

## СЕКЦІЯ II

СВІТОВА ПРАКТИКА МАКРОЕКОНОМІЧНОГО  
АНТИКРИЗОВОГО РЕГУЛЮВАННЯ

УДК 378

**Dmytro BARABAS,**  
**Mariia VOLOSHYNA\*****EXPERIENCE OF HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY EVALUATING  
IN FRANCE AND ITS APPLICATION****ДОСВІД ОЦІНЮВАННЯ ЯКОСТІ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ ФРАНЦІЇ  
ТА ЙОГО ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ****ОПЫТ ОЦЕНИВАНИЯ КАЧЕСТВА ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ФРАНЦИИ  
И ЕГО ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ**

***Abstract.** The evolution of the legislative regulation of quality evaluation of French higher education over the last 30 years was revealed according to the analysis of publications and the content of websites of profile institutions. The main institutions, which evaluate the work of higher education institutions, research units, etc., were characterized. The points of discussion at the modern stage of development of the system of quality evaluation of higher education in France were summarized.*

***Анотація.** На основі аналізу публікацій і змісту сайтів профільних організацій розкрито еволюцію законодавчого регулювання оцінювання якості у вищій освіті Франції протягом останніх 30 років. Охарактеризовано основні організації, що оцінюють роботу закладів вищої освіти, дослідницьких підрозділів тощо. Узагальнено дискусійні моменти на сучасному етапі становлення системи оцінювання якості вищої освіти Франції.*

***Аннотация.** На основе анализа публикаций и содержания сайтов профильных организаций раскрыто эволюцию законодательного регулирования оценивания качества французского высшего образования за последние 30 лет. Охарактеризованы основные организации, оценивающие работу высших учебных заведений, исследовательских подразделений и т.д. Обобщены дискуссионные моменты на современном этапе становления системы оценивания качества высшего образования Франции.*

Since the early 1980s quality has become a central concept in many discussions on higher education [2, p. 356]. In the United States and Canada the debates on the various approaches and instruments with respect to quality evaluation have intensified. In the United Kingdom (in 1984) quality was declared to be a principal objective for higher education. In France the «Comit? national d'?valuation» was set up.

*Regulatory support and history*

At the government level, evaluation appeared quite late compared to other countries: the first legislation providing for evaluation of public policy was published in the early 1990's. The Higher Education Act of 1984, devoted to restructuring of the internal organization of universities, increased the relative autonomy of institutions to the detriment of individual academics and introduced a national committee for evaluation of higher education institutions (CNE — Comit? national d'?valuation des ?tablissements publics d'enseignement sup?rieur). The committee, set up in 1985 as an independent authority, comprised members designated by different academic bodies and public agencies. CNE was a government agency, but it only reported to the President, so it was independent of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Education and other executive agencies. His mission was to systematically evaluate universities and public higher education institutions. From 1986 to 2006 the CNE published 240 evaluation reports: institutional reports on all public universities and a selection of ?coles, thematic reports on specific fields of study and reports on the state of higher education at the national level. Over its first years of existence, CNE developed its own methodology for institutional evaluation that differed

\* **Dmytro BARABAS / Дмитро БАРАБАСЬ / Дмитрий БАРАБАСЬ** — Ph.D., Associate Professor of Management department, Kyiv National Economic University Named After Vadym Hetman, e—mail: dmitry\_barabas@mail.ru;

**Mariia VOLOSHYNA / Марія ВОЛОШИНА / Мария ВОЛОШИНА** — Bachelor of Management, Kyiv National Economic University Named After Vadym Hetman

substantially from what was done in the neighboring countries that were most advanced on the field of higher education evaluation [5].

CNER (Comit  national d' valuation de la recherche), was created soon after for evaluating public research programs and policies. Having no role in the evaluation of individual research centers, it could only conduct survey and write reports on the broad issues of research.

A third agency operated parallel to CNE and CNER, is the «Mission scientifique, technique et p dagogique» (MSTP). Its mandate was to evaluate the laboratories entirely owned by the universities, the academic teaching programs (for accreditation of university programs and doctoral schools) and individual academics staff (for awarding bonuses and distinctions).

The individual evaluation of the academic staff of the universities is mainly devoted to the national council of universities (Conseil national des universit s — CNU). This consultative body, originally created in 1945 and organized in its present shape in 1987, advises the Minister in charge of Higher Education on matters relating to recruitment and promotion of the tenured academic staff of the universities.

France is no exception to other European states that saw a drastic change in Higher Education as a result of the Bologna Declaration (1999). New state regulations were introduced from 2002, aimed at building a degree structure that is common to all higher education institutions. The implementation of these regulations was phased in step by step and a study of the quality evaluation process was put into operation [1].

Two Major acts were voted by parliament in 2006 and 2007, bringing deep changes that have not yet produced all their effects. The «Act on freedom and responsibility of universities» passed in August 2007 provided essentially for a new governance and a larger financial autonomy of universities. The «programme act for research» of April 2006 contained provisions, one of them was the creation of a new evaluation agency for research and higher education, AERES (Agence d' valuation de la recherche et de l'enseignement sup rieur).

#### *Evaluation institutions*

AERES is a French academic research evaluation agency. AERES has the task of «evaluating research and higher education institutions, research organizations, research units, higher education programs and degrees and with approving their staff evaluation procedures». The Italian ANVUR agency was partly modeled on AERES [3]. AERES was conceived as a unified evaluation agency. CNE, CNER and MSTP were actually merged into AERES but a few specialized bodies remained outside. AERES was given four missions:

- Evaluate higher education institutions (universities,  coles) and research agencies;
- Evaluate operation and outcomes of research units;
- Evaluate teaching programs and degrees;
- Validate the procedures for individual evaluation of academic and research personnel.

As far as institutional evaluation is concerned, AERES started by taking over most of the CNE principles and methodology.

In his first five years of operation, AERES was able to produce institutional evaluation reports on all universities, all research agencies and a large number of public and private  coles. Each year a group of institutions is selected for evaluation, with a periodicity of five years.

Concerning evaluation of research units, AERES has taken over activities that were conducted by the research agencies for their own units or for the mixed units. Evaluation procedure is similar to that of institutional evaluation: Self—evaluation report, visit of a panel of experts and publication of a report [5].

Other institutions:

— CEFDG (Commission d' valuation des formations et dipl mes de gestion). The CEFDG's mission is to organize the quality control procedures of higher education in business and management from the perspective of the construction of the European Higher Education Area. It also examines the evolution of management higher education. [4]

— CTI (Commission des Titres d'Ing nieur). Its missions are the evaluation and accreditation of higher education institutions in the field of engineering in order to authorize French grand  coles to deliver the Dipl me d'Ing nieur, the development of quality in engineering education, and the promotion of engineering curricula and careers in France and abroad [6].

— CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique). CNRS is a public organization under the responsibility of the French Ministry of Education and Research. CNRS has the following missions: to evaluate and carryout all research capable of advancing knowledge and bringing social, cultural, and economic benefits for society; to contribute to the application and promotion of research results; to develop scientific information; to support research training; to participate in the analysis of the national and international scientific climate and its potential for evolution in order to develop a national policy.

### *Evaluation criteria and principles*

Evaluation of a training program by the AERES must follow its self—evaluation by the institution. This self—evaluation sets out to position each training program with regard to the institution's strategy and its declared objectives, and it shows where each program stands in the overall range available, in the way it is understood and is in keeping with the whole. Lastly, through its self—evaluation, the institution can detect the strengths and weaknesses of its training programs and how these make use of the schemes placed at their disposal.

4 criteria are applied for the evaluation a bachelor's degree specialty for example [1]:

— The educational project: the bachelor's degree specialty leads to the expected learning outcomes and skills at the end of the program.

— Schemes for helping students to succeed: these provide students with all the information they need throughout their course, refresher classes and methodology classes and tailored tutoring.

— Integration of graduates into the job market and continuation of chosen studies: the training program is developed so as to give students the option to find a job straightaway or continue with their chosen studies by enrolling on vocational bachelor's degrees, master's degrees or in doctoral schools.

— Program leadership: the specialty is managed by a diversified team (subjects, statuses, etc.) whose appointment, skills and method of operating are clearly determined.

In France some objective criteria are used when conducting research evaluation [5, p. 37]:

1. Quality of scientific production, scientific influence;
2. Active participation in national and international networks and programs;
3. Risk-taking in research (particularly at disciplinary interfaces);
4. Accessibility for the world of social demand;
5. Responsibilities in research management (national, international) or in the publication of reviews (editor-in-international collections, director);
6. Investment in the dissemination of scientific culture;
7. Applied research or expertise;
8. Estimation of the proportion of researchers and professors «productive in terms of research and results» exploitation.

Basic principles of quality evaluation in higher education of France [1]:

— The aims and objectives of evaluation must be clear and widely disseminated;

— The evaluation methods must meet their objectives and be based on suitable procedures;

— The evaluation experts and evaluated parties must be familiar with the procedures used;

— The criteria must be explicit and published in particular.

Based on these principles the AERES practices «integrated evaluation» according to a method closely combining the reviews of its three departments: research units, programs and degrees, institutions.

### *Problems of higher education quality evaluation in France*

Many issues feed the current debate on quality evaluation in France, inside the agencies, among them and in the scientific and academics community. Sizable part of this community resented evaluation they see as an element of the managerial approach to the governance of higher education and research. The debate centers four broad issues: the purpose of evaluation, the adequateness of criteria and references, the legitimacy of the evaluators, and the degree of specificity of the evaluation processes [2].

— The purpose of evaluation. Evaluation may have different purposes according to the different stakeholders of the Higher Education and Research system. There may be conflicts between purposes as the tools used by evaluation differ from one to the other.

— The adequateness of criteria and references. AERES has chosen, like CNE, not to grade the outcomes of institutional evaluation. Evaluation reports conclude on a statement of strengths and weaknesses and on some advice. This qualitative approach makes it impossible to compare and rank institutions. A different choice was made for evaluation of teaching programs and research units. Evaluation reports rate the evaluated entity on each of the evaluation criteria with grades A+, A, B and C (excellent, good, satisfactory and below standard). Such grades were compiled by the press and turned into quality rankings of institutions. This was deeply resented by universities because grades remained for five years whatever the actions taken and the corrections achieved.

— The legitimacy of evaluators. There is a general agreement in Higher Education that evaluation should be based on peer review but peers are not necessarily experts and the selection of the adequate people raises several issues. Selection itself may proceed from appointment or election. When experts are appointed, there is a suspicion that they are not independent from the appointing authority. This dilemma may be overcome by having a mixed selection process whereby some of the experts are elected and some appointed. AERES, as an independent agency, insists on appointing all its experts in order to ensure

competency and representativeness. The principles on which experts are chosen are published on the website and as well as the CV of all experts. Possible conflicts of interests are taken seriously.

— Comprehensive or specialized evaluation. AERES strongly supports an integrated evaluation of the higher educational research sector and therefore considers the multiplicity of agencies as a hindrance to this. It discusses with the specialized agencies and bodies in order to unify methodology and coordinate procedures. It also diversifies its own approach to take into account disciplinary specificities in research and teaching that are used as a justification for separate evaluation agencies.

The French system of quality evaluation in higher education is developing. Significant changes have occurred over the past decade. The rise in number of foreign students confirms the correctness of the chosen direction.

### **References**

1. Agence d'évaluation de la recherche et de l'enseignement supérieur, available at <http://www.aeres—evaluation.fr>
2. Chevaillier T. (2013) Evaluation in French Higher Education: history, policy and debates, *Scuola Democratica*, №4 (2), p. 619—627, available at <https://www.rivisteweb.it/download/article/10.12828/74732>
3. Commission d'évaluation des formations et diplômes de gestion, available at [https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commission\\_d'évaluation\\_des\\_formations\\_et\\_diplômes\\_de\\_gestion](https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Commission_d'évaluation_des_formations_et_diplômes_de_gestion)
4. Commission des Titres d'Ingénieur, available at <http://www.cti-commission.fr>
5. Overview of the Quality Assurance System in Higher Education: France / National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education, Tokyo, 2012, 57 p., available at [http://www.niad.ac.jp/english/overview\\_fr\\_e.pdf](http://www.niad.ac.jp/english/overview_fr_e.pdf)
6. Vught F. A., Westerheijden D. F. (1994) Towards a General Model of Quality Assessment in Higher Education // *Higher Education*, Vol. 28, No. 3, pp. 355—371, available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3447776>

УДК 316.32

Олексій БРОЖКО\*

### **ЕКОНОМІЧНА БЕЗПЕКА В УМОВАХ ГЛОБАЛІЗАЦІЇ: ЗАГРОЗИ ТА МОЖЛИВОСТІ**

### **ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКАЯ БЕЗОПАСНОСТЬ В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ: УГРОЗЫ И ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ**

### **ECONOMIC SECURITY UNDER GLOBALIZATION: THREATS AND OPPORTUNITIES**

*Анотація.* Розглянуто вплив глобалізації на економічну безпеку держав на прикладі України. Охарактеризовано можливі загрози та можливості для економік держав світу, дано авторську оцінку.

*Аннотация.* Рассмотрено влияние глобализации на экономическую безопасность государств на примере Украины. Охарактеризованы угрозы и возможности для экономик стран мира, дано авторскую оценку.

*Annotation.* The influence of globalization on the economic security of the states on the example of Ukraine were investigated. Possible threats and opportunities for the economies of the world have been characterized, the author gives his assessment.

Забезпечення економічної безпеки — пріоритетний напрям діяльності держави, адже необхідність у забезпеченні своєї безпеки суспільство відчуває постійно. У наш час посилення багатьох загроз економічної безпеки відбуваються під впливом дії процесу глобалізації, яка розвивається у світі з шаленою швидкістю. Надалі продовжується активний розвиток світового господарчого комплексу торгових, виробничих, фінансових відносин; національні економіки переплітаються й взаємодоповнюють один з одним. З другого боку, економіки держав стають відкритішими, збільшується ймовірність попадання національного ринку у залежність від ринків інших держав, відбувається відтік капіталу.

\* **БРОЖКО Олексій Олександрович / Алексей БРОЖКО / Oleksii BROZHKO** — студент, НТУУ «Київський Політехнічний Інститут», e-mail: brozhkol@mail.ru