

Evaluarea criterială comparativă a instituțiilor de învățământ superior - practici, metode, criterii, rezultate, limite

Nicolae George DRĂGULĂNESCU

Universitatea Politehnica din București, Visiting Professor – Chung Ang University of Seoul, South
Korea, Secretar general - Fundația Română pentru Promovarea Calității
nicudrag@artelecom.net

Abstract

Ranking of different products/ services/ organizations according to their basic characteristics is – for their customers/ beneficiaries - a very valuable, useful and necessary information source. Ranking usefulness can be achieved by so-called “multi-criteria comparative assessment” and by largely and freely disseminating of its provided data and information. This “multi-criteria comparative assessment” is a free-market self-regulatory tool based on very basic customer right to be informed before taking the decision to acquire and on customer behavior to acquire only products/ services providing highest/ best quality-price ratio. Disseminated rankings are freely consulted by prospective customers of these products/ services and may significantly affect their selection decision process as well as, consecutively, some basic business results of their providers. This paper introduces the today’s most important national, regional and international rankings existing around the world in higher education, high lightening their actual basic practices, methods, criteria, results and limits. Rankings in higher education may include academic institutions (or only some of their departments) as well as academic programs, etc. being based on a predefined set of criteria, indicators and weights. Their input data may be either some specific statistical data, and/ or results of surveys (of educators, of prospective and existing students – undergraduates - of graduates, scholars, employers, etc.) and/ or results of dedicated third-party external assessments. The credibility of provided higher education rankings vary significantly because they may be conducted either by mass media’s publishing houses, by profit or no-profit organizations, by first, second or third party organizations (including academic practitioners) and so on. Thus, in some situations, their manipulating character may become obviously.... The paper conclusions are including some hints and necessary measures to be adopted by Romanian universities and educational authorities in order to comply with international practices of higher education rankings.

References:

1. Drăgulănescu, Nicolae ș.a., “Managementul calității servi-ciilor”, Ed. AGIR, 2003, 274 pag.
2. Drăgulănescu, Nicolae, Standarde pentru evaluarea calității în învățământul superior din România, Programul CALISRO (<http://www.calisro.ro/Documentatie/GhidCalitate/StandardeEvalCalit.doc>).
3. Drăgulănescu, Nicolae, Ghid de bune practici pentru legătura dintre universitate și mediul economic, Programul CALISRO (<http://www.calisro.ro/Documentatie/GhidCalitate/GhidBunePractici.doc>).
4. Florian, Răzvan, "Irreproducibility of the results of the Shanghai academic ranking of world universities", *Scientometrics* 72 (1): 25–32.

5. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/College_ranking.
6. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Criticism_of_college_and_university_rankings_%28North_America%29.
7. <http://www.isiknowledge.com> – articole stiintifice publicate in reviste stiintifice si/sau citate in (Social) Science Citation Index.
8. <http://www.isihighlycited.com> – cercetatori frecvent citati.
9. <http://www.mathunion.org/medals> - castigatorii medaliilor Fields.
10. <http://www.nobelprize.org> – castigatorii Premiilor Nobel.