CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS FOR ESTABLISHING AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION SYSTEM OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES OF FUTURE TEACHERS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

INTRODUCTION

The quality of future teachers’ training is one of the planned results of educational modernization (BELYAEVA et al, 2020; FROLOVA, 2021). An objective toolkit is needed to determine the quality, and expert evaluation of the training of graduates in the pedagogical training program is essential. At the same time, currently, there is no unified approach to the evaluation of educational outcomes of future teachers. The problem of developing IES, the optimal combination of internal and external evaluations of the educational outcomes achieved by graduates, becomes urgent. It becomes essential to present methodological guidelines, discuss ways of understanding and interpreting the core concepts of such a system, and define its goals and objectives (AKOPOVA, 2014; WORLD CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION, 2009). Based on the highlighted problems, the article identifies the following components of IES of educational outcomes of future teachers: the system goal and objectives, educational outcomes, the presentation form of evaluation tools, criteria, and indicators of educational outcomes achievement, funds of evaluation tools presented on a digital platform, and levels of achievement of educational outcomes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The evaluation process of educational outcomes uses the concept of the independent interim evaluation of students' knowledge (MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 2015). This evaluation is carried out by the scientific and pedagogical staff of educational institutions of higher education, not involved in the educational process. It aims at evaluating the amount of knowledge, skills, competencies that a student must master in the disciplines (modules) related to the core part of the educational program and which are mandatory for students regardless of the focus (profile) of the program (PAPUKOVA et al, 2015).

The concept of Russian education modernization defines the milestones for the implementation of the competency-based approach in education, whose main goal is the formation of core (base, universal, and others) competencies, readiness to use the mastered theoretical knowledge, skills, and abilities, as well as ways of action in life to solve practical problems. Today, core competencies are proclaimed as the leading paradigm of education outcomes in higher education practice.

Our analysis of the literature has shown that today the competency-based approach implies the orientation of education, first of all, on its results: formation of necessary general cultural (universal), general professional and professional competencies, ability to self-determination,
socialization, development of individuality, and self-actualization (OECD, 2018). This approach has now become traditional for the system of higher education. It focuses the education system on ensuring the quality of training following the needs of modern society. It allows a person to integrate into social activities, which is consistent with the need of society to use personal potential (BELYAEVA et al., 2020; TROYANSKAYA, 2016).

As R.N. Azarova, N.M. Zolotareva, L.P. Filatova (2010) rightly point out, at present, the interpretation of the term “competence” does not cause any particular disagreement in higher education institutions. It is divided into three components: 1) cognitive (knowledge, accumulation, deepening, expansion of theoretical and methodological bases of subject activity); 2) activity-related (ability to apply obtained knowledge in practical activity, ability to use it in new, unusual situations); 3) personal (attitude towards professional activity, common motives, and personal values).

The activity-related component is the main one in the structure of competence because it is determined not by the amount of information learned but by the readiness to use the accumulated experience to acquire new, missing knowledge, the ability to act in unusual circumstances. Competence cannot be observed directly; it is judged by the activity carried out by the learner. Competence maturity is characterized not so much by the ability to perform a specific action in a particular situation but by the readiness for new action methods in a non-standard situation and value orientation (DUNAEVA & SUVOROVA, 2020).

The structure of the educational outcome is a kind of framework oriented on maximum achievements of students in their educational activity and the generation of new changes (personal and activity-related).

Many years of practice have developed a traditional approach to evaluating educational outcomes focused on learning a system of knowledge, skills, and abilities. It should be noted that some studies (KHUTORSKOY, 2003; CHELYSHKOVA, 2002; EFREMOVA, 2010) propose to evaluate the educational outcomes of students’ training based on such evaluation tools as content analysis, interviews, observation, questionnaire, comparison, active-game diagnostic methods, project activities, and others.

Trishchenko D.A. (2020) rightly notes that the formulas of mathematical evaluation models presented in some studies (4) are used either based on the simple summation of grades by discipline or by summing quality points based on the introduction of weight coefficients. According to Trishchenko D.A., the use of evaluation models looks convincing but does not always meet the goal set by the researcher since this approach poorly addresses the developmental aspects of education (BLAS ARITIO, 2007).

**RESULTS**

The system approach of the study identifies and links the core components of IES. In the process of building IES of educational outcomes of future teachers, we assume that this should be an activity-related system, which, in turn, is a subsystem of a higher-level system, including the higher education system. This means that IES should be linked to the regulatory documents in the field of higher education, in particular, meet the requirements of the Federal State Educational Standard for Higher Education (FSES HE) (2018) and the Professional Standard for Teacher (PST) (2021). The system goal is to establish the compliance of the outcomes achieved with the FSES HE requirements. The measure of such compliance makes it possible to establish the quality of training of university students and graduates (POTASHNIK, 2000). Therefore, the target component is a core component of the designed IES of educational outcomes. The system-forming factor is the goal of creating this system: to evaluate the achievements of educational outcomes of future teachers, i.e., to establish the compliance of personal achievements of students and graduates with the FSES HE requirements - the phase-by-phase requirements of the primary professional educational program based on unified evaluation tools.

The following core component of the designed system is the evaluation object. In fact, in the formulation of the goal itself, there is an indication of the evaluation object - educational outcomes. In turn, the analysis of the educational outcomes concept requires an appeal to
system, activity-related, learner-centered, and competency-based approaches. The FSES HE considers competence as the ability to apply knowledge, skills, and practical experience in work. Competencies are defined by professional activities and areas of their professional application. They relate to the tasks of professional activity, for which the learner should be ready. Competencies are currently considered as new indicators of the quality of training of students and graduates (ORLOVA, 2016; MYALKINA, 2019; and CHELYSHKOVA, 2002). Therefore, when determining the evaluation objects, both achievements and reproductive skills should be taken into account and new indicators of learners' quality of training in the form of mastered competencies. The activity-related approach, which is the basis of FSES, focuses on the inclusion of learners in activities, thereby making it possible to describe the results of all their activities. This approach allows us to distinguish the observed and recognized actions of learners, which are part of the future professional activity of the teacher, and necessary for solving professional problems. Reliance on the activity-related approach makes it possible to describe the indicators that characterize the evaluation object in the form of corresponding descriptors.

Since the training of future teachers at the university is carried out based on the FSES HE, built on the competitiveness-based approach, according to regulatory documents, the evaluation objects are the graduate competence. At the same time, the implementation of the educational process at the university cannot be carried out without an appropriate orientation towards the future graduate profession. For teacher training, the PST (GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 2021) becomes such a reference point, which fixes the main labor functions in the teacher’s activity and the corresponding labor actions that he or she must master. This means that when describing evaluation objects, it is necessary to rely on competency-based and activity-related approaches to refine the evaluation objects. So, a rational combination of the competencies of the learners laid down in the FSES HE and the labor actions formulated in the PST can serve as a basis for describing educational outputs as evaluation objects.

We will understand educational outcomes as indicators of the student’s activity, presented as a description of his identifiable actions. The wording of these descriptions should reflect what the student is ready to demonstrate at the end of the training process or its part (KASPRZHAK & KALASHNIKOV, 2014; REBRIN, 2014). With this approach, educational outcomes can be considered as evaluation objects at the level of the basic professional educational program, the module level, and the level of the discipline (practice).

For characterizing educational outcomes, it is essential to take into account the structural components that determine the content and scope of the concept of competence, including cognitive, activity, and personal components. In addition, further detailing of educational outcomes should be carried out based on considering professional activities and professional tasks for which a graduate in the pedagogical training program should be ready.

In order to link the universal and general professional competencies presented in the FSES HE in pedagogical training program (FEDERAL STATE EDUCATIONAL STANDARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION, 2018) with the main functions of training, education, and development, according to the training profile (subject knowledge and necessary skills of a teacher) and the corresponding labor actions presented in the PST (PROFESSIONAL STANDARD OF THE PEDAGOGUE, 2021), their comparative analysis was carried out. It established that the labor actions specific to the primary function of Training make it possible to distinguish a group of competencies related to the methodological competencies and specific to the functions of Upbringing - to personal education. The teacher's functionality, named Development in the PST, represents labor actions that correlate with a group of vocational and pedagogical competencies. Naturally, the teacher's list of necessary knowledge and skills that define the subject area of the taught disciplines fall under a group of subject (special) competencies. Based on this approach, these competency groups make it possible to link them with professional tasks and types of professional activities and provide an opportunity to specify the evaluation objects included in the IES of educational outcomes of the future teacher.

Let us note that such a division of general professional competencies into groups is highly conditional, as the very division of the main functions in a teacher's activity is conditional.
Practically, it means that a teacher performs some competencies, including information and communications technology, by executing different functions. Distribution of general professional competencies in our study into groups is essential both from describing the corresponding educational outcomes groups and developing evaluation tools adequate to the selected groups.

Given that the quality of training of students in planning and implementation of the educational process is a measure of compliance with the planned and achieved outcomes, let us highlight them in the structure of educational outcomes. The planned outcomes are determined based on the FSES HE and PST and recorded in the academic program, and after that prescribed in the working programs of disciplines (practices, modules). For evaluation of the achieved results at all stages of the educational process (current, interim, and final certification) especially created evaluation tools are used. Therefore, the next component of IES of educational outcomes of future teachers should be evaluating tools.

The analysis of various sources for the development of competency evaluation tools and educational outcomes highlighted several existing problems:

- Use of traditional control materials aimed at evaluation of knowledge, skills, and abilities without evaluation mechanism (procedure);
- Transition to mass testing using non-standardized tests where evaluation boundaries are not defined or defined arbitrarily;
- Use of innovative training methods for developing control activities without appropriate evaluation criteria;
- Absence of evaluation criteria, indicators, or boundaries in the representation of some sequence of the examinee’s actions, called an evaluation algorithm usually used in the form of verbal control.

The identified problems and the reliance on the theory of measurement in education allow us to conclude that when developing IES, it is necessary to establish links between the core components of the built system: between the target component, the evaluation object, and evaluation tools. In our study, this idea is the basis of the invariant representation form of evaluation tools considered as one of the critical components of the built system. Note that in this form, there should be three interrelated parts, allowing to answer the following questions: what and why is measured (goal and evaluation object), what content is planned to be evaluated (the content of the control activity), and how evaluation is carried out (criteria, indicators of the evaluation procedure). Thus, within our study, we will understand evaluation tools as a specially constructed presentation form of a control activity (tasks, questions), consisting of three parts. The first part represents organizational and methodological support of the evaluation procedure that fixes the evaluation goals and objects and specifies the indicators of achievement of educational outcomes. This part may include a theoretical basis necessary for the optimal performance of the control task, the control stage, and the time frame of the control activity. The second part contains the control activity and, if necessary, recommendations for its implementation. The third part includes evaluation components: criteria, levels (procedure), and grading scale (PEREVOSHIKOVA et al., 2016; PEREVOSHIKOVA, 2016).

The separation of the three interrelated parts in the presentation form of evaluation tools is due to principles of objectivity, validity, and openness of evaluation procedures. The objectivity principle ensures an objective evaluation based on the coordination of the three parts of the form. The validity principle is responsible for the coordination of the evaluation objects and the content of the evaluation tool, i.e., it makes it possible to establish what exactly planned is checked. The principle of openness of the evaluation procedures is responsible for the development of the third part of the form and means that it must be clear not only to the examinee but also to the person who is doing the corresponding task.

Note that when designing the presentation form of evaluation tools, it is advisable to rely on the criterial approach to evaluation. However, the analysis of existing studies has shown that, at present, there are some unresolved issues related to the implementation of the criterial
approach in the system of higher education. In particular, questions about the construction of evaluation criteria, the ratio of educational outcomes, indicators of their achievement, and evaluation indicators become essential. The criterion is understood as an attribute for evaluation, definition, or classification of something; it is a measure of judgment or evaluation. A measurable characteristic of any one side of the attribute (criterion) of the studied object is called an indicator for obtaining quantitative or qualitative information about the manifestation of this attribute side (ZAGVYAZINSKIJ, V. I. et al, 2008). Considering that the totality of selected educational outcomes groups determines the quality of future teacher training, this totality can serve as an evaluation criterion. Following the same logic, we can describe a set of indicators of educational outcome achievement, describing its substantive and activity-related basis. Within our study, we understand an indicator of educational outcome achievement as a characteristic of a learner’s manifestation of one or another state of educational outcome available for observation and measurement. It means that the formulation of indicators of educational outcomes achievement is based on different aspects of their manifestation. This approach allows us to consider the set of indicators of each educational outcome achievement as a necessary and sufficient condition for its evaluation. It means that the set of correctly constructed indicators can be considered as an attribute of educational outcome achievement, i.e., act as evaluation criteria. In its turn, each indicator of a particular educational outcome is a necessary condition and can be considered as an indicator of its achievement.

Thus, the organizational and methodological part of the presentation form of evaluation tools should indicate both the educational outcome as an evaluation object and the corresponding indicator of its achievement recorded as an indicator in the third part of the presentation form of the evaluation tool.

In building activity-related IES of educational outcomes, a special place belongs to the component of the evaluation procedures connected with a tiered approach to evaluation (FAGANÉL & DOLINŠEK, 2005). This component reflects the processes and procedures of measurement and evaluation at various control points at the current, interim, and final stages of the learner's certification. For each control point, it is necessary to build a link of the type: goal – educational outcomes – indicators of achievement – evaluation tools and to establish the correspondence between the planned and achieved outcomes based on the levels of evaluation known in pedagogy. As a rule, Bloom’s taxonomy, V.P. Bespalko’s and R. Marzano’s levels (MARZANO, 2007), or activity success levels (Modernization of The Educational Process: Assessment of The Formation of Competencies Among Graduates of a Bachelor’s Degree in The Field of Training 03.04.05 Pedagogical Education at the Stage of State Final Certification: A teaching aid, 2018; PEREVOSHCHIKOVA et al, 2020) are used to determine evaluation levels.

We emphasize once again that the objectivity and openness of evaluation procedures are ensured by the presence of evaluation criteria and indicators provided in the criterial part of each evaluation tool. The evaluation procedure is connected with such actions of the teacher as revealing, measuring, and evaluating. Identification of educational outcomes means establishing the amount of actually mastered elements of educational content or performed actions. Measurement refers to obtaining quantitative indicators or quality judgments based on the correlation of obtained educational outcomes with a specific measurement scale. The correlation of quantitative or qualitative characteristics obtained as a result of the measurement with a particular grading system (grading scale) is called evaluation.

The common properties in the studied objects are highlighted, and the degree of its expression is established using the grading scale, which makes it possible to characterize the object in the adopted grading system. In educational practice, as a rule, an ordinal scale is used. This scale has the properties of identity and transitivity, and its use makes it possible to rank objects, calculate the fraction, and find the median. In order to evaluate test results, an interval scale is used in which the properties of metricity are added to the abovementioned properties of the ordinal scale, and it becomes possible to use a particular task as a unit of measurement (CHELYSHIKOVA, 2002).

The tiered approach to evaluation helps, on the one hand, to consider the complexity levels of the control task, which determines the content part of the evaluation tool, and, on the
other hand, to establish levels of the educational outcome achievement (PEREVOSSHCHIKOVA, 2016; PEREVOSSHCHIKOVA et al., 2020). In our study, levels of achievement are considered based on the degree of the learner's success in completing the task, which is an evaluation tool. Such levels include optimal, acceptable, critical, and unacceptable levels. The use of a hundred-point measurement scale allows you to determine the appropriate boundaries (PEREVOSSHCHIKOVA, 2018).

So, the optimal level corresponds to the level of the educational outcome achievement if the percentage of the task completion is from 100 to 86 points. Accordingly, an acceptable level is defined within the boundaries of 85 to 71 points, a critical level - from 70 to 55 points. The result is not achieved if the score for the task is less than 55 points. Considering the above, we emphasize that when designing the IES of educational outcomes of future teachers, its structure should contain the components of levels of educational outcomes achievement and evaluation procedures.

**DISCUSSION**

In recent years, a prerequisite for accreditation of universities is the availability of funds of evaluation tools (FET), understood as a set of measuring and evaluation materials to evaluate the maturity of competencies for the discipline (module, practice) under the basic professional educational program. There are publications containing recommendations on FET development (AJZENSHAT & STEBLEVA, 2018; MIKHAILOVA, 2012). At the same time, the ongoing research on FET development is still in its infancy. As noted above, the tools included in FET themselves are not without disadvantages. In addition, teachers develop FET, and they use these tools themselves to evaluate competencies, so the created tools can only be considered as a component of the internal system for evaluating the quality of learners' and graduates' training.

V.A. Bolotov, describing the concept of independent evaluation, notes that "independent evaluation" means "the absence of connection between the evaluating organization and the evaluation subject" (2015). In this interpretation, the notion of independent evaluation is associated with that of external evaluation.

According to V.A. Bolotov, the creation of IES should be based on the principles of voluntariness of evaluation procedures, complete openness of information, independence of experts peer in the professional community, and thorough verification and validation of data obtained as a result of such evaluation (2015).

The FSES HE interprets the certification process of students in the educational organization as the establishment of compliance of students' achievements with the FSES HE requirements and step-by-step requirements highlighted in the academic program. These requirements aim at the closest approximation to the conditions of students' future professional activity (MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION, 2015; FEDERAL LAW No. 256, 2012). For these goals, in addition to teachers of a particular discipline, it is recommended to actively involve external experts, including employers and teachers of related disciplines.

The above requirements allow for the identification of two evaluation levels: internal and external. The combination of these levels serves as the basis for an independent evaluation of the educational outcomes of future teachers. In this sense, an essential condition for implementing IES of educational outcomes is the optimal combination of the above two levels. Thus, for the completeness of IES of educational outcomes, its structure should include FET for evaluating educational outcomes groups that have been tested and externally evaluated.

The technological approach to building IES of educational outcomes of future teachers allows you to build a technology for designing evaluation tools and related FET and provide opportunities for their representation on a digital platform that provides mechanisms for implementing this system.
CONCLUSION
Thus, the analysis of existing approaches to evaluating competencies and educational outcomes, a comprehensive approach to building IES of educational outcomes of future teachers, including the use of elements of the system, activity-related, competency-based, learner-centered, criterial, tiered, and technological approaches, allowed us to identify the following core components of this system: target component, educational outcomes as evaluation objects, educational outcomes groups, evaluation tools, FET for evaluating educational outcomes groups, evaluation procedures, levels of educational outcomes achievement. In our further works, we plan to consider the design of IES for graduates of teacher’s training colleges and its approbation.
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Conceptual foundations for establishing an independent evaluation system of educational outcomes of future teachers in the Russian Federation

Resumo
Este artigo discute os fundamentos conceituais da criação de um sistema de avaliação independente (IES) de resultados educacionais de futuros professores. Identifica-se as seguintes competências e grupos de desfechos educacionais correspondentes: competências educacionais, psicológicas e pedagógicas, metodológicas e subjetivas. Há uma descrição do formulário de apresentação de ferramentas de avaliação com peças organizacionais-metódicas, de conteúdo e de avaliação de critérios que ajudam a vincular os resultados educacionais, a funcionalidade do professor e tarefas orientadas profissionalmente adequadas e descrever indicadores de obtenção de resultados educacionais como ações avaliadas do aluno. Divulga-se a associação das peças selecionadas com os princípios de construção da avaliação da objetividade, validade e abertura das ferramentas de procedimentos de avaliação. A inclusão de ferramentas de avaliação e fundos de ferramentas de avaliação envolve seus testes e exames. Como mecanismo de implementação do IES, propõe-se a utilização de uma plataforma digital que inclui grupos de ferramentas de avaliação adequadas aos grupos de resultados educacionais selecionados.

Abstract
This article discusses the conceptual foundations of establishing an independent evaluation system (IES) of educational outcomes of future teachers. The following competencies and corresponding educational outcomes groups are identified: educational, psychological and pedagogical, methodological and subject competencies. There is a presentation form description of evaluation tools with organizational-methodical, content, and criterion-evaluation parts that help link the educational outcomes, teacher functionality, and appropriate professionally-oriented tasks and describe indicators of achieving educational outcomes as evaluated actions of the learner. The association of the selected parts with the principles of constructing evaluation of objectivity, validity, and openness of evaluation procedures tools is disclosed. The inclusion of evaluation tools and funds of evaluation tools involves their testing and examination. As a mechanism for implementing IES, it is proposed to use a digital platform including groups of evaluation tools adequate to the selected educational outcomes groups.
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