Journal of Innovations in Business and Industry

aspur

Vol. 01, No. 02 (2023) 65-70, doi: 10.61552/JIBI.2023.02.002 - http://jibi.aspur.rs

QUALITY CRITERIA IN UNIVERSITIES

Bülent Eker[1]
Ayşegül Akdoğan Eker

Received 07.01.2023.
Accepted 12.04.2023.
Accepted 21.05.2023.

Keywords:

Q*uality, innovation, Universities, criteria.*

Original research

A B S T R A C T

The increase in the number of universities in all countries in recent years has necessitated a rethinking of the criteria for evaluating education. It is important to keep in mind that no single indicator can capture all the factors that contribute to the quality of a university and different institutions may prioritize different factors depending on their strengths and objectives. It is important to note that university quality is a multifaceted concept and cannot be assessed based on only one indicator. A comprehensive assessment of a university's quality may require consideration of multiple indicators and contextual factors in order to get a holistic picture of its overall performance. Creative and innovative thinking is at the heart of this. As a result, many different criteria emerge. Quality is undoubtedly the first criterion that comes to mind. There have been great developments in this regard in Turkey. Every institution has started to create strategic plans targeting quality. In this sense, the Higher Education Council in Turkey has taken a new step in higher education with YÖKAK (Higher Education Quality Authority). Now, all universities are subjected to external evaluation, monitoring and accreditation by preparing KIDR (Internal Evaluation Report). It is observed that this is a great quality move for our country. In this sense, YÖKAK is making efforts to realize the desired quality indicators in universities not only on a formal basis but also on the basis of practice. In this sense, YÖKAK has been working on 4 basic issues (Leadership, Governance, Quality - Education, Teaching - Education, Teaching - Research Development-Social Contribution) which are addressed in quality in all universities. A systematic structure has been established to monitor quality. Each university now has a Quality main heading on its web pages, and the studies carried out are explained to the society. Of course, these studies find an increasing place not only on the web page but also in the application areas. In this study, quality criteria in Turkish universities are explained in a basic sense and suggestions are given about what needs to be done..

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality is generally defined as "the degree to which a set of inherent properties (attributes) of an object satisfies a set of requirements". The quality of an object is therefore determined by comparing a set of predetermined characteristics against a set of requirements. If these characteristics conform to the requirements, high quality is achieved. A traditional definition of quality includes literacy, numeracy and life skills and is directly linked to critical components such as content, methodologies, curricula, examination systems, policy, planning and management (Pigozzi, 2009).

Academic quality is a way of describing how well the learning opportunities offered to students help them

[1] Corresponding author: Bulent Eker
Email: buekeray@gmail.com

reap the rewards (Romiszowski, 2016). It is about making sure that appropriate and effective teaching, support, assessment and learning opportunities are provided for them. A common policy debate in countries around the world is whether education is public or private. Students recognize that the benefits are individual. Quality education helps in finding a job, raising social status, etc (Danneker & Bottge, 2009).. Policy makers assume that the benefit is socio-political. Quality education has to be in place to increase national productivity and social equality or social cohesion and political solidarity (White, 2003). Depending on one's perspective, quality education should be measured by its cost-effectiveness relative to employment; and from another perspective, it should be measured by overall intellectual output (Garrison, 2005). Although quality has become the center of attention, neither its meaning nor its Use is consistent. Indeed, there is no agreed technical side to the concept of quality in higher education (Trow, 2007). Its meaning and use often involve a heavy contextual overlay of some political or educational position" (Lindsay, 1992) Although. quality has come into the limelight, neither its meaning nor its implications are always clear. Indeed, there is no agreed technical specification of the concept of quality in higher education. Its meaning and use often involves the overlay of some political or educational issues (Lindsay, 1992). Quality in higher education encompasses all its functions, activities, teaching and academic programs, research and scholarship, staff, students, buildings, facilities, equipment, services to the community and the academic environment (Ramsden & Moses, 1992; Healey, 2000; Ramsden 2003).

The world knows that the economic success of states is directly determined by the quality of their education systems and that the most influential factor of production is human capital, expressed in the knowledge, skills, creative abilities and moral qualities of individuals in society (Martín-de-Castro et al., 2011). In the last decade, higher education institutions have come to be considered within the growing importance of knowledge-driven economies that place them at the center of national competitiveness agendas all over the world. Higher education institutions are increasingly viewed by policy makers as "economic engines", enabling the generation of knowledge through research and innovation and the continuous training of the workforce (Williamson, 2021). As a result, higher education policy on quality in higher education is becoming increasingly important on European and national agendas. The widespread recognition that higher education is the main driver of economic competitiveness in an increasingly knowledge-driven global economy has made higher education more important than ever (Miotto et al., 2020; Paiva et al., 2020; De Wit & Altbach, 2021).The imperative for countries is to increase higher levels of employability skills, maintain a globally competitive research base and improve knowledge dissemination for the benefit of society (Chan et al., 2020).

When it comes to global trends in higher education, universities are caught in the middle of the public-private debate. This has led to the desire to contribute to human development and career skills; to attract highly qualified students, which also raises the institutional status; and to be seen as key social institutions in their countries. Therefore, the most important indicators in recent times include student selectivity, reputation and research output (Alsmadi et al., 2020). These indicators assume that at least a good university will be an elite university, whether or not it meets various individual and societal expectations of universities.

Increasingly, research impact is seen as the most important quality indicator in higher education. Research impact is typically measured by rewards such as the Nobel Prize, research grant income and article citations (good research papers are more often cited by other researchers). While research impact does not directly affect the quality of education, it serves a university's educational mission in two different ways: First, it informs teaching with the latest and most advanced knowledge; second, it enhances university reputation, thus making research-intensive universities more selective. But research does not have a direct and immediate impact on teaching quality, and in many highly ranked research universities, the faculty members who do the best research are the ones who teach the least. Thus, countries that focus on building their higher education systems and institutions solely through increasing research productivity may still face significant challenges in increasing employment and income for their citizens. Other countries are therefore looking instead at measures that focus on teaching quality, intellectual rigor and workforce skills.

Such measures include employer reputation, student retention, percentage of international faculty and the like. But when it comes to global university rankings, research still trumps education. Such metrics include employer reputation, student retention, percentage of international faculty and the like. But when it comes to global university rankings, research still trumps education. Such metrics include employer reputation, student retention, percentage of international faculty and the like. But when it comes to global university rankings, research still trumps education.

In order to raise the social and intellectual level of students and raise their level of awareness, universities make use of quality measures and even link this measure with the transition of students into business life, such as the entrepreneurship index.

University quality indicators are quantitative or qualitative measures used to assess the overall quality of a university. These indicators can vary depending on the context and purpose of the assessment. In the case of academic rankings, various organizations such as Times Higher Education, QS World University Rankings and Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) interpret available data in terms of publications, research output, international reputation, faculty qualifications and student-faculty ratio (Safón, 2019;

Hauptman Komotar, 2019; Chowdhury & Rahman, 2021). It is important to note that university quality is a multifaceted concept and cannot be assessed based on only one indicator. Quality in universities should be seen as an area that can be continuously improved (Budiharso & Tarman, 2020).

Universities should aim for excellence in education and training processes. Factors such as up-to-date and innovative curricula, effective teaching techniques, classroom interaction, real-world applications and internship programs should be considered to improve the quality of education. Qualified and experienced academic staff is an important factor determining university quality. Universities should attract academics who are experts in their fields and have up-to-date knowledge, support them and encourage their continuous development. Factors such as research support programs, research infrastructure, scientific publications and projects can help improve university quality. Universities should improve the support services provided to students. Services such as academic advising, career planning, scholarships and financial support, guidance and psychological counseling can help students improve their success. Strengthening physical and technological infrastructure: Up-to-date and adequate physical infrastructure, laboratories, libraries and technological resources can improve quality. It is important to strengthen infrastructure through investments and to adapt to modern technologies.

.In addition, universities should implement quality assurance and evaluation mechanisms. Within the continuous quality improvement cycle, performance evaluations, accreditation processes, peer review and other quality assurance methods should be used to assess the performance of the university and identify opportunities for improvement. In short, universities should have a strategy for quality improvement.

2. WHERE TO START TO CREATE QUALITY IN UNIVERSITIES

In order to create quality in universities, a quality management system must first be established. This system ensures that the university is managed in accordance with its quality policy, objectives, strategies and quality standards. This should start with analyzing the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the university. This analysis provides a basis for how the university's quality management system will be established and in which areas improvements need to be made, which should already be set out in the quality policy. The quality policy should include a clear statement of the university's quality objectives and commitments. Quality objectives should be set in accordance with the quality policy and should be measurable. The university's activities, processes and procedures should be identified and the quality of these processes should be assessed to ensure that they comply with standards. If existing processes need to be improved and redesigned to ensure better performance, these processes should be studied.

The resources of the university include elements such as human resources, financial resources, physical resources and technological resources. Effective management of these resources is important for the quality management system. Measurable objectives should be set for the quality management system and a set of indicators should be defined to measure performance. Performance measurements provide information on the effectiveness of the quality management system and help identify opportunities for improvement. The quality management system is based on a philosophy of continuous improvement and development. The university's quality management system should be regularly reviewed and improved in accordance with quality management standards. These steps provide a framework to help a university establish a quality management system. By establishing a quality management system, universities can improve the quality of education and training

Quality education increases students' success. A good education provides students with the necessary knowledge, skills and abilities to increase their academic success. Thanks to quality education, students have a better educational experience and start their careers with a better foundation after graduation. A good education provides students with a wider range of career opportunities. Students who receive a quality education gain a competitive advantage in the business world. Graduating from a good university offers students better job prospects, higher salaries and greater opportunities for career progression. Universities produce leaders, experts and professionals who contribute to society. Graduates with a quality education make a more valuable contribution to society.

By supporting social development, universities reinforce a sense of social responsibility. They also play an important role in research and development (R&D) activities and innovation. Quality education and research capabilities help universities foster scientific, technological and social innovations.

R&D activities lead to new knowledge and findings and contribute to the scientific literature.

High-quality R&D activities at universities ensure a respected place in the academic world and help the university to gain more prestige at national and international level. Universities that provide a good education have a higher reputation nationally and internationally. This enables them to attract more students, academics and resources

As a result, the quality of education at universities has many important impacts on student success, career opportunities, social contribution, R&D and innovation activities, and university reputation. A quality education increases the success and impact of universities and offers students a better future.

3. THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION ON QUALITY IN UNIVERSITIES

Universities engage in education, research and service activities to respond to the needs of society. Universities develop quality education programs and research projects by responding to the expectations of society. Thus, they train qualified graduates in line with the needs of society and offer solutions to social problems. contribute to social development through education and research activities. Graduates who are trained with quality education become leaders in different areas of social development and contribute to the economic, social and cultural development of society. Universities increase their social contributions by cooperating with society. Universities collaborate with stakeholders such as the public and private sectors, non-governmental organizations and local governments to develop educational programs, research projects and social services that meet the needs of society. These collaborations enhance the quality of universities and strengthen their social contributions.

4. CONCLUSION

Quality assurance in higher education also has a responsibility to frame and articulate core values to students, government, employers and the public. This is part of the dimension of social responsibility. This can be done by using quality review to articulate and examine the social responsibility efforts of higher education, calling on colleges, universities and emerging providers to take meaningful steps in areas such as access, equity, diversity and inequality, for example. It can be done by demonstrating that academic freedom and autonomy are part of the foundation on which social responsibility rests. In many ways, 'social responsibility' relates to the role of both quality assurance and higher education in ensuring social justice in a country, region or internationally.

Nowadays, universities are confronted with rankings based on certain criteria, but rankings in universities are constantly criticized by some. The main problem with rankings is their homogenizing effect on universities. Instead of allowing universities to adapt to student markets, local economies, cultural preferences, etc., rankings have led universities to follow almost identical paths. Ideally, a country should encourage a mix of institutional types in its higher education landscape: research schools/community colleges and the differences between them. To answer this question in a different way, rankings in general are important as a benchmark if a university wants to improve its ranking. But university rankings emerged because of the desire of students, their families, employers and governments to identify (and in a sense reward) universities that have always been of high quality. Journalists were the first to take note, and several publications quickly realized how popular and profitable university rankings could be. Some countries and a few universities have also developed new ranking programs in an effort to prioritize different measures. To date, there are several widely cited global ranking schemes, each weighing certain measures slightly differently. From a regional perspective, only one publisher ranks universities in the Middle East, and this publisher focuses only on research impact, but it is troubling that it is done from a very narrow perspective and unfortunately based on an extremely limited publication database.

As is well known, most of these rankings were developed without significant input from universities, employers or governments. Typically, when a ranking scheme emerges, intense criticism of the methodology, often by universities, can eventually lead to change. It is tempting for rankers to base their assessment on easily accessible data, so research is often the first criterion. Equally, data from universities themselves or from employers is difficult to obtain and therefore less attractive to rankers.

In terms of research quality, rankings can give us valuable insights into the impact and productivity of the best universities. Indeed, the criteria considered in the rankings have created a self-reinforcing system. If a university ranks well one year, its reputation with peers and employers will be maintained, often because peers and employers see the high ranking. In other words, we are all subconsciously influenced by rankings, whether we agree with their methodology or not. Beyond that, I find that ranking schemes provide very little useful information. From personal experience, the differences between universities on a global level are never accurately portrayed in point differences, even if they are ranked several hundred places apart. I have visited universities ranked in the 100s in certain programs that clearly have terrible teaching quality and very low student satisfaction. Conversely, I have visited universities not even ranked that have extremely strong employer reputations, high student satisfaction, innovative teaching, etc. The advice I would give to someone looking for a good university is to focus with great care on what they want to get out of it. Universities are never designed to be one-size-fits-all.

focus. Universities were never designed to be one-size-fits-all.In practice, American research universities still follow the paradigms of the liberal arts by mandating breadth before depth, such as basic or general education courses before specialization in majors. A traditional humanities university would tend toward smaller classes, and faculty members would be encouraged to place more emphasis on their teaching than on their research, although research (i.e. publishing in peer-reviewed journals or academic publications) is still necessary to ensure that knowledge within the institution is current and relevant. A research institution in the United States will need a broad-based curriculum before specialization, and many of the principles of a liberal arts education can still be seen in research institutions. The main difference is that faculty members

are encouraged to publish much more and therefore spend a little less time teaching. In contrast, very few teaching or research institutions in Europe require a broad curriculum before specialization. As mentioned in the answer to the previous question, universities are not one size fits all. Every student will always want something special and unique from a university education.

Many students want more independence and may therefore choose a large research institution. But others may want a more personalized approach and therefore choose a liberal arts institution. And there are many variations in between. Increasingly, liberal arts universities are adding professional programs or research centers and master's degrees. Likewise, many large research universities have created smaller programs that mimic the liberal arts mission.

The point is that universities are constantly evolving and in many ways quality is in no way related to institutional type. Diversity of types is a very good thing in itself. The question should be whether the university is achieving what it says it aims to achieve. Unfortunately, if we were to just look at the rankings, we would get the message that diversity of species is not welcome. quality has nothing to do with institutional type. Diversity of types is a very good thing in itself. The question should be whether the university is achieving what it says it aims to achieve. Unfortunately, if we were to just look at the rankings, we would get the message that diversity of species is not welcome. quality has nothing to do with institutional type. Diversity of types is a very good thing in itself. The question should be whether the university is achieving what it says it aims to achieve.

References:

Alsmadi, I., Taylor, Z. W., & Childs, J. (2020). US News & World Report Best Colleges rankings: Which institutional metrics contribute to sustained stratification?. *Scientometrics*, 124, 1851-1869.

Budiharso, T., & Tarman, B. (2020). Improving quality education through better working conditions of academic institutes. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 7(1), 99-115.

Chan, A. K., Nickson, C. P., Rudolph, J. W., Lee, A., & Joynt, G. M. (2020). Social media for rapid knowledge dissemination: early experience from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Anaesthesia*, 75(12), 1579.

Chowdhury, A. R., & Rahman, Z. (2021). Global ranking framework & indicators of higher educational institutions: A comparative study. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*, 5268.

Danneker, J. E., & Bottge, B. A. (2009). Benefits of and barriers to elementary student-led individualized education programs. *Remedial and Special Education*, 30(4), 225-233.

De Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: Global trends and recommendations for its future. In Higher Education in the Next Decade (pp. 303-325). Brill.

Garrison, D. R. (2005). Quality and access in distance education: theoretical considerations. In Theoretical principles of distance education (pp. 9-21). Routledge.

Hauptman Komotar, M. (2019). Global university rankings and their impact on the internationalisation of higher education. *European Journal of Education*, 54(2), 299-310.

Healey, M. (2000). Developing the scholarship of teaching in higher education: A discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 169-189.

Lindsay, A. (1992). Concepts of quality in higher education. *Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration*, 14(2), 153-163.

Martín-de-Castro, G., Delgado-Verde, M., López-Sáez, P., & Navas-López, J. E. (2011). Towards 'an intellectual capital-based view of the firm': origins and nature. *Journal of business ethi*cs, 98, 649-662.

Miotto, G., Del-Castillo-Feito, C., & Blanco-González, A. (2020). Reputation and legitimacy: Key factors for Higher Education Institutions' sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Research*, 112, 342-353.

Paiva, T., Ribeiro, M., & Coutinho, P. (2020). R&D collaboration, competitiveness development, and open innovation in R&D. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(4), 116.

Pigozzi, M. J. (2009). Quality education: A UNESCO perspective. In International perspectives on the goals of universal basic and secondary education (pp. 249-259). Routledge.

Ramsden, P. (2003). Learning to teach in higher education. Routledge.

Ramsden, P., & Moses, I. (1992). Associations between research and teaching in Australian higher education. *Higher Education*, 23(3), 273-295.

Romiszowski, A. J. (2016). Designing instructional systems: Decision making in course planning and curriculum design. Routledge.

Safón, V. (2019). Inter-ranking reputational effects: an analysis of the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) and the Times Higher Education World University Rankings (THE) reputational relationship. Scientometrics, 121(2), 897-915.

Trow, M. (2007). Reflections on the transition from elite to mass to universal access: Forms and phases of higher education in modern societies since WWII. In International handbook of higher education (pp. 243-280). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

White, D. (2003). Social policy and solidarity, orphans of the new model of social cohesion. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers canadiens de sociologie*, 51-76.

Williamson, B. (2021). Making markets through digital platforms: Pearson, edu-business, and the (e) valuation of higher education. *Critical Studies in Education*, 62(1), 50-66.

Bülent Eker
Namık Kemal University,
Biosystem Engineering
Department,
Tekirdağ, Turkey
buekeray@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-3227-050X

Ayşegül Akdoğan Eker
YıldızTeknik University
Machinery Faculty,
İstanbul,
Turkey
akdogan@yildiz.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0003-0212-9230