
Methodology for Assessing the Quality of Educational Services in Higher Education

VINOGRADOVA MARINA V.¹, KULYAMINA OLGA S.², VASILEVA LIDIA A.³,
BRONNIKOVA EVGENIYA M.⁴, VISHNYAKOVA VIKTORIYA A.⁵

¹Doctor of Economics, Vice-Rector for Research, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia.

²Candidate of Economics, Head of Interdisciplinary Research Laboratory, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia.

³Researcher, Scientific and Research Institute of Prospective Trends and Technologies, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia.

⁴Candidate of Economics, Senior Researcher, Interdisciplinary Research Laboratory, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia.

⁵Candidate of Economics, Head of Department of Scientific and Technical Information, Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia.

Abstract:Annotation: The article examines the criteria and indicators for assessing the quality of educational services. The coverage of the topic of this article passes through the prism of factors related to the assessment of educational services quality, which allowed the authors to identify current methodological problems, as well as to emphasize the importance of using an integrated approach in studying the issues of providing educational services. The authors identify criteria and indicators for assessing of educational services. The authors developed the composite coefficient of educational services quality. The practical implementation of the proposals prepared by the authors determines the prerequisites for the development of a methodology for assessing educational services quality, which will allow for an objective assessment and, as a result, take the necessary measures to improve the quality of educational services on the part of the educational organization.

Keywords: assessment of educational services, educational services, quality of educational services, methods for assessing of educational services quality, educational organization, indicators for assessing educational services quality, criteria for assessing educational services quality, the composite coefficient of educational services quality

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, there is a fierce competition in the educational services market. Only the educational organization that is continuously engaged in quality improvement issues can win in it. Currently, there is no single methodology for assessing the educational services quality to recommend to all educational organizations. Therefore, the universities force to develop criteria and indicators of the educational services quality at the level of self-examination. The need to assess the educational services quality is due to the interest of society and the state in ensuring that the population mastered significant and necessary competencies to maintain the quality of work at a certain level. It should grow in proportion to the development of science and technology, providing the labor market with qualified personnel. (Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp et. all, 2017) This fact forms a number of mandatory characteristics that are significant for a particular consumer of educational services.

The variety of methods and approaches for assessing the educational services quality has its own specifics and often does not allow making objective analysis timely and qualitatively. In this regard, the issue of assessing the provision of educational services requires a detailed study.

METHODS

In order to analyze the effectiveness of evaluating the educational services quality in the course of the study there were used methods of comparative analysis, which revealed the main approaches to the assessment of educational services. The set of general scientific methods made it possible to determine the main criteria and indicators for assessing the quality of educational services.

The work also considered the approaches of Russian and foreign scientists to the definition of educational services quality (Asanova I.M., Sergeeva S.Yu., 2019, Gerritsen-van Leeuwenka mp K.J., et all , 2017, Berzina K., et all , 2017), the concept of quality in higher education (Escobar-Jimenez C., et all, 2019), the approaches to

education management (Panasyuk V.P., 2017). The features of the methodology for the transition to e-education, transformation of higher education, the introduction of an electronic environment were analyzed (Carcamo J.L., 2021, Veretekhina S.V. et al, 2019). The quality of higher education, influencing factors, assessment systems (Bolotov V.A., 2018, Zhang A., 2019, Ilichenko I.A., 2017), including issues of assessing the quality of the teaching staff (Gonzalez-Geraldo et al, 2021) assessment of students satisfaction with the quality of educational services were studied (Velichko N.Y.).

As part of the analysis, special attention was paid to legislative regulations and standards of the Russian Federation (Federal Law of December 29, 2012 № 273-FZ, GOST R 50691-2013, form number 1-Monitoring, Reference information Federal State Educational Standards, Statistical reporting forms).

The main goal of the study is to develop a methodology for assessing the quality of educational services in higher education, including the calculation of criteria and indicators for assessing the educational services quality.

RESULTS

At the present stage, educational services are an integral part of the education system. The assessment of the quality of educational services is based on meeting the needs of students, creating conditions for learning, as well as focusing on personal development and effective competitiveness in the educational services market.

The formation of consumer expectations can be influenced by many factors: the student's own needs, life experience, the opinion of society, the status of the educational organization, current information about the labor market. Depending on the ratio of the assessment, the reasons for the gaps between the expectation and the perception of the quality of educational services highlighted: the assessment by the management of the educational organization of the consumer's expectations without research; untimely elimination of problems in the educational services.

The assessment of educational services quality in fact should proceed from the perception of its potential result, directly the student receives the educational service.

In practice, there is also a method for evaluating educational services based on the results of a preliminary survey of the consumers. This analysis will allow the educational organization to assess the entire process of providing a service from the initial stage - the conditions of obtaining, to the final result - the possibility of learning. (Berzina K., et al, 2017)

The information database for assessing the educational services quality can be the results of a survey separately for each consumer, the results of self-examination. Thus, evaluation of the quality of educational services carries out using methods (differential, complex or mixed) and take into account the data obtained from the consumer survey.

In order to determine a quantitative assessment of educational services quality, it seems appropriate the main directions of educational activities (criteria). The particular indicators will characterize criteria. The authors proposed to use a complex method, which consists in the use of a consolidated quality indicator (composite coefficient), which interprets the quality level as a single factor.

Each of the coefficients characterize the criteria of educational services quality. It describes by a number of indicators with their weight (Table 1). The criteria for assessing the quality of educational services should be determined in accordance with the objectives of the educational organization functioning. The number of criteria should be sufficient to conduct an effective assessment.

Table 1. The criterion and the indicators of educational services quality

№	Indicators	Calculation formula	Explanation of the formula	Indicator weight
1	The criterion "Quality of HE educational programs" (C_{r1})			
1.1	The share of educational programs implemented under double degree programs ($C_{d.d.p.}$)	$C_{d.d.p.} = N_{d.d.p.} / N_{e.p.}$	$N_{d.d.p.}$ - the number of double degree programs; $N_{e.p.}$ - the total number of educational programs	a_1
1.2	The share of network programs implemented in cooperation with leading Russian universities (C_n)	$C_n = N_n / N_{e.p.}$	N_n - the number of network programs implemented in cooperation with leading Russian universities	a_2
1.3	The share of educational programs implemented in foreign languages ($C_{f.l.}$)	$C_{f.l.} = N_{f.l.} / N_{e.p.}$	$N_{f.l.}$ - the number of educational programs implemented in foreign languages	a_3
1.4	The share of students studying on individual trajectories of	$C_{i.t.d.} = N_{i.t.d.} / N_{t.n.s}$	$N_{i.t.d.}$ - the number of students studying on	a_4

No	Indicators	Calculation formula	Explanation of the formula	Indicator weight
	development ($C_{i.t.d.}$)		individual trajectories of development; $N_{t.n.s}$ - the total number of students	
1.5	The share of e-learning courses hosted at the International and Russian educational digital platforms ($C_{e.c.d.p.}$)	$C_{e.c.d.p.} = N_{e.c.d.p.} / N_{e.c.}$	$N_{e.c.d.p.}$ - the number of e-learning courses hosted at the International and Russian educational digital platforms; $N_{e.c.}$ - the total number of e-learning courses	a_5
1.6	The share of graduates satisfied with the quality of education ($C_{g.q.e.}$)	$C_{g.q.e.} = N_{g.q.e.} / N_g$	$N_{g.q.e.}$ - the number of graduates satisfied with the quality of education; N_g - the total number of graduates	a_6
1.7	The share of students satisfied with the quality of educational programs ($C_{s.q.e.p.}$)	$C_{s.q.e.p.} = N_{s.q.e.p.} / N_{t.n.s}$	$N_{s.q.e.p.}$ - the number of students satisfied with the quality of educational programs	a_7
1.8	The share of SSE program's graduates continued studies in HE programs ($C_{g.SSE HE}$)	$C_{g.SSE HE} = N_{g.SSE HE} / N_{g.SSE}$	$N_{g.SSE HE}$ - the number of SSE program's graduates continued studies in HE programs; $N_{g.SSE}$ - the total number of SSE program's graduates	a_8
1.9	The share of bachelor course students continued studies in master's degree program ($C_{s.b.m.}$)	$C_{s.b.m.} = N_{s.b.m.} / N_{s.b.}$	$N_{s.b.m.}$ - the number of bachelor course students continued studies in master's degree program; $N_{s.b.}$ - the total number of bachelor course students	a_9
1.10	The share of HE program's students studied under contracts for targeted training ($C_{t.t.}$)	$C_{t.t.} = N_{t.t.} / N_{t.n.s}$	$N_{t.t.}$ - the number of students of HE program's studied under contracts for targeted training	a_{10}
2	The criterion "Quality of the teaching staff" (Cr_2)			
2.1	The share of teaching staff up to 39 years old (C_{age})	$C_{age} = N_{up\ to\ 39} / N_{t.s.}$	$N_{up\ to\ 39}$ - the number of teaching staff up to 39 years old; $N_{t.s.}$ - total number of teaching staff	b_1
2.2	The share of teaching staff with a scientific degree ($C_{s.d.}$)	$C_{s.d.} = N_{s.d.} / N_{t.s.}$	$N_{s.d.}$ - the number of teaching staff with a scientific degree	b_2
2.3	The share of teaching staff with a PhD degree (C_{PhD})	$C_{PhD} = N_{PhD} / N_{t.s.}$	N_{PhD} - the number of teaching staff with a PhD degree	b_3
2.4	The share of teaching staff who speak a foreign language ($C_{f.l.}$)	$C_{f.l.} = N_{f.l.} / N_{t.s.}$	$N_{f.l.}$ - the number of teaching staff who speak a foreign language	b_4
2.5	The share of teaching staff who have completed internships with leading employers and abroad, per year ($C_{in.}$)	$C_{in.} = N_{in.} / N_{t.s.}$	$N_{in.}$ - the number of teaching staff who have completed internships with leading employers and abroad	b_5
2.6	The share of students satisfied	$C_{q.l.} = N_{q.l.} / N_{t.n.s}$	$N_{q.l.}$ - the number of	b_6

№	Indicators	Calculation formula	Explanation of the formula	Indicator weight
	with the quality of the of lessons (C _{q.l.})		students who are satisfied with the quality of lessons	
3	The criterion "Quality of educational technologies" (Cr ₃)			
3.1	The share of teaching staff using interactive methods (training, coaching, gaming practices and so on.) (C _{i.m.})	$C_{i.m.} = N_{i.m.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{i.m.} - the number of teaching staff using interactive methods	c ₁
3.2	The share of teaching staff using modern electronic educational resources, including their own developments (e-learning courses, Coursera, video lectures, content courses) (C _{e.e.r.})	$C_{e.e.r.} = N_{e.e.r.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{e.e.r.} - the number of teaching staff using modern electronic educational resources, including their own developments	c ₂
3.3	The share of teaching staff using a training project-based approach (C _{pr})	$C_{pr} = N_{pr} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{pr} - the number of teaching staff using a training project-based approach	c ₃
3.4	The share of educational programs developed using inclusive technologies and methods (C _{inc})	$C_{inc} = N_{inc} / N_{e.p.}$	N _{inc} - the number of educational programs developed using inclusive technologies and methods	c ₄
3.5	The share of teaching staff who have learned the methods of inclusive education (C _{inc. ed.})	$C_{inc. ed.} = N_{inc. ed.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{inc. ed.} - the number of teaching staff who have learned the methods of inclusive education	c ₅
3.6	The share of teaching staff received communication and media skills (C _{c.m.s.})	$C_{c.m.s.} = N_{k.m.s.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{c.m.s.} – the number of teaching staff received communication and media skills	c ₆
4	The criterion "Quality of material and technical support of the educational process" (Cr ₄)			
4.1	The level of students satisfaction with digital services (C _{s.d.s.})	$C_{s.d.s.} = N_{s.d.s.} / N_{t.n.s}$	N _{s.d.s.} - the number of students satisfied with digital services	d ₁
4.2	The level of teaching staff satisfaction with digital services (C _{t.s.d.s.})	$C_{t.s.d.s.} = N_{t.s.d.s.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{t.s.d.s.} - number of teaching staff satisfied with digital services	d ₂
4.3	The level of provision of educational and scientific processes with modern equipment (C _{m.eq.})	$C_{m.eq.} = N_{m.eq.} / N_{eq.}$	N _{m.eq.} - the amount of modern equipment; N _{eq.} - the number of installed equipment	d ₃
4.4	The level of teaching staff satisfaction with the quality of the educational and scientific infrastructure (C _{t.s.e.s.i.})	$C_{t.s.e.s.i.} = N_{t.s.e.s.i.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{t.s.e.s.i.} - the number of teaching staff satisfied with the quality of the educational and scientific infrastructure	d ₄
4.5	The level of students satisfaction with the quality of educational and scientific infrastructure (C _{s.e.s.i.})	$C_{s.e.s.i.} = N_{s.e.s.i.} / N_{t.n.s}$	N _{s.e.s.i.} - the number of students satisfied with the quality of the educational and scientific infrastructure	d ₅
5	The criterion "Quality of educational processes management" (Cr ₅)			
5.1	The level of students satisfaction with the work of Centralized Dean's office (C _{s.C.D.o.})	$C_{s.C.D.o.} = N_{s.C.D.o} / N_{t.n.s}$	N _{s.C.D.o.} - the number of students satisfied with the work of the Centralized Dean's Office	e ₁
5.2	The level of teaching staff satisfaction with the work of Centralized Dean's office	$C_{t.s.C.D.o.} = N_{t.s.C.D.o.} / N_{t.s.}$	N _{t.s.C.D.o.} - the number of teaching staff satisfied with the work of the Centralized	e ₂

№	Indicators	Calculation formula	Explanation of the formula	Indicator weight
	(C _{t.s.C.D.o.})		Dean's Office	
5.3	The level of students satisfaction with the Technical Support Service (C _{s.T.S.S.})	$C_{s.T.S.S.} = N_{s.T.S.S.} / N_{t.n.s}$	N _{s.T.S.S.} - the number of students satisfied with the Technical Support Service	e ₃
5.4	The level of teaching staff satisfaction with the Technical Support Service (C _{t.s.T.S.S.})	$C_{t.s.T.S.S.} = N_{t.s.T.S.S.} / N_{t.s}$	N _{t.s.T.S.S.} - the number of teaching staff satisfied with the Technical Support Service	e ₄
5.5	The level of students satisfaction with the current regulations and local regulations (C _{s.c.l.r.})	$C_{s.c.l.r.} = N_{s.c.l.r.} / N_{t.n.s}$	N _{s.c.l.r.} - the number of students satisfied with the current regulations and local regulations	e ₅
5.6	The level of teaching staff satisfaction the with the current regulations and local regulations (C _{t.s.c.l.r.})	$C_{t.s.c.l.r.} = N_{t.s.c.l.r.} / N_{t.s}$	N _{t.s.c.l.r.} - number of teaching staff satisfied the with the current regulations and local regulations	e ₆

Further, an expert assign a weight to each criterion. This weight takes into account in calculating the composite coefficient of educational services quality (Table 2).

Table 2. The criteria of educational services quality

№	Criteria	Calculation formula	Criterion weight
1	The criterion "Quality of HE educational programs" (Cr ₁)	$Cr_1 = a_1 C_{d.d.p.} + a_2 C_n + a_3 C_{f.l.} + a_4 C_{i.t.d.} + a_5 C_{e.c.d.p.} + a_6 C_{g.q.e.} + a_7 C_{s.q.e.p.} + a_8 C_g SSE HE + a_9 C_{s.b.m} + a_{10} C_{t.t.}$	n ₁
2	The criterion "Quality of the teaching staff" (Cr ₂)	$Cr_2 = b_1 C_{age} + b_2 C_{s.d.} + b_3 C_{PhD} + b_4 C_{f.l.} + b_5 C_{in.} + b_6 C_{q.l.}$	n ₂
3	The criterion "Quality of educational technologies" (Cr ₃)	$Cr_3 = c_1 C_{i.m.} + c_2 C_{e.e.r.} + c_3 C_{pr} + c_4 C_{inc} + c_5 C_{inc. ed.} + c_6 C_{c.m.s.}$	n ₃
4	The criterion "Quality of material and technical support of the educational process" (Cr ₄)	$Cr_4 = d_1 C_{s.d.s.} d_2 K C_{t.s.d.s.} + d_3 C_{m.eq.} + d_4 C_{t.s.e.s.i.} + d_5 C_{s.e.s.i.}$	n ₄
5	The criterion "Quality of educational processes management" (Cr ₅)	$Cr_5 = e_1 C_{s.C.D.o.} + e_2 C_{t.s.C.D.o.} + e_3 C_{s.T.S.S.} + e_4 C_{t.s.T.S.S.} + e_5 C_{s.c.l.r.} + e_6 C_{t.s.c.l.r.}$	n ₅

The composite coefficient of educational services quality (C_{e.s.q.}) is determined as the sum of generalizing indicators for each criterion, taking into account the weight. It determines by the formula:

$$C_{e.s.q.} = n_1 Cr_1 + n_2 Cr_2 + n_3 Cr_3 + n_4 Cr_4 + n_5 Cr_5, \quad (1)$$

Thus, the composite coefficient makes it possible to assess the quality of educational services in quantitative terms, the maximum value of which will be one. In the future, it will be possible to compare the composite coefficient and particular indicators, taking into account their weight, with the previous year's coefficients.

It is effectively to use a mixed method for assessing the quality of educational services. The indicators, criteria and a composite indicator (integrated method) will first be determined. Then a differential method based on a comparison of quality indicators of the base and current periods will be applied.

The criterion and indicators will have its own characteristics to each educational institution, so the internal audit has individual character.

DISCUSSION

The study of the assessment of educational services quality emphasized the need for an effective assessment through the implementation of an internal audit. The internal audit should be organized on a regular basis in order to trace the dynamics of changes in indicators and obtain reliable results. It will allow us to take timely measures to improve the quality of educational services. Based on the results of the internal audit, university can plan and carry out measures for effective management of the educational process. It will improve the quality of educational services, meet the needs of consumers and the requirements of Federal state Educational Standards. The methods for assessing the quality of educational services studied in the work made it possible to distinguish two main stages:

- 1) the analysis of reports of the educational organization activities;

2) the analysis of sociological surveys.

Meanwhile, it was determined that in order to assess the quality of educational services effectively, it is necessary to analyze the data throughout the entire period of providing educational services. Moreover, in order to increase competitiveness and achieve leading positions as at the educational services market and the labor market, education and professional training institutions is advisable not only to maintain a certain level of quality of educational services, but also to ensure its increase.

The number of researchers emphasized the need to improve the procedure for assessing the quality of educational services. They identified the questionnaire with open and closed questions as one of the effective methods of assessing, involving the use of scoring parameters and the method of weighted estimates (Golubeva O.A., et. all, 2017). The objectivity of the survey results depends on the number of questions. That's why it is important to study in details the questionnaires for each consumer on a specific educational process (Baydakova A., et. all, 2015).

The results of the analysis of the educational services quality assessment emphasize the need to improve efficiency through the determination of the management system, including all management levels of the educational organization (Basyuk A.S., et. all, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Thus, in order to establish and develop an effective system for assessing the educational services quality, educational organizations should apply methods of comprehensive assessment, which depends on the internal organization of educational activities. Therefore, if educational activity is a service, the assessment parameters defined by internal standards may apply to it. The educational services should have the features that characterize their quality and satisfy the interests of consumers. However, it is important to emphasize that the choice of methods for assessing the educational services quality should take into account the requirements determined by the objectives of the study, as well as adapt to specific levels of education and categories of consumers. The developed methodology is complex. It allows the educational organizations to take into account both the data of monitoring the educational services quality and the data of sociological surveys of students of various courses and areas of training and the teaching staff of the university.

REFERENCES

1. Asanova, I.M., Syrtsev, A.N. Internal Audit Methodology. URL: https://akvobr.ru/metodika_vnutrennego_audita.html (accessed 15.10.2020).
2. Babakaev S., Vishnyakova V., Patsula A., Kulyamina O., & Vinogradov M. 2019. New approaches to assessing consumer preferences. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 8(10), pp. 153-170.
3. Babakayev S. V., Vinogradova M. V., Vishnyakova V. A., Zanina K. D., & Ermilova A. N. 2018. The influence of personal characteristics on the formation of consumer preferences for goods and services. *International Journal of Management and Business Research*, 8(1), pp.108-119.
4. Basyuk, A.S., Antipenko, R.V. 2019. Assessment of the quality of educational services of the university. *Scientific Bulletin of the Southern Institute of Management*. 4, 123 - 117.
5. Baydakova, A., Komin, M., Almamatov, A. 2015. Factors of unreliability of the results of sociological surveys. URL: <http://www.cogita.ru/a.n.-alekseev/andrei-alekseev-1/factory-nedostovernosti-rezultatov-sociologicheskikh-oprosov> (accessed 12.10.2020).
6. Berzina, K., Zicmane, I., Kuckovskis, J. 2017. Self-assessment as a key criterion for increase of quality of higher education in modern conditions. *11th International Conference on Electromechanical and Power Systems, SIELMEN 2017* Proceedings. 2017-January, 16-19
7. Bolotov, V.A. 2018. The past, present and possible future of the Russian system for assessing the quality of education. *Education Issues*. 3, 287 - 297.
8. Carcamo, J. L. 2021. Factors associated with the teacher's practice that affect the dropout of students in the e-learning modality, a case study in the context of chilean higher education. *CIENCIA E INGENIERIA*. 42 (1), 101-112
9. Escobar-Jimenez, C.; Delgado, A. 2019. Quality and Quality in Higher Education: A Theoretical Discussion in Ecuadorian Higher Education System. *REDU-REVISTA DE DOCENCIA UNIVERSITARIA*. 17 (2), 159-175
10. Federal Law December 29, 2012 No. 273-FZ "On Education in the Russian Federation". URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_140174/ (accessed 08.10.2020).
11. Gerritsen-van Leeuwenkamp, K.J., Joosten-ten Brinke, D., Kester, L. 2017. Assessment quality in tertiary education: An integrative literature review. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*. 55, 94-11
12. Golubeva, O.A., Mereuts, K.I., Tkhazaplizheva, A.N. 2017. Assessment of the quality of educational services by assessing consumer satisfaction. *Science today: problems and development prospects*. 31 - 33.

13. Gonzalez-Geraldo, J.L.; Monroy, F., Del Rincon Igea, B. 2021. Impact of a Spanish higher education teacher development programme on approaches to teaching. *Psychometric properties of the s-ati-20 scale. Educacion XXI* . 24 (1), 213-232
14. GOST R 50691-2013. National standard of the Russian Federation. Services to the population. Service quality assurance system model. - URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_267904/ (accessed 08.10.2020).
15. Ilichenko, I.A. 2017. The quality of educational services: factors, problems, prospects // *Problems of the quality of education. Psychological and pedagogical aspects of the humanitarian culture of society. Management in regional socio-economic systems*. Taganrog: Publishing CHOU VO TIUiE, 114-148.
16. Ivanov A.V., Akhtyan A. G., Vishnyakova V. A., Zotova M.V., Richikhina E. N., Ziroyan M. A., & Potekhina E. V. 2018. Pedagogical conditions for developing a sense of responsibility in adolescents and youth. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 9(11), pp.1809-1821.
17. Ivanov A.V., Akhtyan A.G., Vishnyakova V.A., Demidova T.E., Karpunina A.V., Konstantinova N.P., & Kvitkovskaya A.A. 2018. Development of volitional qualities of adolescent in the pedagogy of consciousness. *Eurasian Journal of Analytical Chemistry*, 13(1), doi:10.29333/ejac/102252.
18. Ivanov A.V., Chelysheva Y.V., Akhtyan A.G., Vishnyakova V.A., & Sorikhina V.P. 2018. Ethical concepts of pedagogy of consciousness as a foundation for the development of the school for the future. *Astra Salvensis*, 6, pp.453-462.
19. Panasyuk, V.P. 2017. Management of education and educational systems: state, trends, problems and prospects *Education and Science*. 2, 72-88.
20. Reference information: "Federal state educational standards". URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_142304/#dst0 (accessed 08.10.2020).
21. Sergeeva, S.Y. 2019. Modern approaches and methods for assessing the quality of education. *Young scientist*. 37 (275), 162-165.
22. Statistical reporting in the form "Form No. 1-Monitoring" Monitoring of the main activities of the educational organization of higher education" URL: http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_359722/ (accessed 08.10.2020).
23. Velichko, N.Y., Tordinava, I.K., Belyaeva, E.V., Kripon, N.S. 2020. Satisfaction of consumers of educational services as a factor contributing to improving the quality of services. URL: http://www.tsutmb.ru/nayk/nauchnyie_meropriyatiya/int_konf/vseross/professionalno_lichnostnoe_razviti_e_prepodavatelnya_i_studenta_tradiczii,_problemyi,_perspektivy2/sekcziya_1/udovletvorennost_potrebitele_j_obrazovatelnyx_uslug (accessed 08.10. 2020).
24. Veretekhina, S.V., Novikova, V.A. 2019. Transformation of education in the digital economy. *Contemporary Problems of Social Work*. Vol 5. № 2 (18), 30-37.
25. Zhang, A.; Li, G.; Li, Z. 2019. Research on High Quality Development of Higher Education. *5th International Conference on Humanities and Social Science Research (ICHSSR) Guilin, PEOPLES R CHINA*. 319, 472-475