequence, the lack of support outside the school and the teacher and pupil, drastically reduce the likelihood of this encounter. This, in turn, separates from the reflective teacher’s position on the course of the educational process, the results of their labor, and thus realize the necessity of the existence of the school as an instrument of a cultural (civilized, legal) transformation of the society.

There is an urgent need to “uncover” school, to discuss its problems not only and not within the education system, and to involve people, who have become successful outside the school. Otherwise, we, on the one hand, will be faced with a denial of managers at all levels – the denial of any reform of school, and, on the other – a significant degradation of the teachers associated with the adoption of the existing flawed way of life because of the impossibility of going beyond the school as an institution. However, the attempt to conduct a qualitative set of measures to upgrade the Russian system of secondary education, launched this year already, sadly, largely confirmed the hypothesis formulated above.

The key, I think, here is the idea of public schools, completeness and relevance of which can be seen from 2001. In one of the discussions held in 2011, Deputy Minister of Education and Science, Igor Remorenko brought a very interesting analogy between the evolution of operating systems used in modern computers and the development of the school. “... Computer users” experienced “may recall that the first operating system – Norton Commander, popular in the late 80’s early 90-ies, programs run consecutively. To open the n, it was necessary to close the first team n-1. As in a traditional school: first math, then – history.

Then came the era of Windows. There was no need to shut down one program in order to launch

another. Does it remind you such innovations as the project-based learning, integration of subjects, etc.

Today we started working with the operating system Android, which does not require software installation on your computer. This problem is introduced in the PC, sent to the server, processed there and returned back in the form of a solution. If we assume that the development of the school (public information) copies the evolution of operating systems, we can assume that...⁵”.

So – the school becomes “uncovered” by acquiring fundamentally new development resources, and we were able to see this in 2001

Now we shall discuss the notion of correspondence of school to the concept of school development at various stages of history.

According to L.N. Modzalevsky⁶, result of training in pre-Christian era, was the development of a young man (baby boys) a body of knowledge and skills that allowed him to save himself, his specimen (now I have written his self-sufficiency). The ancients meant to learn to produce food, the ancient Greeks – to become a citizen (to know the laws, to be able to take part in the debate), etc. etc. This, as you know, and was the main function of traditional school at those times.

We now turn to the work of Jacques Le Goff, “Intellectuals in the Middle Ages⁷”. The main task of school early medieval author sees in the creation of conditions under which the clergy and people of the state will determine the difference between “religious and educational responsibilities⁸”. That is, the creation of conditions for the emergence of intellectuals (clerics) – “... those whose profession was teaching to think and conveying their thoughts⁹...”.

But the same goals (tasks) were put by the pre-Christian school of Socrates, weren’t they? Thus, the school of Socrates ahead of the traditional school of his time made a man solved the problem of the subsequent interim period.

We now shall try to apply the same reasoning to the scheme of educational technology (School) Komensky. Created in "... the Middle Ages, with their commitment to authority and tradition ¹⁰", at the school on the one hand, were "restored the rights of the individual mind in reading the Bible¹¹...", and on the other – "Teachers conveyor" Komensky preparing citizens of industrial society. Is not it possible to treat the full name of the main things for us, his work: «The Great didactics, containing the universal art of teaching all around, or ...¹²»?

Thus, the forward-looking school of Komensky, you can call the school of his time.

Without claiming to conduct systematic analysis, we add only that Peter Shchedrovitsky, in the "Education and Society¹³", gives sufficient appreciation of the Soviet school as an institution, which provides "... the reproduction and mentality that determine the meaningfulness of the execution of these types of activities and save the data structures of municipal and industrial relations, ...". That is, it is best to replicate the (simulated) existing social relations, and not preparing a man capable of developing them, and doomed themselves and society that it served to die. Thus, the absence in the educational system of schools, sooner or later returns to the starting point of the society. Recent history has proved it.

The reproduction ... Following Toffler, I note only that the ideology of education usually try to set "of the past" – "image of the future", repeating the model school of archaic societies, but the situation changed in the world. Consequently, it and the school must change. At the same conference in Krasnoyarsk, already in 2003, we developed, elaborated on this point.

"... A new quality of education for us is the degree of fitness – as the school system, the ground of its main tool", a cultural form, for the solution of other than the previously popular media practice goals and objectives. In other

words, if we agree that the quality of education depends on how the result fits the needs of the customer, then the definition of a "new quality", we should point out the change of request.

Society moves to a new stage in its development. For schools this means, above all, change the criteria of success. If the industrial (post-industrial) society could predict a set of characteristics of a successful person next decade, but now hardly anyone takes up the description of the "model of the graduate." In these circumstances, "learning" begins in the market valued more than "learning." For the same disciple to become a "man of the student," he at least should be in school that does not discourage learning. He should understand that in order to be successful in life one should have a lifetime to learn and relearn. For this, the study should probably be different in other ways...¹⁴".

The traditional school and the school of development – two components of the education system

In the first half of the 20th century, Hessen, Modzalevsky, other native teachers attempted to separate the tasks of school for training and for shaping cultural values. So Hessen, following Kant, says that "cultural values" in their very essence are inexhaustible tasks "Problems without any solution¹⁵". This, in our view means that the school-oriented development, focused on the tasks that are valuable in themselves, that is precisely on cultural values. Is this why in any society, there appeared schools that were focused on the family, for whom the process of education was the value? Is it because Goff, in reference to the question of intellectual dependence on the Church in the Middle Ages, says: «Of course, along with universities, despite fierce opposition of the church, could be based secular schools, but instead give a general education, they were limited to technical education designed to

merchants: letters, invoices, foreign languages. Thus, began to increase the gap between general culture and special training¹⁶”. Is it our basic curriculum that the French scholar says about, that it “distributes” between the parties the possibility of the educational process? Indeed, the development has a chance to manifest itself only in the school opportunities. “... Who? If you follow the humanistic theories – students, consumers of educational services. In this case it is not difficult to guess that only all the organizers of the educational process “hanging” over the child (a teenager, young man, young man). School in their texts (concepts, programs, projects, etc.), presented in a way that it focuses on the management of the support of teaching, which, in turn, promotes self-responsible student teaching. And this verbal picture looks good. Well, it remains to tweak something somewhere and

But if you look at what is happening a little more closely, as they say, use the naked eye, you begin to realize that the situation is somewhat more precisely – is not so. The entire hierarchical educational ladder is designed in such a manner that “... schools teach only those whose every step in the study corresponds to pre-established measures of social control ...¹⁷”. This is a reproduction of this scheme, “the reproduction of culture samples accumulated by mankind” (another cunning) for several centuries, modern arranged in regular school.

But time moves forward inexorably. Joining the information society demands changes to the results and, consequently, the organization of education. Figuratively speaking, the educated man gives way to a person, who is in the process of learning...¹⁸”. The appearance of the school of teaching (opportunities) is connected with opportunities of schools that are regulated in any country by state educational standards”. Let us, now, take the next step.

So, if we accept that different schools may have different functions, to be focused on the priority of a solution of the problem, then we can formulate a question, the answer to that depends largely on the face of the modern Russian school: “Should the school be confused by mass resolution of these two tasks and, if so, why?”.

I think that at the level of common sense answer to this question is simple – each school has to deal with these tasks in parallel. Since only a statement of the teacher in front of the “eternal questions of pedagogy,” puts it in a reflexive with respect to the position of their own actions, his work makes him interesting, and as a consequence, the school is “alive”. That is, each institution must be an element of school development. But, and this is very important, just a steady balance between the physical operation of the (non-virtual, as is customary in some so-called “innovative” schools) and development based on knowledge of the traditions and precise forecast will provide the normal forward movement. Otherwise ... However, here, in my opinion, the best result, a very modern, unfortunately today, Leo Modzolevsky quote: “Only ignorance of history and lack of respect for those it could make Don Quixote in the education business, which we had a lot lately, and sometimes, with all its noble aspirations, only to harm the proper development of teaching cases in our country¹⁹”.

To make the school “live”. In achieving this task orient us to consistently poor results of Russian schoolchildren in the study. PISA. Beginning in 2000, we participate in the fourth cycle of this international study of quality of education (study carried out once every three years), showing more than modest results, significantly below the average. However, in another study, TIMSS²⁰ purpose of which is a comparative evaluation of general (substantive, academic) training of secondary school students

in math and science, our students show good results.

In 2009, KN Polivanov, made a very interesting comparison, imposing on each other the results of Russian students in the two studies mentioned above. It is noteworthy that in all countries except Russia, the two studies agree. This means that for students from other countries increase subject knowledge related to the success of their application, and our young people – no. One hypothesis is that the reason for this is too much academic quality of programs, their information overload, isolation of objects from each other.

Relying on the stated above we may conclude that in discussing the actual teaching (technological) aspect of the school (Education) development, we must not shy away from answering the following questions:

- Can the teacher science make a correct prognosis and predict those educational technologies that will bring the educational institutions of the elements of the school?
- Can the school in our transition to an information society period be regarded as a unique and self-contained institution that is able to solve this function (open school)?
- What resistance the modern Russian school will face in the process of modernization (development of educational technology development)?

This, in our opinion, is particularly important, since with high probability it can be argued that the projected changes will cause resistance to all consumers of educational services (from the state to the child). The reason is simple – making the cost of education, they want a guaranteed result, and the school development only creates the conditions to ensure that its graduates could achieve this result (one of the main distinguishing

features of the school of our time by forcing the school).

Technological aspect

In discussing the possible ways of developing the content of general secondary education, all agree on what should be changed. In this case all (analysts, researchers, teachers, practitioners) agree that it (the content of education) is overloaded, cannot be mastered by all students within the allotted time frame on it. But, we need only touch on the theme of object-centrism, a departure from the principle of scientific certainty and completeness in the presentation of an issue as supporters of the traditional subject-object pedagogy Komensky and, surprisingly Herbart, “stand in the rack,” and further dialogue becomes impossible.

But ... life has, and the Russian education system of governance does not notice. «... Options (domestic) curriculum, suggest that the “package” of traditional academic subjects, and complete. Every student, regardless of their chosen educational program must, at all levels, study, at least in some extent, all the subjects. The result of this project is not too difficult to predict:

- Students will sit in a classroom for 6-8 hours daily and, consequently, do not do their homework;
- Teachers will continue to lecture (the material, then “pass” should be) and just talk about the need to develop some competence;
- A parent who understands that his/her children needed more life in the modern foreign language (and, it is English) and the computer, not the ability to “cobble together a stool,” takes a tutor.

And at the first lecture in a university auditorium will sound very familiar phrase: «Forget what you learned in school²¹».

For this reason, the task of this conference, I see the proof of the two is quite obvious to many of the provisions:

- *First. The need for a “school development” within each school. In my opinion this thesis, to some extent, has been proven above.*
- *And the second one. The school of educational technology should be used with certain characteristics. And we should proceed to the discussion of this issue.*

I think that in this audience do not detail the proof that the basic contradiction of today’s Russian school is that the ability to work with the information, formulate a research problem, to choose the path of the solution, not always associated with a specific set of knowledge and skills, which are developed on the basis of appropriate skills. We are, traditionally, out of habit, have a linear “knowledge”, “abilities”, “skills”. For us, the need to increase the latter determines the need to increase the former. Is this true?

“..After the comparative analysis of the draft federal educational standard of the national school in 2002²² and materials of the Program “Key competencies 2000²³”, we came to the following conclusions:

a. Both instruments are built in a “linear logic”. The English document shows the average path of the formation of skills of students as they move from class to class, the domestic growth – the amount of information over the same period.

b. The rate increase in the amount of information (knowledge), which has a student to learn in English school on the way to the outlet of the first class is small and considerably less than the rate of change of training objectives. In national schools – the situation is totally different.

That is, the main difference we see is that the strategy of the English school is to organize tasks with simple information in complex situations, domestic – complex information in standard situations ...”.

Thus, the growth of knowledge is not directly connected with the growth of skills possessed by the pupil. As an indicator of “progressive” will focus on finding a way out of object-centrism as extensive, humiliating and exalts the teaching learning. That is, it looks at the child and the teacher as equal subjects of the training activities.

General Conclusion

In conclusion, I would like to say that the expected acceleration in the transition of school, teachers and students in the new quality is unlikely to happen in the nearest future. It, primarily, has the following reasons:

- A manager is not yet ready to legalize the right of a school for independent search and to consider forecasting, not control as the basis of his/her own activity;
- Pedagogic science today is not even attempting to begin to build the content of education, forms of organization of training sessions so that it could satisfy both – the present and the future (yet unknown to the customer) demands. By the way, maybe this is the reason for this overload!?
- A teacher – practitioner is just beginning to understand (he is the closest to the consumer), that his main task on the one hand, is finding and testing relevant technologies, and, on the other – deliberate execution of tasks, and not work in general.

And yet, I do not want to finish my statement comments in such a minor tone.

One of the ideas of our approaching reform relates to what the school should give the student,

above all, habits of behavior in today's dynamic and competitive environment, which requires the adoption and implementation of independent decisions, necessary skills to interact with modern institutions (financial, administrative and etc.).

The results of a number of studies that we conducted last year show that nobody denies the validity of these new requirements to school. It seems to be clear to everybody, however, so far, mostly in words...

P.S. The development of education and socialization of children in the future up to 2020 to discuss the materials prepared by the expert to the Government of the Russian Federation (Supervisors: A. Kasprzhak, I. Frumin)²⁴.

The Russian school is not very different from the Soviet school in terms of both content and methods, and in the management model as well²⁵. This conservation has helped to preserve some of the strengths of the Soviet-secondary education, first of all, a fairly high level of mathematical preparation and teaching reading in elementary school. But in the society, which has radically changed over the years, and economy of the archaic school, its insufficient or inadequate adaptation to modern conditions determine the current status of the main problems and the unwillingness to answer the most important challenges of tomorrow:

1. There is a growing gap between schools in terms of the quality of education and, hence, increasing inequality in access to quality education. According to the results of research there is a clearly distinguished segment of schools (from 4-5% to 25%, depending on the region), where students are concentrated in risk groups: people from disadvantaged families and families with low incomes, showing very low educational outcomes, insufficient knowledge of the Russian language. There is a marginalization of such schools and their students. As a result, the system

of secondary education ceases to function as a social elevator, and, conversely, increases social inequality.

2. There is a growing backlog of Russian school of the world's best systems in terms of program content. Not an effective system of ongoing, evolutionary update the content of educational programs in response to the cultural and technological change. The attempts of the radical, one-time upgrade (development of a complete set of new standards) predictably fail. The most severely lagging behind of the quality of education is seen in such areas such as social studies, English language. An archaic school leads to the alienation of children, the loss of their interest in formal learning.

3. A high level of quality of individual areas of school education, which is confirmed by international surveys (mathematics and science education (TIMSS), and reading (PIRLS), the results of the participation of Russian schoolchildren in Olympiads show that the average level of Russian schoolchildren grades 4 and 8 of these subjects consistently higher than the average international rates. However, according to other international comparative studies (PISA) Russian teens lag behind their peers in most developed countries on the key for the formation of functional literacy areas, have limited abilities to apply their knowledge in practice. This data reflect the contradiction between the needs of a modern economy that requires high-level intellectual skills (summarize, analyze, predict, propose hypotheses, etc.) and the orientation of the Russian school for training as a reproduction of knowledge and application of known algorithms.

4. In Soviet times, the effectiveness of the school system was largely determined by its embeddedness in a wider system of socialization, the presence of "props": roles and responsibilities for the upbringing and

socialization were distributed among family, school, further education system, territorial children's organizations, children's culture industry. Currently, these "props" either absent (destroyed), or do not perform in the same degree of its functions. This leads to the laying of all responsibility for the socialization and education in the education system. However, the existing personnel structure and the remaining from the Soviet school of parenting practices do not allow it to cope with this task. Today the school has lost its monopoly and the objective in the socialization of children, and a channel for information dissemination. On the contrary, public policy, while maintaining a narrow focus on school does not account for the rapid development and the possibility of non-formal education and socialization of children (including the internet, media, children's and cultural industries). In the stagnation of the system of education and

additional education reduces the overall culture of the younger generation, growing rates of violence, extremism, alcohol and drug abuse.

5. The conflict between modernization strategy of school "from above" on the one hand, and the growing diversity of local conditions and needs, which must meet the school. The reforms "from above" do not leave any room for real initiatives "from below", limit the opportunities for effective and responsible solutions in the regions, municipalities and educational institutions. As a result of increasing alienation of teachers and parents from the processes of modernization of education, the reforms often have imitating nature. Citizens have a very limited capacity to influence what is happening in the schools – both as parents and as voters. This is in contradiction with the capabilities and needs of educated parents, who are the majority.

¹ In part – as equally?

² Информационное общество и школа: учебно-методические материалы к курсу повышения квалификации (М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2008).

³ С.И. Гессен Основы педагогики (М., Школа-пресс. 1995).

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ Каспржак А.Г. Выпускник школы для инновационной экономики. Модернизация образования как условие устойчивого развития: материалы междунар. конф. Ярославский образовательный форум.(Ярославль: ГОАУ ЯО ИРО, 2012).

⁶ Очерки истории воспитания и обучения с древнейших времен до наших дней (СПб.: Алетей, 2000). (Долгопрудный, Аллегро-Пресс, 1997).

⁸ *Ibid.* P. 128.

⁹ *Ibid.* the Cover.

¹⁰ Антология гуманистической педагогики. Коменский (Издательский дом Шалвы Амонашвили. 1996. P. 5).

¹¹ *Ibid.* P. 6.

¹² *Ibid.* P. 42.

¹³ П.Г. Щедровицкий. Очерки по философии образования (М.: Педагогический центр «Эксперимент», 1993).

¹⁴ А. Каспржак, К. Митрофанов, К. Поливанова Становление ключевых компетентностей и результаты традиционного обучения: материалы конф. «Педагогика развития: становление компетентностей и результаты образования в различных подходах (Красноярск, 2004).

¹⁵ С.И. Гессен Основы педагогики (М.: Школа-пресс, 1995. С. 33).

¹⁶ Жак Ле Гофф. Интеллектуалы в средние века (Долгопрудный, Аллегро-Пресс, 1997. С. 127).

¹⁷ Иллич И. Освобождение от школ. Пропорциональность и современный мир (фрагменты работ разных лет), (М.: Просвещение, 2006).

¹⁸ Каспржак А. Информационное общество и школа: учебно-методические материалы к курсу повышения квалификации (М.: Российская политическая энциклопедия, 2008).

¹⁹ Л.Н. Модзалевский. Очерки истории воспитания и обучения с древнейших времен до наших дней (СПб., Алетей, 2000. С. 32).

²⁰ Trends in Mathematics and Science Study.

²¹ Школа возможностей и возможности школы // Вопросы образования. 2009. № 3.

²² Под редакцией Э. Днепров и В. Шадрикова.

²³ Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations.

²⁴ Сборник материалов 18-й науч.-практ. конф. «Педагогика развития» (Красноярск: ИПК СФУ, 2011).

²⁵ Only the collapse of the educational system can be regarded as essential changes.

Педагогика развития: взгляд из 2012 – в 2001

А.Г. Каспржак

Институт развития образования

Национальный исследовательский университет

«Высшая школа экономики»

Россия 109028, Москва, Покровский бульвар, 11, к. 303

Предпринята попытка развернутого комментария к собственным размышлениям, представленным в докладах на конференциях по педагогике развития, датированным 2001 из 2012. Именно такой ход представляется автору наиболее продуктивным. Указывается на границы возможного предвидения, которое в образовании есть неотъемлемая часть повседневной работы каждого практикующего педагога. Указывается на необходимость срочно «открывать» школу, обсуждать ее проблемы не только и не столько внутри системы образования, привлекать к работе в ней состоявшихся вне школы людей. В противном случае есть риск, с одной стороны, столкнуться с отрицанием управленцами всех уровней необходимости какого-либо реформирования школы, а с другой – деградацией значительной части педагогов, связанной с принятием существующего ущербного образа жизни из-за невозможности выхода за пределы школы как института.

Ключевые слова: педагогика развития, образовательные технологии, традиционная школа, школа развития, социализация, управление образованием.
