Qalıb Sharifov
Doctor of Philosophy in Physics, associate professor, Azerbaijan State Pedagogy
Head of the Quality Assurance Department of the University.
E-mail: galibsharifov@gmail.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9836-0618

Evaluating the Effectiveness of New Educational Quality Indicators in Higher Education

Abstract

Based on a case study at the Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University (ASPU), this article investigated the effectiveness of quality indicators developed with new methods in higher education. The study is part of a larger project called "Strengthening Internal Quality Assurance of Education in teaching, training and assessment in higher education institutions of Azerbaijan and Russia" launched in 2022. The aim is to evaluate the impact and usefulness of these new indicators. A survey was conducted among 1016 students of the Faculty of Philology of ASPU, who were selected as the pilot faculty for this initiative. The survey included a number of new indicators designed to measure various aspects of education quality, including teaching effectiveness, learning outcomes and student satisfaction. These indicators are precisely designed to adapt to modern educational standards and the specific needs of higher education institutions in Azerbaijan. The methodology used in this study included both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Quantitative data were collected through the survey method and statistics on the effectiveness of the new indicators were provided. Qualitative data collected through open questions and focus group discussions provided deeper information about students' opinions and experiences related to these indicators. Preliminary results suggest that the new indicators have had a positive impact on the educational experience of ASPU. Students reported increased satisfaction with the quality of teaching and learning and significant improvements in assessment processes. This study makes a significant contribution to the literature on quality assurance in higher education by providing empirical arguments from a specific institutional context. It also serves as a practical example for researchers and educational administrators who wish to implement similar quality improvement measures in their institutions. The results of this study are expected to lead future actions in the field of quality assurance and educational excellence, both in Azerbaijan and beyond.

Keywords: *Quality of Education Indicators, Higher Education, Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, Quality Assurance in Education, Mixed Methods Research, IQAinAR*

Introduction

The landscape of higher education is undergoing rapid and significant changes, which requires a flexible and forward-looking approach to quality assurance. Focused on the ASPU, this study was developed against the background of the evolving European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) and the latest innovations in education quality indicators. At the heart of this change is the need to adapt educational practices to the dynamic and diverse needs of modern learners, which is becoming more apparent in the context of recent global developments.

In order to respond to these challenges, the "Strengthening the Internal Quality Assurance of Education in the Organization of Training and Evaluation in Higher Education Institutions of Azerbaijan and Russia" (IQAinAR) project has been launched. This initiative reflects the joint effort of higher education institutions to improve their internal quality assurance mechanisms and to adapt them to advanced international practices and the special educational context of Azerbaijan. ASPU's

participation in this project emphasizes its commitment to increase the quality and usefulness of education by striving to meet international standards and criteria.

Although the focus on new education quality indicators is useful, it shows a significant departure from traditional criteria, which are often lacking in providing a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the quality of education in modern times. The emergence of these new indicators is due to the limitations inherent in the existing ESG framework, which has been criticized for its lack of inclusiveness, flexibility and adaptability to different educational contexts. Nevertheless, ESG remains a key component of the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), which forms the framework for both internal and external quality assurance mechanisms.

This study tries to evaluate the impact and usefulness of these new indicators in improving the quality of education in ASPU, especially in the Faculty of Philology. The focus is on various dimensions of educational quality, including teaching effectiveness, learning outcomes, and student satisfaction. The initiative to develop these indicators stems from the need to better adapt educational practices to modern educational standards, taking into account the specific needs and expectations of students and the wider academic community.

Methodologically, this study used mixed methods combining both quantitative and qualitative analyses. A survey made on more than thousands of students provides statistical information on the effectiveness of new indicators, while qualitative data collected through focus group discussions and open-ended survey questions allow for a deeper analysis of student experiences and opinions.

The results of this study are expected to make significant contributions to the literature on quality assurance in higher education. By presenting empirical arguments from a specific institutional context, the study aims to provide practical examples for policymakers and education administrators seeking to implement similar quality improvement measures. In addition, the results of this study are expected to guide future initiatives in the field of quality assurance and educational excellence not only in Azerbaijan but also in a wider international context.

As higher education continues to evolve, the importance of quality assurance becomes increasingly apparent, this research is an important step towards understanding and improving the mechanisms underlying educational quality to ensure institutions like ASPU remain at the forefront of educational innovation and excellence. By exploring the effectiveness of new educational quality indicators, this article contributes to the body of literature that seeks to reshape and improve quality assurance in the context of contemporary higher education.

Literature Review

The ever-evolving landscape of higher education requires rethinking quality assurance paradigms to effectively meet the diverse and dynamic needs of today's students. At the heart of this debate are the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), which serve as criteria and guidelines for improving organizational performance. However, in the face of undetected risks and changes, traditional criteria may struggle to provide a comprehensive framework (Issa-Salwe and others, 2023), (Manatos & Huisman, 2020).

First introduced in 2005 and later revised in 2015, ESG standards have been revised due to problems of inclusion, flexibility and adaptability to different contexts (Westerheijden & Kohoutek, 2014), (Zhang et al., 2019). Nevertheless, it remains a key foundation for quality assurance within the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), which includes both internal and external mechanisms.

Regardless of the degree of importance, the critical approach to ESG standards continues, and this requires the formation of new indicators to meet modern educational requirements. These proposed standards not only serve as benchmarks but also act as catalysts for continuous improvement by facilitating the adoption of sustainable education models (Cheng, 2020). Comparative analysis between existing ESG standards and planned standards is important to guide the development of quality assurance in education (Izmaylova et al., 2020), (Durdas et al., 2023).

Furthermore, there is a crucial question in this discussion: How can these new indicators effectively solve the limitations of the traditional European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) and provide a more comprehensive and effective assessment of modern educational institutions in accordance with the evolving requirements? Can these indicators be implemented to meet the ever-changing demands of the educational landscape? This question serves as a guide in the search for innovative solutions in the field of quality assurance in higher education.

Initiatives such as the "Strengthening the Internal Quality Assurance of Education in Teaching, training and Evaluation in Higher Educational Institutions of Azerbaijan and Russia" (IQAinAR) project play an important role in this research. Led by institutions such as the ASPU, the goal of this project is to strengthen internal quality assurance mechanisms in higher education institutions, align them with leading international practices, and contribute to continuous improvement. In addition, the participation of ASPU emphasizes Azerbaijan's commitment to increasing the quality and relevance of the educational experience in accordance with global standards.

Recent research by Cheng (2020) sheds light on the impact of ESG on internal and external quality assurance processes in UK higher education institutions and quality assurance agencies. A positive assessment of this impact highlights the potential of ESG to facilitate the development, review and improvement of quality assurance systems.

As crossing through these challenges and opportunities, it becomes clear that overcoming the limitations of traditional quality assurance frameworks requires a concerted effort and a willingness to embrace change. For this reason, the improvement and renewal of the quality assurance system and its indicators based on the experience of the developed countries of the world has become one of the priorities of the universities. Based on the above, in the following sections, we will further analyze the implications of these findings and explore potential opportunities.

Pursuing excellence in higher education is a flexible and multifaceted endeavour, the different approaches and criteria used by universities globally to measure their performance and quality proves it. An important aspect of this search involves the systematic evaluation of the quality of education through carefully developed indicators, which reflect different criteria for university performance.

One prominent example of such an evaluation framework is the Times Higher Education (THE) ranking of world universities. According to research by others (2018), THE rankings are based on 13 indicators that reflect five key areas of university performance: teaching, research, citations, international reputation and industry income. These indicators provide a detailed overview of the university's performance, offering valuable insights into its strengths and areas for improvement.

Another important study in this field is Abubakar et al. (2018), which in this research we can show a complex study consisting of 12 indicators covering 10 directions. This study involved factor analysis to highlight the effectiveness of the newly developed measurement tools and emphasised the potential of such comprehensive assessments to improve educational quality.

American researchers York Gibson and Rankin have joined the debate on quality assessment in higher education and conducted a study examining university academic achievement (York et al., 2015). They have successfully tested 21 indicators classified into six criteria: career, academic achievement, satisfaction, acquisition of knowledge and skills, realization of learning outcomes and sustainability. This classification not only provides a basis for understanding the intricacies of academic success but also serves as a valuable tool for universities to evaluate and improve their performance in these key areas.

Analysis and application of these indicators are often performed by Quality Assurance (QA) centers within the university. In this regard, the Erasmus+ program of the European Commission played an important role, especially through the project "Establishment and Development of Quality

Assurance Centers in Azerbaijani Universities (EQAC)" launched in 2018. This initiative led to the establishment of Quality Assurance departments in many universities, including the ASPU.

Following this development, the years 2020 and 2021 attained significant expansion of QA activities with the establishment of quality assurance departments in five ASPU branches. In addition, in 2021, a special working group was established under the quality assurance department at ASPU and started functioning with a full staff of 26 people. This group played an important role in conducting satisfaction surveys among students and evaluating the performance of professors and teachers, thereby contributing to the continuous improvement of the quality of education at ASPU.

The initiatives and studies mentioned above highlight the international tendency towards more comprehensive and multidimensional approaches to quality assessment in higher education. By applying such diverse indicators, universities can gain a more holistic understanding of their performance, enabling them to make informed decisions and enable targeted improvements. These developments not only reflect the changing landscape of higher education but also highlight the importance of adapting to these changes to ensure continuous improvement in the quality of education.

Research Methodology

In this study, a mixed research method, which includes both quantitative and qualitative approaches, was used to comprehensively evaluate the effectiveness of newly developed quality indicators of education at the ASPU, especially at the Faculty of Philology. A mixed-method approach was chosen to take into account the breadth and depth of student experiences and opinions, facilitating a comprehensive analysis of the impact of these new indicators on the quality of education.

The new indicators developed on the basis of the project "Strengthening the internal quality assurance of education in teaching, training and evaluation in higher education institutions of Azerbaijan and Russia" (IQAinAR) are comprehensive and comply with the European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance (ESG). The performance and perception indicators of these indicators are classified according to three main areas: teaching and learning, research and evaluation.

1.Teaching and Learning (15 indicators): This category includes performance indicators such as qualifications of academic staff, pedagogical talent, research-based teaching, innovative teaching methods, advanced teaching and learning opportunities, transparency in student assessment, facilitation of experiential learning, industry, collaboration, lifelong learning and internationalization.

2.Evaluation (6 indicators): this includes performance indicators such as adherence to guidelines, administrative efficiency, achievement of learning outcomes, various evaluation methods and quality control mechanisms.

3.Research (8 indicators): It includes a strategic framework for research, defining strategic research goals, trajectories of candidates of sciences, protection of research quality, making ethical decisions in research and research objects, and social impact of research.

Table 1 compares the pre-2023 indicators with the 2024 baseline and improved indicators in two key areas, and the 2024 indicators show significant progress in both areas. There is a shift from general student support to more structured and comprehensive frameworks for Quality Assurance Policy, including regular policy reviews and transparent complaints processes. In Program Design and Validation, emphasis is shifted from the core relevance of subjects to closer alignment with specialized skills, clear explanation of course content, and involvement of students and faculty in course design. These improvements inform about a more dynamic and student-centred approach to educational management and curriculum design.

Table 1. Comparison of previous and newly improved indicators

Previous indicators (2023)	Basic direction of indicators (2024)	Improved indicators (2024)
Quality Assurance Policy 38. The university always helps students in organizational work. 39. The faculty has serious support for students. 48. The university meets current scientific and technological needs.	1.1 Quality assurance policy: 1.1.1 Specialization of academic staff 1.1.3 Research-based teaching	*Quality Assurance Policy* 3.8. The University provides a comprehensive support system, including guidance and resources, to address student organizational issues. 3.9. There is a structured and accessible support framework for students at the Faculty level, including academic advising, mentoring, and problem-solving. 4.8. The University's curriculum and research initiatives are regularly updated to reflect the latest scientific and technological advances. *Additional indicators:* • The University conducts a regular review process of its quality assurance policies, involving input from students, faculty and industry experts. • Students' complaints and academic appeals are solved clearly and objectively thanks to the efficient mechanism created.
Design and approval of programs 11. The subjects taught are relevant to my major 18. Is it clear to you why the subjects taught to you are being taught? 23. The purpose and expected results of the taught subjects are not clear to me	1.2 Design and approval of programs 1.2.1 Quality of teaching 1.2.3 The quality of the training process (work experience, mobility, etc.)	*Design and approval of programs* 1.1. The curriculum is closely aligned with the specific skills and knowledge required in the relevant fields of study. 18. Students receive clear explanations and rationales for the inclusion of each subject in their curriculum, linking them to specific learning outcomes and professional competencies. 2.3. Students have access to detailed course outlines that clearly state the purpose, learning outcomes and relevance of each subject to their overall education. Additional indicators: • The content of the program and teaching methods are effectively implemented in accordance with the latest technological innovations in the field of education. • Students and teachers participate in the design and approval process to maintain the relevance and relevance of the

		programs.

In total 1016 students of the Faculty of Philology of ASPU participated in the research. These participants were selected based on their studies in the various majors offered by the faculty, ensuring diverse representation in terms of academic level, from first-year undergraduates to final-year students. The selection criteria also took into account factors such as willingness to participate and representation of the wider student mass in the faculty.

The new education quality indicators were jointly developed by a team of education quality assurance experts, faculty members, and student representatives. The development process included a review of existing literature on education quality standards, an analysis of European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), and focus groups with stakeholders to identify key areas for measurement. These indicators included criteria such as teaching effectiveness, learning outcomes, student satisfaction, and infrastructure adequacy, which ensure compatibility with both the ESG and Azerbaijan's special educational context.

The survey was an important tool for collecting quantitative data. It consisted of a series of both quantitative (e.g. Likert-scale items) and qualitative (e.g. open-ended responses) questions designed to assess the new indicators. The survey questions were validated through peer review and testing to ensure clarity, topicality, and relevance (Sharifov G.M. 2022).

Qualitative data were collected through focus group discussions, which provided concrete insights into students' experiences and perceptions of the new indicators. These discussions facilitated an in-depth exploration of the themes that emerged from the survey data.

The survey was conducted electronically over a four-week period, giving students ample time to participate. Periodic reminder emails were sent to increase response rates. After the survey, focus group discussions were conducted, and participants were selected based on their responses to the survey and their willingness to participate in further discussions.

Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, their right to privacy and that participation was voluntary. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before being included in the study.

Quantitative survey data were analyzed using statistical software (e.g. SPSS) using both descriptive and mathematical-statistical methods. Qualitative data from open-ended survey responses and focus group discussions were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify themes and content.

Results and findings

Survey results on various aspects of university performance or quality in 2023 and improvements in 2024 were analyzed. (Table 2). Table 2 is divided into two main sections, each for one year, and each section includes indicators, respondents' answers, and the percentage of each answer. Responses range from "Strongly Disagree" to "Disagree", "Partially Agree", "Agree", and "Strongly Agree".

Table 2. The result of the survey with the indicators of 2023 and 2024

Indicators in 2023	Respondents' answers	Answers in percent	Improved Indicators in 2024	Respondents' answers	Answers in percent
38. The university always helps students in organizational work.	Strongly disagree	2%	38. The University provides a comprehensive support system, including guidance and resources, to address student organizational issues.	Strongly disagree	3,50%
	Disagree	5%		Disagree	7,80%
	Partially agree	22,5%		Partially agree	30,10%
	Agree	46,7%		Agree	41,50%
	Strongly agree	23,8%		Strongly agree	17%
39. The faculty has great support for students.	Strongly disagree	2,6%	39. There is a structured and accessible support framework for students at the Faculty level, including academic advising, mentoring, and problem-solving.	Strongly disagree	4,80%
	Disagree	3,8%		Disagree	8,80%
	Partially agree	24,5%		Partially agree	24,40%
	Agree	41,2%		Agree	43,40%
	Strongly agree	27,8%		Strongly agree	18,60%
48. The university meets current scientific and technological needs.	Strongly disagree	7,4%	48. The University's curriculum and research initiatives are regularly updated to reflect the latest scientific and technological advances.	Strongly disagree	7,10%
	Disagree	11,8%		Disagree	11,50%
	Partially agree	33,3%		Partially agree	27,90%
	Agree	33%		Agree	36,60%
	Strongly agree	14,4%		Strongly agree	16,90%
11. The subjects taught are relevant to my speciality	Strongly disagree	2,1%	11. The curriculum is closely aligned with the specific skills and knowledge required in the relevant fields of study.	Strongly disagree	2,40%
	Disagree	6%		Disagree	3,90%
	Partially agree	33,3%		Partially agree	20,30%
	Agree	38,7%		Agree	48,30%
	Strongly agree	19,9%		Strongly agree	25,10%
18. Is it clear to you why the subjects are being taught to you?	This is not clear	4%	18. Students receive clear explanations and rationales for the inclusion of each subject in their curriculum, linking them to specific learning outcomes and professional competencies.	Strongly disagree	3,30%
	Partially clear	49,7%		Disagree	8,10%
	Mostly agree	15%		Partially agree	21%
	Everything is clear	31,3%		Agree	42,40%
				Strongly agree	25,20%
23. The goals and learning outcomes of the t subjects taught are not clear to me.	Strongly disagree	15,4%	23. Students have access to detailed course outlines that clearly state each subject's purpose, learning outcomes and relevance to their overall education.	Strongly disagree	2,10%
	Disagree	48,9%		Disagree	5,40%
	Partially agree	21,2%		Partially agree	18,30%

	Agree	9,7%		Agree	47,40%
	Strongly agree	4,7%		Strongly agree	26,80%

Table 2 compares the 2023 and 2024 survey results on various aspects of university support, curriculum relevance and clarity of educational objectives.

Organizational support of the university: In 2023, 46.7% of respondents agreed that the university always helps students with organizational issues, and 23.8% strongly agreed. In 2024, some improvements were made to the question. Here, 41.5% agreed with this improved statement and 17% strongly agreed, which indicates a change in perception.

Faculty level support: 41.2% of students agreed and 27.8% strongly agreed that there is great support for students in the faculty in 2023. In 2024, the statement was refined to reflect a structured support framework, with 43.4% agreeing and 18.6% strongly agreeing. This suggests that support at the faculty level has slightly improved.

Alignment with current science and technology: 33% agreed and 14.4% completely agreed with the university's meeting the requirements of modern science and technology in 2023. Focusing on a regular update of the curriculum and research initiatives in 2024, the university received 36.6% agree and 16.9% strongly agree with responses.

Correspondence of the curriculum with the specialities: Significant positive changes are noticeable in the correspondence of the subjects to the specialities. In 2023, 38.7% agreed and 19.9% completely agreed on the appropriateness of the curriculum to the specialities. In 2024, the statement was changed to emphasize adapting the curriculum to specific skills, resulting in 48.3% agreeing and 25.1% strongly agreeing.

Understanding of the subjects taught: A marked improvement was observed in students' understanding of why the subjects were taught. In 2023, 31.3% answered that it is absolutely clear. In 2024, the focus is on providing clear explanations for each topic. As a result, 42.4% agreed and 25.2% completely agreed on understanding the subjects taught.

Clarity of goals and learning outcomes: 9.7% agree and 4.7% completely agree about the clarity of the goals and expected outcomes of the subjects taught in 2023. 47.4% agreed and 26.8% strongly agreed with the 2024 statement, which indicates significant progress in this area.

Overall, these benchmark results show significant improvements in university support, curriculum coherence and clarity of educational goals between 2023 and 2024, which reflect positively on the university's efforts to enhance the educational experience.

Analysis of the 2023 and 2024 survey data, revealed noteworthy results, focusing on various indicators of student perceptions and university services. Spearman's correlation was used to determine the relationship between the respective indicators over two years. This choice was made to take into account the ordinal nature of the data (percentages of responses) and any potential non-linearity in the relationships between indicators.

Table 3. Spearman correlation coefficient

Spearman's rho	2023 indicator	2024 indicator
2023 indicator	-	
Correlation coefficient	1,000	0.494
Sig. (2-tailed)	.	0.04
N	1016	1012
2024 indicator		-
Correlation coefficient	0.494	1,000
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.04	.
N	1016	1012

Table 3 shows Spearman's rho (correlation coefficient) of 0.494 between the indicators of 2023 and 2024, which represents a moderately positive relationship. This indicates that as the ranking of one indicator increases, the other indicator also ranks with a higher correlation coefficient (e.g. above 0.7 or 0.8), with a significance level for correlation reported at 0.04. This is below the conditional threshold of 0.05, which indicates that the correlation between the indicators of 2023 and 2024 is statistically significant. The weak correlation value (0.494) shows that students ' responses to certain indicators have improved, so, there are certain differences. However, the main direction of the students ' answers to these questions has not changed. The number of observations (N) for each indicator is over 1000 (1016 for 2023 and 1012 for 2024). This is a relatively large sample size, which adds confidence to the correlation coefficient and its significance level. Large sample sizes can more accurately estimate population parameters and increase the power of statistical tests. A correlation coefficient of 1,000 along the diagonal is the standard result, as it indicates a perfect positive correlation of each indicator with itself.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that there is a consistent but moderate correlation in the ranking of indicators from 2023 to 2024. This suggests that there is a certain trend, although there are some changes from one year to another. That is, the indicators move in the same relative direction. In other words, if an indicator ranks high in 2023, it is likely (but not certain) that it will also rank relatively high in 2024

Finally, taking into account the statistical significance of this relationship, university leaders or stakeholders are advised to dig deeper into specific indicators to understand which areas have seen more stability and which may change more markedly. This can help identify areas of strength that should be maintained and areas that need improvement or further investigation.

In addition, the university may consider implementing feedback mechanisms that allow for continuous monitoring and adjustments based on changing student needs and expectations (Table 4). Establishing transparent communication channels and regularly soliciting feedback from students and teachers can contribute to a more responsive and adaptive learning environment.

Table 4. Additional indicators in 2024

Indicators	Respondents' answers	Answers in percent
1st indicator		
The University conducts a regular review process of its quality assurance policies, involving input from students, faculty and industry experts.	Strongly disagree	4%
	Disagree	7,90%
	Partially agree	26,20%
	Agree	43,90%
	Strongly agree	18%
2nd indicator		
Thanks to the efficiently created mechanism, students' complaints and academic appeals are resolved clearly and objectively.	Strongly disagree	4,60%
	Disagree	8,20%
	Partially agree	26,30%
	Agree	41,60%
	Strongly agree	19,30%
3rd indicator		
The content and teaching methods of the program are effectively implemented in accordance with the latest technological innovations in the field of education.	Strongly disagree	5,60%
	Disagree	10,30%
	Partially agree	27,30%
	Agree	38,60%
	Strongly agree	18,20%
4th indicator		
Students and faculty participate in the design and approval process to maintain the modernity and importance of programs.	Strongly disagree	3,90%
	Disagree	8,80%

	Partially agree	26,80%
	Agree	41,80%
	Strongly agree	17,70%

The new indicators added to the table present the students' opinions related to the continuous monitoring of the quality assurance policy, the effectiveness of mechanisms for solving student complaints and academic appeals, the application of the latest technological innovations in program content and teaching methods, and the participation of students and faculty members in the process of designing and approving programs (see table 4). The results, presented as percentages of agreement or disagreement, offer insights into perceptions of various aspects of the university experience.

According to Table 4-5, 43.90% of the respondents fully agree with the monitoring of the quality assurance policy and are extremely satisfied with the university's efforts. However, we should note that 11.90% of the respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed, and this figure implies a significant minority with dissatisfaction about continuous quality assurance monitoring.

Regarding the effectiveness of the mechanisms for reviewing student complaints and academic appeals, the majority of respondents (41.60%) were satisfied, and 19.30% were completely satisfied. Nevertheless, a total of 12.80% highlighted areas that may require attention to improve the clarity and objectivity of the resolution process and opted for "strongly disagree".

38.60% of respondents answered that they agree with the application of the latest technological innovations in the program content and teaching methods, and in addition, 18.20% answered that they completely agree. Conversely, 15.90% highlighting the need for potential improvements in adapting educational practices to modern technological advances answered that they either disagree or strongly disagree with the case.

Regarding the participation of students and teaching staff in the process of designing and approving programs, 41.80% were satisfied and 17.70% were completely satisfied. However, 12.70% expressed dissatisfaction or strong dissatisfaction, which indicates that some of the respondents were left out or were not sufficiently involved in these decision-making processes.

Discussion

The comparative analysis of the indicators applied in the ASPU during 2023 and 2024 provides an in-depth study of the effectiveness of new education quality indicators in higher education. The results of the study, as shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4, are multifaceted and highlight significant development in various aspects of the university's activities and provisions, as well as areas where further improvement is required.

The improvement in the university's organizational support is evident from the increase in the percentage of respondents who agree or strongly agree with the revised statement of 2024 (Table 2). This change suggests that the university's efforts to provide a more comprehensive support system are recognized and appreciated by students. Additionally, there is some improvement in the sense of support at the faculty level, with a higher percentage of agreement reached in 2024 compared to 2023. This reflects positively on the university's strong approach to providing structured support at the faculty level, which includes such aspects as academic advising.

The relevance of the subjects to students' qualifications and the clarity of why the subjects taught showed significant positive changes (Table 2). The increased agreement percentages in 2024 indicate that the university's efforts to closely align the curriculum with specialized skills and provide clear explanations for each subject means that there is a strong connection with the student body.

The improvement in clarity regarding the objectives and expected outcomes of the subjects being taught should be noted particularly.

A moderate Spearman correlation coefficient of approximately 0.494 (Table 2) indicates a consistent but evolving trend in student thought and university services. This indicates a dynamic environment in which certain elements maintain their trajectory while others undergo significant changes at the university. The data in Table 2 shows opinions on the university's quality assurance policies and brings out ideas about the continuous monitoring of its effectiveness. The responses show considerable satisfaction with the university's efforts in this area. However, the existence of a significant minority expressing dissatisfaction highlights the need for continuous attention and improvement as well.

The effectiveness of mechanisms for reviewing student complaints and academic appeals is positively assessed by the majority of respondents. Nevertheless, the presence of a significant percentage of disagreements points to the need to increase the clarity and objectivity of these processes.

Responses regarding the application of the latest technological innovations in program content and teaching methods highlight the need for continuous updates and improvements to adapt educational practices to modern technological advances.

The involvement of students and faculty in the process of program design and its confirmation is seen by many as a positive thing, but the data also shows that some respondents feel excluded from these decision-making processes. This area requires further attention to ensure inclusiveness and full participation.

Conclusion

The study highlights the active approach to increasing the educational experience of the Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University through the application of new educational quality indicators. Improvements in university support, curriculum alignment and educational objectives are commendable. However, such areas as continuous monitoring of quality assurance, handling of student complaints and appeals, implementation of technological innovations and participatory decision-making processes require continuous attention for further improvement.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the staff of the Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, especially the Dean of the Faculty of Philology, Dr. Konul Hasanova and her team, for their cooperation in this research on quality indicators of education.

References

1. Abubakar A., Hilman H., Kaliappen N. (2018). New Tools for Measuring Global Academic Performance. SAGE Open, 8(3), 215824401879078.

2. Buinytska Oksana, Hrytseliak Bohdan, Smirnova Valeriia. (2018). Ratıng as assessment tool of qualıty and competıtıveness of unıversıty. Open educatıonal e-envıronment of modern unıversıty. 16-32

3. Cheng, M. (2020). The European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education: A Critical Analysis of Their Development and Implementation in the United Kingdom. Journal of Studies in International Education, 24(1), 18-33.

4. Durdas, A., Harbuza, T., Borshchovetska, V., Radchenko, Y., & Starosta, H. (2023). HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE: CONTEMPORARY TENDENCIES. Neperervna Profesìjna Osvìta : Teorìa Ì Praktika, 75(2), 25–32. https://doi.org/10.28925/1609-8595.2023.2.3

5. EEAS. (2020). Support To Strengthening The Higher Education System In Azerbaijan. Retrieved from https://www.eeas.europa.eu/delegations/azerbaijan/support-strengthening-higher-education-system-azerbaijan_en?s=217

6. Employees awareness when the quality management system is converted at higher education organization. (2024). Quality-Access to Success, 25(199). https://doi.org/10.47750/qas/25.199.01
7. ENQA. (2023, January 25). ESG • ENQA. https://www.enqa.eu/esg-standards-and-guidelines-for-quality-assurance-in-the-european-higher-education-area/
8. Issa-Salwe, A. M., Mohamed, A. A., & Reeb, D. (2023). Controlling quality standards to enhance higher educational quality assurance. Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal, 10(4). https://doi.org/10.14738/assrj.104.14367
9. Quality assurance: E4 Group publishes statement stressing relevance of ESG. (n.d.). https://eua.eu/news/547:quality-assurance-e4-group-publishes-statement-stressing-relevance-of-esg.html
10. Manatos, M. J., & Huisman, J. (2020). The use of the European Standards and Guidelines by national accreditation agencies and local review panels. *Quality in Higher Education*, *26*(1), 48–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2020.1728835
11. Official website of President of Azerbaijan Republic. (n.d.). Order of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan on approval of "Azerbaijan 2030: National Priorities for Socio-Economic Development." Retrieved from https://president.az/en
12. Sharifov G.M. (2022). Rating evaluation of the university of the teaching staff effect on the activity. Azerbaijan school. No. 3(700), p. 11–20
13. Westerheijden, D. F., & Kohoutek, J. (2014). Implementation and translation. In *SensePublishers eBooks* (pp. 1–11). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6209-494-9_1
14. York Travis, Gibson Charles, Rankin Susan. (2015). Defining and Measuring Academic Success. Practice Assessment, Research & Evaluation. 20(5), pp.1-20.
15. Zhang, Lan-Yong & LIU, Sheng & YUAN, Xin & LI, Liang. (2019). Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area: Development and Inspiration. DEStech Transactions on Social Science, Education and Human Science. 10.12783/dtssehs/icesd2019/28072.
16. Измайлова, M. A., Korneva, E. Y., Makolov, V. I., & Salimova, T. (2020). Quality assurance in higher education in the context of European approaches. Integration of Education, 24(3), 377–395. https://doi.org/10.15507/1991-9468.100.024.202003.377-395