On the criteria for the comparative evaluation of universities in various countries.

S. Levinzon

Kaluga Branch of the Baumann Moscow State Technical University Kaluga, Russia svlev@web.de

The first attempts to determine the technical and economic evaluation and efficiency of electrical devices have been taken by the author in the late 60's and early 70's, that is, More than 50 years ago. Evaluation was carried out in two stages: design and production, and also took into account that the power supplies are energy converters are 4 types: AC to AC, AC to DC, DC to DC, DC to AC.

For the evaluation of two identical for the appointment of the products or of the same product in different operating conditions introduced the generalized parameter (TEC), which characterizes the degree of satisfaction of the needs in this system. Comparative technical and economic evaluation was carried out by four main criteria: efficiency, the specific parameters of weight and volume, the operating time to refusal or failure-free operation probability and cost. The possibility of comparison and by additional criteria [1-3].

Was developed industry standard criteria comparative evaluation units and components of electronic equipment in the editorial office 1-78 After 10 years of use appeared edition 2-88. Programmers' were developed in the calculation on the computer each of the indicators, and the generalized parameter, prepared version of the state standard. But the USSR has collapsed, and then everything was forgotten. By this method we used, for example [4], for comparative evaluation of the quality and novelty of inventions.

Currently there are 3 main methods to determine the comparative evaluation of Universities: the world rating QS World University Ranking, the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) the so-called Shanghai ranking, THE World University Rankings) -rating of the best universities of the world values according to the British edition of the Times Higher Education. In addition, a number of countries have national ratings.

The report provides comparative tables for the world rankings [5-7], the national ratings of Russia and Germany in some specialties of universities [8, 9], in addition, the weighting coefficients adopted for the calculation of the overall index and the ratio between them [8, 9], the structure of some higher educational institutions of Russia and Germany and the list of main professions.

1. It is possible to compare only comparable and on the same parameters.

2. Coefficients of key parameters can be or equiprobable, or preference has to be proved.

3. The most objective criteria of comparison are subjective, because "he who pays the piper calls the tune".

4. For higher educational institutions expediently comparison by the profile principle, i.e. technical colleges, medical, legal, economic, etc.

5. Information on national ratings, i.e. on the countries is quite sufficient; ratings on continents don't make sense. Ratings on versatile universities, as a whole, complicate their quantitative assessment because consider a prestige factor more, than a real situation for today and demand further improvement.

6. The abundance of international and national ratings leads to confusion in identifying the true place of a University does not provide specific values of the state of Affairs in one direction or another activity. There is the hope of being developed U-Multirank under the auspices of the European Union.

List of references

1.Левинзон С.В. Технико-экономическая эффективность применения оптоэлектронных структур в устройствах связи. Техника средств связи. -1981.-Вып.10.-С.31-35.

2. Левинзон С.В., Абраменкова В.В., Кузнецова Л.Н. Обобщенный критерий сравнительной оценки источников вторичного электропитания. Радиотехника.-1982.-№ 9.-С.84-87.

3.Левинзон С.В. Определение технико-экономического показателя ИВЭП РЕА//Техника средств связи. -1990.-Вып.5.-С.58-67.

4.Patent US 7 816 894 Method and Apparatus for regulating voltage. Int.CI.G05F 1/12. L. Feigin, S. Levinson, D. Klavsuts et al.Oct.2010.

5.QS World University Rankings. URL http://www.topuniversities.com/qs-world-university-rankings (26.06.2013).

6. Shanghai Jiao Tong University (SJTU). URL http://www.shanghairanking.com/FieldSCI2012.html# , http://www.shanghairanking.com/index.html (24.06.2013).

7. THE World University Rankings. URL http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2012-13/world-ranking/analysis (22.06.2013).

8. Das System der Hochschulbildung in Deutschland. Uni-Ranking in Deutschland. URL http://langford.ru/foraged/highedu/germany/rating/, system/ (29.06.2013)

9. Рейтинг вузов России. URL http://www.interfax.ru/russia/txt.asp?id=310566 (05.06.2013)