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Summary. The article examines the issue of the management system of the first Soviet pedagogical institutions of higher education in the 1920s - institutes of public education. On the basis of normative documents that established the management system of each higher education institution, the scope of duties of the rector, political commissar, activities of institute and faculty councils, commissions, general meetings, etc. were revealed.
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With the formation of a new type of pedagogical institution of higher education in the USSR in the early 1920s - the Institute of Public Education (IPE), the Soviet regime formed its same type of management structure, which was recorded in a number of normative documents. They clearly spelled out the positions and responsibilities of the administrative team - from the all-institutional to the faculty levels. This aspect has been insufficiently addressed in the works of Ukrainian researchers, so it is of justified interest. Its clarification makes it possible to better understand new conceptual approaches to the formation of the administrative sphere of pedagogical universities, which were subordinated to the existing system and, unlike the period of the liberation struggle of 1921-1920, were tasked with training teachers on proletarian ideological principles.

In August 1920, the Soviet government began to restructure the system of higher education in the republic, which was reflected in Resolution No. 8 of the USSR State Commission for Higher Education “On Reforming Higher Education.” It emphasized, in particular, the need for changes in the management structure of each institution and its subordination to the bodies of structures that were under the jurisdiction of the district executive committees of the councils of workers', red army and peasants' deputies [18,
According to this document, for example, universities, which were soon transformed into IPE, created economic committees and councils: scientific and school, scientific and educational. In addition, the position of a political commissar was introduced, who, along with the rector, concentrated all the power of the educational institution: adopted and approved orders, resolutions, and reports of the university; controlled the implementation of orders and other documents from the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR; considered and approved the staff, salaries for teaching and technical staff, and resolved a number of other issues related to the management and organization of the educational, scientific, and economic life of the institution [11, sheet 31; 19, p. 31]. The main goal of the reformed higher education institutions was to provide social education for students in the cycles of preschool, school and extracurricular training, which corresponded to the tasks of creating a communist society [12, sheet 53, 53зв.].

With the advent of the regulation "On Higher Educational Institutions" of September 2, 1921, the administrative structure of the pedagogical university was spelled out more clearly than in the previous document [16, p. 803–809; 14, p. 3, 4; 17, p. 10; 20, p. 49, 58]. According to the regulations, the rector and political commissar were responsible for educational, administrative, and economic management. Important decisions made by them were approved by the Main Department of Vocational Education of Ukraine under the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR and only then came into effect. The rector was considered to be the responsible head of the higher education institution, and the political commissar (this position was practiced until the middle of the decade) was the responsible representative of the state authorities in the same institution. The former was solely responsible for all work and the state of the university and issued oral orders with the political commissar's consent, and written orders signed by both. If necessary, for example, due to a large number of employees, students, or academic workload, the rector was appointed a vice-rector (for example, in Kharkiv, Kyiv, Katerynoslav/Dnipropetrov'sk IPE). The same was true for the political commissioner, who was appointed a deputy if necessary. Both positions were filled through local elections with the approval of the Main Directorate of Vocational Education of Ukraine [15, p. 2].

To coordinate the work of the faculties, a bureau was created under the rector and political commissar, which included the rector, vice-rector, political commissar, his deputy, and deans of the faculties [13, p. 2]. For example, in the Kamianets-Podilskyi IPE, the functions of such a bureau were performed by the general council or bureau [2, sheets 35; 3, sheet 16; 4, sheet 3; 5, sheets 13, 19; 6, sheets 1–3; 7, sheet 58; 8, sheets 37, 45; 10, sheets 3, 7]. Such a body (bureau) discussed general issues of the Institute's work and was more in the nature of a meeting. It was convened once a week. The rector was the chairman of the bureau, and in his absence, the vice-rector chaired the meeting.

There were two commissions under the rector and the bureau/council: 1) a central commission of specialists and 2) a control commission. The former was in charge of educational and methodological work, and the latter monitored the implementation of the curriculum and programs by students, which the commission of specialists agreed upon with the People's Commissariat of Education of the Ukrainian SSR [15, p. 3; 9, sheet 18; 14, p. 3-4].
In addition, the IPE practiced general meetings of the university. They were held with the participation of the management, all teachers, technical staff and several representatives from students who were elected at the general meeting of each faculty. Meetings were held with the consent of the political commissar and organized by the rector once a trimester. A chairman was elected at each meeting. Here, in particular, the rector's reports on the work for the academic year were presented and discussed. The minutes of the general meeting were sent to the Main Department of Vocational Education of Ukraine with possible feedback from the provincial department of vocational education [15, p. 3].

The faculties were responsible for educational and scientific affairs: academic disciplines, courses, clubs, etc.; developed draft curricula and programs; monitored the quality of teaching; organized student work, developed conditions for transferring young people from one trimester to another; organized tests, exams, etc.; submitted candidates for teaching positions, etc. The faculty was governed by three bodies: the dean, the faculty commission, and the general meeting of the faculty. The dean was appointed with the consent of the provincial department of vocational education from among the institute's faculty, and approved by the Ukrgolovprofesvit. He was responsible for the work and condition of the faculty to the rector and the political commissar.

The academic departments had faculty commissions consisting of a dean, a secretary, representatives of the teaching staff, and two students (one appointed by the rector and the dean, and the other personally by the political commissar). This commission was an advisory body on the internal affairs of the department and assisted the dean in his management work. It was convened when necessary [15, p. 3].

The general meeting of the faculty consisted of teachers, technicians and students. They were convened by the political commissar of the IPE once a trimester to receive the dean's report on the educational, scientific, and economic work of the educational unit. The minutes of these meetings were sent to the provincial department of vocational education with the political commissioner's feedback and signature. The chairman of the meeting, like the faculty commission, was elected at each meeting. In addition, if necessary, it was allowed to create temporary commissions on general issues with the consent of both university leaders, but in most IPEs, according to archival sources, the right to create such bodies was not exercised.

A separate regulation, which appeared in the summer of 1921, regulated the activities of labor faculties at IPEs. The rector and the political commissar were responsible for the general state of this structural unit. The faculty administration consisted of the presidium, the faculty commission, and the general meeting. The presidium, consisting of the dean, his deputy, and the secretary, also had executive functions. The powers of the other two bodies were the same as at other faculties [15, p. 4].

In general, the management structure of all IPEs was unified, and the work of educational units was harmonized with the "Declaration on the Social Education of Children" (July 1, 1920), the regulation on higher education institutions of the Ukrainian SSR, and the needs of the new school. The implementation of this approach influenced the number and nature of educational units. Thus, such departments as school, preschool, out-of-school education and labor processes were transformed into faculties for training teachers for vocational schools.
(vocational education) and social workers (social education) [21, p. 211–213]. They appeared in the structure of the Ukrainian SSR's IPE by the end of 1921.

Thus, this management structure of the IPEs and their faculties was generally not similar to the one practiced in Ukrainian universities in 1917-1920, although it had some similarities. The priority place in the management of IPEs was occupied not by the rector, but by the political commissar, who was actually the supervisor of the political mood of the staff, compliance with the requirements of the ruling party in the process of training specialists. Various councils functioned, general meetings were convened, and various commissions worked, demonstrating collegiality in making decisions that met the interests of the regime but were dependent on it. The developed management model changed somewhat in the mid-1920s, but it continued to ensure the stability of the universities, their fulfillment of all orders of the governing bodies of the country and the republic to train teachers loyal to the new state and social system.
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