Е. Ю. Илалтдинова, Т. Н. СЕРГЕЕВА, С. В. ФРОЛОВА

Институциональная идентичность педагогического образования: проблемы и тенденции развития

Введение. Происходящие геополитические и социально-экономические глобальные изменения, несомненно, оказывают сильнейшее влияние на образовательные системы в целом и на парадигму педагогического образования в частности. Актуальной представляется способность образовательных экосистем предвосхищать возможные перемены, своевременно на них реагировать, а в идеале, – делать эти изменения управляемыми.

Материалы и методы. Контент-анализа педагогической литературы, источниковедческий метод, сравнительное описание, бинарный анализ, лингвистический анализ.

Результаты исследования. Анализ социокультурных и образовательных трендов, а также университетских трендов и собственно трендов педагогического образования позволил прийти к выводу об институциональном кризисе педагогического образования.

Обсуждение результатов. Посткритической фазой развития институциональной идентичности педагогического университета выступает этап формирования и внедрения новой институциональной модели педагогического образования – Открытого педагогического образования будущего (ОПОБ). Трансрегиональная открытая проектная образовательная институция осуществляет подготовку кадров для построения экономики знаний, является инновационным базовым центром повышения профессионального мастерства педагогов, а также ресурсным центром передовых образовательных проектов, обеспечивающим системную подготовку агентов инноваций.

Заключение. Открытое педагогическое образование будущего должно стать основой создания новой управляемой образовательно-педагогической реальности, которая, в свою очередь, станет фундаментом новой педагогики.

Ключевые слова: педагогическое образование, институциональный кризис, тенденции развития, тренды развития, миссия университета

Ссылка для цитирования:

Илалтдинова Е. Ю., Сергеева Т. Н., Фролова С. В. Институциональная идентичность педагогического образования: проблемы и тенденции развития // Перспективы науки и образования. 2021. № 2 (50). С. 70-87. doi: 10.32744/pse.2021.2.5

E. YU. ILALTDINOVA, S. V. FROLOVA, T. N. SERGEEVA

Institutional identity of pedagogical education: problems and development trends

Introduction. The ongoing geopolitical and socio-economic global changes, undoubtedly, have a strong impact on educational systems in general and on the paradigm of pedagogical education in particular. The ability of educational ecosystems to anticipate possible changes, respond to them in a timely manner, and, ideally, to make these changes manageable, seems to be relevant.

Materials and methods. Content analysis of pedagogical literature, source study method, comparative description, binary analysis, linguistic analysis.

Results. The analysis of socio-cultural and educational tendencies, as well as the university trends and the actual trends in pedagogical education, let the authors conclude that pedagogical education faces an institutional crisis.

Discussion. The post-critical phase of development of the pedagogical university's institutional identity is represented by a stage of formation and implementation of a new institutional model of pedagogical education – Open Pedagogical Education of the Future (OPEF). The open transregional project-based educational institution trains personnel for constructing a knowledge economy; it is an innovational basic centre for improving pedagogues' professional mastery, as well as a resource centre for advanced educational projects providing systemic training of innovation agents.

Conclusion. The open pedagogical education of the future should become a basis for creating a new manageable educational and pedagogical reality which, in turn, will become a foundation of the new pedagogy.

Keywords: pedagogical education, institutional crisis, development tendencies, development trends, university mission

For Reference:

Ilaltdinova, E. Yu., Frolova, S. V., & Sergeeva, T. N. (2021). Institutional identity of pedagogical education: problems and development trends. *Perspektivy nauki i obrazovania – Perspectives of Science and Education*, 50 (2), 70-87. doi: 10.32744/pse.2021.2.5

Introduction

Modern society is characterized by a number of persistent challenges, expressed back in 1987 in the form of “VUCA-world”. Over time, the situation of social changes and the growth of their pace intensifies, the social mechanisms of interaction become more complex, and the transition to a digital model of society is gradually taking place: digital economy, digital education, robotization, virtual communication space. The digital age is a new era that has emerged.

The period of powerful growth of technologization and the pace of globalization of the last few decades allows us to speak of an unprecedented rate of change in society, when we have already gone beyond the image of the notorious VUCA world in the version of the late 80s of the 20th century. Today, this concept no longer reflects the essence of the modern world – from volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity, we move to suspense, unpredictability, dispersion and diversity. School, society, family must learn to prepare a child for action in unpredictable situations, for life in a world without a single paradigm of values, for the using of technologies that have not yet been created.

H. Ortega y Gasset, on the threshold of the technical revolution, as early as 1930, noted that "an excess of technical and cultural wealth threatens mankind with a catastrophe, since it is more and more difficult for each new generation to master them" [5, p. 87]. Today the moment has come to realize that it is impossible to master them all. There is a completely different goal of education – to teach “learn and unlearn” in a situation of rapid renewal and change, initiate your own educational request, analyze and select information in conditions of deepfake content, manage your education and personalized career trajectory throughout life in conditions of obsolescence or disappearance of chosen profession in the labor market.

The storm that awaits the world is already approaching us, bringing radical changes to all areas of human life. The education sector, including higher pedagogical education, is no exception [1]. Predicting changes in education is complicated by the fact that it is difficult to predict exactly when and how radical changes will finally turn the world of education upside down, because their pace is fast and their nature is unpredictable. An example of such a change is the unforeseen large-scale transition to distance learning online in the spring of 2020, caused by external global factors – the threat of the spread of coronavirus infection (COVID-19) [16].

Large-scale innovations in the world economy and its cyclical changes create the preconditions for the transformation of educational systems, geopolitical and socio-economic relations lead to the creation of a single global educational space, between the participants of which there is a continuous "dialogue" that contributes to a constant feeling of the need to update educational ecosystems.

The paradigm of the pedagogical university, as an initial conceptual scheme, recognized by everyone and giving the community a certain vision of the situation and a model for posing problems and solving them, is under the pressure of changes, which cannot be ignored, but better be managed, or at least anticipated. It is necessary to analyze socio-cultural and educational trends, as well as university trends and the actual trends in teacher education, in order to form a new identity of higher teacher education and create a chain of balanced reactions to these changes.

Materials and methods

The material for the research was the official documents of the Russian Federation and foreign countries, a wide array of scientific periodicals on the problems of higher pedagogical education in Russian and English. As a leading methodological guideline, it was accepted that identifying trends in the development of the university in general and the pedagogical university in particular will allow not only to predict the future of the pedagogical university, but also to manage this future effectively. The peculiarities of the problem underlying the study determined the need to use content analysis of pedagogical literature on the approaches, principles of historicism and dialectical parallelism, and as methods: source study method, comparative description, binary analysis, linguistic analysis (for correct interpretation of terms). Attention is drawn to the socio-cultural, economic and political context of teacher education systems in Russia and abroad.

Research results

1. Sociocultural and educational trends

The change in the space of the XXI century as a phenomenon of socio-cultural reality is expressed in the leading trends in the transformation of the global economy, geopolitical decisions, management of social ecosystems, digitalization, multiculturalism, increasing complexity and rate of change, automation, demographic and social changes.

The IFTF Report "Future work skills 2020" describes 6 drivers of change in the modern world: extreme longevity, rise of smart machines and systems, computational world, new media ecology, superstructured organizations, global globally connected world [15, p. 4-6].

The first trend among significant changes in the sociocultural space is the erasure of old and the birth of new norms of social relationships. The right of absolute freedom in the formation of personal identity as a set of social constructs leads to the loss of the traditional way of life. Such freedom can have an impact on the gradual disappearance of the crisis of personal identity, expressed in the discrepancy between the I-real and the I-ideal, since the I-ideal no longer exists. Usually, any situation of dissatisfaction with something is a stimulus for development and change. The absence of a situation of dissatisfaction can contribute to "stagnation" or even regression, no matter how paradoxical the idea seems at first glance. It is possible to change the nature of the stimulus for human activity, which will certainly have an impact on all spheres of human life.

Multiculturalism, ideas about non-binary gender identity, the phenomenon of the family and its perception in the modern world, etc., create the basis for the emergence of a new system of values that lay the foundation for new goals of upbringing and the character of personality maturation. Russia is perhaps the most conservative in this regard (but at the same time progressive on the frontier of changes), and this does not refute the idea that fundamental changes are already on the threshold of today.

The strengthening tendency for the development of a new personal identity is manifested in the second trend - the formation of a "new type of childhood", which presupposes a different pedagogical interaction, and, as a consequence, the emergence of a new type of adults.

The emergence of a new generation of children is convincingly illustrated in Michel Serres's essay "Petite Poucette" [8]. Children learn, integrate, synthesize differently than

we, their predecessors, they live in virtual reality. Judging by the data of cognitive sciences, surfing the World Wide Web, reading or typing messages, searching on Wikipedia or Facebook activate neurons and areas of the cerebral cortex other than a book, blackboard or copybook. Children can easily access multiple sources of information simultaneously.

Any structure of "childhood", which we consider as a metaphor, is a simplified version of the understanding of "growing up," a complex typology of "childhood," which today the World Health Organization extends to 30 years. On the one hand, such a duration of a homogeneous period within the framework of age periodization raises great doubts and requires additional substantiation, on the other hand, within the framework of the concept of education throughout life, it even seems insufficient.

Demographic and social shifts contribute to the allocation of three hypotheses of "childhood" and, accordingly, three tasks of education, determined in accordance with a specific "hypothesis", in formal and informal institutionalization [5, p. 23].

The first hypothesis – "childhood-1" – assumes that a "growing up" person is an object of "growing up" processes external to him. In this position, it is assumed that some difficulties and "anomalies" will be overcome when the object "matures", becomes "adult" and reach the norm of development. Thus, the stage of active formation and development, both in personal and professional terms, is considered as a deviation from the norm, a short period of preparation for a future state, requiring external influences expressed in paternalistic attitudes. The leading task of education is striving for the norm as an ideal of development.

The second hypothesis – "childhood-2" – assumes that "growing up" is an independent, equal subject of relationships, formulating goals and determining the content of joint activities. Thus, "growing up" becomes a process of co-creation in a nonlinear sequence of events, the essence and result which is the formation of a conventional norm. The task of education is understood as the co-configuration of personal vocational and educational success for the sake of a civil convention, based on the meanings of natural changes.

The third hypothesis – "childhood-3" – considers the "maturing person" as an agent of change, "innovatics", providing the transition from linear procedures of formation and development to upward advancing development and the emergence of "new" in the specific results and products of his purposeful activity. In this context, the task is related to the provision of the logistics of self-realization of giftedness in the real process of creating a new one, and not the simulation of innovation.

The first type is well understood by us, it is absolutely preserving, and is distinguished by such qualities as teleology, communication, the ability for self-development, social responsibility, criticality, the ability to self-restraint, the ability to preserve tradition, environmental friendliness, citizenship, health preservation.

The second type is ascending, characterized by such signs as revolutionaryism, titanism, demiurgism, culculativeism, neocinism, ethics of nondiscrimination, futuromorphism, suppletivism in creating new things in any way, but not at any cost for the sake of converting into a clear and understandable result with the absolutization of the implementation effect and obtaining a financial result. We observe a rejection of tradition, a devaluation of archetypes, hard points and personal centers of tradition. This type does not admit the possibility that there is something that cannot be realized.

The third type is what is least developed in pedagogy, what constitutes genuine giftedness, what just needs to be analyzed in detail. This type of childhood gives rise to a new type of student, for which the educational space must be ready, triggering the requirement for the processes of renewal – the changing status and role of the teacher,

social needs and social expectations, methods and ways of teaching, educational content, etc.

That is where an urgent need arises to find a new institutional model of teacher education capable of responding to these challenges. But at the same time, the complexity of pedagogical education lies in the fact that it is necessary to work simultaneously and in parallel with different types of childhood, taking into account their specificity, to organize their interaction in various combinations.

The context of the "new type of childhood" entails the pedagogical problem of giftedness [13] and determines the next trend – increased competition for talents – in all spheres – both in education and in the professional environment. Universities are looking for talent, employers are no longer focused on finding performers. The paradigm shift from the industrial model of education to the integral one enhances the importance of new types of literacy and the individual potential of every person who is able to “learn, unlearn and relearn” [4]. This determines the need to search for new solutions, one of which is indicated in the report "Russia 2025: Resetting the Talent Balance" [7] as “enhancing the educational system’s flexibility by means of significantly mitigating the regulation of educational activities”. The ability to "learn, unlearn and relearn" throughout a person's life gives an understanding of the need for a plurality and diversity of entry groups into the profession, which replaces a single "classic" option for a young specialist after graduation.

II. University trends

The educational space as part of the socio-cultural landscape by all means cannot but experience the consequences of the impact of social changes in such conditions. However, among other categories of social spaces and environments, educational space seems to be the slowest to respond to the need for change: the growing rate of social change is so fast that educational reality, which is conservative in essence, lags behind practical environmental solutions; emerging concepts often do not find practical application even in the experimental context of education, and the transfer of new ideas into mass practice, to school occurs with an obvious delay.

The first trend that we note is the emergence of a new type of relationship between teacher and student as a natural reflection of the emergence of a new type of people. A generation of students living in a digital space and a world of new values from birth generate a certain demand for new qualities of teachers and the nature of relationships. In attempts to determine the nature of the relationship "professor - student", "student - teacher" the most popular point of view is about the priority of students, students as the main "clients", consumers, subjects of education. We come across such point of view both in Russian scientific research on education, and in the reports of major foreign experts.

However, this seems to be the main misconception. In fact, nobody is prime. All holders of educational dialogue are important – this indicates the absence of a vertical hierarchy in the educational space, the subjects of educational relations form a network, a network-centric community.

If we define the phenomenon of education through the metaphor of dialogue, then can we say that only one of the “participants” is the speaking actor? Will there be a dialogue in this case and will it ever take place? Absolute joint development, mastering and design of educational reality give rise to an understanding the normal type of interaction between student and teacher. The network-centric community of education stakeholders as a “community of interconnected people” (E. L. Glaeser), a university as a “rational community”, “a microcosm of a pure public sphere” [6, p. 38] (B. Readings) should have

a general intention to create a better education through immersion in the experience of communication, co-action, co-creation, co-knowledge and co-experience.

Certainly, the university should be guided by the educational request of the student. The material, physical expression of the university, of course, must and will be transformed from the metaphor "teacher's house" to the image of "student's house" – this is the main transformation of university campuses, due to which "designation", the appropriation of university space by the student, lies.

However, it is absolutely wrong to regard the professor outside the framework of this "house" as a metaphor for denoting and assigning space in the rank of personal values. Here we see the need for student-professorial collaborations and their conventional interaction.

With the emergence of new interactions and a new type of social space, the second trend becomes obvious: the model of higher education and teaching at the university is outdated. This feeling is very vividly conveyed in the essay of M. Barber, K. Donnelly, S. Rizvi "An avalanche is coming. Higher education and the revolution ahead". Today, researchers predict the prosperity of new university models built on the basis of new trends in the digital world.

Traditional organization of university into faculties and chairs slows down the development of innovative breakthrough research, as the most part of such research is interdisciplinary.

There is a gradual going beyond the transmission of objectively organized knowledge. The leading form of educational activity is strategic project work in teams, based on the principles of cooperation, an important attribute of which is joint immersion in educational reality, the emotional response of everyone, the reliability of the significance of personified educational results.

The role of the lecturing professor is changing – the functions of a tutor, mentor, expert, organizer, participant of joint work with a student are becoming more and more in demand. The curriculum is insensitive to technological progress and the changes that follow.

Devaluation of the diploma and traditional assessments of knowledge is observed: the diploma is losing its significance, it is determined, first of all, massive spread of higher education. Assessment tools at the university are undergoing changes. The formal assessment of the student's achievements and the grades in the diploma are not so important – what matters most are the competencies and experience, the student's involvement in various types of professional activities in other communities, a professionally oriented background.

The third global trend unites several trends, among which, in particular, is the trend towards university openness. The university space is not the only place for student education and growth. The space for professional growth is opening, the connection of the university with the region and the national education sector and the global educational space is being updated. Traditional university education is no longer responding to the challenges of our time - its closed walls are no longer able to respond to new challenges.

The quality of university education directly affects the economic well-being of the region and the country as a whole. There is a growing trend of the influence of universities on the prosperity of the region and urban space. The main subjects of the dialogue here are employing organizations, public and private sector companies, public organizations, business communities working for short or long term prospects, depending on the nature of the tasks and type of activity, etc.

We are witnessing an open space of education: the strengthening trend of distance education, online education, a teacher "in the cloud". This is a completely new reality, which,

as 2020 has shown, is not just additional education or a trend of the last decade, but can be considered as a key tool in organization of educational processes of various institutions – from high school, colleges and universities to institutions of additional education: online training, online drawing, online lessons in music schools, etc.

The trend towards educational independence can also be referred to this trend. The open educational space of the university becomes endless not only due to the mobility of its subjects, but also due to their dispersion in it – the physical space is complemented by the virtual educational space. The open space of education is also directly related to the growing popularity of massive open online courses. “Today, teaching outside the walls of the classroom often turns out to be more significant than teaching within these walls” [1, p. 187]. A professor can, without leaving their home, lecture an infinite number of students in one limited period of time, while a student can “move” into the educational space of any university without leaving his room. The possibility of embedding everyone in the open landscape of education is realized only if there is a conscious independence of the student.

The essence of the fourth trend, in our opinion, lies in the fact that the functions of the university are steadily distributed among other institutions and organizations outside its walls. What place does the university occupy in this diverse social and educational ecosystem? Competition among universities is growing not only in their academic niche, but also in the space of other education stakeholders and organizations against the backdrop of the global economic crisis, which cannot but have an impact on the university.

According to Barber, Donnelly and Rizvi, it is very likely that the cyclical nature of the crises will cause universities to stop receiving adequate funding, the quality of teaching will decline, and the student-to-faculty ratio will increase. Obviously, such a situation will severely hit the competitiveness of the university in relation to other open educational institutions, education in which is economically more profitable [14].

The scattered knowledge and its economic availability affect the decline of the university as an educational institution, since such constructs of the university – lecturers and the library – no longer have a monopoly on knowledge in the context of a variety of sources of knowledge – not only a textbook and scientific articles, but tweets, hash tags, posts, videos, online courses, forums, blogs.

The mismatch between labor market expectations, student expectations, and what universities offer is another pressing problem for universities. The mismatch between the needs of the new generation and what education offers is complemented by a third agent – the labor market. The lack of connection between education and life is an eternal problem of fundamental education.

The situation of rapid change in social and cultural constructs in an open multipolar space determines the complexity of strategic education management, since it is extremely difficult to build any strategy to stay ahead in a situation of total obscurity, there is only an “intuitive” movement based on ideas divorced from reality.

The listed tendencies indicate that the university cannot be the same and is already being transformed. The university is in a state of struggle for survival in a situation of increasing competition among other providers of educational services, quasi-environments of professional experience.

III. Trends in teacher education

Among the other trends of pedagogical education that we have identified, let us especially note the universal nature of pedagogical education, in other words, pedagogy for everyone. The universality of pedagogical knowledge for human life has always been

recognized. Today representatives of various professional spheres and the daily life of each person and the community as a whole find the need for pedagogical knowledge. Building family relationships and raising children, leading a professional community and organizing labor relations in a team – all this is permeated with a pedagogical meaning and is built on the basis of well-known pedagogical principles. New branches of pedagogy are being born and actualized – business pedagogy, adult education, educational entrepreneurship, instructional design, etc., behind which, on the one hand, is the differentiation of pedagogical work and the emergence of new pedagogical professions, and on the other hand, the "pedagogy" of various spheres of life.

In this regard, we know absolutely for sure that the client-user of pedagogical education today may not have a direct relationship to the "school". This means that the educational space of the pedagogical university is being saturated with new educational needs and programs. But at the same time, there is a need for new opportunities for entering the teaching profession, forming a request for the content of teacher education programs, new educational technologies and formats – variable training trajectories based on the universality of pedagogical knowledge for the social sphere.

The second most important trend is, in our opinion, the actualization of education in the continuity of the tasks of transforming pedagogical theory and practice, the generation of new pedagogy in the joint activities of teachers and students, in the development of this social and humanitarian knowledge. In the essay of M. Barber, K. Donnelly and S. Rizvi "An avalanche is coming. Higher education and the revolution ahead" the need to educate an "inspired generation" is reasonably mentioned. Representatives of this generation are "ready to bear personal responsibility, both for themselves and for the world around them" [1, p. 156]. However, this is not really the problematic issue. The real problem is finding the answer to the questions - what is the generation inspired by? What values? These questions are much more difficult to answer. And this is due to the lack of a single measure and norm: the last decades have been characterized by the blurring of the boundaries of social norms.

In other words, it seems that in a multipolar world, in the chaos of changes and social transformations, there is no single system of values. This is where the idea of "ethical improvisation" emerges. The obvious disadvantages of these ideas convince us even more that we, first of all, need to deal with the value content of human thought and behavior, the boundaries of permissibility, the proper and the unacceptable, and not just designate the generation as "inspired" and tolerant people, whose value system is drowning in relativism. "Ethical improvisation" will contribute to the already progressive social destruction.

This is compounded by the enthusiasm or threat of online learning and teachers in the cloud. In these conditions, the attainability of educational effects is questionable, which means not only the assimilation of knowledge, but the acquisition of special (set, including at the state level) personality traits and skills that allow one to socialize, build a strategy for one's own life in a changing unknown world and change this world for the better with their productive activities.

Online courses, as well as education in general, provide "... the content side of learning, but they do not allow to ensure and control the formation of more general personality traits in students, necessary for success in the labor market or in society in the XXI century" [1, p. 201].

When education is reduced to the transfer of knowledge, "moral relativism" begins to be perceived in society as a threat. That is why pedagogy as a science of upbringing is of paramount importance today and will experience a powerful renaissance not only in Russia, but also abroad.

At the same time, the transformation of the didactic paradigm is developing: gamification, mobile learning, blended learning, project learning, event education. It gives birth to a new landscape of education, bringing a touch of informality to education and increasing the importance of student motivation. An attempt of educational systems to launch the student's self-development is revealed. Most of the technological solutions are built on the basis of the development of the student's motivation, their cognitive functions.

The tendency towards individualization of education is gradually increasing and moves from individualization to personification. This means that not only the individual educational request of the student based on the choice of disciplines and courses is important, but also the emotional response, the state of immersion in educational reality, when educational meanings become personally significant, is important. The edges of everyday life – hobbies and education – are being erased. Hence the desire to bring educational contexts closer to the entertainment industry is observed, the principle of "learn by playing".

In this regard, the third trend of pedagogical education is becoming obvious: the need to purposefully introduce and develop new phenomena that are inextricably linked with the arrival of digital education in our life, namely: digital education, digital socialization, digital ethics. These new subject-problem areas of pedagogical knowledge are absolutely not formulated and unexplored to date. The need to determine the pedagogical content of these phenomena will be progressive scientific frontiers, the subject of which will be behavioral analytics of users of online educational platforms, the development of online didactics, and the understanding of the ethics of digital behavior.

The future of education depends on whether organizational solutions are identified to make the future manageable. The effectiveness of decisions is determined by avoiding radicalism and overcoming the speculative and declarative nature of pedagogical science. The birth of a new institutional identity of pedagogical education is closely associated with the problem of creating a new pedagogy, directed towards the future, having successive ties with the past and present.

The fourth trend that we note is the revolution in teacher education, which will consist not only in changing the subject-content context of vocational training (digital didactics, digital education, new assessments of educational results based on cognitive research and digital technologies, pedagogical ethics in a new world). personal identity [10]), but also in the search for its institutional expression.

This is what is happening today in New York, where teacher training programs are being successfully implemented at the Relay Graduate School of Education, which functions on the basis of public-private partnerships. The specificity of training lies in constant immersion in educational practice in partnership with a network of effective charter schools (KIPP and Uncommon Schools, Doug Lemov being the managing director). The creation of such a system allows us to speak about a new model of teacher training, which destroys the patterns of traditional professional training of teachers. Through partnerships with schools, students will have to prove that their own pupils have achieved better grades over the year as a measure of the minimum effectiveness of their own training. Based on this, the effectiveness of the training is assessed and a diploma is awarded attesting to the successful completion of the training program.

The implementation of an alternative practice-oriented teacher training program in the United States (Teacher Residency Programs) is of great interest. By analogy with medical professionals who are required to complete a residency under the supervision of a senior

physician before starting independent work in the clinic, a future teacher can complete a Teacher Residency at school under the guidance of a mentor.

Programs vary from state to state, but many programs offer a master's degree in one year. The training time is reduced to one year due to the intensity of the training program: four days a week are devoted to teaching at the school under the guidance of a mentor (from observing the teaching process at the beginning of the year to self-teaching at the end), one day a week is devoted to self-study online and coursework writing. After completing the teaching internship, teachers sign a contract to work at the school for three years.

Pedagogical internship programs have shown their success in several parameters: subject, methodological, as well as psychological and emotional preparation; meeting the need for the teaching staff of urban US schools, retention in the profession for more than three and five years.

The need for the continuity of the professional training of teachers with educational practice is expressed by the Minister of Education of the Russian Federation S. Kravtsov in the project of creating basic schools at pedagogical universities designed to solve this problem. In the implementation of this initiative, it is necessary to provide for a systematic study and use of all the latest achievements in the field of teacher training in countries that are leaders in world ratings of general education.

The discussion of the results

Institutional Identity Crisis in Teacher Education: In Search of a Mission

Traditionally, the mission of the university is determined through the ratio of three target zones – the socio-cultural phenomenal spheres of the university's existence – culture, science, profession [5] – thus creating a three-dimensional model of the university mission. And this is a very understandable structure that embodies the multi-component goal of a traditional university outside the context of its specifics.

Everything changes when a market economy is established - there has been a transition to a four-dimensional model, in which economics becomes the fourth sphere of university life, which is no longer just a condition for the implementation of the mission, but one of its four essential components:

1. Culture. Creation and broadcast of transboundary cultural heritage;
2. Science. Research and research culture. Transfer "to life";
3. Profession. Professional training and educational process, including professional competencies and values;
4. Economy. Labor market. The cost of education and the financial independence of the university.

Today we are witnessing the transformation of the mission of pedagogical education as an effect of the influence of the internal crisis, "within the institutional" gap. The essence of this crisis lies in the fact that the economy has a dominant influence on all other "spheres of being" of the university, exerting significant, sometimes even decisive, pressure on the content of the components of activity, and giving rise to a paradigmatic break in the definition of the mission. The consequence of the crisis is the problem of the university in the disappearance of intellectual freedom due to the influences of the market and politics.

The mission of education in the digital age is changing from education as the transmission of knowledge to education as an industry of opportunities that contribute to the development of the cognitive and value sphere of the subjects of the educational space.

The transnational discussion of the late 1990s about the mission of a modern university balances between two positions "university-firm" - "university-society", focusing on the labor market, on the one hand, and the requirements of educational and professional standards, on the other, where the key source of development is, first of all, human capital. Economy and culture turned out to be opposite positions in the development space of universities. The problem is that criticism of the fundamental nature of the classical institutional model of the university led to the understanding of the university as a "mill" creating products for the labor market, focusing on the momentary demands of the economy.

The crisis of the institutional identity of pedagogical education is formed as a result of the loss of the classical paradigm of ideologies, based on the definition of the main mission of the university in the production and transmission of culture [6, p. 38]. And it is aggravated by the lack of striving to achieve the objective ideals of science, art and ethics, in which social communities reach the heights of their development.

Culture – as "life ideas", which are "the repertoire of our actual beliefs about the world and the people around them, about the hierarchy of values possessed by things and actions: which of them are more valuable, which are less" [5, p. 31] – is no longer dominant. The university is influenced by the economy – what is bought and sold is good, an immediate and proactive response to economic challenges is required. Such contradictions form a functional gap within the university. It ceases to be the driving force of history, "not forming" the time reflected in the bearers of the culture of that time.

The traditional view of education, considers this philosophical and anthropological phenomenon as "human activity", bringing reality closer to the ideal [5, p. 18]; the purpose of such activities is a person who is able to create a culture together with other people [5, p. 19]; a category designed to "fix the fundamental foundations of human existence and the form of becoming human in a person" [9, p. 7]. People are carriers of social culture of a certain time. Considering education as a means of cultural and social reconstruction, H. Ortega y Gasset means by this the birth of specific objects: "Education should strive not to transfer cultural forms, but to shape life itself, generate cultural objects" [5, p. 20].

Traditionally, life at the university proceeds at the level of the culture of its time: the student finds themselves in the culture – a situation of agreement or disagreement arises, giving rise to the radicalization of traditional culture, thanks to which new cultural objects are born – a new time comes.

It becomes clear that the loss of this cultural function (or its significant transformation) prepares society for a new reality – history is driven by the economy, what changes the idea of the university completely.

What is the university's mission today? The main idea of the university and its mission can be expressed as creating a balance of four institutional spheres of the university's existence – culture, science, profession, economics – based on institutional pragmatism for the sake of the progressiveness of the present and the manageability of the future.

The sensitivity of teacher education to the demands of state policy, to the trends in the digital economy and to the demands of the labor market is undoubtedly a key factor contributing to the spread of the idea of the existence of a crisis in education and pedagogy in general.

The development of universities as social and cultural institutions should create and develop research practices as the basis for the professional training of teachers who are carriers of not only new competencies, possessing not only new types of literacy, but, above all, a carrier of pedagogical culture, not only broadcast, but also produced in university. Only then the moment of conjugation of different target settings of the development of pedagogical education is born – the acceptance of sociocultural, educational reality and the ability to consciously manage it [12, p. 12].

The new institutional model of teacher education recognizes as its mission not only the training of high-quality professionals in pedagogical work, as a natural and necessary direction for the development of regional socio-educational ecosystems, but, above all, in what today we call "birth" and "broadcast" pedagogical culture. The world of the profession, like life, can be described with the metaphor "wild forest". Culture is a system of beliefs that contribute to the conscious movement of a person in life.

Pedagogical culture is a system of fundamental pedagogical beliefs that make it possible to form a holistic professional worldview, on the basis of which a person is able to successfully build a vocational and educational route in the world of the pedagogical profession, position pedagogical work and the image of a teacher as part of national culture, have a beneficial effect on growing generations and define the image the future of the nation as a whole.

The system of pedagogical beliefs forms the basis for the formation of professional and personal qualities of national and transnational contexts, the basic principles of interaction between a student and a teacher, a system of national and universal values. This allows you to maintain clarity of mind in the world of true and false pedagogical decisions.

The Pedagogical University must give birth to a system of ideas about the world of the teaching profession: to form a professional worldview based on pedagogical beliefs and the research culture of a teacher.

Mission of open teacher education of the future

We consider the stage of formation and implementation of a new institutional model of pedagogical education – Open Pedagogical Education of the Future (OPEF) – to be the post-critical phase of the development of the institutional identity of a pedagogical university.

Open teacher education of the future – a model of a new institutional identity of teacher education – is an open public corporation as a result of the transition from a pedagogical university to a university of education, whose area of responsibility is not limited only to teacher training, but expands to address the strategic objectives of the state educational policy, including the modernization of education and teacher education. The University of Education in the Russian context of modern reality is a trans-regional educational holding that combines regional socio-pedagogical clusters.

OPEF is the architecture of teacher education, giving rise to a new institutional environment, the purpose of which is preparation and continuous development of a team of professionals for the educational systems of the region and the country, striving for an innovative restructuring of the regional educational ecosystem based on the intention to improve education and share a single system of professional values that can change the world for the better,

Open pedagogical education of the future is built on completely different value orientations, first of all, realizing that the essence of value as a philosophical category is not only an attitude towards something, but the active construction of reality.

Table 1**Characteristics of the values of the institutional identities of teacher education**

Value type	Values of traditional teacher education	Values of OPEF
Fundamental, higher integral value	Belief in the ability to make the world of education a better place	Belief in the ability to improve the world through flourishing education
Intentional value	Striving for educational quality standards as reflected in the diploma	Striving for creating conditions for regional excellence based on the development of education in the region
Anthropological value	Striving to retain the quantity of students: carriers of ideas for educational renewal	Striving to attract talent: creating teams of changes that transform educational reality based on packages of solutions
Functional value	The value of education according to the principle "once and for all"	The value of life-long education with the design of constructs of various entry groups into the profession
System-forming value	Creation of a university space for the needs of society: an attempt to design the content of education on the basis of the existing school and its problems	The vector of variations changes direction: OPEF is the center of changes and influences on the educational space of the region and the country

The characteristics of OPEF are reflected in a number of pedagogical metaphors, which is typical for the stage of formation in the development of a new concept.

Lost illusions. A sober view of the world is what is expected from educational institutions today: the world is rapidly developing and moving forward, education should not "lag behind" as a belated transfer of ideas into life, but should become the center of world changes based on advanced environmental decisions. The combination of pragmatic environmental solutions and conceptual ideas will create an institutional model of teacher education. The Pedagogical University (University of Education) is the center of changes in the world of education and pedagogy.

Education in search of meaning. The New Institution (OPEF) implies openness to new experiences and ideas. An important institutional goal is the need for a deep understanding of how to apply the acquired knowledge in practice and what fundamental values-norms and values-meanings to lay in the educational basis during the period of growing a person up, not only taking into account socio-cultural, educational, university trends, but also forming them.

Institutional pragmatism. OPEF is built on the principle of institutional pragmatism, the content of which is not relativistic, blurry perspectives of the future, but timely applied solutions being implemented today in order to consciously create and manage the future. Institutional pragmatism is contrasted with lofty educational ideals so far removed from reality that they are practically unattainable.

Institutional functions of open teacher education of the future:

- Creation and transmission of pedagogical culture as part of the world cultural heritage;
- Development of the economy of the region and the country based on the professional training of teams of changes;
- Development of an academic niche;
- Advances in key areas of educational research.

The OPEF mission is to ensure the upward advance development of the quality of higher professional education for the sake of training and educating an innovative

specialist who is able to contribute to the cultural and socio-economic growth of the region and the Russian Federation and to ensure his own progress throughout his life under any circumstances.

OPEF as a flagship of educational technologies, a transregional open design educational institution that trains personnel to build a knowledge economy, an innovative basic center for improving the professional skills of teachers, a resource center for advanced educational projects that provides systematic training for innovation agents.

The architecture of open teacher education of the future contains the following areas of activity:

- technological platform of education quality;
- a system of open educational services based on the principle of an educational service book as a specific technomental device;
- a multifunctional open educational cluster that includes all levels of pedagogical education in the region and goes beyond (cross-border);
- outsourcing of educational programs (hiring course teachers, partners on the free market);
- individual life and professional trajectories and group educational routes, implemented through the program of clinical bases of practice, advanced employment and blended learning, focused on the combination of subject and supra-subject competences, formed on the basis of the principle of pedagogical advance;
- system of professional independent cyclical certification (assessment of the quality of training by the professional community).

A new round of development, based on the complex of the above strategic directions, will allow the new institution of pedagogical education to become a necessary element of the future, a universal chain of "value creation" that necessarily complements any type of social activity.

This suggests that the trend towards the consolidation of universities, which erodes the identity of each of them, has not justified itself. That is why the pedagogical university should not dissolve in other institutions.

Among the positioning options, university teacher education should be defined as a university providing lifelong learning.

Open pedagogical education of the future as a new institutional model of pedagogical education presupposes environmental solutions for openly going beyond the university into the socio-educational space of the region (regional socio-pedagogical cluster) and the country as a resource for the continuous design of a vocational and educational route throughout a person's life. The route is closely linked with the ideology of the "path", which is present in many cultures, and is distinguished by co-existence, continuous cultivation of oneself in joint being with many others.

When we talk about open teacher education of the future, we, first of all, consider such a key characteristic of the new model as openness in the broadest sense of the word. This openness is characterized not only by the diversity of entry groups into the educational trajectory, which makes it possible to implement the concept of education throughout life. The connection between the prosperity of the regional educational ecosystem is clearly revealed with the quality of the pedagogical university: the university creates personnel investments in the regional economy.

Openness to everyone is another aspect that allows us to talk about the universal nature of pedagogical knowledge, which is and will be the foundation of absolutely diverse human

activities, including professional ones. Management, management of a professional team, management of its development strategy and much more – all this, one way or another, is built on pedagogical knowledge.

Openness to a variety of types of students: older students, working students, part-time students, foreign students, professionals seeking to change their career path from non-pedagogical to pedagogical, etc. In the report *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution* [14], this diversity of the student audience is one of the striking demographic trends in 2030.

The phenomenon of "openness" of the new institution lies in the spatio-temporal nonlinearity – the transformation of the past and the trends of the future give rise to a controlled present.

Conclusion

Open pedagogical education of the future is not a futuristic prospect, divorced from the socio-educational reality, but, first of all, a platform for creating a new controlled educational and pedagogical reality based on cognitive neurobiological research and digital technologies, in its totality giving birth to a new pedagogy.

Thus, in the current institutional state of pedagogical education, we identify four main problem areas that require deep methodological understanding and clear organizational solutions to implement the tasks of searching for a new institutional identity of a pedagogical university:

1. The belated response of pedagogy as a scientific branch to the challenges of our time – the image of the future education, presented in a number of studies, is not the future, but the present. The set of approaches that define the "new literacy" poses a significant threat to educational practices – digital literacy should have been born with the advent of the first smartphone, which happened decades ago.
2. The lack of certainty in the theory and practice of pedagogy in the issue of subjectivity in education - the desire to determine the subject positions in the educational space leads to the absolutization of theoretical and practical solutions that regard the student as the only key subject of education, ignoring the specifics of the role of the teacher in the educational space, which has already been discussed above.
3. Attempts to give birth to a new didactics without reliance on pedagogical measurements, cognitive and neuroresearch. A number of studies make it possible to state the need to create not only new theoretical propositions in pedagogy, but also the production of practical adequate solutions. So, the idea of developing a new didactics today has not received the required, necessary evidence base. The problem of proving pedagogical hypotheses today acquires special significance – the world is rapidly changing, the growth of the complexity of social space and the pedagogical process taking place in it is increasing, in which a new person acts, carrying a completely different conscious educational request. It becomes impossible to train a teacher on the basis of methods that do not prove their effectiveness.
4. Absence of a pedagogical super task, an arch-goal of education. The loss of the national identity of education in a situation where there is no assignment of transnational identity, the blurred portraits of the teacher and the student, the inaccessibility and immeasurability of educational ideals, the chaos and uncertainty

of didactic teaching tools, the uncertainty of the content of education, the absence of an education management strategy – all this creates conditions for uncertainty in the functioning and development of the educational system.

REFERENCES

1. Barber M., Donnelly K., Rizvi S. An avalanche is coming. Higher education and the revolution ahead. *Education Issues*, 2013, no. 3, pp. 152-236.
2. Glaeser E. L. *Triumph of the City: How Our Greatest Invention Makes Us Richer, Smarter, Greener, Healthier, and Happier* / translated from English by I. Kushnareva. Moscow, Publishing house of the Gaidar Institute, 2014. 432 p.
3. Ilaltdinova E.Yu., Frolova S.V. The role of the teacher in the digital world of education. *Nizhny Novgorod Education*, 2019, no. 2, pp. 34-39. (in Russ.)
4. Loshkareva E., Luksha P., Ninenko I., Smagin I., Sudakov D. Report "Skills of the future. How to thrive in the complex new world", 2017. 93 p. Available at: https://worldskills.ru/assets/docs/media/WSdoklad_12_okt_rus.pdf (accessed 3 December 2020) (in Russ.)
5. Ortega y Gasset J. *Mission of the University* / translated from Spanish by M.N. Golubeva, A.M. Korbut. Moscow, Publishing house of the State University – Higher School of Economics, 2010. 144 p.
6. Readings B. *The University in Ruins* / translated from English by A. M. Korbut. Moscow, Publishing House of State University – Higher School of Economics, 2010. 304 p. (in Russ.)
7. *Russia 2025: Resetting the Talent Balance*. Moscow, The Boston Consulting Group, 2017. 70 p. Available at: <https://www.bcg.com/ru-ru/perspectives/188095> (accessed 3 December 2020)
8. Serres M. *Petite Poucette* / translated from French by A. Sokolinskaya. Moscow, Ad Marginem Press, 2016. 60 p.
9. Slobodchikov V.I. Systemic crisis of Russian education as a threat to Russia's national security. Analytical report / Systemic crisis of national education as a threat to the national security of Russia and ways to overcome it. Moscow, Russian Institute for Strategic Studies, 2016. 140 p. (in Russ.)
10. Fedorov A.A., Ilaltdinova E.Yu., Filchenkova I.F. Typology of electronic services in an open educational space. *Bulletin of Minin University*, 2017, no. 2 (19), p. 10 (in Russ.)
11. Fedorov A.A., Ilaltdinova E.Yu., Frolova S.V. "Convention of Generations" in the New World of Education. *Higher Education in Russia*, 2018, no. 7, pp. 28-38. (in Russ.)
12. Fedorov A.A., Ilaltdinova E.Yu., Frolova S.V. *Open pedagogical education of the future: new environmental solutions: monograph*. Moscow, FLINTA; Nizhny Novgorod, Minin University, 2020. 124 p. (in Russ.)
13. Fedorov A.A., Ilaltdinova E.Yu., Frolova S.V. *Pedagogical giftedness. Actual psychological and pedagogical solutions: monograph*; Nizhny Novgorod, Minin University, 2019. 348 p. (in Russ.)
14. Altbach Ph. G., Reisberg L., Rumbley L.E. *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution. A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. 2009. Paris, UNESCO. 246 p.
15. Davies A., Fidler D., Gorbis M. *Future work skills 2020*. San Francisco, CA: Institute for the Future for the University of Phoenix Research Institute. 2011. 14 p.
16. Thomas M. Virtual Teaching in the Time of COVID-19: Rethinking Our WEIRD Pedagogical Commitments to Teacher Education. *Frontiers in Education*, 2020, vol. 5, Article № 595574. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346591515_Virtual_Teaching_in_the_Time_of_COVID-19_Rethinking_Our_WEIRD_Pedagogical_Commitments_to_Teacher_Education (accessed 3 December 2020)

Информация об авторах

Илалтдинова Елена Юрьевна

(Российская Федерация, Нижний Новгород)
Доктор педагогических наук, доцент, первый
проректор

Нижегородский государственный педагогический
университет имени Козьмы Минина
E-mail: ilaltdinova_eu@mininuniver.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9017-4658
Scopus ID: 57190758002

Фролова Светлана Владимировна

(Российская Федерация, Нижний Новгород)
Кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры
общей и социальной педагогики
Нижегородский государственный педагогический
университет имени Козьмы Минина
E-mail: frolova_sv@mininuniver.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2822-0358
Scopus ID: 57190755212

Сергеева Татьяна Николаевна

(Российская Федерация, Нижний Новгород)
Кандидат педагогических наук, доцент кафедры
общей и социальной педагогики
Нижегородский государственный педагогический
университет имени Козьмы Минина
E-mail: serge199@yandex.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1791-4426

Information about the authors

Elena Yu. Ilaltdinova

(Russian Federation, Nizhny Novgorod)
Doctor of Education,

Associate Professor, Acting rector
Kozma Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical
University (Minin University)
E-mail: ilaltdinova_eu@mininuniver.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9017-4658
Scopus ID: 57190758002

Svetlana V. Frolova

(Russian Federation, Nizhny Novgorod)
PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of
Department of General and Social Pedagogy
Kozma Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical
University (Minin University)
E-mail: frolova_sv@mininuniver.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2822-0358
Scopus ID: 57190755212

Tatiana N. Sergeeva

(Russian Federation, Nizhny Novgorod)
PhD in Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of
Department of General and Social Pedagogy
Kozma Minin Nizhny Novgorod State Pedagogical
University (Minin University)
E-mail: serge199@yandex.ru
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-1791-4426