

idman yarışları, müsabiqələr vasitəsilə təşkil edilirdi. Eyni zamanda şagirdlərin və müəllimlərin ittifaq respublikalarına səfərləri və təcrübə mübadiləsi formalarından da istifadə edilirdi. Belə əlaqələr daha çox ali və orta ixtisas təhsili sahəsini əhatə edirdi. Azərbaycanın ali təhsil müəssisələrinin beynəlxalq əlaqələrinin tarixi ötən əsrin əvvəllərinə təsadüf edir. Belə ki, həmin illərdə yaranmış ali təhsil müəssisələri xaricdə təhsil almış azərbaycanlı mütəxəssisləri dəvət etməklə müəllim heyətinin tərkibini keyfiyyətə yüksəltdilər. Eyni zamanda yarandıqları ilk vaxtlardan ali təhsil müəssisələrimiz həm qonşu respublikalar, həm də Asiya, Afrika və ərəb ölkələri üçün kadr hazırlığını həyata keçiriblər. 1921-ci ildə Azərbaycan Xalq Maarif Komissarlığı Sovet Rusiyasının Xalq Maarif Komissarlığına müraciət edərək ölkədə ali təhsilin təşkilinə kömək göstərilməsini xahiş edib. Müraciətə əsasən Azərbaycanın ali məktəblərinə və elmi-tədqiqat müəssisələrinə daimi işləmək üçün Rusiyadan görkəmli alimlər göndərilmişdi, onlar ali təhsil müəssisələrinə tədris-təşkilati işlərdə böyük yardım göstərirlər.

Ədəbiyyat:

1. Cabbarov R.H. Təhsil müəssisələrinin idarəetmə məsələləri, Bakı, 2001.
2. Cabbarov R.H. Təhsil müəssisələrinin idarə edilməsində metodik xidmətin təşkili və planlaşdırılması, Bakı, 2005.
3. Məmmədzadə R.H. İxtisasartırma təhsili: Yeni problemlər yeni münasibətlər. Bakı, 2004.
4. Mehrabov A.O. Azərbaycan təhsilinin müasir problemləri, Bakı, Mütərcim, 2007-448 s.

UDC 378.019.3:378.014.6

FEATURES OF QUALITY ASSESSMENT IN GERMANY

Shimpf Karin, Ph.D., Associate Professor

Magdeburg University Otto von Guericke

Pererva P.G., Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor

pgpererva@gmail.com

National Technical University «KhPI»

Each country in the world uses its own system of grades in educational institutions. Germany is no exception in this regard. The state has its own system for calculating students' points. This information is necessary for students who want to enter German universities. It will also be useful for students who transfer to a local school from the country with

different scores.

The German grading system is radically different from most others. Many students who come to study from abroad cannot get used to the rules for calculating grades for a long time. German schools use the six-point methodology. Compared to other countries, the highest score is one. Many are accustomed to seeing an unsatisfactory result in the "1" rating, but in Germany this score is considered positive. Next in importance are scores from 2 to 6. Each score is tied to a verbal formulation. The highest score in the German education system "1" is called *ausgezeichnet* or *sehr gut*, which means "excellent". Next comes "2" – *gut*, which translates as "good". The rating "3" is called *befriedigend*, the translation is "satisfactory". After that, there is a score of "4" with the designation *ausreichend* and the translation "enough".

Now a few words about the negative scores that no student in German schools wants to receive. The number 5 is considered an unsatisfactory grade. The lowest score is "6", which means "not enough".

Many foreign visitors to Germany are often surprised by the school grading system in Germany. A child can be heard coming home from school and being praised by parents for receiving a unit for a test.

Germany divides school scores on a scale from 1 to 15 – which is more detailed and detailed. If we compare the assessment system with the first example, we get a similar picture: 1 – 15 points; 2 – 12; 3 – 9; 4 – 6; 5 – 3; 6 – 0.

According to this system, schoolchildren are trained. With its help, it is convenient to calculate the final knowledge of a student or schoolboy that has accumulated over a certain period of study. For example, all the results of tests and exams are added up, after which one final score in points is issued.

The scoring system in higher education is similar to the school grading system in Germany. The main difference is the absence of the lowest school grade of "6", which means "not enough". The fact is that with such a score it is impossible to continue your studies, to enter the university after school. Because of this, in higher universities it was simply removed.

The rating scale in Germany at universities also begins with a score of "1" - excellent, and continues to "5" - unsatisfactory. This system is used in every higher education institution in the country. There are similarities with school calculations, but with a slight difference of one point.

Now let's take a closer look at the basic components of the quality of

education in German universities, which have been created in recent years and combined into a system focused on process and dialogue and based on actual indicators of quality development [1-17].

The Otto-von-Guericke University of Magdeburg (OVGU) has created an apparatus for a continuous and sustainable quality assurance and development process, taking into account all relevant aspects of design and within its own image, which is based on the classical understanding of the continuous improvement process in the form of Deming's cycle PDCA and continuous study of learning and teaching factors. The cycle consists of 4 stages: "planning", "execution", "verification" and "action". The process is performed linearly, while the completion of one cycle is associated with the beginning of the next cycle.

The learning and teaching quality improvement cycle involves contact with relevant stakeholders within a given cycle based on data (through surveys and evaluations) and assessments of those involved in learning and teaching, as well as through quality criteria in course discussions. Thus, the culture of communication, especially in the faculties of OVGU, and personal responsibility are used for sustainable and continuous quality assurance and development. A differentiated system of documentation and reporting serves not only as a basis for further development of the course, but also as a basis for external communication and informing ministries and the public concerned.

The tasks and responsibilities of the individual units and committees are set out in the Act on Higher Education of the State of Saxony-Anhalt (capital - Magdeburg), in the main provisions of the OVGU and are further differentiated by fields of study and teaching in accordance with the Quality Charter. Quality measures in the field of learning and teaching are mainly the responsibility of faculties or dean's offices, as well as the Senate and the rectorate [2, 6, 9, 13]. The organization of study and teaching is carried out at the level of the rectorate, in particular, by the vice-rector for academic and academic affairs, and at the faculties by the deans of educational institutions.

In addition to the established central and decentralized committees, OVGU has introduced quality responsibility at the central (central quality manager), decentralized (faculty quality manager) and student level (student quality manager). This ensures that there is a dedicated contact person for all matters in this field at each faculty, as well as at the central level and at the level of the student group. Together, the quality managers and other members form a working group of those responsible for quality,

which meets regularly, in addition to the constant exchange at the working level, also prepares the understanding and further development of the system for the relevant authorities [4, 7, 13, 15].

Regular reflection on quality degree programmers using external expertise is also fundamental. To this end, regular and mandatory exchanges with cooperating universities, as well as representatives of science, professional practice and graduates, as well as responsible ministries, are necessary.

The university uses a data-enabled monitoring system that preserves anonymity and data protection for surveyed respondents, with which it generates data on specific courses centrally available to faculties to analyze their courses. In addition, OVGU conducts central surveys. students about admission and progress, change of courses and deregistration, as well as surveys of graduates, the results of which regularly serve faculties to reflect on the quality of learning and teaching. The university also takes part in inter-university surveys and uses their results. If necessary, additional reflective survey procedures in learning and teaching can be tested and established. The preparation, conduct and evaluation of decentralized surveys, in particular the evaluation of the course, are the responsibility of the faculty offering the training.

References:

1. Kocziszky György, Pererva P.G., Szakaly D., Somosi Veres M. (2012) Technology transfer. Kharkiv-Miskolc: NTU «KhPI». 668 p.
2. Pererva P.G., Kocziszky G., Veres Somosi M. (2019) Compliance program: [tutorial]. Kharkov; Miskolc : NTU «KhPI». 689 p.
3. Pererva P.G., Tkachev M.M., Kobielieva T.O. Evaluation of holder profits violation of their exclusive rights. *Науковий вісник Полісся*. 2016. № 4 (8), ч.2. С.240-246.
4. Tkachov M.M., Pererva P.G., Kobielieva T.O., Tkachova, N.P., Diachenko T.A. (2021). Management of relations with enterprise stakeholders based on value approach. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*. Vol.19, Iss.1. P.24-38.
5. Kosenko O.P., Kobielieva T.O., Tkacheva N.P. (2017). Monitoring the commercial potential of intellectual property. *Scientific bulletin of Polissia*. №1, ч.2. С.140-145.
6. Kocziszky G., Kobielieva T.O., Pererva P.G., Veres Somosi M. Compliance program. Kharkov-Miskolc: NTU «KhPI». 2019. 689 p.
7. Кобелева Т.О., Витвицька О.Д., Перерва П.Г., Ковальчук С.В. Стратегічне управління розвитком підприємства на засадах інтелектуальної власності. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ» (екон.науки)*. Харків : НТУ «ХПІ», 2022. № 1. С.

52-57.

8. Кобелева Т.О., Перерва П.Г. Формування системи економічної стійкості та комплаєнс захисту машинобудівного підприємства. *Економіка: реалії часу*. 2018. № 1 (35). С. 98-106.

9. Перерва П.Г., Кобелева Т.О., Ткачова Н.П. Формування інноваційної та інвестиційної політики промислового підприємства на засадах збалансованої системи показників. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ» : зб. наук. пр. Темат. вип. : Технічний прогрес та ефективність виробництва*. Харків : НТУ «ХПІ», 2015. № 59 (1168). С. 96-100.

10. Старостіна А.О. Маркетинг: теорія, світовий досвід, українська практика: підруч. Київ: Знання, 2009. 1070 с.

11. Ілляшенко С.М., Перерва П.Г., Маслак О.І., Кобелева Т.О., Кучинський В.А. Ефективність інформаційних технологій в управлінні інтелектуальною власністю промислового підприємства. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ»: Екон.науки*. Харків : НТУ «ХПІ», 2021. № 1. С. 53-58.

12. Маслак О.І., Перерва П.Г., Кобелева Т.О., Кучинський В.А., Ілляшенко С.М. Аутсорсинг патентних, логістичних та інформаційних послуг як інструмент підвищення ефективності управління інтелектуальною власністю на промисловому підприємстві. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ»: Екон.науки*. Харків : НТУ «ХПІ», 2021. № 2. С. 21-26.

13. Ткачова Н.П., Перерва П.Г., Кобелева Т.О. Формування інноваційної та інвестиційної політики промислового підприємства на засадах збалансованої системи показників. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ»: зб. наук. пр. «Технічний прогрес та ефективність виробництва»*. Харків: НТУ «ХПІ», 2015. № 59 (1168). С. 96-100.

14. Кобелева Т.О. Сутність та визначення комплаєнс-ризиків. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ»: Екон.науки*. Харків: НТУ «ХПІ», 2020. № 1 (3). С. 116-121.

15. Гусаковська Т.О., Кобелева Т.О. Вплив розміру збитків від порушень прав інтелектуальної власності на процес ціноутворення. *Вісник НТУ «ХПІ»: зб. наук. пр. «Технічний прогрес та ефективність виробництва»*. Харків: НТУ «ХПІ», 2014. № 64 (1106). С. 52-57.

16. Tkachova N., Kobieliava T., Pererva P. Formation of competitive advantages of machine-building enterprises on the basis of the benchmarking concept [Electronic resource]. *International Marketing and Management of Innovations: Global Sci. E-Journal*. Bielsko-Biala, 2021. № 6. 10 p.

17. Кобелева Т.О. Комплаєнс-безпека промислового підприємства: теорія та методи: монографія. Харків: Планета-Принт, 2020. 354 с.