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The article focuses on the essential characteristics of the creative and innovative paradigm of 
higher education in the anthropocentricity principle context. The new educational paradigm is also 
characterised by the principles of self-development of activity subjects, co-creativity of activity 
subjects on the level of their co-existence, openness, integrity, self-organization. The article considers 
continuity of the creative and innovative educational paradigm and the current concept of higher 
education development. In this regard, special attention is paid to the acmeological approach 
to individual development. This approach is directly related to creative activity and can serve as 
a methodological basis for competence approach used as additional means for the assessment of 
specialists trained at universities. Focusing on the intentionally dynamic model of “acme”, the article 
reveals a set of criteria and indicators for intellectual maturity, recommended for use at all stages of 
specialist training and their professional activity.
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Introduction

Information, knowledge and innovation are becoming the main driving force of the 
post-industrial society. In 1973, Daniel Bell’s historical work predicted a dramatically different 
model of society development, relying rather on the “economics of information” than on the 
“economics of goods.” Daniel Bell stated that the post-industrial society would witness the shift from goods to services and the expansion
of services in the economic sector, the rise of new technical elite and increasing dependence on science and theoretical knowledge as a means of innovation and organization of technological change (Bell, 1973).

Forty years later, it is also important to note such by-products of this society as stress, frustration and depression. In Russia, we can observe an increase in illness attributed to stress and anxiety. Stress-related illnesses are, on the average, the costliest of all work-related illnesses in terms of days lost per case (Dmitrieva, 2008) (teachers’ stress level is higher than the average).

Innovation plays the key role in the adaptation of higher education to the demands of knowledge-based society. To achieve this objective, higher education needs to be reformed. In the new paradigm of higher education, creativity and innovation are its fundamental elements intended to streamline higher education to become efficient and globally competitive.

Hereinafter, we shall point out essential characteristics of the new educational paradigm in the anthropocentricity principle context. We shall also consider continuity of the creative and innovative educational paradigms and the current concept of higher education development. In this regard, we shall focus on the acmeological approach to individual development. This approach is directly related to creative activity and can serve as a methodological basis for competence approach used as an additional means for the assessment of specialists trained at universities.

**Anthropocentricity principle and competence approach**

The *innovation* term assumes constructiveness of something new introduced into human life. Study of innovation is pervaded by positive bias. The word innovation itself seems to have positive connotation only. Innovation is often viewed as a good thing because new idea must be useful, profitable, constructive. New ideas that are not perceived as useful are not normally called innovations; they are usually called mistakes. Objectively, of course, the usefulness of an idea can only be determined after the innovation process has been completed and implemented.

We hardly ever stop thinking of negative impacts a new product, process or design may produce. However, innovation might give rise to negative consequences as well. One cannot but agree with Andrei Voznesensky, who said: “All progress is reactionary if man collapses”. The benefits of any innovation towards man need to be assessed before it is actually implemented.

However, as a result of various social factors, contradictions and frustration become the driving force of human development. Constructiveness or destructiveness of new things, their reactionary nature as well as their positive influence on man cannot be clearly defined. It is often a complicated matter, which encompasses the whole range of existing views of the world order, man’s place in nature and society, the place of a certain community in the system of administrative, ethnic, religious and other aspects of the society with its own peculiarities and aspirations.

The anthropocentricity principle of innovative changes requires certain commentaries as far as the moral expedience of innovations is concerned. On one hand, innovative activity should be anthropocentric according to the abovementioned quotation. On the other hand, man is an element of nature, and his view of the world and himself make up the unity of both the individual and common. Thus, from this point of view anthropocentrism is inappropriate and even pernicious. When a person commensurates their desires and necessities, satisfied with the help of innovations, only with their Selves, the person can do harm to Another one, or to the environment,
which gave birth to the person and a part of which they still remain.

The study of innovative processes in education makes it easier to define constructivism of innovation, for innovation activity control in higher education does not directly touch upon natural environment (except for some certain innovative projects). That is why the proposed thesis of **anthropocentricity of innovative changes** can be regarded as the main criterion of Higher Vocational Training (HVT) reform. First of all, it means **minimization of social and psychological frustration factors, which accompany innovations. It also means measures to compensate for the destructive influence of educational institutional forms on the participants of educational activities.**

Speaking of higher education, it is the term “competence” that prevails in modern educational discourse, rather than “innovation”, “creativity”, “creativeness”, or “co-creativity”. After fifteen years of reforming higher education following the Bologna Process and under the aegis of competence approach, the latter is becoming a new education paradigm, as many modern domestic researchers claim.

It is possible to underline some features of the competence approach, which show that it will share the fate of many other paradigms, constructs and theories, based on promising but for some reasons gradually losing their lustre categories. The most significant of all the features is “the absence of flawless arguments obtained through observations of graduates’ (not students’) professional activity, in favour of its feasibility” (Robotova: 48). Moreover, indeed, numerous dissertations and monographs analyse students’ activity rather than that of qualified specialists. A.L. Andreyev is even more categorical about the competence approach, saying: “being accepted as a new paradigm, it has not led to any visible improvement or increase in the competence level of graduates. Paradoxical as it may be, in a number of cases it has even caused its decrease” (Andreev, 2014: 32).

Academician of Russian Academy of Education (RAE) A.M. Novikov emphasizes, “in fact, competence is synonymous with skill. … Domestic pedagogical science and psychology developed the theory of forming skills long time ago. Besides, since the works by E.A. Milerian written in the 1970s, skills have been considered not in their narrow technological sense, but as “complex structural formations, including sensual, intellectual, volitional, creative and emotional qualities of an individual, ensuring the achievement of activity purposes under changing conditions” (Novikov, 2010: 19).

In the middle of the previous century (and even earlier), university community also understood the importance of close interconnection between university education and practice, as well as significance of the former, when dealing with practice-oriented tasks. It was not enough just to know; it was knowing how to do that mattered. It is hardly possible that the conditions for this have radically changed for the better in today’s HVT, the contrary is more likely (especially if to consider natural science areas of training). Could this be the reason for the decrease in graduates’ competence level, as Professor A.L. Andreyev has outlined?

According to A.S. Robotova, while discussing competence development and suggesting new educational technologies, educators-researchers do not mention that in most cases it is still quasi-professional activity (Robotova: 49).

However, as A.M. Novikov states, there are some differences between skills and competence: modern researchers-educators in their works point out that competence differs from skills in motives. This is how Academician A.M. Novikov comments: “If motives are included into competence, and thus, following the
competence approach, they will be included into educational standards, curricula, the motives will be programmed in the content of education! This means that the motives of university students’ and those of university graduates will be the same, which means attack on individual freedom!... The fact that motives are included into American (and European) educational standards is not a random phenomenon. It reflects some dangerous trends in the development of Western civilization...” (Novikov, 2010: 19). Indeed, it is hard to imagine that strictly regulated development of uniform motives meets the individual-oriented pathos, which for the last years has been pervading the world literature dedicated to educational issues. Similarly, it is hardly possible that the development of uniform motives corresponds to the anthropocentricity of innovative changes principle.

A.M. Novikov’s warning has not been heard, and today motives are included into competence, appearing in educational standards and curricula. Professor A.L. Andreev points out that “Mixing knowledge with personal qualities and socialization level, on the one hand, and professional skills and habits with value orientations, on the other, is typical of both competence approach theory and regulatory documents, which sets educational goal setting rather blurry and vague” (Andreev, 2014: 33). This is partly explained by the fact that there is a fundamental difference for a learner between “I can and I want”, “I want but I cannot”, “I can, but I do not want”, and “I cannot and I do not want”, for the ability to do something and the motivation to do it are developed in absolutely different ways and by different specialists (Andreev, 2014: 33).

Moreover, the development of motivation has a pronounced physiological character. It depends on a great number of factors, exceeding the time-space framework of education at an educational institution.

The researcher cites a number of other counter-arguments against competence approach as educational paradigm. Thus, A.L. Andreev observes that the term “competence” is not applicable to all academic abilities and mental abilities: “For example, how is it possible to define the efficiency of productive imagination or artistic talent with the help of competence approach?” (Andreev, 2014: 32).

Another debatable issue is that “since it has appeared, despite the theoreticians’ original designs, the notion of “competence” in its broadest sense is not so easy to put into practice. And this means that unlike the classical triad of “knowledge-skills-habits”, the degree of competence formation in many cases is difficult and even impossible to accurately monitor.” (Andreev, 2014: 32). As a result, “all the recently prescribed paper and test materials, starting from the Unified State Exam (USE) and finishing with the problems of checking students’ residual knowledge at universities, are nothing but a means of sensing knowledge” (Andreev, 2014: 35).

Let us not continue the permanent discussion (Andreev, 2014; Babintsev, 2014; Kochetkov, 2014; Novikov, 2010; Robotova; Seer, Pavlova, et al., 2005; and others) of advantages and disadvantages of the competence paradigm. Not claiming to provide comprehensive argumentation, we will formulate our vision of the future educational paradigm. It shall grow from the current educational paradigm and take into account both its justified goals and achievements and unfulfilled expectations, thereby opening opportunities for their implementation.

Future higher education paradigm can be termed creative and innovative according to the integrative development task of creative and innovative educational environment. Modern philosophical concepts of creativity consider novelty as a criterion, typical not only of a result of some activity, but of the process of creation...
as well, which is determined by such notions, as duration, inter-subjectivity, polyphony, diversity, inter-paradigmaticity and others. Besides, in non-classical tradition the process of creation and its results are additionally characterized by anthropologic and social aspects (Tomiuk, 2014). Given this, the following principles, such as “self-development of activity subjects”, “co-creativity of activity subjects on the level of their co-existence”, “openness, integrity, self-organization”, “anthropocentricity of innovative changes” characterize the educational paradigm, which should correspond to post-industrial society.

**Continuity of creative and innovative educational paradigm and the current concept of HVT development**

In fact, creative and innovative types of activity coincide as originally these notions are synonymous. With time, the notion of “innovation” began to be used to describe comprehensively and effectively implemented innovations in this or that sphere of human activity. The term “innovation” was understood as a complex process of development, controlled by man, which is purposefully used by society, as well as by its structures, aiming at certain progress, a positive result in this or that sphere of life (Usmanov, 2009: 35). Besides, in their classical variant, changes originate in the field of fundamental knowledge and continue in science and technology. They are completed in consumer sphere, achieving socially significant effects.

The word combination “creative and innovative” means that innovative educational HVT environment is an environment oriented towards integration with production activity to solve practice-oriented problems. In this sense, creative and innovative educational HVT environment can reveal all its facets to the students later, in their senior years at universities.

Teaching how to create is a mystery, which primarily depends on individual’s influence, the influence of the deep sides of human nature, imperceptible even “face to face” and predetermined by the potential, hidden capabilities of the individual. All creativity-connected issues are closer related to upbringing rather than to education, to art rather than to technology, and to a “live” individual’s influence, rather than to Internet communication. It is the individual’s influence, deprived of any rating, the influence of the multi-dimensional co-existence, created by both student and teacher, and not its virtual and digital likeness that opens up the secret of the most efficient way of developing creativity and forming personal creative orientation. To prove it, let us cite the brightest examples of domestic scientists, such as V.I. Vernadsky, A.F. Ioffe, P.L. Kapitsa, S.P. Korolyov, I.V. Kurchatov, L.S. Landau, A.G. Rubinstein and many others. In this connection, the necessity to change the existing educational paradigm can be proved by A.L. Andreev’s words. “Somehow, Russian theoreticians of the competence approach absolutely do not consider the fact that not everything we know and can do (or we should know and should be able to do) can be explicit and can be communicated to students in the form that allows control and qualitative assessment. Moreover, the implicit, “personal” knowledge (M. Polanyy), which individuals to a great extent develop themselves on the basis of their practical experience gained from their professional activity and social interactions, is the most valuable part of their intellectual baggage” (Andreev, 2014: 34). In addition, certain knowledge and competence can be transmitted only in the form of an individual’s knowledge (Polani, 1985: 83).

Distance moral education is also rather limited. Love for the Fatherland, acceptance of
moral standards, regional cultural peculiarities and the whole country are, in any educational environment, including universities, developed by influential people, traditions, and the established order of the university. Morality and ethics are becoming an adequate innovative resource of post-industrial society. They are also becoming a condition for positive changes, feasibility of national projects and innovative programs of development of various sectors, the whole country and its regions.

Such methods as testing, typical of distance education, formal tasks and Internet communication, losing its efficiency as the number of trainees is growing, do not favour training of future specialists capable of innovative development of the society. The process of creation is incompatible with the teacher’s routine or making someone deal with typical tasks. Existing technologies standardize thinking and prevent creative and multidisciplinary awareness development. All the more so they hamper the development of interpersonal communication skills and skills of work in creative teams.

Development of creative and innovative educational environment as HVT educational paradigm continues along with competence approach and at the same time has a number of significant methodological advantages. In the first place, there are advantages connected with the category of creativity, and namely, its relevance to the development of personal characteristics, which are indivisible in the course of activity. Secondly, the implicit practice-oriented aim favours innovative education activity due to the urgent social and economic goals of society development and logical development of the underlying sciences. Thirdly, there appears a possibility to “rehabilitate” qualification approach to education quality assessment. The approach has proved to be dominating in higher education. Competence approach is then defined as an additional one, as a method for maintaining both students’ and graduates’ activity, evaluating the performance of the latter (it is important to understand that competence development cannot be limited only to university environment. It is an open system embracing all the forms of a student’s, and, later, a specialist’s development in the course of their work). Fourthly, and lastly, creative and innovative educational environment development assumes development of the individual’s creative orientation, which, to a certain extent, goes along with competence approach in its motivation perspective. It simultaneously stops development of students’ motivation in the way it takes place today in the process of HVT modernization. This means that it better satisfies the principle of anthropocentricity of innovative changes.

Advantages and peculiarities of creative and innovative educational environment as an educational paradigm can be also projected at the school education stage. In this case, they presuppose pedagogical innovations, which determine the uniqueness of educational environment in various schools. Russian secondary education successfully followed the way in the 1990s. However, it turned off the way and rushed in the direction convenient for education officials, to uniform supervisory tools, educational standards with few alternatives, uniform educational technology, USE and multi-level reporting. In order not to mix the senses hidden in the notion of “innovation” (pedagogical innovations in pre-university education and practice-oriented ones in university education), it is appropriate to introduce a creative educational paradigm with a clarifying detail of “creative and innovative” for higher professional education.

The emphasis put on the innovative aspect of higher professional education environment due to the continuity of education levels implies the corresponding meta targeting at school and even pre-school levels of education (realization of
social and economic innovations in Russia ahead of their time).

Creative educational environment development as an integrating task of educational system improvement is consistent with A.L. Andreev’s ideas. He poses the problem of forming creative intellectual environment, thus proclaiming a new educational paradigm (Andreev, 2014: 37). Indeed, the notion of creativeness is close to the notion of creativity. The evaluation features of creative activity can be fairly represented in the form of a scale with the activity effectiveness poles titled as creativeness and reproduction.

However, A.L. Andreev’s idea cannot be fully accepted as it does not correspond to the specifics of pedagogical systems. The fundamental problem of pedagogical systems is the problem of a balanced combination between creative and reproductive methods and means of education, upbringing and development of an individual. Teachers deal with this problem constantly when planning their activity.

Unconditional declaration of priority of students’ creative development (a rather widespread trend in contemporary theory and practice of education), and consequential planning of educational material and education technology are unacceptable for the following reasons.

Firstly, there is no direct dependence of creativity parameters on intellect, which, as a rule, many innovative educational systems primarily develop (the works of R.M. Granjvskaya and Iu.S. Krizhanskaya, E.V. Nikiforova, V.F. Wollach, and L.M. Terman contain experimental data on the absence of direct dependence of creative abilities on intellect).

Secondly, it is known that the educational process based primarily on creative tasks is very exhaustive for students. It is proved by the studies of M.A. Volakh and N.A. Koga. Having borrowed Mednik’s “associative approach” concept, they defined “creativeness” with the help of the terms of “uniqueness” and “productivity” as “an ability to generate unique and abundant associations”. They carried out some tests that included verbal and visual tasks and used the criteria of uniqueness and productivity to evaluate the results. As a result, the psychologists observed that such an extremely great association flow encouraged by the experimenter, quickly exhausted the testee.

Thirdly, an individual’s creative potential is conditioned by both reproductive and creative abilities. Successful performance of any more or less difficult task requires certain automatic actions, recollection of some information, some model-based actions. And, only after the successful completion of these steps, it requires the ability to handle unfamiliar situations, to generate ideas and not to act mechanically.

Fourthly, it is rather problematic to fulfil all educational tasks on the creative level, especially with the lack of training time. Assimilation of “ready” knowledge with the help of explanatory and illustrative methods, as well as “follow the image” method, are inherent in reproduction. Reproductive methods are also crucial in pre-university education, especially when it is necessary to develop one’s motivational sphere. Yanush Korchak said: “one is given ten commandments carved in stone when he wants to burn them with the heat of his heart in his chest, and the other is made seek the truth which he needs ready made”. Patriotic education, assimilation of moral standards, cultural peculiarities, and development of many personal qualities are, first of all, conditioned by reproductive educational methods and means.

Creative and innovative educational paradigm and acmeological approach to an individual’s development

Working out of the creative and innovative educational paradigm actualizes everything
that is closely connected with individual creative potential. Yet the theories that focus on an individual’s entire life path are becoming particularly relevant due to the continuity of the creative and innovative educational paradigm and the competence approach (the latter, being an additional one within the new educational paradigm, provides prolonged specialists training process.)

One of such theories appeared due to the study of intellectual development and maturity in the context of the intentionally dynamic “acme” model. The model is targeted at individual’s personal growth, constant improvement and creative development, which with appropriate efforts and under appropriate social conditions can continuously go on an upward trajectory. Hence, maturity is not the destination the development aims at and finishes with. It is a continuous process, which reflects development of an individual’s activity as long as they are capable of self-realization.

The founder of sociology Auguste Comte introduced the notion of “maturity” as a social phenomenon and applied it to human beings in the middle of the 19-th century. The notion has a complex nature. The complexity is proved by the intensive study of the phenomenon in a large number of natural and social sciences, studying human.

Studying human being from the perspective of acmeology is a relatively new area. The object of acmeology is the phenomenon of maturity of an individual or a process and a result of reaching one’s peaks (including professional ones) by an individual, a personality or a subject of activity. The term “acmeology” comes from the Greek “acme”, which means flourishing and peak. “Acme” is often interpreted as achieving the peak point of human development, the maximum maturity in all aspects of self-manifestation and functioning.

Considering “acme” as the apex of perfection, it is appropriate to mention Hegel’s statement that perfection is worthy of death, and thus, inevitably dies because it has no potency to develop. That is why the “apex” dynamic model presupposes the possibility of recession, regression, and involution after achievements. A.A. Derkach emphasizes that the contemporary acmeology theories of professional education are based on the “multi-apex” phenomenon model: “Acme” does not mean the final point of life movement and development, but the apex which opens new horizons of further advancement” (Derkach, 2000: 102). The study of the conditions required to achieve one apex can contribute to technologizing and optimizing the process of achieving the following one. Yet, both “one-apex” and “multi-apex” models have similar drawbacks. Because of this, we can speak of “acme” only after stating that until the point is fixed it is impossible to be certain if the real acme phenomenon has taken place. There is always a possibility of a new higher stage of development to occur.

In our research, we rely on the intentionally dynamic model of “acme”, according to which the criterion of empirical and conceptual identification of “acme” phenomenon is not the point of the upper extremum of development, i.e. transition from development to regress, but intensive growth and a qualitative leap of development. This defines the essential features of “acme”, such as progressive direction as a constructive intention, intensity as avalanche dynamic development, incompleteness as openness to the next round of development (Stepanov, 2000). Thus, the process criteria are dominant in contrast to the outcome criteria.

The research emphasizes that from the perspective of the intentionally dynamic model, the achievement of each subsequent point of maximum development does not necessarily lead to degradation. On the contrary, development may lead to even more intensive development.
case, “acme” is interpreted not as an apex point in the maximum of the extremes of human life but as a point of continuous, possibly exponential development curve. Consequently, it is possible to distinguish acmeological periods not only in mature and old ages, but also in childhood, adolescence, student age and any other age as well. In this way, the intentionally dynamic model orients personal growth on continuous improvement and creative development, which under appropriate social conditions and with appropriate efforts can continuously go on an upward trajectory.

There are three acmeological models: “one-apex” (type 1), “multi-apex” (type 2) and “intentionally dynamic” (type 3). They are shown in Fig. 1.

Considering maturity not only as a result, but also as a process of personality formation, it should be emphasized that “the state of maturity of an object or phenomenon is not a short moment of its development, but a fairly long period of deployment of its essential powers” (Danilenko, 1980: 7). L.A. Antsiferova states that the complicated and contradictory process of an individual’s formation, including three aspects of maturity – physical, social, and moral and psychological, is not limited to certain periods of time. It occurs at all stages of human life. “The maturity period cannot be regarded as the final state the development aims at finishes with. On the contrary, the more socially and psychologically mature an individual is, the greater is their capacity for further development” (Antsiferova, 1981: 8-9). Indeed, formation of such quality as maturity is a lengthy process and it reflects the development of the subject of activity and the possibility of their self-realization. Since each individual possesses their own peculiarities, the maturity of each individual, as well as the components of their personality, does not occur simultaneously; it is individual. Thus, maturity is a non-stationary state, a set of complex development processes, and their inconsistency lies in their non-uniformity and heterochrony. Maturity is a dissected notion, as it always requires an attribute, such as “political”, “social”, “intellectual”, “moral”, “emotional”, or “personal”.

The problem is the focus of university education on specialization and underestimation of the individual’s position. Besides, the learners’ stereotypical attitude to studies is difficult to break. Former students got used to going to school (or university) to acquire knowledge (with teachers providing them with knowledge), and this very fact is important for them. Having received their high school certificate, they are still intellectually immature, as they do not have their own views and attitudes yet. They are also immature in the sense of having low self-organizing and analytic skills. Finally, they are emotionally immature, as they do not feel guilty for either negligence to learning as major activity during studies and its result.

Fig. 1. Types of acmeological models
which is professional inefficiency. Since they are unable to acquire knowledge on their own, students are often unable to build their personal trajectory of professional development, they feel no responsibility for the results or quality of their performance.

For this reason intellectual and personality education should be in the first place in the educational system of professional education. Professional specialization can serve as a means of “carving” the human “stone”, which would contribute to the realization of its uniqueness. Therefore, the development of intellectual maturity of the trainee (both at the stage of training and at the stage of professional activity) now acquires particular importance.

Intellectual maturity is a process of accumulating knowledge, creative thinking experience as well as developing abilities to set long-term objectives of intellectual development and achieving them in the future. The process is indivisible. Intellectual maturity is a state, and a result, and a productive process of developing and assimilating intellectual and moral values. From the perspective of such age group as young students, it is the most favourable period for intensive intellectual development of their personality. University specialization also favours the solution of intellectual education problems.

B.G. Ananiev and his followers’ studies of the sensitive age of students when they reach the heights of professional maturity have shown that age factor is very important for the intellectual development of the future specialist. According to the results achieved by B.G. Ananiev, intellectual development in the form of evolution covers the period from 18 to 30 years and the optimum development of intellectual functions is between 18-20 years. B.G. Ananiev interprets optimum development of intellectual functions as the highest manifestation of human intellectual activity. According to B.G. Ananiev, the notion of optimum is close to that of “acme”, as it determines the highest level of manifestation of one’s abilities and functions during activity (Ananiev, 1980).

Intellectual maturity includes a set of criteria and indicators of its development. Cognitive interest is the need to enrich and update knowledge, search for the truth, etc. Cognitive independence is the ability to manage the learning process consciously and actively, to use rational methods of mental activity, etc. Being intellectually active is the ability to defend one’s position, intellectual initiative, active handling of the stored knowledge and skills, etc. Intellectual competence is the attitude to a different position from the perspective of its worth, width, consistency, and efficiency, it is the categorical nature of knowledge, metacognition, etc. Intellectual creativity means fluent and flexible thinking, producing original ideas, figurativeness, the ability to see different solutions to problems, variability and diversity of subjective methods of interpreting events, etc. Dialogism of individual consciousness means variability and diversity of subjective methods of interpreting one and the same event, the ability to synthesize different cognitive positions in a dialogue with others, etc. Psychological autonomy means development of evaluative position, responsibility, self-reflection, self-regulation, etc.

The set of criteria and indicators of intellectual maturity development, tested on university students, is universal and can be also applied to university graduates, for example, in the course of advanced training, which is the task of our further experimental work.

Conclusion

Summarizing the research results presented in the article, we may state that the coming educational paradigm shall satisfy the principle of anthropocentricity of innovative changes in
a post-industrial society (the main distinctive feature of the new paradigm). This presupposes minimizing the social and psychological frustration factors, which accompany innovation, as well as measures compensating for the destructive effect the changes of the educational environment, bring about on the participants of educational activity.

The prospects of the higher education development according to the new educational paradigm actualize the acmeological approach to the development of an individual. It is directly related to creative activity and may serve as a methodological basis for competence approach being additional means for the assessment of specialists trained at universities.

In this connection, the article discloses the intentionally dynamic model of “acme” as a theory of developing an intellectually mature individual (one of the maturity types). Apart from this, it provides a set of criteria and indicators of intellectual maturity, which are recommended to be used at all the stages of specialist training and their professional activity.
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Творчески-инновационная парадигма образования и акмеологический подход к развитию субъекта профессиональной подготовки

М.В. Кочетков*, Е.М. Чеботарёва*

* Сибирский федеральный университет
Россия, 660041, Красноярск, пр. Свободный, 79

* Полоцкий государственный университет
Республика Беларусь, 211440, Новополоцк, ул. Блохина, 29

Обосновываются сущностные характеристики творчески-инновационной парадигмы высшей школы. Принцип антропоцентричности инновационных изменений рассматривается в качестве основной отличительной особенности грядущего высшего образования. Новую образовательную парадигму также характеризуют принципы «саморазвития субъектов деятельности», «сотоверчества субъектов деятельности на уровне их со-бытийной общности», «открытости, целостности, самоорганизации». Раскрывается преемственность творчески-инновационной образовательной парадигмы и ныне сложившейся концепции развития высшего профессионального образования. В связи с этим особое внимание уделяется акмеологическому подходу к развитию человека. Данный подход, благодаря своей непосредственной связи с закономерностями творческой деятельности, рассматривается как методологическое основание использования компетентностного подхода при осуществлении практендированного сопровождения оценки качества подготовки специалиста (не только на этапе обучения в вузе, но и на стадии профессиональной деятельности). Ориентируясь на интенционально-динамическую модель «акме», раскрывается комплекс критериев и показателей сформированности интеллектуальной зрелости личности, который предлагается использовать и при подготовке будущего специалиста, и в ходе его профессиональной деятельности.
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