

RATING AND QUALITY AS FACTORS OF HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS

The overall regularity of modern science development is increasingly accompanied by a union of efforts and concentration of research on the problem of human. In the new economic paradigm in the center of the analysis of socio-economic development puts the economy's ability to effective qualitative and structural changes that directly and immediately incorporated in the person, human capital. The study of human as a living resource of knowledge, creativity and energy with which he transforms himself and the world was stands and will be the central problem of world scientific thought [1, p. 48]. Efforts to develop the theory of human capital, was the works of T. Schultz, and G. Becker, the laureates of Nobel Prize in Economics [2, p. 3].

Human resource management system will work effectively only with the application of effective motivation system. Effectively working person always interested in what his personal contribution to the organization in which he works. He assesses the results of his operations and tries to understand how these results affect the goals that the organization has set itself [4, p. 251]. In the western system of higher education during the attestation the most important significance is given to assessment of qualifications of the University teaching staff [5].

Features of the development and implementation of a rating system of teachers' evaluation investigated by such scientists as: Basalaeva O. G., Stepanov Y. S., Malikov T. S., Zagoruyko N. G., Vasilieva E. Ju. and others [6; 7; 8; 9; 10]. Problems of evaluating the quality of teaching activity are examined by the following scientists: Seregin S. M., Romashkina G. F., Chemekov V. [11; 12; 13] and others. The presence of these works confirms the actuality of the chosen research topic.

The aim is to consider the rating and quality as factors in effective human resource management in higher educational establishments, to justify the proposals for building a system of rating and approaches to assessing the quality of the teaching staff (TS) in Ukrainian universities.

The criteria, most significantly affects the quality of higher education include: staff quality, quality of students, quality of infrastructure. Staff quality and quality of educational programs in combination with teaching and research, according to the terms of their conformity to public demand, determine the academic quality of education. Different universities in different ways address the problem of staff quality, which depends primarily on the quality of management [12, p. 84].

Klimovich L.A. distinguishes two extreme

approaches to organization of internal control activities: to control the largest possible number of indicators and to monitor only those indicators that have the status of accreditation. Universities tend to have control over some of the averaged scheme. The question to be decided when it was built — how many and which indicators will be monitored. The answer to this question depends on the complexity of the monitoring system to ensure the adequacy of processes and control. The choice must be made from a complete list of tasks which are solved by a division [14, p. 73].

Most researchers now recognize that improving the training and activities of the teaching staff is central to quality management education. But evaluation of quantitative and qualitative indicators of the teaching staff is not the aim in itself. Information on indicators of quality of teaching is needed in order to manage the maintenance and increase teaching skills and see how the increment of each teacher provides quality education, to assess the contribution of each teacher to the achievement of high school goals [6, p. 65].

Abankina I. V., Osovetskaya N. Y. pay attention to the fact that an important indicator of activity is the ratio of students and teachers. It describes the two sides of the university: the quality and efficiency. A low value rate or decreases the size of teachers' salaries, which does not attract qualified personnel, or payroll costs increased by reducing the cost of development of the university, according to conditions of providing the quality of education costs per student are increased. In large meaning of the indicator can not talk about achieving a high quality education, as it becomes unlikely that the individual work of teachers with students [15, p. 207]. In this case, the teacher can spend almost all their time on training and testing tasks of the current controls on individual work with students and effort to the detriment of other kinds of work.

Kotlyarov I. D. notes that in calculating the productivity of research activities (PRA) one should use only those indicators that characterize this scientific work. Characteristics of other activities (for ex. teaching) can not be included in the index PRA. Of course, a manual or textbook can contain new scientific results obtained by the author, but they can not be regarded as a place of first publication of the results of scientific work [16, p. 44].

The problem of "compensation" (when the researcher is not important to publish one good article or a lot of bad ones, and in some cases, he prefers to follow the path of least resistance and places articles of low quality in non-prestigious journals and anthologies

unimportant conferences) can be solved in two ways: PRA defined as homogeneous or heterogeneous as an indicator. In the first case of its calculation takes into account only one species (subspecies) of scientific activity. As a basis scientist offers to impact — the factor of the journal, in which the article was published. In the second case, the calculation takes into account several PRA types of scientific activity. However, engaging in "inappropriate" activity, you can dial a strictly limited number of points (the value of the contribution of this activity, irrespective of the results has an upper limit), whereas "destination" type of activity (in this case, the placement of articles in leading journals), so there is no upper limit [16, p. 46 — 47].

The success of the training also depends on many components of the personal characteristics of students motives to entering college, developmental abilities, intellectual and creative abilities, the extent of formation of skills of self work and others. Malikov T. S. draws attention to the fact that the evaluation of effectiveness of teaching efficiency only as progress of students does not lead to success, which is associated with different levels of training and potential impacts of students of different possibilities, courses, specialties and groups. It is advisable to consider the opinions of students about the teacher. In this questionnaire should not be abstractly and apart, but connected with each other. For example, it is appropriate to ask students to explain the availability of material by the lecturer, or whether they have interest of his presentation. This information is much more objective it assesses lecturer mastery than the quantity of teaching materials written by the teacher [8, p. 52 — 53].

Stepanov Y. S., Rabinovich M.I. note that existing rating can be divided into two groups. One part is the system in which to bring disparate data into one dimension is applied normalization. And another group includes systems in which the ratings are calculated based on total points accrued to faculty (department) per unit of work performed [7, p. 51].

Noteworthy is the method of ranking performance using ground control points. The essence of the method consists in the fact that the minimum (different from zero) and maximum number of points that can be evaluated respectively the least and the most significant figures is selected. For example, doctoral theses are 150 points, an advanced training course — 5 points. All other figures are placed by experts in this range in order of importance (more or less important, right or left, respectively), excluding points. After completing the ranking uniform scale scores on the whole range of indicators is calculated. On a scale exhibited several reference points are assigned to them marks. For example, a reference point may be a "defense in an accounting period, PhD thesis", which is assigned 100 points. If you need to add a new index or changing the unit of measurement of some indicators, it is sufficient to determine its place in the scale

of indicators and perform conversion points between two neighboring control points [17].

Zagoruyko N.G., Donetskaya S.S., Ryskulov S.N. conducted was study of the problem of automatically selecting the number and composition of the characteristics that most impact of the ranking of departments, and assessment of weighting of these characteristics. Their analysis showed that from the 32 indicators proposed for the evaluation of rating of 17 departments, the most useful information is in five. The coefficient of pair correlation between expert assessment and rating of departments, designed by five and thirty-two indicators, confirmed the feasibility of selecting the optimal subsets of indicators [9, p. 29].

Melnychuk D.A. explains the method-rated based on application of time standards for the implementation of educational, scientific, methodological, cultural, educational and other work [5].

Vasilieva E. Ju. examine a model of rating calculation system of teachers and Chairs, based on determining an average value. In determining the rating of the teacher, three of his qualities are: status ("past"), productivity ("present") and the perspective ("future"). Integrated estimates of teaching profession activity are displayed according to their individual research and teaching ratings, performance indicators have been assessed on a scale. The average rating is calculated as the arithmetic average of individual ratings of some professors teaching staff for the groups: "Masters of Science," "PhD" and "teachers who does not have a degree" at the base on data presented by the faculty chairs of the Institute on the following academic year. In order to determine the level of teacher rating, the range of the individual ratings in group is divided into four levels: high, upper middle, lower middle, low [10, p. 40 — 41].

Seregin S., Sharov Yu. expressed the view that for the rating of the faculty and Chairs appropriate to use different techniques. Assessing the success of research and teaching department proposed to take apart using a special system of indicators [11, p. 23].

The basis of the formation of effective motivation mechanisms must be a market theory of salaries. Improving the system of payment is possible if the dependence of wages on the results of research and teaching activity [18, p. 70].

Chemekov V. P. considering grade technology based on the relationship of job evaluation to the measurement of competence and efficiency of staff. Through the ratio requirements and competencies of the officer, we can conclude as to whether he suits to the post and to what extent. The difference between the competence and requirements gives an idea of the scope and content of training, as well as what level of payment is adequate for this level of employee training. But competence — this is only the ability to perform the task at the right level, the potential worker. The level of competence does not say anything about the competence — of how the ability of

being implemented, the effectiveness of the employee. If, attestation showed that the level of competence of the staff member does not meet most requirements of the job, but her performance is satisfactory at this point. Therefore, he should be taught to his efficiency has been improved [13, p. 9 — 10]. Competence (Latin *competentia* — responsibility) — the terms of person's reference, on what she has some knowledge and experience. The professional competence of the teacher is the basis of his skill [19, p. 82].

On the self-development and self-improvement of our knowledge we haven't known much. But we do know one thing: people in general, and knowledge workers in particular are developing in accordance with the requirements which they impose on themselves. If they push themselves to the depressed demand, then sooner or later they will stop the growth [4, p. 261].

In accordance with the Law of Ukraine "On Education" the salaries of employees of educational establishments and educational institutions are established on the basis of the Unified Tariff Scale in the manner determined by the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine [20]. The wages are generally set at the start of the school year, does not depend on the results of the main factors that affect the size of salaries is the existence of a scientific degree and academic rank, salary differentiation is limited, and because of this tariff wage loses catalytic role. In Russia, December 1, 2008 introduced a new pay system (NPS), under which the payroll is based on the salary, compensation and incentive payments, in accordance with professional qualification groups. NPS based not on a sectoral basis, but on departmental. That is mean that each agency is to pay their system has developed normative — legal acts [21].

Grade technology involves the establishment of grades — intervals of "weights" or ranks, which positions are considered equivalent to the organization and have the same range of payment [13, p. 184].

Kotlyarov D. proposed method of calculating payments to the faculty on the basis of scientific productivity index (SPI). General Fund payments for the scientific work is divided into three parts: a stimulating fund — SF, money units (90% of the total fund) fund lump sum payments — FLP, money units (10%), compensation fund on going research activities money units (10%). Further the total value of all SPI researchers over the past year and the amount of incentive payments for each employee will be calculated. At the same incentive payments may be paid to the employee a lump sum or installments evenly throughout the year. The Fund is a lump-sum payment for one-time rewards to researchers for publishing monographs in the leading Russian publishing houses, obtaining scientific prizes, the registration of patents, etc. The order of these benefits is regulated by the agency. Compensation Fund of current scientific work is distributed in the manner prescribed by the Academic Council of the scientific or educational

institutions, to encourage participants classroom conferences [18, p. 47].

If, in accordance with ratings provided material and moral encouragement of the best teachers and departments, the appearance of unfair ratings can discredit the entire quality of management system of education [7, p. 54 — 55].

Improving the system of personnel management, corporate governance is associated with the automation of control processes. This may be created by the database used by the program "1C: Payroll and Human Resource Management 8 for Ukraine", which allows you to automate: payroll, management of financial motivation of personnel, accounting personnel and staffing analysis, planning, staffing requirements, management competencies, performance appraisal etc. [22].

In this research we can make the following conclusions: rating score and quality assessment are important factors in human resource management, an appearance of organizational culture of the university. The main thing that unites effective people — business practices that make effective all of what they do. A method is known, we can teach [4, p. 249 — 250]. The effectiveness of this work is influenced by many causes: the choice of indicators, methods of evaluation and taken in future management decisions, and others. The formation of indicators must be approached comprehensively. In particular the level of student performance depends on the personal competencies as students well as teachers. Estimation technique should be free of hidden or overt discrimination, to be comfortable to use, have approved and understood by most people. It should stimulate researchers to get meaningful results, exchange of experience. It is necessary to prevent situations in which a small number of good papers and a large number of low-level operations are described formally as equal values of the indicators, or one secondary objective to recruit more points than on others. This can be done to standardize the indicators points to restrict the growth of secondary destinations, ranging use of indicators with reference points and other credit rating is necessary to build such a way that was not profitable to adjust its results, carried out jointly educational, methodical, scientific research and other activities. The fair rating score is the basis for making optimal management decisions with regard to certification of teachers training, motivation, and determination of priorities in the field of quality management. The process of implementing a system of rating assessment should include the task of designing methods of allocating financial resources to fund formation of incentive payments.

References

1. **Бородина Е.** Человеческий капитал как основной источник экономического роста / Е. Бородина // Экономика Украины. — 2003. — № 7. — С. 48 — 53.

2. **Becker G. S.** Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis / G. S. Becker. — N. Y., 1964.

3. **Shultz T.** Investment in Human Capital / T. Shultz. — N.Y.L., 1971.

4. **Друкер Питер Ф.** Энциклопедия менеджмента / Питер Ф. Друкер. — М.: Изд. дом “Вильямс”. — 2004. — 432 с.

5. **Мельничук Д. А.** Рейтинг субъектов деятельности национального аграрного университета Украины / Д. А. Мельничук, И. И. Ибатуллин, А. В. Шостак // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2004. — № 3 (31). — С. 44 — 58. — [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа : — <http://www.umj.ru/index.php/pub/inside/439>

6. **Басалаева О. Г.** Проблемы внедрения рейтинговой системы оценки деятельности преподавателей / О. Г. Басалаева, Ю. М. Басалаев, А. Н. Садовой // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2006. — № 2. — С. 65 — 68.

7. **Степанов Ю. С.** О проблемах получения рейтинговых оценок деятельности преподавателей, кафедр и факультетов во внутривузовской системе управления качеством образования / Ю. С. Степанов, М. И. Рабинович // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2006. — № 6. — С. 51 — 55.

8. **Маликов Т. С.** О рейтинге преподавателей вузов / Т. С. Маликов // Стандарты и мониторинг в образовании. — 2007. — № 2. — С. 52 — 54.

9. **Загоруйко Н. Г.** Методика отбора показателей для рейтинговой оценки деятельности кафедр университета / Н. Г. Загоруйко, С. С. Донецкая, С. Н. Рыскулов // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2006. — № 6. — С. 23 — 29.

10. **Васильева Е. Ю.** Рейтинг преподавателей и кафедр в вузе / Е. Ю. Васильева // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2007. — № 3. — С. 39 — 48.

11. **Серьогін С.** Оцінювання успішності діяльності кафедр та науково-педагогічних працівників / С. Серьогін, Ю. Шаров // Публічне управління: теорія та практика : зб. наук. пр. Асоціації докторів наук з державного управління. [Електронний ресурс]. — Х.: Вид-во “Док.НаукДержУпр”, 2010. — № 2. — С. 22 — 27.

12. **Ромашкина Г. Ф.** Оценка качества образования: опыт эмпирического исследования / Г. Ф. Ромашкина // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2005. — № 5. — С. 83 — 88.

13. **Чемеков В. П.** Грейдинг: технология построения системы управления персоналом / В. П. Чемеков. — М.: “Вершина”, 2007. — 208 с.

14. **Климович Л. А.** Формирование списка контролируемых показателей деятельности кафедры на основе векторных оценок / Л. А. Климович // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. — 2008. — № 3. — С. 73 — 77.

15. **Абанкина И. В.** Экономический потенциал вуза как фактор принятия решения о переводе в автономное учреждение / И. В. Абанкина, Н. Я. Осовецкая // Вопросы образования. — 2007. — № 3. — С. 199 — 219.

16. **Котляров И. Д.** Управление продуктивностью научной работе профессорско-преподавательского состава / И. Д. Котляров // Университетское управление: практика и анализ. —

2009. — № 5. — С. 41 — 48.

17. **Архипова Е. Н.** Адаптируемая система рейтинговой оценки деятельности преподавателя / Е. Н. Архипова, В. В. Крюков, К. И. Шахгельдян // [Электронный ресурс]. — Режим доступа : <http://www.vvsu.ru/UserFiles/File/oiskp/rating2.pdf>

18. **Герасименко О.** Економічні методи мотивації науково-педагогічних працівників / О. Герасименко // Вища освіта України. — 2003. — № 2 — С. 68 — 73

19. **Данилова Г.** Акмеологічна модель педагога / Г. Данилова // Освіта і управління. — 2005. — № 3 — 4. — С. 82 — 90.

20. **Закон України “Про освіту”** [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу : <http://zakon.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=1060-12-21>. [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу : <http://www.ug.ru/archive/26531>

22. [Електронний ресурс]. — Режим доступу : <http://www.uasoft.com.ua/1cv8/hr8.php>.

Zagoriy A. N. Rating and Quality as Factors of Human Resource Management in Higher Educational Establishments

In the article suggestions to the construction of the effective system of rating estimation and estimation of quality of activity professorial — teaching staff in the higher educational establishments in Ukraine here grounded. The article has a practical value for the construction of rating estimation of personnel of higher educational establishments.

Key words: staff management, rating, quality, indexes, methods, competence, attestation, organizational culture, salary.

Загорій А. М. Рейтинг та якість як фактори управління трудовими ресурсами ВНЗ

У статті обґрунтовано пропозиції щодо побудови ефективної системи рейтингової оцінки й оцінки якості діяльності професорсько-викладацького складу у ВНЗ України. Стаття має практичне значення для побудови рейтингової оцінки персоналу вищих навчальних закладів.

Ключові слова: управління трудовими ресурсами, рейтинг, якість, показники, методика, компетентність, атестація, організаційна культура, заробітна плата.

Загорий А. Н. Рейтинг и качество как факторы управления трудовыми ресурсами вузов

В статье обосновываются предложения относительно построения эффективной системы рейтинговой оценки и оценки качества деятельности профессорско-преподавательского состава в вузах Украины. Статья имеет практическое значение для построения рейтинговой оценки персонала высших учебных заведений.

Ключевые слова: управление трудовыми ресурсами, рейтинг, качество, показатели, методика, компетентность, аттестация, организационная культура, заработная плата.

Received by the editors: 04.04.2011
and final form in 25.11.2011