Asesorías 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: ATI120618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.
http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/
Año: VII Número: 2 Artículo no.:46 Período: 1ro de enero al 30 de abril del 2020.

TÍTULO: Métodos actuales de garantía de calidad para actividades de educación superior.

AUTORES:

1. Ph.D. Cand. Shynar Yelezhanova.

2. Ph.D. Cand. Aigul Myrzasheva.

3. Ph.D. Cand. Akhmaral Khairzhanova.

4. Ph.D. Cand. Shara Syrbayeva.

5. Ph.D. Cand. Rakhat Shuakbayeva.

6. Máster. Gulmaidan Myrzagereikyzy.

7. Senior Lect. Gulnara Mustagaliyeva.

8. Máster. Torgyn Tilegenova.

RESUMEN: El artículo confirma la necesidad de modernizar las estructuras organizativas de la gestión de la educación superior en el contexto del desarrollo innovador. Se describe la experiencia de la creación y el funcionamiento de estructuras educativas innovadoras. El artículo refleja el papel del control intradepartamental como parte del sistema de gestión de la educación superior. Los cambios sistémicos causados por los procesos de modernización de la educación superior requieren la mejora del sistema de gestión de una institución de educación superior, la estructura organizativa de la gestión y la introducción de métodos de gestión más eficaces.

PALABRAS CLAVES: garantía de calidad en educación, educación superior, gestión educativa superior, control intradepartamental, comité del programa educativo.

TITLE: Current quality assurance methods for higher education activities.

AUTHORS:

1. Ph.D. Cand. Shynar Yelezhanova.

2. Ph.D. Cand. Aigul Myrzasheva.

3. Ph.D. Cand. Akhmaral Khairzhanova.

4. Ph.D. Cand. Shara Syrbayeva.

5. Ph.D. Cand. Rakhat Shuakbayeva.

6. Master. Gulmaidan Myrzagereikyzy.

7. Senior Lect. Gulnara Mustagaliyeva.

8. Master. Torgyn Tilegenova.

ABSTRACT: The article substantiates the need for the modernization of organizational structures of higher education management in the context of innovative development. The experience of the creation and functioning of innovative educational structures is described. The article reflects the role of intra-departmental control as part of the higher education management system. Systemic changes caused by the processes of modernization of higher education necessitate the improvement of the management system of a higher education institution, the organizational structure of management, and the introduction of more effective management methods.

KEY WORDS: quality assurance in education, higher education, higher educational management, intra-departmental control, educational program committee.

INTRODUCTION.

The educational community is aware that the project and research-based methodologies contribute to the development of the most important creative, orientational, and general competency-based abilities and skills. However, it is still difficult to single out the personality-related qualities and abilities that are most successfully developing during the implementation of research activities; as well as to substantiate their importance for socialization and professionalization, and to propose methodologies for consolidating educational outcomes (Koyanbayeva & Zaurbekova, n.d.; Tagberliyeva, n.d.). A solution to this problem could contribute to a change in ideas about the content of specialized learning (Alekseyeva, Kopylov, & Maracha, 2003; Malakhova, 2002; Stepanova, 2005; Yanovitskaya & Adamsky, 2005).

Many practitioners raise the issue of developing narrow-subject teaching research methodologies. However, it is not the methodology that matters, with the widespread implementation of research results, the key is the question of changing a teacher’s position: either refusing the image of a bearer of an amount of ready knowledge or switching to the functions of an organizer and analyst of students' independent work (Blackmur, 2008; Billing, 2004).

It is important that a teacher knows how to highlight problems in the teaching material and motivate students to creatively solve them; independently develops a methodology for research work, otherwise, he/she returns to the beaten path of reproductive individual work with students (such as, for example, tutoring). In this aspect, it is important that a teacher possesses the culture of research and research thinking, mastering the methods of designing such forms of educational activity in which the teacher would be an ally in relation to students, a senior friend in solving educational legal problems.

DEVELOPMENT.

The modern environment determines the number of features of higher educational management including:

• The multiplicity of higher educational goals.

• The complexity of the system of interconnected processes.

• Many control channels.

• Close interconnection of controlled processes.

• System management with no clear boundaries.

• The high inertia of a higher educational institution as a system.

• A high level of democracy in governance.

• Increasing, in recent years, the degree of independence of a higher educational institution's units and, as a result, decentralization in management.

• Widespread use of information technology in the activities of a higher educational institution (Abykanova, Yelezhanova, Mailybayeva, Sadirbekova, Turmukhanova & Kabiden, 2019).

The above-listed factors actualize the analysis of higher educational management problems and the search for new managerial models that can increase the susceptibility of higher educational institutions to new requirements and adaptability to new operating conditions.

Educational program committees (EPCs) are established in the structure of some Kazakh higher educational institutions. An EPC consists of qualified teaching staff who have experience in methodological work in relevant educational areas, health care practitioners, and students. The main goal of EPCs is to improve the educational process at a higher educational institution.

The main objectives of the EPC are:

• Systematic implementation of the principles of the educational model in accordance with competency-based training at all levels of education.

• Control over educational and methodological support and the educational process assistance at a higher educational institution.

• Scientific and methodological support for the implementation of educational programs.

• Monitoring the implementation of innovative educational technologies and promising forms of organization of the educational process.

• Assessment of the quality of educational programs in areas of specialization and development of recommendations for quality improvement.

• Coordination of the intra-departmental control activities.

• Systematization and control over the provision of the educational process with educational and methodological literature.

The following activities are carried out by EPCs:

1. Examination of educational programs within specialty areas.

2. A systematic study and comprehensive assessment of educational programs with the aim of improving and guaranteeing their quality (determining the value of the program, achieving the goals and the required degree of compliance with the needs of society and the requirements of employers, and achieving the effectiveness of training methods).

3. Monitoring the formation of specific competencies among students, interns in each discipline within the framework of educational programs; Participation in the preparation of projects and peer review of standard curricula.

4. Monitoring the implementation of innovative educational technologies and promising forms of educational process organization in a higher educational institution.

5. Planning and reviewing elective disciplines with the determination of the place of study, pre- and post-requisites.

6. The selection of optimal methods for assessing key competencies of students and quality monitoring.

7. Monitoring the preparation of teaching and methodological complexes of disciplines for their compliance with regulatory documents such as instruction letters, state compulsory education standards, standard discipline programs, and educational competency-based models; discussion and approval of work programs and their vertical coordination.

8. Determining the need for the development and publication of textbooks and teaching aids for the relevant specialties.

9. Planning for the production of textbooks, teaching aids, methodological recommendations, teaching, and methodological complexes, and their review and discussion followed by approval at the HEI (higher educational institution) Methodological Council.

10. Independent review of teaching materials submitted by the staff of the associated departments for approval by the Committee.

11. Analysis of the quality and procurement of teaching materials within specialty areas.

12. Coordination of educational and methodical work in the departments, discussion of plans and reports of departments concerning the optimization of the educational process; providing advisory and methodological assistance to departments in the preparation of educational programs at all levels.

In view of the goals and objectives, in addition to the EPC chairman, deputy chairman and secretary, the following functional responsibilities of the Committee members are provided for experts monitoring the educational process in accordance with technologies (innovative, interactive ones, etc.), courses and specialties; a test expert; an expert dealing with educational programs; experts dealing with teaching practicum; an expert assessing competencies; a person responsible for the analysis of methodological support, publishing, and advisory work.

The following expert groups are to be created in order to effectively carry out functions within the EPC:

1. Expert group for the development and assessment of educational programs.

2. Expert group for monitoring teaching quality.

3. Expert group for educational and methodological support of educational programs.

4. Expert group for development and assessment of testing tools.

5. Section for the implementation of 3-language learning.

The most important function of the EPC is the constant analysis of the educational process, monitoring educational programs within disciplines. As part of this activity, the continuity of pre- and post-requisites is monitored; a catalog of elective disciplines for undergraduate, internship, master's-level and doctoral studies is formed; the educational path is adjusted according to the declared competencies of a graduated specialist. EPCs participate in the development of educational standards and programs within specialty areas; EPC chairpersons are part of the Central Methodological Council (CMC).

EPCs are actively involved in creating integrated training programs. For example, departments and modules included in the EPC for basic disciplines have mastered the methodology of conducting

integrated lectures. The departments of such an EPC are currently developing a methodology for the integrated teaching of basic disciplines based on the PBL method.

Another relevant area of EPC activities is the development of trilingualism in education. EPCs are doing a great job of introducing elements of trilingualism in the disciplines within a specialty, as well as individual work programs aimed at professional language learning.

Therefore, the EPC is the entity responsible for the direct creation, implementation, and monitoring of educational programs including methodological support for them. A lot has been done and is being done but more needs to be done to achieve our common goal - the formation of a highly competitive specialist.

The most important tool for assessing and monitoring the implementation of educational activities is the intra-departmental control (IDC). IDC exists as a tool for continuous monitoring of the learning quality, the work quality of each teacher, and of the department as a whole. IDC is aimed at assessing and analyzing the level of professional and pedagogical competence of a teacher, providing educational activities and, ultimately, assessing the student training quality.

In the narrow sense, IDC is a system for evaluating the work of each teacher by conducting open classes and by attending classes mutually. In this case, control is carried out by direct observation and a report on the results of such observation. Mutual attendance of classes enables assessing many teacher competencies such as the knowledge and the application of teaching methods and technologies including active and interactive methods; the level of knowledge on the topic of the lesson (subject and teaching discipline); time management; communication skills; the ability to maintain motivation and student interest; the ability to organize productive student activities during the lesson; providing feedback; using formative assessment, etc. Mutual visits are most productive in terms of assessing the performance of teaching staff.

An interesting and important point is the fact that in the process of mutual visits and reports on them there can be several options for interactions (Strongin, 2006; Potudanskaya, Litvinova, & Mamontov, 2012). The first option is when a more experienced (more competent) teacher evaluates the work of a younger and less experienced one. In this case, in the control process, to a large extent, there is an element of mentoring and training via feedback from an experienced colleague. The second option is when a less experienced teacher is present at the lesson of a more competent teacher. At the same time, one should not confuse it with a demonstration lesson carried out specifically for the purpose of training young teachers.

In the case of IDC, a less experienced teacher is required to evaluate the work of a more competent one. In this case, a number of the following interesting problems are solved: the junior colleague must give an objective assessment despite the pressure of the authority of the senior colleague; the senior colleague must adequately and kindly accept the assessment, the view from the young colleague by showing a model of correct reflection. Both teachers get the opportunity to learn something new from the point of view of pedagogical technology and from the point of view of pedagogical psychology. The third option is to attend a lesson conducted by a teacher with an equal competency level. In this case, the assessment will probably be the most objective since there is some healthy competition in the assessment. An evaluator unwittingly imagines himself/herself in the same situation - "how would I conduct a lesson on this topic (using this technique)".

Mutual attendance of classes is not only productive but also the most time-consuming method of control. Ideally, attending classes for an objective assessment should occur from its start to finish. This means that the supervising teacher himself/herself must be completely free from all types of work (academic, clinical, scientific one, etc.) for this time. It is especially difficult to organize this with sufficient multiplicity.

Modern technologies enable solving this problem differently - via the use of video recordings of a practical lesson, lecture, training, real work, etc. Moreover, the video recording of the lesson allows for debriefing (analysis of the lesson) with the participation of a greater number of teachers of the department (or the entire department), to review and analyze the key points of the lessons repeatedly, to work out the positive and negative sides more deeply. Particularly promising and relevant is the use of video recording of an active teaching method. The method of debriefing has proven itself in conducting training for the assimilation of practical and communication skills by interns. It is also very productive in the process of mutual control and self-training of teachers. This control tool can be indispensable for monitoring the work of part-time workers.

Another very important component of IDC is the peer review of the methodological support of classes. It is very important for the formation of effective teamwork that all the teachers of the department, not only the headteacher and the head of the department, participated in the examination of the educational and methodological developments, work programs, syllabuses, visual aids, and presentations.

An IDC method is also a cross control of the educational achievements of students. It can also be a midterm (intermediate) control by another teacher (usually a more experienced one). In the case of part-time workers, such control should be organized and carried out as mandatory (a full-time teacher, usually an assistant professor or professor, carries out mid-term control of a group of students who studied with a part-time job). Crosschecking can also affect the assessment of students' assignments (essays, presentations, creative assignments, discussions, projects, etc.). The next significant component of IDC is the mutual examination of the developed test tasks and tasks for assessing practical skills (situational tasks, simulation scenarios, and tasks for objective structured practice exam).

A very important component of IDC is the assessment of the process by students themselves. First of all, this refers to the assessment of a teacher's work by students. Such feedback (usually in the form of an anonymous questionnaire) is most unbiased, of course, only if the learning process is completed at a given department. However, feedback in the form of questionnaires, interviews, or open discussions is also possible within the team between teachers.

The ultimate goal of any method and form of IDC is to increase the effectiveness of the pedagogical process, increase the level of competence of teaching staff, and improve the mastering of the students' professional competencies. IDC, subject to constant and continuous use, is the most effective tool to increase the level of competence of the department teaching staff. An open and friendly discussion of the IDC results works to consolidate the department as a team of like-minded people.

The case-study method or the specific situation method is a method of active problem-situational analysis based on learning by solving specific situations (solving cases).

The main purpose of this method is to train students for solving specific problems. There are the following classical case-study schools: Harvard (American) and Manchester (European) ones (Rhoades & Sporn, 2002; Reinalda, Kulesza, & Klingemann, 2006; Dittrich, 2018). The implementation of the method at Harvard Business School began in 1924. The Case Clearing House of Great Britain and Ireland was created in 1973 at the initiative of 22 higher educational institutions; it has been called the European Case Clearing House (ECCH) since 1991 and is the leader in collecting and distributing cases.

The teacher provides problematic questions on the topic together with a described situation. Students show interest and try to solve a specific problem by analyzing and synthesizing the information received (Gvaramadze, 2008; Coates & Mahat, 2014; Dhamani & Kanji, 2017). In order to solve a case, the following is recommended:

1) Students work in groups of 4 to 6 people.

2) A group selects a coordinator who will try to engage all members of the group to participate so that no one monopolizes the work.

3) The coordinator activates the attention of the group if it decreases.

4) The coordinator proposes solutions.

5) The coordinator writes down the above solutions.

6) The coordinator will act as a representative of the group to state the final solution.

Students and a teacher built an associogram that helps students to better remember and learn teaching material. A project is a set of actions specially organized by a teacher and independently performed by students. These actions culminated in the development of a creative product. The project is valuable because, in the course of its implementation, students learn to acquire knowledge on their own, gain experience in cognitive and educational activities (Coates, 2005; Travers, 2007; Wolter, 2010).

When studying the methodology of using modern approaches and teaching methods that improve the quality of teaching, teachers should know that there are distinguishing features of non-standard tasks different from traditional ones.

Distinctive features of non-standard tasks from traditional ones are as follows:

1) Creative approach.

2) An independent students' search of ways and solutions to the educational task.

3) The active reproduction of previously acquired knowledge in unfamiliar conditions.

4) Unusual working conditions.

The success of the professional activities often depends also on knowledge of a foreign language, which is necessary when interacting with foreign partners, colleagues, as well as for detailed familiarization and preparation of various documents (Hargraves, Palmer, Orav, & Wright, 1996; Salter & Tapper, 2000; Benjamin, 2018). It is generally recognized that the motivation of students is half the success of a teacher. Today we need to take care of the role of youth education, so we must grow up healthy, young, intelligent, harmonious and patriotic professionals. Teachers should pay attention to students' reading, not only scientific and educational literature but also the press (media).

The assessment of educational outcomes is an integral and important part of the activities of educational institutions. In modern higher education, various approaches to assessing the results of education are practiced, nevertheless, each of them must answer one or several questions such as "what, when, whom, by whom and how to evaluate?"

The effectiveness of the educational program, each studied discipline, as well as the educational process as a whole directly depends on the goals and objectives of the training, the achievement of educational results and the compliance of monitoring and evaluation tools with expected results. The most commonly used method for assessing educational outcomes at a university is testing. A test is a method of measuring a learner's ability, knowledge, or activity in a particular field.

The state, society, employers, students, and their parents are interested in improving the quality of education. At present, most HEIs in Kazakhstan are primarily focused on fulfilling the requirements of the state, as reflected in state compulsory education standards, and indicators of state certification and accreditation of HEIs. Both can be considered as regulatory requirements for educational services, the need for which is a condition for the existence of HEIs financed from the government budget.

Employers are most interested in university graduates since it is in the real economy that the result of an educational service, expressed in the knowledge and skills of a graduate, can fully manifest itself. Therefore, it is obvious, that with potential employers, universities should determine which characteristics of graduates are most significant for them. At the same time, not all employers are now able to formulate impartially and competently their own requirements for graduates. Therefore, the marketing of potential employers should be active, i.e. it should be not only studying but also shaping the demand for future graduates. As a result, a number of wishes (requirements) of enterprises will be obtained.

When creating systems for ensuring and assessing the quality of higher education institutions, various approaches to quality management, as well as methods and criteria are used. There are three main methods for assessing quality, which is somewhat close, but still differ from each other:

- The assessment method for quality management of university activities (SWOT analysis).
- A concept based on the principles of Total Quality Management (TQM).
- An approach based on the requirements of international quality management standards ISO 9000:2000.

The quality assessment method based on the SWOT analysis involves a systematic self-assessment to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the university, as well as positive and negative factors of its development. Based on the use of this method, measures are developed and proposed for resolving problem situations and improving the activities of higher educational institutions.

In accordance with the terms of the evaluation method, performance assessment is based on statistical data obtained from the centralized services of the university (planning and financial department, accounting, research department, personnel department, etc.), annual reports of departments and information provided by deans of faculties. Based on these data, relative indicators

(per teacher, researcher, and student) are calculated for the university as a whole, as well as for each faculty individually.

Based on the data obtained, a self-examination report is prepared. The purpose of the self-examination report is to analyze all aspects of the university's activities that affect the quality of education and scientific research. In the process of conducting a university self-assessment, a SWOT analysis is used, which involves identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the university, as well as the positive and negative factors of its development. A particularity of this method is that its parameters and characteristics may vary depending on national and local characteristics.

The quality assessment method based on the principles of TQM is based on a deeper analysis of the university as a producer of services. The TQM concept assumes that the university has a clearly formulated mission, strategic goals that are developed as a result of comprehensive studies of the needs of the external environment in the basic services of the university. The TQM method implies a process approach to the activities of universities, uses a number of specific, quite complex, but very effective methods and tools of quality management (Kablashova, 2000).

When choosing a TQM strategy, quality in the broad sense of the word becomes the main goal of the organization's functioning. It is not only about the quality of the actual services or products, but about the quality of the organization’s interaction with the outside world, the quality of its functioning and management, the quality of life of its employees.

In addition, another method, based on the requirements of international quality management standards ISO 9000:2000, involves identifying stakeholders, their requirements for services’ quality, creating a system for continuous improvement of activities. This method is based on the fundamental principles of quality management including the process approach. In it, unlike the TQM model, a key management toolkit is a documented management system focused on quality.

In particular, such documents as “quality manual”, “document management”, “personnel management”, “classroom management”, “logistics management”, “library information resource management”, “management of the applicants’ selection process”, etc. are being developed. In order to support and ease the use of this documentation, an information model of the quality management system is created, access to which is available to all interested audiences. A feature of ISO-based models is that they do not imply uniformity in the quality management structure and uniformity of documentation.

In accordance with the requirements of international standards, the quality system is interpreted as a quality management system consisting of three subsystems: a quality management system, a quality assurance system, and a quality confirmation system (Sabitova, 2016; Taubayeva, 2002; Hou, 2012). Quality management is based on documentation in which all processes are described (documented), as well as the actions of process participants to achieve the required level of quality. The necessary documentation is available in each university including technological documentation (educational programs), regulations on structural units, internal audit plans, etc. (Dill, Massy, Williams, & Cook, 1996; Bradney, 2001; King, Griffiths, & Williams, 2007).

Technological and regulatory documents form the foundation of the entire quality management system, so it must be brought into line with modern requirements (including the requirements of state standards).

The mandatory documents of the quality system include:

• Quality objectives and policies.

• Instruction on quality management.

• Description of processes.

• Description of the interaction between processes.

• Registered data on quality (quantitative indicators).

Currently, HEIs, on the basis of the above methods, use the following models of quality management systems:

1. EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management) model. Among European organizations, the most popular model is that of the European Quality Award developed by the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM). The use of the EFQM model implies not only a competitive assessment but also a serious diagnostic study and measurement of the capacity and effectiveness of the organization's management potential, an assessment of the maturity of the management system in relation to a benchmark, identification of strengths, as well as areas where improvement is advisable. It also uses two groups of criteria, like the industry competition model.

2. Model of the American "Baldrige National Quality Award" in the field of education. In order to achieve excellence, this model is based on the following educational criteria: leadership, strategic planning, focus on students, stakeholders, and the market, measurement, analysis and knowledge management, focus on faculties and staff, process management, and results.

3. Model of a quality management system based on the international standard ISO 9001:2000. This model implies a demonstration of the university's ability to produce services that satisfy consumers; moreover, their needs are regularly monitored and studied. In accordance with the requirements of the standard ISO 9001:2000, the main goal of a HEI should be to increase the satisfaction of individuals, society and the government in educational services, training of specialists, scientific products, etc.

4. Model of the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU). The basis of this model is the idea of dividing all HEI activities into three main business processes: educational activities, research, and services offered to society.

5. Benchmarking model for Australian universities. The purpose of this model was to develop the perfect Benchmarking Guide for Australian universities with the aim of conducting a self-assessment and independent evaluation of their activities and the results obtained and evaluating the university's quality management system (Harman, 1998). The benchmarking guide is intended.

• To provide the university top management with tools to identify development trends and conduct continuous improvement of activities.

• For structural departments of universities that wish to compare the quality of various types of their activities.

• To determine the competitiveness of the university.

6. Model of the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) of the University of Twente (the Netherlands). The model is based on a self-examination guide developed as part of a cooperation project between the Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) of the University of Twente and the Information Scientific Center for State Accreditation of the Russian Federation. The basis of the self-examination is the so-called checklist, which is a combination of various indicators, questions, and requirements divided into several blocks and covering almost all aspects of the educational institution.

7. The Belgian-Dutch model (HBO Expert Group) or “Method of improving the quality of higher education based on the EFQM model” was developed in 1999 by an expert group consisting of representatives from the Netherlands, Denmark, and Belgium. The method is focused on issues of quality management in higher educational institutions and can be used to conduct self-assessments and determine orientations for improving the activities of an educational institution, and allows universities to carefully prepare for external testing.

8. The standards and directives of the ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education). The ENQA was created in order to coordinate the development of European quality standards and solve the problems of certification and accreditation of educational programs and institutions. In accordance with the decision of the Berlin Declaration, ENQA has developed “Standards and Guidelines for guaranteeing the quality of Higher Education in the European Region”. This document is the basis for building systems of the internal and external assessment and the quality assurance of education and accreditation of the European agencies for assessing the quality of education.

Each model is used in HEIs in different countries in function of the policy and structure of an educational institution. Kazakhstan, for example, has chosen a management model based on the requirements of international quality standards ISO 9000:2000. The choice of model is most likely due to the following advantages:

• The transformation of the educational process into a modern system focused on quality, i.e. oriented on the satisfaction of the needs of interested parties and primarily a student, as the main consumer of education.

• Improving the quality of applicants' recruitment.

• Increase in student attendance and academic performance.

• Advantages in licensing and certification.

• Measurability of indicators by which teaching work is assessed.

• Enhancing the teacher competency level, improving the qualification level for the conduct of disciplines.

• Clear planning of the lesson schedule, early communication of changes in the schedule and replacements of teachers.

• Streamlining the management of external and internal documentation including in cases of changes made to the documentation, and familiarizing specialists with them.

• Enhancing the competitiveness and the image of the teachers of higher educational institutions.

• The clarity of the activities of the university accreditation indicator "the effectiveness of the university system to ensure the quality of education".

The advantage of the quality management system (QMS) is that the system covers all the activities of higher education institutions without exception. The QMS in an educational institution, like the quality management system in any other organization, considers the entire technological chain of activities according to its processes. The process approach inherent in the international QMS standard clearly regulates research and analytical work, planning and quality control of educational services, internal audits, educational work, market analysis, and customer satisfaction assessment, as well as complaint management. The quality management system also regulates such activities of an educational institution as personnel management, and infrastructure, which includes not only educational buildings but also social facilities, as well as the management of the professional educational environment (Tashkeyeva, Abykanova, Sariyeva, Sadirbekova & Marhabaeva, 2016).

CONCLUSIONS.

The intra-university quality system of the educational process is monitored at 4 levels. Student-level monitoring is carried out to identify students' satisfaction with the quality of the educational services provided.

The form of diagnostic procedures in this case is questionnaire. The timing of the diagnostic procedures is 2 times a year (questioning students to identify the degree of satisfaction with the quality of the educational services provided and the questionnaire “Teacher through the eyes of a student”). In order to conduct questionnaires, they are developed and constantly reviewed (in view

of changes in the organization of educational and other processes at the university), then approved by the rector. An analytical report is compiled in accordance with the results of the questionnaire. This report is discussed at the academic council of the university, educational and methodical councils of faculties, who compile an action plan.

The department-level monitoring is carried out to identify experience in the use of new teaching technologies, exchange of experience, to relate the quality of teaching to learning outcomes, to identify the reasons for the low level of students' assimilation of knowledge in individual disciplines, to assess the availability and quality of work programs and methodological support.

The faculty-level monitoring is carried out in order to identify the level of educational and methodical work in the department, assess the quality of educational programs, educational literature, and organize certification procedures.

The university-level monitoring is carried out in order to identify the relationship between the quality of educational and methodological work and the results of training with different teachers and in different departments, as well as to assess the quality of the educational services provided at the faculties and at a HEI in general.

The quality assurance of the organization of the educational process can be carried out in the educational unit as a whole and in certain areas of work, for example:

• Quality of lecture classes at the department.

• Organization of final certification at the faculty.

• The state of regulatory documentation on the organization of the educational process at a university, etc.

When implementing the quality assurance of the organization of the educational process at any level, a verification program is drawn up, which selectively includes quality indicators corresponding to the area being checked.

Therefore, in the intra-university system of quality assurance of the organization of the educational process, the following types of checks can be used:

• Comprehensive one, which implies the analysis and assessment of the activities of the structural unit of the university in all aspects of its activities. These checks are carried out by decision of the rector.

• Self-examination is carried out annually by the head of the structural unit in all areas of activity and is issued in the form of a report for the academic year.

• Spot checks are carried out with the aim of analyzing and assessing a particular area of activity of a particular structural unit.

• Operational verification implies working with structural units, the activities of which revealed deficiencies or deviations in the implementation of regulatory documents governing the organization of educational activities.

• Questionnaire (in the form of a sociological study) assesses the quality of the educational process by consumers (students, teachers, employees, parents, and employers).

• Testing can be conducted to control regulatory documents when determining the level of methodological training for the purpose of expert analysis.

Organizational issues for verification are assigned to the department for monitoring the quality of the educational process, which includes:

• Preparation of the rector’s order on the composition of the commission, the timing, type of control, and date of submission of the final document.

• Scheduling a check.

• Preparation of a final document based on the results of verification of internal university control.

The procedure for the implementation of intra-university quality assurance of the organization of the educational process of a faculty (department) includes:

• Creation of a commission consisting of the chairperson and those responsible for the identified areas of verification.

• Approval of the composition of the commission, inspection plan and schedule of its work by the university rector.

• The activities of the commission created to analyze the work of the unit according to the relevant audit plan.

• Preparation of an analytical report on the results of the audit.

• Familiarization of the head of the unit with the results of the audit.

• Speech of the chairperson (members) of the commission at a meeting of the Council of the faculty (department), Teaching and Methodological Council of a university.

• Making decisions and drawing up plans for preventive and corrective actions based on the results of the audit.

In order to ensure the required quality of the audit, the commission may include university staff, as well as representatives of the teaching staff and employers.

The commission conducting the audit has the right: to request any information necessary for work related to the issue being studied; carry out the monitoring of students' knowledge and their questioning, attend training classes, if this is provided for by the verification plan.

The analytical report reflects all the sections highlighted in the verification plan. The content of each section should be built according to the following system: positive aspects; limitations; conclusions and offers.

The copies of documents certifying the facts stated in the audit materials and confirming the correctness of the conclusions of the commission may be attached to the certificate.

At the university level, a quality assurance of the organization of the educational process by the faculty and departments is organized according to the following indicators:

Status of regulatory documents:

• Provision of all specialties of the faculty with government standards.

The status of operational syllabuses:

• Provision of all specialties with standard syllabuses.

• Provision of all specialties with approved operational syllabuses.

• Timeliness of approval of operational syllabuses.

• Conformity of operational syllabuses to standard ones.

The quality of operational disciplinary curricula:

• Provision of all disciplines with standard curricula.

• Provision of all disciplines with approved operational curricula.

• Timeliness of approval of operational curricula.

• Compliance of operational curricula with standard ones.

• Compliance of curricula formalization with the requirements of university standards.

• Timely updating of the content of operational curricula in accordance with the requirements of the current state of science.

• Availability of operational curricula for elective courses, special seminars, and special disciplines.

Educational work planning:

• The availability of a long-term plan for the development of the faculty, the timeliness of its consideration and approval.

• Completeness of the relevant areas of the faculty.

• Timeliness of the discussion of the issues posed by the academic council of the faculty and dean's office; the recording of the issues in the minutes.

• Timeliness and validity of decisions made.

Organization of work with graduates:

• An operational plan for working with graduates and external consumers of educational services.

• Forecasting and long-term development of specialist training for certain areas.

• The effectiveness of employment activities.

• The effectiveness of ongoing activities.

Career guidance:

• Availability of a career guidance plan, teaching materials, advertising booklets.

• Clear and timely organization of lectures in schools, lyceums, and gymnasiums for parents and schoolchildren, coordinated with other faculties.

• Organization of effective work in nearby secondary schools.

• The effectiveness of career guidance work carried out by the faculty.

Qualification level of the teaching staff:

• Compliance of the education of teaching staff with the positions held.

• Professional level of teaching staff.

• Availability of a continuing education program for faculty's teaching staff and its feasibility.

• Organization of work to guide the training of undergraduates and doctoral students.

Organization of educational activities:

• Availability of schedules of the educational process and its compliance.

• Availability of student work schedules.

• Timeliness of drawing up and approval of the class schedule.

Educational and methodological support:

• Methodological support of the educational process, compliance with modern requirements for the training of specialists.

• High quality of methodological support.

• Sufficient quantity of educational and methodical literature (manuals, developments, etc.) published by the teaching staff of the faculty.

• Organization of methodological seminars (intra-university and inter-departmental ones).

• Implementation of modern educational technologies, new teaching methods, and means for enhancing the cognitive activity of students.

• Provision of disciplines with test materials.

• Timeliness of updating educational and methodological support.

Certification organization:

Organization of current and midterm monitoring:

• Timely conduct of the register of educational achievements of students.

• Clarity and timeliness of the organization of current monitoring.

• Timeliness, completeness, and effectiveness of measures taken upon absenteeism.

• Timeliness of providing information on underperforming students to the dean's office.

• Compliance with the rules for conducting current monitoring and reporting the results of midterm monitoring in the rating sheets.

• Work plans of the faculty have to include questions about the organization, results and effectiveness of current monitoring.

• Recording of issues related to the results and performance of the current monitoring in the minutes of meetings of departments and faculties.

Organization of intermediate certification:

• Availability and adherence to a consultation schedule.

• Timeliness of preparation and approval of the exam schedule.

• Correct preparation of examination sheets and referrals.

Logistics capacity support of the educational process:

• Provision of educational and laboratory equipment and training aids.

• Participation of the faculty in the formation of logistics capacity support of the educational process.

• The presence of exhibition stands to show the state of the educational process at the faculty.

The presented intra-university system of education quality assurance enables the provision of the educational process with various types of control and monitoring measures. The system analysis and the evaluation of all indicators, on which the educational outcomes depend, enable developing corrective measures and determining areas for improvement in educational activities at all levels, is one of the most important elements of the educational quality management system in a university.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Alekseyeva, L. N., Kopylov, G. G., & Maracha, V. G. (2003). Issledovatelskaya deyatelnost uchashchikhsya: formirovaniye norm i razvitiye sposobnostey [Students' research activity: formation of norms and development of abilities]. Issledovatelskaya rabota shkolnikov, 4, 25-28.

2. Benjamin, R. (2018). The Role of Generic Skills in Measuring Academic Quality. In Weingarten H., Hicks M., & Kaufman A. (Eds.), Assessing Quality in Postsecondary Education: International Perspectives (pp. 49-64). Montréal, Kingston; London; Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press.

3. Billing, D. (2004). International Comparisons and Trends in External Quality Assurance of Higher Education: Commonality or Diversity? Higher Education, 47(1), 113-137.

4. Blackmur, D. (2008). A Critical Analysis of the INQAAHE Guidelines of Good Practice for Higher Education Quality Assurance Agencies. Higher Education, 56(6), 723-734.

5. Bradney, A. (2001). The Quality Assurance Agency and the Politics of Audit. Journal of Law and Society, 28(3), 430-442.

6. Coates, H. (2005). The value of student engagement for higher education quality assurance. Quality in Higher Education, 11(1).

7. Coates, H., & Mahat, M. (2014). Threshold quality parameters in hybrid higher education. Higher Education, 68(4), 577-590.

8. Dhamani, K., & Kanji, Z. (2017). Assessing the Cognitive Domain through MCQs: Critical to Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Journal of Higher Education in Africa / Revue De L'enseignement Supérieur En Afrique, 15(1), 135-142.

9. Dill, D., Massy, W., Williams, P., & Cook, C. (1996). Accreditation & Academic Quality Assurance: Can We Get There from Here? Change, 28(5), 16-24.

10. Dittrich, K. (2018). Quality assurance: What it was, is, and should be. In Heijnen A. & Van der Vaart R. (Eds.), Places of Engagement: Reflections on Higher Education in 2040 - A Global Approach (pp. 142-146). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctvfjd0xs.24

11. Gvaramadze, I. (2008). From Quality Assurance to Quality Enhancement in the European Higher Education Area. European Journal of Education, 43(4), 443-455.

12. Hargraves, J., Palmer, R., Orav, E., & Wright, E. (1996). Are Differences in Practitioners' Acceptance of a Quality Assurance Intervention Related to Their Performance? Medical Care, 34(9), SS77-SS86.

13. Harman, G. (1998). Quality Assurance Mechanisms and Their Use as Policy Instruments: Major International Approaches and the Australian Experience since 1993. European Journal of Education, 33(3), 331-348.

14. Hou, A. (2012). Mutual recognition of quality assurance decisions on higher education institutions in three regions: A lesson for Asia. Higher Education, 64(6), 911-926.

15. Kablashova, I. V. (2000). Vseobshcheye upravleniye kachestvom (TQM) [Total Quality Management (TQM)]. Voronezh: VGTU.

16. King, R., Griffiths, P., & Williams, R. (2007). Regulatory Intermediation and Quality Assurance in Higher Education: The Case of the Auditors. Oxford Review of Education, 33(2), 161-174.

17. Koyanbayeva, G., & Zaurbekova, L. (n.d.). Issledovatelskaya Deyatelnost Studentov kak Faktor Formirovaniya Sovremennoy Lichnosti [Student Research Activity as a Factor of Forming a Modern Personality]. Retrieved from http://scibook.net/filosofiya-nauki-knigi/issledovatelskaya-deyatelnost-studentov-kak-30427.html

18. Malakhova, I. A. (2002). Razvitiye lichnosti: sposobnost k tvorchestvu, odarennost, talant [Personality development: creativity, giftedness, talent]. Minsk.

19. Potudanskaya, V. F., Litvinova, O. I., & Mamontov, S. A. (2012). Sovremennyye podkhody k razvitiyu organizatsionnykh struktur upravleniya vuzom [Modern approaches to the development of organizational structures of HEI management]. Rossiyskoye predprinimatelstvo, 16(214), 88-92.

20. Reinalda, B., Kulesza, E., & Klingemann, H. (2006). The European Union and Higher Education. In the Bologna Process – Harmonizing Europe's Higher Education: Including the Essential Original Texts (pp. 39-50). Opladen; Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich. doi:10.2307/j.ctvbkk39v.11

21. Rhoades, G., & Sporn, B. (2002). Quality Assurance in Europe and the U.S.: Professional and Political Economic Framing of Higher Education Policy. Higher Education, 43(3), 355-390.

22. Sabitova, A. A. (2016). Mezhdunarodnyy i pravovoy aspekt mezhgosudarstvennogo sotrudnichestva v sfere obrazovaniya [The international and legal aspect of interstate cooperation in the field of education]. Vestnik KazNPU. Seriya Mezhdunarodnaya zhizn i politika, 4(47), 20-21.

23. Salter, B., & Tapper, T. (2000). The Politics of Governance in Higher Education: The Case of Quality Assurance. Political Studies, 48(1), 66-87. doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00251

24. Stepanova, M. V. (2005). Uchebno-issledovatelskaya deyatelnost shkolnikov v profilnom obuchenii [Educational and research activities of schoolchildren in specifically oriented education]. Saint Petersburg.

25. Strongin, R. G. (2006). Cherty novogo [Features of newness]. Nizhny-Novgorod: NNGU.

26. Tagberliyeva, G. (n.d.). Proyektnaya i Issledovatelskaya Deyatelnost Uchashchikhsya v Sovremennom Obrazovatelnom Prostranstve [Project and Research Activities of Students in the Modern Educational Space]. Orleu Institute. Retrieved from http://zkoipk.kz/kz/2016smart1/2527-conf.html

27. Taubayeva, S. (2002). Issledovatelskaya kultura pedagoga [Research culture of an educator]. Almaty.

28. Travers, M. (2007). Quality assurance as a new occupation. In The new bureaucracy: Quality assurance and its critics (pp. 9-34). Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt1t89305.5

29. Wolter, A. (2010). Higher Education. In German Data Forum (RatSWD) (Author), Building on Progress: Expanding the Research Infrastructure for the Social, Economic, and Behavioral Sciences (pp. 891-910). Opladen; Farmington Hills: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

30. Yanovitskaya, Y., & Adamsky, M. (2005). Bolshaya didaktika i 1000 melochey v raznourovnevom obuchenii [Big didactics and 1000 little things in multilevel education]. Saint Petersburg.

31. Abykanova, B., Yelezhanova, S., Mailybayeva, A., Sadirbekova, D., Turmukhanova, G., & Kabiden, K. (2019). Information technology in modern education. Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores. Año: VI, Número: Edición Especial, Artículo no.:27, Período: Agosto, 2019.

https://dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/_files/200005592-718027270f/EE%2019.08.27%20La%20tecnolog%C3%ADa%20de%20la%20informaci%C3%B3n%20en%20la%20educaci%C3%B3n%20moderna.pdf

32. Tashkeyeva, G., Abykanova, B., Sariyeva, A., Sadirbekova, D., & Marhabaeva, A. (2016). Application of Methods of Interactive Training in the Educational Environment of Higher Educational Institutions. Proceedings from 16th International Multidisciplinary Scientific GeoConference SGEM 2016: June 28 - July 6, Стр. 747-753.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Shynar Yelezhanova. Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences. Associate Professor, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: shinar1802@mail.ru

2. Aigul Myrzasheva. Candidate of Engineering Sciences. Associate Professor, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

3. Akhmaral Khairzhanova. Candidate of Philological Sciences. Senior Lecturer, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

4. Shara Syrbayeva. Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences. Assistant Professor, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

5. Rakhat Shuakbayeva. Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences. Assistant Professor, Sh. Yessenov Caspian State University of Technology and Engineering, Kazakhstan.

6. Gulmaidan Myrzagereikyzy. Master of Sciences. Lecturer, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan. E-mail: gulmay_86@mail.ru

7. Gulnara Mustagaliyeva. Senior Lecturer, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

8. Torgyn Tilegenova. Master of Arts. Lecturer, Kh. Dosmukhamedov Atyrau State University, Kazakhstan.

RECIBIDO: 1 de diciembre del 2019. **APROBADO:** 11 de diciembre del 2019.