



*Aseorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898475*

RFC: AT1120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VII

Número: Edición Especial

Artículo no.:27

Período: Octubre, 2019.

TÍTULO: Identificación de riesgos de las instituciones de educación superior.

AUTORES:

1. Ph.D. Rasulya R. Aetdinova.
2. Assist. Prof. Alexandra A. Nikolaeva.

RESUMEN: La educación superior, caracterizada por el mayor dinamismo del entorno educativo, así como de la sociedad, está sujeta a la influencia de riesgos generales y específicos. El artículo analiza los resultados de una encuesta de expertos, realizada por los investigadores de la Universidad Federal de Kazan, en Rusia y en la Unión Europea, en 2016. En el estudio, se pidió a los participantes que identificaran las fuentes de los riesgos de la educación superior y el riesgo universitario, para analizar los diversos enfoques de gestión del riesgo, utilizados por las universidades en su práctica. Los resultados de la encuesta de expertos mostraron la importancia del desarrollo de métodos aplicados de gestión de riesgos en el sistema de educación superior, la necesidad de estandarizar los procedimientos de gestión de riesgos.

PALABRAS CLAVES: Educación superior, Riesgos de educación superior, Riesgos universitarios, Norma ISO 31000: 2009.

TITLE: Identification of risks of Higher Education institutions.

AUTHORS:

1. Ph.D. Rasulya R. Aetdinova.
2. Assist. Prof. Alexandra A. Nikolaeva.

ABSTRACT: Higher education, characterized by the increased dynamism of educational environment, as well as society, is subjected to the influence of general and specific risks. The article analyzes the results of expert survey, conducted by the researchers of Kazan Federal University, in Russia and in the European Union, in 2016. In the study, participants were asked to identify the sources of higher education risks and university risk, to analyze the various approaches to risk management, used by universities in their practice. The results of the expert survey showed the importance of development of applied methods of risk management in the system of higher education, the need for standardization of risk management procedures.

KEY WORDS: Higher Education, Higher Education Risks, University Risks.

INTRODUCTION.

Globalization of modern society, manifested in the intensification of information exchanges, high mobility of people, the intensification of migration flows and the unification of human behavior patterns, leads to an increase in the role of higher education in the socio-cultural and economic development of society.

The formation of postindustrial society, the main value of which is knowledge, increases the requirements for the competencies of graduates (UNESCO, 1998). At the same time, such phenomena as the mass character of higher education, the decrease in funding, lag in mastering new technologies, change in the demands of the labor market, become the barriers to achieving education goals (<http://www.unesco.org>). This leads to the development of risks, caused by the uncertainty of educational outcomes.

The main goal of the study was the analysis of the practice of higher education risk management in Russia and abroad. This study was of an interdisciplinary nature, and was aimed at identifying of external and internal risks of higher education; the assessment of the degree of internal risks controllability; the definition of approaches to managing the risks of higher education, used in the universities of the Russian Federation and the EU. The expert method and method of questioning were used as the methods of the research.

The study of risks in education is a new direction. Some aspects of this issue were considered in 1995 by A.G.Abramova, who introduced the term "pedagogical riskology" into practice. It means a scientific direction, with the object of the research - risks, associated with the personalities of student and teacher (OECD, 2016).

Further works were devoted to the identification of risks (Aetdinova, 2013), formation of databases of specific risks (Kostyukova, 2009), risk assessment (Sorokina, 2009; Abramova, 1995; Aetdinova, 2013; Kostyukova, 2009). More ambitious approach to identifying risk factors in education was made in 2013, in the report of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. The main risk factors of higher education were indicated there: the evaluation of educational outcomes, the massive nature of higher education, globalization, flexibility and adaptability, inconsistency with stakeholder expectations, finance system and reporting forms (OECD, 2013).

A number of studies are dedicated to the specific risks of education in different countries (Fleacă et al., 2015; Topinka et al., 2013; Kaptan & Timurlenk, 2012). In these works, the authors consider the threats and challenges of modernization of the national higher education system, in the context of the European Union. Thus, in the work of Czech researchers Topinka D., Dosekal V., Poslt J., social risks and their impact on higher education are studied. The authors emphasize the problem of social inequality and segregation in Czech society, which is the determining factor in obtaining

higher education. The way out of this situation is the introduction of a system of grants for gifted graduates, which make it possible to pay for university tuition (OECD, 2013; Fleacă et al., 2016; Topinka et al., 2013).

An extensive analysis of universities risks and recommendations for their identification, using the example of higher education in Romania, is presented in the work of Toma S., Alexa I., Sarpe D. (Toma et al, 2014). Romanian researchers distinguish the risks of the loss of university autonomy, the risks of inconsistency of the education strategy at the national level and the higher education strategy of the EU, different capabilities of universities from the rich and poor regions of the country, the risks of Rumania's scientific and research lag (Kaptan & Timurlenk, 2012; <http://www.ferma.eu>).

The high interest of researchers in this problem makes it urgent to study and classify the risks of universities, the development of risk management issues. The results of the research can be used by universities to create their own risk management systems.

Methods.

In the course of the study of higher education risks, the main attention was paid to the identification of external and internal factors, which contribute to the formation of risks, and the possibilities for their management.

The method of expert analysis was the main method of the research. Twelve experts from four Russian universities and two universities of the European Union were invited: Northern (Arctic) Federal University, Southern Federal University, Astrakhan State University, Crimean Federal University; in the European Union: the University of Bologna (Italy), the University of Szczecin (Poland). Such number of experts increased the degree of reliability of the analysis to 90%.

The method of self-assessment was used to determine the level of experts' competence. Experts assessed their level of theoretical knowledge in the field of educational management, work experience and the ability to predict in terms of indicators "high", "medium", "low", that corresponded to numerical values: 1; 0.5 and 0. Then there was a coefficient, corresponding to the expert's competence, based on the arithmetic mean of the indicators. Consequently, the coefficient of expert's competence was in the range from 1 (full competence) to 0 (complete incompetence).

In the course of survey, the experts had to distinguish the risks of the higher education system, the sources of which were the external and internal environment of higher education. The questionnaire was divided into two parts, where experts pointed out the external and internal risks of higher education. Also, the experts were asked to indicate age, work experience and place of work.

The assessment of the degree of manageability of internal risks of higher education was carried out through the assessment of internal risks, according to the following manageability scale: "absolutely manageable", "highly manageable", "moderately manageable", "weakly managed", "unmanageable". This allowed to determine the place of risks in the form of natural numbers, in terms of their manageability. Further, the ranking was carried out. The ranks were determined in the following way: the risks were placed according to the sums of their ranks, obtained as a result of individual estimations of each expert. Therewith, the risk, which had the maximum sum of the ranks, was put at the first place. Thus, all internal risks were ranked, according to the degree of their manageability.

The survey method was used to assess the approaches to higher education risks management. The questionnaire included 10 questions. Questions 1-5 were devoted to identifying the features of the policy and strategy of educational institution risk management, its goals and objectives. Questions 6-10 determined the evaluation of risk management methods in considered educational institution.

Results.

The result of the questionnaire survey was a list of external and internal risks of higher education. The survey showed that most of the risks were of a general nature. At the same time, the specific risks of higher education point to the problems, the knowledge of which allows to prioritize further optimization of the universities' activities.

During the survey, the experts identified the following external risks of the higher education system:

- Political risks (simultaneous existence of contrary tendencies of education globalization and preservation of national (country) educational identity, transition to the Bologna system, changes in the normative base of pedagogical education, participation of universities in international ratings, consolidation of universities, the mass character of higher education, the need of colleges graduates for higher professional education).
- Socio-economic risks (risks of changing the budgetary policy in the field of education, changing the organizational and legal status of the university, the impossibility or inadequacy of contractual works, restructuring of the educational services market, deterioration of tax burden for universities, changing of requirements for entrants at the state level (increase of the USE minimum passing grade), appropriation of budgetary places to non-state HEIs, increased competition between higher education institutions, demographic situation, risks of shortage of students and reduction of budgetary places, deterioration of material and technical base of educational institutions, low wages of teachers).
- Branch risks (introduction of new educational standards, tightening of requirements for educational institutions, increasing requirements for the training of teachers, regulatory requirements for the assessment of quality of educational outcomes, poor quality of graduates training, competition between universities).

Internal risks of the higher education system include:

- Organizational risks (irrational organizational structure of universities, copying of functional areas of activity, errors in management decisions, unattractive image of universities, ineffective marketing, decreasing the quality of education by means of increasing the number of branches, incorrect planning of training activities, irrational organization of educational process in universities, personnel risks, admission of students with a low level of knowledge, lowering of the passing grade, large study load for students, discrepancy of the training program to the demands of labor market, etc.).
- The risks of subjects of educational process (staff and non-staff teachers, low level of motivation of teachers and students, high level of stress, the problem of student adaptation, the quality of students' basic training, the state of students' health, the level of teachers' competence, methodological mistakes, inadequate assessment of teachers' abilities, lack of self-education skills among students, etc.).
- Innovative risks (participation in economic and contractual activities, the correspondence of innovation activities of universities to stakeholders' expectations, the results of innovations in the educational process, etc.).
- Informational risks (high rates of informatization, risks of communication process, risks of information distortion, risks of obtaining of forbidden Internet content by students, etc.).
- Financial risks (risks of increasing the costs of educational services, risks of financially fragile position due to the borrowing, profit risks).
- Criminal risks (availability of expensive equipment).

Thus, experts identified more than 60 risks. Most of the risks can be foreseen, and, therefore, the university can form a specific strategy for managing them.

To determine the degree of manageability, 34 internal risks were ranked. Table 1 shows the results of ranking.

Table 1. Evaluation of the degree of manageability of higher education organizational risks.

№	Organizational risks	Absolutely manageable - 5	Highly manageable - 4	Medium manageable - 3	Poorly manageable - 2	Unmanageable - 1	Degree
1	Irrational organizational structure of universities	1/5	8/32	2/6	1/2	0/0	46/2
2	Copying of functional areas of activity	3/15	3/12	4/12	2/4	0/0	33/6
3	Errors in management decisions	1/5	3/12	3/9	4/8	1/1	35/5
4	Unattractive image of universities	0/0	1/4	7/21	1/2	1/1	31/7
5	Ineffective marketing	1/5	2/8	7/21	1/2	1/1	37/4
6	Decreasing the quality of education by means of increasing the number of branches	1/5	1/4	1/3	6/12	3/3	27/9
7	Incorrect planning of training activities	1/5	3/12	5/15	2/4	1/1	37/4
8	Personnel risks	7/35	4/16	1/3	0/0	0/0	54/1
9	Irrational organization of educational process	2/10	6/24	2/6	1/2	1/1	43/3
10	Admission of students with a low level of knowledge	0/0	1/4	1/3	6/12	4/4	23/10
11	Large study load for students	0/0	3/12	3/9	3/6	1/3	28/8
12	Discrepancy of the training program to the demands of labor market	1/5	1/4	2/6	4/8	4/4	27/9

The analysis of the results shows that the personnel risks, and risks, connected with the irrational organizational structure of universities, the risks of irrational organization of educational process have the highest degree of manageability. These risks are highly predictable, that increases the ability to manage them. The risks, caused by the admission of students with a low level of knowledge, and the problem of discrepancy of the training program to the demands of labor market are considered by the experts as unmanageable risks. The content of these risks is largely

determined by the subjects of educational process, which are also the part of the external environment of education. This is the reason for the difficulties in management of such risks.

Discussion.

The survey was conducted among the experts, with the aim to assess the different approaches to the management of higher education. The results of the survey showed high interest of the heads of educational institutions in the problem of risk management.

When comparing different approaches to risk management, 51% of experts noted, that the choice of approaches was based on the management system, adopted in considered educational institution.

17% of respondents believe, that in small universities only the elements of risk management can be used, since there is a high level of control in such universities, and most processes are extended to small groups. The representatives of large universities (67% of experts) believe that the most effective is the risk management at all levels of the university, beginning with the stage of strategic planning. 50% of the surveyed experts noted, that the "road maps" of federal universities in the Russian Federation contain sections on the management of university risks. This is a confirmation of the need to introduce risk management into educational practice.

One of the most important elements of risk management is the implementation of national and international standards. 87% of experts from the Russian Federation and the EU recognized the need for higher education institutions to use ISO 31000: 2009 (Toma et al., 2014). European experts (34% of respondents) pointed to the positive experience of applying the standard, expressed in the ability to develop a risk management system for higher education, improving the results of risk management. This standard was introduced in the territory of the Russian Federation in December 2010 and was actively used in the sphere of business and finance. However, the experience of its using in the educational institutions of the EU proves, that the application of ISO 31000: 2009 increases the probability of achieving goals, improves the processes of identifying the opportunities

and threats, and allows to allocate resources for risk management efficiently. Its applicability is very important to any type of risk, due to the high degree of uncertainty in the environment of higher education.

Understanding of the importance of risk management introduction calls for optimism: about 70% of experts note the need to create applied risk management techniques for universities. 87% of respondents point to the lack of available methods for assessing education risks, the need to use quantitative and qualitative risk assessments.

CONCLUSIONS.

Conducted research confirms the importance of creation of risk-oriented education management system. The experts point to the need of creation the tools, allowing educational institutions to develop risk management systems independently, to perform quantitative and qualitative assessment of the risks of higher education.

These findings are consistent with the results of the studies of Topinka D., Dosekal V., Poslt J. (2013), Toma S., Alexa I., Sarpe D. (2014) in the field of education risk management.

The assessment of possible threats and risks will allow to forecast the undesirable results timely, to create a system of situational response to unforeseen circumstances and, ultimately, to develop a safe strategy for the development of higher education, which corresponds to the actual needs of the individual, society and the state.

Acknowledgements.

The work is performed according to the Russian Government Program of Competitive Growth of Kazan Federal University.

The author is grateful to the colleagues from Northern (Arctic) Federal University, Southern Federal University, Astrakhan State University, Crimean Federal University, the University of Bologna (Italy), the University of Szczecin (Poland).

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Abramova, I. G. (1995). Pedagogical Riskology. SPb: Obrazovanie, 93.
2. Aetdinova, R. R. (2013). Exogenous and endogenous factors of risk development in educational institution. *Kazan Pedagogical Journal*, 2, 21-27.
3. Fleacă, E., Marin, A., & Fleacă, B. (2016). The challenges of Romanian higher education—a review on the key enablers for modernization. *Procedia Technology*, 22, 1121-1128.
http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/declaration_eng.htm#world%20declaration
4. Kaptan, K., & Timurlenk, O. (2012). Challenges for Science Education. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 51, 763-771.
5. Kostyukova, T. P. (2009). The Concept of Risk Assessment in the Educational Activity of the University [Text]. *Informatics: problems, methodology, technology: Materials of the Ninth International Scientific and Methodical Conference (12-13 February, 2009)*. Voronezh: Publishing and Polygraphic Center of VSU, 1, 363-366.
6. OECD (2013). *Testing Student And University Performance Globally: OECD's AHELO*.
<http://www.oecd.org/edu/skills-beyond-school/AHELOFSReportVolume3.pdf>.
7. OECD (2016). *Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing, Paris.
http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/education-at-a-glance_19991487.
8. Sorokina, N. D. (2009). *Management of Innovations in Universities (Sociological Analysis): Scientific Monograph*. M.: “Kanon + RSDP “Reabilitatsiya”.
9. Toma, S. V., Alexa, I. V., & Şarpe, D. A. (2014). Identifying the risk in higher education institutions. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 15, 342-349.
10. Topinka, D., Dočekal, V., & Poslt, J. (2013). The Reproduction of Social Risks and Social Exclusion within the Education System of the Czech Republic. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 106, 3062-3068.

11. UNESCO. (1998). World declaration on higher education for the twenty-first century: Vision and action. In World Conference on Higher Education. Ginebra: UNESCO.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. **Rasulya R. Aetdinova.** PhD in Pedagogy Kazan Federal University. Email: rasulya_a@mail.ru
2. **Alexandra A. Nikolaeva.** Assistant Professor of Naberezhnye Chelny Institute Kazan Federal.

RECIBIDO: 2 de septiembre del 2019.

APROBADO: 11 de septiembre del 2019.