

Evolutionary Theory Of Management In Education

Olena Moskalenko-Vysotska[†], Emiliia Melnyk^{††}, Serhii Tovstenko-Zabelin^{†††},
Svitlana Lehka^{†††}, Maryna Didenko^{†††}, Kostiantyn Hrubykh^{†††}

maxnik888@gmail.com

[†] Department of the Cinema and Television Arts, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

^{††} Department of Public Management and Administration, Vinnytsia Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi State Pedagogical University, Ukraine

^{†††} Department of the Television Journalism and Acting, Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts, Kyiv, Ukraine

Summary

The article notes that one of the reasons for the crisis in education was the sharp discrepancy between the emerging new forms and content and the model of macro-management that has developed over the decades. The level of management of the educational system did not emerge as a specific activity characterized by its own mechanisms and processes, just as qualified carriers of this activity - professionals - managers - did not appear. At the same time, there is practically no theoretical and methodological model of the macrolevel of education management, that is, management of the educational system as an integral structure.

Key words: organization system, management decisions, modeling, production systems, philosophy of management.

1. Introduction

Obtaining modern knowledge about management is not only to have a classical understanding of it, but also to understand its deep philosophical beginnings. Knowledge is the basic basis for the correct impact on the process of streamlining the life of renewed economic objects, the functioning of which is closely related to other processes taking place in society.

The classical control theory cannot remain unchanged, since the control objects and the environment of their functioning change. There is a need to move from the use of general and object-oriented management functions in the classical version to management as a management system based on the philosophy of the functioning and development of various types of society.

To streamline life in regional, municipalities, in organizations through small, special and very close to a specific person, it is necessary to have a management system, the general guidelines for the development of which are worked out by national public and state

institutions. The main subject of this system is a spiritualized person, focused on the preservation and enhancement of the original values and traditions of the people. The main goal of such a system of government on a national scale is to maintain the processes of functioning of a new community, formed on the basis of the vital principle of complementarity, ensuring strong sovereign unity and stability in the development of a multinational state.

Management of education systems is one of the most pressing problems in this area, as it is directly related to the quality and efficiency of educational institutions. The history of the development of national education systems indicates that the specific organization, forms and methods of education management largely depend on the characteristics of the political, economic and cultural traditions of society, on the specifics of the state structure and law [1, 2].

2. Theoretical Consideration

Despite the existing set of national education systems, in the field of education management, depending on how the powers in decision-making are distributed, two models have historically formed: centralized and decentralized.

The centralized model of management of the education system presupposes the concentration of decision-making rights, the concentration of power at the top level of management. Such a centralized management model (with some transfer of authority from the center to local authorities) is typical for Italy, Spain, Greece, Portugal, Luxembourg, and France.

The decentralized model of education management implies the transfer or delegation of responsibility for making a number of decisions, and hence the delegation of the rights corresponding to this responsibility to the lower levels of government. An active shift towards a decentralized model of education management was observed in the last twenty years of the twentieth century. In this regard, there are six

approaches to decentralization observed in the member states of the European Union. These are the dispersal of power among social partners, regional transfer of power, regional deconcentration, localization, institutional autonomy, marketization. The regional management model is typical for Austria, Germany, Belgium. Local control in the management of the education system is carried out in the countries: Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Ireland. Institutional autonomy is characteristic of the educational systems of the Netherlands and Great Britain[1,2].

The transformation of the educational system involves the implementation of a whole range of activities that would serve as a mechanism for the implementation of the tasks. The process of reforming education is usually focused on reforming the content of education, changing educational and methodological support and transforming the organizational structure of the model of various educational institutions. A deeper reform also affects the functioning of the entire structure of the educational system, which inevitably leads to a change in the relationships between individual elements of the system, as well as to the emergence of new structures.

The functioning of the education system in the previous conditions presupposed a high degree of centralization, which was reflected at all levels and structures of education. In a sense, this method of organizing the education system was the best fit for the order for education, which required the upbringing of a certain type of personality within the walls of educational institutions. This person had to be ready for life in the conditions of the domination of a totalitarian system, when the absence of democracy and civil society was compensated by developed stereotypes of behavior and ideologized forms of thinking. This, of course, led not only to the unification of educational institutions, but to the fact that all education was permeated with the spirit of uniformity. At the level of the formation of the content of education, centralization was embodied in unified approaches to the modeling of information blocks. The teaching of subjects in the socio-historical and humanitarian cycles was largely ideological in nature, which to a large extent also reflected the desire to obtain a certain type of personality as a result of education at school. Educational and methodological support was developed in the same way, when all similar educational institutions throughout the country studied using the same textbooks. The teaching methods looked similarly unified, although in a sense it was here that teachers had the greatest degree of freedom. Thus, a high degree of centralization ultimately formed a certain model of the school, which also required a certain type of management. This management model had its own specific features, which could be defined in the most general terms as the following:

- Availability of a developed system of management vertical, which effectively delegated authority and the implementation of management tasks from the center to the periphery of the system.

- Ensuring a high degree of controllability of the system through the implementation of command and control methods of management.
- Use of authoritarian methods of management of the education system.
- Practical absence of non-administrative levers of system management.
- Lack of special mechanisms for managing the educational system (systems for accrediting educational institutions, comparing education diplomas, assessing the quality of education, standardizing education, testing, etc.).
- Lack of public governing bodies of educational and institutions and public associations that have the right to influence the functioning of educational institutions (for example, associations with the right to accredit educational institutions).
- Lack of special institutions that would carry out the processes of regulation of the educational system by non-administrative methods (for example, educational audit institutions).
- Lack of qualified specialists in the field of education management and management of the education system as well.
- Lack of professionally trained specialists who, while not being managers, at the same time implement the mechanisms of democratic education management (for example, experts on the quality of education).

Such a management system met the goals and objectives of the functioning and development of the education system. The unconditional achievement of this education system can be considered the presence of a real universality of education and its accessibility to all citizens of the country without exception. It is also important that education was universal in nature, which made it possible to form a generation with a certain level of culture of intelligence and education. The disadvantage of this management system was that it could be effective only under certain conditions, since it was devoid of flexibility and was not capable of rapid changes and structural reforms. In general, we can say with a certain amount of stretch that in our country there was no management of the educational system in the full sense of the word. This happened because the management of the educational system was carried out according to the same scheme as the management of an educational institution, additional government bodies simply appeared (departments of public education, for example), which also considered the regional educational system as an educational institution that simply did not need other mechanisms and control algorithms, but simply in a different type of regulatory documents[3].

In these conditions, there was completely no idea that the national educational system is part of international education, an important principle of functioning of which is the free movement of students, their right, having started education in one system, to continue it in another, not to mention the right

of professors and teachers to teaching in different countries, which is one of the ways to manifest academic freedom.

The existing model of management of the educational system functioned effectively and ensured the development of the educational system with the means available to it until the moment when large-scale changes began in the country, which eventually caused the transformation of education. The inertial potential inherent in the management system of the educational system allowed it to launch the reform of education, which was carried out, first of all, through the formation of an idea of what should change in the content of education. The managers of the old school were able to call on a new generation of theorists and practicing teachers, rally them into creative associations and organize organizational and business games that were focused on developing a new vision of the educational system.

A new model was formed, its individual elements were embodied in specific educational practice, new types of educational institutions, new programs and textbooks, new methods and technologies of education appeared. In fact, all the elements of the new educational system were created, especially since the principles of its existence were also obvious: democracy, decentralization, public control over education, etc. But the new education system, nevertheless, did not emerge, since the old model was replaced by its improved version, which ultimately turned into a real crisis in the education system. This happened partly due to the deterioration of the economic situation in the country during the transition period, and partly because the new ideal model of education was not supplemented by new models of the educational system and management of the educational system. In the presence of a huge number of innovations in the education system (educational institutions of a new type, a non-state education system, changes in the content of education and teaching technologies, the emergence of educational and methodological complexes, etc.), there has been no real change in the management of the educational system. The imperatives of development, nevertheless, dictated the need for the emergence of new forms. This is how the system of accreditation of educational institutions appeared in the education system, but only by the state and not by the public. In fact, a new type of activity appeared, but there were still no professionals able to engage in this activity - certified experts in assessing the quality of education. The new activity was not provided with elementary modern ideas about the quality of education and its monitoring, not to mention the system for comparing the quality of education. The development of education standards began in the country, which was carried out in an extremely short time, which was hampered by the lack of a developed theory of standardization and models of testing achievements in education, without which the real launch of education standards is impossible. Huge loads on the education system led to its imbalance, since the principle of continuity of education was violated, and at once in several links of the

educational chain (preschool education - primary school, primary school - secondary school, secondary school - higher school). The lack of uniform management standards for the non-state and state higher education system led to excessive workloads on higher education, and then to a significant decline in those entering higher educational institutions due to the general decline in the birth rate in the country.

Thus, it should be noted that one of the reasons for the crisis in education was the sharp discrepancy between the emerging new forms and content and the model of macro-management that has developed over the decades. The level of management of the educational system did not emerge as a specific activity characterized by its own mechanisms and processes, just as qualified carriers of this activity - professionals - managers - did not appear. At the same time, there is practically no theoretical and methodological model of the macrolevel of education management, that is, management of the educational system as an integral structure[5].

The management of the national education system can be viewed as an aggregate activity for the design, organization, regulation and development of various, but closely interrelated objects. First of all, we are talking about various types of management aimed at various areas of the educational space and educational environment. One should take into account the ambiguity of interpretations of these concepts in modern educational and pedagogical discourse. Therefore, first of all, it is necessary to highlight the following pair of concepts: management of the educational system - management of the educational space.

The educational system is a set of educational institutions and mechanisms for the implementation of interaction between these institutions. The educational system can be both regional and national. The educational space is a broader concept than the educational system. It includes not only institutions, but mass media focused on education, the public involved in solving educational problems, as well as the prevailing educational theories and socio-psychological stereotypes that regulate people's behavior regarding their attitude to education. Thus, the educational space is a concept that is to a large extent more complex and diverse than the educational system, which, of course, cannot affect the specifics of management either.

Macro-management in education has two levels of management: management of the educational system (national and regional levels) and management of the educational space. Since the educational space is a concept that is largely more complex and diverse than the educational system, the possibilities for real management of this space are largely limited. In fact, we can only talk about some regulation and harmonization of interests, about attempts to influence, carried out not so much through direct guidance and directives, but through a clear setting of educational goals, a good knowledge of the mechanisms for the development of education and familiarity with various theories and practices

of international education. Only such mechanisms make it possible to create a flexible and developing model for managing the regional educational space[8].

Thus, the education manager must clearly understand not only the management mechanisms, but also the boundaries of their capabilities in each specific case, which, of course, is the key to successful management activities. Attempts to plan and organize a national or regional educational space in all details and aspects, to build all possible relationships based on the fact that management will be carried out from one center of strategic planning, are doomed to failure, no matter how rational and scientifically grounded. Effective managerial activity is possible only if specific mechanisms are used to regulate the interaction of various institutions of the educational system with all the phenomena of social and spiritual life in one way or another related to the field of education.

Of no small importance for the development of the educational space is the development of educational thinking, as well as educational theory. It should be noted that the carriers of this type of thinking should be not only representatives of the education sector, but also managers of all levels responsible for the development of various spheres of society. Thus, it is advisable for managers at various levels to provide special training in the theory and practice of education management and especially management of educational systems. Constant work on the development of the educational culture of the whole society is also of great importance.

Management of educational systems involves the consistent implementation of the function of designing and programming education, as well as the use of special tools for regulating the functioning and development of educational systems. These instruments include, first of all, mechanisms for ensuring the continuity of education, standardization of education, comparison of diplomas, assessment of the quality of education, accreditation of educational institutions and testing. Thus, we can say that the specificity of education management at the national and regional level is the need to ensure the internal stability of the education system and, above all, its continuity, as well as the implementation of the principles of coexistence with other educational systems, that is, providing opportunities to continue education in other regions and countries.

The most important feature of management in education is the need to implement the design and programming functions. In a sense, we can say that these functions are the most essential for the management of the regional educational system. The most important part of the project activity is the description of the technologies for the implementation of the project and the resources that are required for this. The concept of resources should be as broad as possible and include not only material resources, but also intellectual, human resources, etc. Project implementation technologies should also be sufficiently multivariate and complementary to

each other. The success of the project largely depends on this. An important aspect of project activity is a constant reflection of the actions taken, which allows you to respond in time to the difficulties that have arisen in the implementation of the project and adjust the technology and the activity plan.

The success of the management of the regional educational system depends to a large extent on the success of the project activity, which is the core of management activity, and on how high-quality the products of this activity are, embodied in the design and normative documentation. At the same time, the content of the activity is to ensure the continuity and integrity of education within the educational system and the possibility of interaction between various educational systems on the scale of world education. In fact, this means that the management of the educational system should, first of all, be focused on ensuring the integrity of the system, which is the key to its successful functioning and development. Ensuring integrity is possible only as a balance of internal stability and external relationship with other educational systems.

In the conditions of democratization of society, education, more and more acquiring the character of an open system, has the possibility of a variable path of development. At the same time, in a multicomponent system in education there is a constant movement, the result of which is the transition of its structures and subsystems from one ordered state to another. Thus, the processes of self-organization in the educational system are always inevitable. On the one hand, they spontaneously "encroach" on the destruction of the integrity of the system, and on the other hand, they spontaneously "report" the emergence of new sources of development. The quantitative and qualitative characteristics of these processes are determined by the internal conditions of the system, including resource conditions, as well as by the measure of influence on the system from the outside[1-4].

The attitude of society and the state to this is different. The need for a variety of educational content is increasingly being formed in society, which clearly stimulates the processes of self-organization. However, the system governing education tries to maintain its integrity while not taking into account the promising needs of society, does not take into account that education as a "complex evolutionary whole" includes a large number of structures and subsystems, the rate of development of which may not coincide with the rate of development of the whole.

One gets the impression that the governing system is distancing itself from the educational system. Individual acts and even programs adopted outside the general context further exacerbate the contradiction that has arisen, which, in turn, becomes the cause of problems in educational systems of different levels, including in educational institutions[8-13]. Innovative activity is a qualitative stage in the self-development of an individual, the process of self-actualization of the subjects of the educational process, which became possible as a result of self-education,

self-reflection. Therefore, educational institutions carrying out innovative activities are especially characterized by the processes of self-organization in the pedagogical and student environment, it can be the emergence of stable structures (creative groups, associations), and the emergence of creative individuals capable of creating a "personality-new", regardless of the previous public experience. The degree of activity of the environment also changes, which leads to an expansion of the educational space, a change in the relationship with it of all its subjects participating in the educational process. In these conditions, management becomes a backbone factor in the further development of the system. The problem of the optimal ratio of purposeful organizing influence and self-organization appears, which will allow preserving not only the integrity of a single one, but also a share of chaos as a source of self-organization and order in a single one[9].

In a dynamically changing social environment, the management of the educational process should be of an anticipatory, preventive nature. At the same time, the efficiency of managerial decisions becomes so high that it is impossible to implement and develop them at the level of high administrative echelons. This implies more and more the transfer of managerial functions, including strategic ones, to the level of school administrations, pedagogical collectives of various educational levels and even to the level of small creative groups of teachers, including class teachers, individual teachers (masters, tutors, innovators). The latter is possible in innovative educational institutions, in which the number of participants in management is much greater than in a standard educational institution. At the same time, some of the degrees of freedom associated with the administrative form of management are transferred to free creative groups, associations or teachers. The so-called enriched educational environment with a multivariate choice arises, living according to its own synergetic laws, the laws of self-organization and creative dynamic chaos, which generates new goals (meanings), values and creative impulses. This new educational environment requires special care for itself and new delicate forms of management. In such an educational space, the managing subject is delocalized and inseparable from the participants in the educational process. This is its synergetic essence, and that is why synergetics is viewed as an approach that is adequate to modernity in education.

In these conditions, the administration takes on the functions that generate the development strategy, including:

- forced reaction to self-organization in a general education institution. This function can be defined as catching up;
- initiation of innovations. This is a forward control function;

To clarify this approach, it is necessary to consider the role of administrative management in a general educational

institution of the pre-perestroika period, during the period of democratization of society and in a democratic civil society.

In the first case, the administration is a conductor of standards and regulatory instructions, the initiative of the teaching staff is minimal, it is local in nature, an example is individual innovative teachers who were known to the entire school. The administration is practically passive to innovations from below, which corresponds to the principles of rigid centralization characteristic of the Soviet period of social development.

At the present stage, in the conditions of democratization of society, the management system is increasingly acquiring a state-public character, which is enshrined in the law on education. Councils of educational institutions have been created everywhere, which are supposed to provide feedback between the teams of teachers, students and parents with the administration, adjusting its decisions taking into account the tendencies of self-organization in educational spaces. However, only at first glance, this scheme ensures that internal and external social views and trends in the development of society are taken into account. In fact, the time between the adoption of a managing administrative decision, its implementation and adjustment (feedback) is quite long in modern conditions. Here we are dealing with a "catching up" and, in many cases, a hopelessly lagging control system. Correction often takes place by trial and error in finding the best option and is hopelessly lagging behind already changed living conditions. Such a system of consistent, slow groping for optimal solutions is ineffective in modern conditions, especially in the future[7].

The most appropriate is the third - the innovation-synergetic management system. In this system, the administration is no longer a passive, waiting participant in the innovation chain performing only stimulus-response functions. The role of administration, in addition to homeostatic functions, functions of responding to initiatives from below, is complemented by the function of preventive, anticipatory management, carried out by generating parallel, alternative fields of possible initiatives presented to any subjects of the educational space. This occurs not only within the corridor of admissible functions of homeostasis, but also due to the processes of self-organization in the educational space, for example, in the direction of a qualitative new development of the educational program. And these are by no means the only initiatives. And other opportunities can be generated by the processes of self-organization in the educational space. The emerging variety of parallel paths of development of the educational process makes it possible to quickly select and maintain the most optimal of them. The implementation of advanced, innovative administrative management allows creating an educational space with high adaptive properties and a high reaction rate to the challenges of rapidly changing social conditions. In addition, such a synergistic system, to a large extent modeling the very social environment of the modern world, influences its development,

because in education, like in no other sphere, the future is presented in the present [2-5].

In accordance with the principles of synergetics, a model for managing the educational space has been built. In this model, the purpose of management is such a coordinated interaction of the elements of the system, which would ensure the functioning of the elements and the existence of the entire system as a whole, ensure the preservation and development of the education system, create conditions for the development of communication links between educational institutions of the region. Ultimately, the goal of management is to create conditions for the development of the individual. The task of management is to optimize the interaction of mutually exclusive processes of conservation and change that take place in the educational space. This task can be presented as a complex of tasks of two levels: a) tactical - management of spontaneously formed diversity and b) strategic - management of the very process of the emergence of diversity.

In an open system, new elements of diversity that arise spontaneously threaten the existing system of connections, demand their place in this system, invade it, violating its unity. To preserve this unity, it is necessary that management be of a preventive nature, anticipate the emergence of new elements, maintain flexibility, variability of connections between elements, and maintain a certain measure of their freedom. This will make it possible to preserve the unity of elements in their relation to each other, to provide conditions for the emergence of new elements, to increase the degree of their diversity. The emergence of the new is possible where there are great opportunities for this, where there is great freedom of choice.

The condition for the formation of self-organizing structures is the presence of forming flows. In education, we note the following types of flows: informational (degree of communication), resource (time, finances, personnel and material support). In turn, the management of the self-organization process can be represented by three main types:

- Parametric: Creates and commits control streams that are control parameters. This is the current medium-term management, in a state of norm, management at the macro level.

- Dynamic: situational, quick response, decision-making at points of choice, bifurcations, states of instability and dynamic chaos. Management of short-term processes at the micro level.

- Game: establishing the rules of communication, the logic of interactions. Strategic, long-term management at the mega-level.

Thus, tradition, large-scale modeling emerges.

With these types of management, the educational space is self-organizing due to its order parameters, in other words, collective variables arising in the process of dynamic

hierarchization of the system of relations between the subjects of the environment.

Conclusions

One of the distinctive features of the modern education system is the transition from state to state-public administration of education. The essence of state and public administration is to combine the efforts of the state and society in solving the problems of education.

The presence of problems in the management of the educational system. These include:

- fragmentation of joint activities of society, the education system and the media for the dissemination of educational, educational, scientific and educational programs and other materials;
- imperfection of forms and insufficient activation of the participation of professional associations and associations of educational institutions, pedagogical and scientific workers, parents (legal representatives) and public organizations in the implementation of state policy in the field of education;
- the practical absence of forms and methods for the development of self-government of students;
- underdevelopment of the legal framework for the relationship between providers of educational services, students and their parents.

Despite the presence of problems, it should be noted that the current state of management of the education system is characterized by the process of creating a new decentralized management model, and it is possible that the management theories developed by scientists will be implemented.

References

- [1] Alekseev N.G. Principles and criteria for the examination of education development programs. Methodological issues 1994, NN 1,2.
- [2] Coombs PH. The World education crisis. A systems analysis. Paris, 1968.
- [3] Coombs P.H. The World crisis in education: the view from the eighties. New York, 1985.
- [4] Encyclopedia of Global Studies / Ed. H.K. Anheier, M. Juergens Meyr. Los Angeles, London and others, 2012.
- [5] GEO-5. Global'naya ekologicheskaya perspektiva. Rezyume dlya politikov. YuNEP. Nairobi, 2012.

- [6] Botkin J., Elmanjra M., Malitza M. No limits to Learning. Bridging the Human Gap. A Report to the Club of Rome. Oxford. 1979.
- [7] Itogovyi dokument Konferentsii OON po ustoichivomu razvitiyu «Budushchee, kotorogo my khotim» // URL: <http://www.un.org/ru/sustainablefuture>
- [8] Iasechko, M., Shelukhin, O., Maranov, A.: Evaluation of the use of inertial navigation systems to improve the accuracy of object navigation. International journal of computer science and network security, 2021, 21, 3, p. 71-75. Available at: http://paper.ijcsns.org/07_book/202103/20210310.pdf.
- [9] Mykhailo Sherman, Yaroslav Martynyshyn, Olena Khlystun, Liubov Chukhrai, Yuliia Kliuchko, Uliana Savkiv. Optimization of the Educational Environment Using Information Technologies. IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security, VOL.21 No.4, April 2021. pp. 80-83.
- [10] Lazorko, O, Zhanna, V., Yahupov, V., Valchuk-Orkusha, O., Melnyk, I., & Sherman, M. (2021). The Safety of Professionalization Subjects in Psychological and Neuropsychological Aspects. BRAIN. Broad Research in Artificial Intelligence and Neuroscience, 12(1), 19-39.
- [11] M. Iasechko, O. Shelukhin, A.Maranov, S.Lukianenko, O. Basarab, O.Hutchenko (2021). Evaluation of The Use of Inertial Navigation Systems to Improve The Accuracy of Object Navigation. IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security. Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 71-75.
- [12] S. Piskunov, M. Iasechko, O. Yuhno, N. Polstiana, Y. Gnusov, K. Bashynskiy, A.Kozyr. (2021). Application Of Probability Filter For Maintenance Of Air Objects. IJCSNS International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security. Vol. 21 No. 5, pp. 31-34.
- [13] M. Iasechko, N. Sachaniuk-Kavets'ka, V.Kostrysia, V.Nikitchenko and S. Iasechko. The results of simulation of the process of occurrence of damages to the semiconductor elements under the influence of multi-frequency signals of short duration, Journal of Critical Reviews, 7(12), 2020, pp. 109 - 112. doi:10.31838/jcr.07.13.18.