

## ***Kazakhstan Higher Education Anti Corruption Project - Completion REPORT***

### ***Background***

*The project was developed by The Development of Civil Society Foundation (PFDC) in consultation with the Partnership for Transparency Fund (PTF). PTF provided a grant of US\$ 26,400 to be release in three tranches of US\$ 10,000, 10,000 and 6,400, respectively. The grant agreement was signed on December 8th , 2011. The first tranche was released on December, 29<sup>th</sup> 2011 and the second tranche on May, 28<sup>th</sup> 2012. In accordance with Section 3 c) of the Grant Agreement, this report serves as the project completion report. Upon approval of the report by PTF, PFDC expects the release of the third and final tranche of the grant in the amount of US\$ 6400.*

*The project was designed to study sensitivity to corruption issues: open-mindedness inside academic institutions, particularly in the student community, and Kazakhstani society in general.*

*The following PFDC and other Kazakh experts were involved in the data collection, surveys and interviews:*

*Raushan Nauryzbayeva –manager of the project;*

*Adil Djurumbayev - sociologist of the project; His responsibility is to get interview of students, student's parents, academicians, representatives of administration. Also the sociologist collected all receiving data during the interview in Kunaev and Kazakh American Universities, processing it into computer' SPSS program. Finally he made a sociological survey, including tables, analytical information and prepared a general recommendations.*

*The financial repors were prepared by PFDC's chief financial officer: Nurzhanat Abdrahmanova.*

The Ministry of Education wanted to give guidance and put into place concrete measures to eliminate corruption in education. Some of the problems they intended to address included late payment of salaries and scholarships, requiring illegal contributions, and illegal collection of money from students for educational services. The Ministry also planned to curb the misuse and abuse of power by leaders of educational organizations. In order to do this, they included on-site meetings between the teaching staff of the educational institution and representatives of the Departments of Education, trade unions, and local authorities “akimats.” Special commissions would be created in order to investigate the facts of alleged violations.

*In 2011, the Ministry of Education created an action plan for the years from 2011 to 2015 in order to fulfill these directives. Part of the action plan included training and retraining of teachers and managers of educational institutions regarding the issues of combating corruption in the form of lectures, seminars, round tables. During the school year, meetings were planned between representatives of the teaching staff and the law enforcement oversight organizations in all educational institutions. Even though the Ministry of Education implemented 29 activities for combating corruption, within this framework each university has adopted its own plan for carrying out the initiative. As a result, anti-corruption measures can be different in each university.*

1.Enable academicians to appreciate their rights, benefits and privileges for proper faculty policies:

The case study (survey and interviews), included a wide range of issues concerning the quality of education, degree of satisfaction with educational services in the universities, the measures taken by the leadership of universities to ensure the transparency of the educational process at KAU (Kazakh American University), and Kunaev University. Some of the focus group members were lecturers. The participation of teachers in the sociological study, the two phases of the survey and the interviews, significantly improved the understanding of education policy and the transparency of the educational process carried out by the universities in general.

The internal case studies of various components of the educational process were conducted by these universities. The Development of Civil Society Foundation conducted an external independent investigation. The present study includes an analysis of the current state of the educational process and of the level of transparency in the educational process. The study contains recommendations to improve the educational process at universities and increase transparency.

2. Assist academics in Kazakhstani Universities to discover new ways to implement honor codes of behavior.

The design and implementation of a code of ethics was discussed with the teachers of both universities in the "Prevention of corruption in the Kazakh universities project. As a result of public participation a code of "Ethics was adopted at the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the administration of the Kazakh-American University on April 19, 2012.

At Kunaev University the code of ethics was also presented for discussion at various department meetings. Up to this point no final decision has been made. The adoption of a code of ethic is still under consideration at Kunaev University. Current status: The code of ethics is still under consideration by various departments at Kunaev University.

3. Increase the level of understanding of anti-corruption legislation among academics and the student community:

The survey and the interview included some questions about the specifics of the crimes that can be attributed to the corruption offenses and are in violation of the anti-corruption legislation in the Republic of Kazakhstan. There were also questions about what measures should be taken by people who face corruption in higher education. Also, the survey questions and the interview included information on the state law enforcement agencies which can be contacted in case of corruption.

Thus, in our opinion, the survey raised awareness *among teaching KAU and Kunaev teaching and administration staff, students and parents* of anti-corruption legislation in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

I. Monitoring of corruption at the two Kazakhstani Universities.

1) Data Collection regarding anti-corruption measures in place before the project began:

- Action Plan of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan to prevent corruption in higher education for 2011-2015. The plan included 29 specific actions taken to develop a set of interrelated measures aimed at the rigid control of corruption.

The Ministry will disseminate information to the public on the progress of anti-corruption programs in education through bulletins, information materials, etc. A blog was created where complaints can be submitted to the Minister of Education and Science. Analysis of the

complaints shows that many of them relate to misconduct of the heads of schools, colleges and universities;

- Regulations related to professor evaluations;
- Records of Board of Academics for different years;
- Regulations on scholarships (we researched regulation on scholarships in order to see if there is corruption in any stage of the process);
- Internal decrees by the dean;
- Internal decrees by the president;
  - Plan of events of the Ministry of Education of Republic of Kazakhstan for corruption prevention in Kazakhstan from 2011 to 2015;
- Plan of anti-corruption measures during midterms and finals (exams);
- Work plan of the Board of Academics for 2011-2012 school year;

## II) Surveys

The surveys *were carried out* at the beginning and the end of the project.

The survey showed the following results: a low level 6-7% of *what is perceived as* corruption in the Kazakh-American University and Kunaev University.

Each of these universities has implemented anti-corruption policies.

However, it should be noted that a high percentage (up to 20% of respondents) selected “difficult to answer” in some parts of the questionnaire and interviews. This suggests the need for further monitoring to improve the transparency of higher education institutions at all stages of training. In Kazakh society people are not accustomed to participating in surveys. Current students are very hesitant to express their opinion because they think it might result in negative consequences, such as being expelled from the university.

The survey focused on the study of legal education standards, operated in Kazakhstan.

*In conclusion, the surveys provided a mixed picture of what is perceived as “corruption” and an indication that people in Kazakhstan at large and students in particular are often not comfortable to inquire or talk about corruption.*

### **Prior to the project**

Both universities had the following structures in place for monitoring corruption:

1. Students could contact the president or dean directly by mail;
2. Video cameras in the classrooms;
3. Meetings between the president or dean and the students for open discussion;
4. Meetings between the student advisors and the students;

### **Prior to the project**

Both universities had the following structures in place for monitoring corruption:

1. Students could contact the president or dean directly by mail. There is no evidence or statistics as to whether students could contact the president or dean directly by mail

2. Video cameras in the classrooms- Video cameras in the classrooms always work.
3. Meetings between the president or dean and the students for open. There is no evidence how often such meeting occur.
4. Meetings between the student advisors and the students . There is no evidence how often they meet.

### **After the project**

The following recommendations were made to the Kazakh-American University and to Kunaev University to enhance their anti-corruption strategy:

1. The universities need to do a better of informing the students and faculty that they have direct access to the president or dean and encourage them to take advantage of this opportunity.
2. More widespread use of video cameras- include examinations and thesis defense.
3. Give students the ability to call a meeting with the president or the dean when they have information about corruption.
4. More frequent meetings between the student advisors and the students.
5. Conduct professional development for the staff of the university on the importance of the honor code and consequences of violating it.

### **Introduction**

This report presents the results of the study conducted in the Kazakh-American University (hereafter KAU) and the Kunaev University (KU). The research project was carried out between March and June 2012, in two stages: March-April and May-June. The methodology and tools were developed by the sociologist of the project.

The purpose of this case study was to study the quality of education among students and undergraduates, as well as the transparency of the educational process at KAU and KU. The main objectives of the research project were to identify the views of the task group on:

- The educational process at KAU and KU;
- The level of satisfaction of the target audience (hereafter TA) about the quality of education in institutions of higher education;
- Characteristics of high-quality education at KAU and KU;
- Actions taken by the institutions of higher education to ensure transparency in the educational process at KAU and KU;
- Recommendations and wishes of the TA to improve the educational process at KAU and KU, as well as to prevent corruption;

### **2. Research methodology:**

#### **2.1. Poll the task groups.**

In order to get information on the issues, semi-structured interviews were conducted, as well as in-depth interviews with students, parents of the students, and lecturers from KAU and KU. A survey (questionnaire) was used as the primary source of data.

The survey was conducted as a personal, semi-structured interview (with closed and open questions). Specialists developed a semi-structured questionnaire. The questionnaire included questions related to the purposes and objectives of this research project. This profile consisted of a list of questions and answers, and the respondent selected the most appropriate one in his or her opinion.

In contrast to a in-depth interview, a semi-structured interview is not time-consuming and takes a survey respondent no more than 15-20 minutes. An in-depth survey usually takes 30-40 minutes because the respondents formulate their own answers.

The average interview length for this project was about 15-20 minutes.

## 2.2. Location of the research

The research was conducted in Almaty.

The project involved two universities:

- Kazakh-American University (KAU)
- Kunaev University (KU)

## 2.3. Coverage

The total sample includes students, undergraduates, parents of students / undergraduates, administrators, and lecturers of KAU and KU.

The sample size is 500-mass surveys (2 phases), as well as 100 in-depth interviews (2 phases) in each university. The sample in the context of universities was as follows:

The processing and analysis of the data:

SPSS and PinPoint software were used to input and process the data collected from the surveys. Synthesis and analysis of the quantitative data was carried out by the analyst.

## 3. Conclusions and recommendations:

This project at both universities focused participants, mostly students, on the following key aspects of university life:

- The quality of education provided by the university at all stages of the learning process.
- Raising the issue of transparency in the university at the proper level, i.e. public monitoring / controlling the level of corruption among students, undergraduates, teachers, parents, and the administration of universities.

Efforts need to be taken to raise awareness in the academic community (staff, students, etc.) that individuals have the right to file an appeal during exams, they can contact the rector directly by mail.

This project also “*reviewed*”) financial benefits / discounts, scholarships at university.

- Raising the status of students in the university by studying and taking into account their recommendations and expectations in the evaluation / improvement of the office for student academics records, the offices of the dean and the rector of the university, as well as methods to combat corruption (installation of additional cameras, increasing the salaries of teachers, hiring foreign teachers, competitive selection of personnel, conducting anonymous surveys, etc.)

The main essence of the project was a detailed study of the quality of university education at all stages of the learning process among all members of the target audience. This group included students, undergraduates, lecturers, parents and members of the administration. The study also looked at the reputation, image and the transparency of KAU and the Kunaev University.

The main results of the survey:

- About 85% of respondents in KAU and 75% in Kunaev University pay tuition. The others have scholarships, loans and other funding sources.

The key recommendations to improve the transparency of higher education institutions at all stages of the learning process, as well as the quality of education provided by universities (KAU and Kunaev University):

The attitude of university students and undergraduates regarding the quality of education –

The main sources of information on higher education that guided potential students in their choice of university: family / friends / acquaintances. Recommendations by people in this category played a crucial role in selecting the university, more than the Internet, advertising and print media (newspapers, magazines, etc.). Consequently, universities need to maintain a positive image among students and undergraduates, as well as lecturers and administrators, since the survey results showed that this audience is a powerful source of advertising among their relatives and friends (including the internet).

- During the admissions process to universities a bulk of the respondents were acquainted only with a list of documents required for admission. There is a lack of information about financial aid: opportunities for co-financing grants (in KAU on Scholarships) and sponsor help. Only once students were enrolled and taking classes did they become partially informed about the additional benefits of the university. It is necessary to hold an open house for students, to organize work in high schools (in the final year) to disseminate information about the university. Selection committees should also focus on the additional benefits of the university, namely, the promotion for students, training discounts, special scholarships, grants, etc.

- According to the results from the two phases of the research, 90% of the students and graduate students at KAU said they had a good understanding of the grading system. Out of this group, 73% were second year students. At Kunaev University, only 80 % responded that they had a good understanding. Among the respondents of Kunaev University, 72 % were first year students. Despite the relatively high awareness, it was difficult for students to get used to this grading system. In Kunaev University, 70% of the students and parents believe that the grading system is acceptable. Approximately the same number of surveyed teachers (about 42%) of Kunaev University and KAU also consider the grading system established by the university acceptable. There is a need for intensive work with the administration of KAU to enhance perception and to adapt the grading system for students.

- The results of the first and second phases of the research showed a relatively high awareness of the availability of direct communication with the rector of the university: most of the students and undergraduates of KAU (in average 62% of the respondents) and 42% of the University named after Kunaev consider the process of appeal to the dean and the university admission office easy, while the application process to the rector of KAU is considered accessible by only 30% of the target audience. The administration of both universities should focus their attention on working with students more (not just online, but also by holding mini-conferences, seminars, round tables, public discussion of the most frequently asked questions and urgent problems) for a closer confidential dialogue with the rectors of the universities. This will prevent such undesirable effects as a feeling of

uncertainty and insecurity among students at university, a sense of neglect and avoidance of their needs and requirements.

- Despite the high awareness of the availability of direct communication with the rector of the university, the number of actual users of this appeal was 8% of the respondents in KAU in the first phase and 34% in the second phase, which improved the picture by 28%. At the Kunaev University the combined results of the two phases, was 35%. The same trend is observed in both universities. The third and fourth year students at Kunaev University and the first year students of KAU have the greatest confidence in this type of communication.

Approximately the same number of respondents of KAU and Kunaev University considered the appeal to the dean (about 34% of the respondents), university admission office (about 32% of the respondents) and the rector (about 28%) quite accessible. About 15% of respondents from each university consider it inaccessible. The administration should strengthen its connections with the students with the goal of raising student opinion about the availability and confidence in dealing with the administration of each university to 80-90%.

- The study looked at the level of trust students had in appeal process at the university. About 65% of respondents at KAU and 50% at Kunaev University in the first phase of the survey believed that it is worthwhile to use the appeal process. About 27% of the respondents of KAU and 18% of the respondents of Kunaev University talked about the difficulties they had with this process. The number of students who were uninformed about this opportunity was 28% at Kunaev University, which was higher than at KAU (8%). The second phase showed the following picture: this process is considered worthwhile by 57% of the respondents of KAU and 42% of the respondents from Kunaev University. At KAU, 24% of the respondents consider the process very difficult, and 34% at Kunaev University. These results show a clear decline in confidence in the appeal process from the first to the second phase of the survey. The administration of the universities need to simplify this process for the efficiency (speed) of the solution of controversial issues that arise during the exam period (any kind of testing), by simplifying the procedure (in time), because the respondents often complained about the length of the review of their requests.

Advantages of KAU:

- 1) Low level of corruption, the high transparency of the learning process.
- 2) The professionalism of teachers (high level of academic staff).
- 3) Accessibility of the Internet, the quality of internet connection.
- 4) Equal opportunities for students to receive special scholarships (for example, KAU President's Scholarship)
- 5) Establishing partnerships with other universities and organizations, in order to improve the quality of education, to support technical and cultural relations.

The advantages of Kunaev University:

- 1) Access to the Internet, the quality of the internet connection.
- 2) The professionalism of the teachers (high levels of the academic staff of the high school).
- 3) Holding public events at the university.
- 4) Provision of educational literature to prepare for classes completely, writing theses, etc.
- 5) Preparation of highly competitive specialists of higher education in their field

The weaknesses of KAU which need improvement:

- 1) Assistance in job placement of students and alumni.
- 2) Availability of rooms in the dormitories and scholarships.
- 3) The possibility of practical training abroad (study abroad program), participation in

international projects and programs.

The weaknesses of Kunaev University which need improvement:

- 1) Availability of information about the various possibilities of co-financing or obtaining a sponsorship (if your level of knowledge or personal assessment of the data allows).
- 2) Equal opportunities for students to receive special scholarships;
- 3) Availability of rooms in the dormitories and scholarships.

- According to the results of two phases of the study about 45% of the survey respondents of KAU and Kunaev University evaluate the work of the university admission office/ the dean of the university at different stages of the learning process as “doing a good job.” Approximately the same number of the respondents in the second phase of the survey evaluated their work satisfactorily, although the number was lower in the first phase at 35%. With regard to the university admission office, the respondents pointed to his slowness in carrying out his duties (according to the statements of the students it can be concluded that the shortcomings in the work of the university admission office are due to the fact that he is the only one to deal with the incoming students and as a consequence has a lot of work to do). The students often made proposals to expand the university department of student academic records to increase respond more quickly and also to pay more attention to kindness and courtesy in working with students. They believe the university administration should select more competent staff. The Dean's Office should increase courtesy and kindness towards students and participate in the lives of students more actively. Students also want the Dean's Office to improve access to information.

The level of transparency of the universities:

- The results of the first phase of the research about corruption in KAU and Kunaev University at different stages of the learning process showed that on average 92% had not heard any information about corruption.

In comparison with the first phase of the study, the second phase showed a higher percentage of respondents who openly faced the facts of corruption in higher education. However, it should be noted that corruption has not reached a critical level in any of the universities. This suggests the need for similar surveys in the future and monitoring to improve the transparency of institutions of higher education at all stages of training.

- Based on the first phase of the research data, a quarter (23%) of the respondents in KAU, in a situation where they observed corruption, 15% preferred to keep quiet and not make the administration aware of it, 14% preferred to report it anonymously through the mail to the president of KAU, and 10% preferred to report it to a classmate. The survey results of the second phase of the study, showed an of average 28% of the respondents of KAU and Kunaev University in a situation where they observed corruption in higher education preferred to “keep quiet about it,” 23% “reported it to the administration,” about 12% made “an anonymous report through the mail to the president (or the rector of the university) and 12% decided to “tell a friend or classmate.” In-depth interviews revealed the following picture: overall the representatives of the target audience because they preferred to keep quiet about corruption, they hinder the anti-corruption measures carried out by the university. They preferred to talk about it outside the university.

To fight corruption more effectively, the university administrations need to work together with lecturers, students and undergraduates for the prevention and eradication of emerging problem of illegal contributions.

The main preventive anti-corruption measures according to the respondents of both universities (including the various stages of the learning process):

- 1) to strengthen penalties (fines, public disclosure, calling the police, dismissal);
  - 2) to increase salaries for lecturers;
  - 3) to hire staff based on qualifications (preferably lecturers from abroad);
- The method in that respondents believed to be least effective in preventing corruption, which was mentioned by 22-25% of the respondents from both universities, was video surveillance.

- Approximately 40% of the respondents of both universities expressed the view that the purpose of this survey is “a study of the quality of education at the university.” 48% of students at the Kunaev University said that the purpose of the survey was “to examine the levels of corruption,” while in KAU only 28% responded this way. The survey confirmed the hypothesis that the quality of education and transparency of the educational process are interdependent components of the university as a whole.

List of criteria for ideal universities, according to respondents of KAU were:

- 1) ranks highly among other universities;
- 2) their own dormitories with enough rooms for students;
- 3) high academic expectations for the students;
- 4) has academic scholarships available;
- 5) information about finances and other details about the university are available to the public;

List of criteria for ideal universities according to Kunaev respondents:

- 1) classrooms and corridors of the university are always clean, fresh and repaired;
- 2) has highly qualified professors/ staff;
- 3) ranks highly among other universities;
- 4) information about finances and other details about the university are available to the public;
- 5) high academic expectations for the students.

### **Questions and comments**

1 a. At the level of the university administration (*I suggest you delete the first part of this sentence*) Question: *How does the approval mechanism and control of the university budget work*

1 b . *Answer:* The approval mechanisms and control of the budget for the university: Kazakhstan has a mechanism regarding the control of university budgets. As for private universities, in this case, Kazahk American University (KAU) and University Kunaev (UK), budgets are governed by the laws of the Republic of Kazakhstan (RK). There are four laws in particular that guide this governance. These are titled, "On Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan" (27 July 2007 № 319-III with changes and amendments as of 10.07.2012)]; “On Technical Regulation" (November 9, 2004 № 603-II); (21 January 2006, 29.12.06 № 209-III); "On Joint Stock Companies" (13 May 2003 № 415-II); and the Law of RK as of January 31, 2006 № 124-III “On private entrepreneurship" (as amended and supplemented as on 10 July 2012).

Making a recommendation on control measures regarding spending money would be to contradict legislation.

2 a. *Question re the transparency of the university salary system or lack thereof (the issue of "salaries" is often mentioned as one of the reasons for corrupt behavior);*

2 b. *Answer:* In the course of the survey, many respondents linked their actual as opposed to appointed wages with a potential risk of corruption in the university.

Recommendation: A special group of top university administrators (for example, the university president, vice-president, human resources and department directors) oversee and manage the actual wages of university staff positions, including academic teachers and administration officials. Guidelines for managing staff wages should include individual academic qualifications such as work experience, education, and salaries that match equivalent Kazak non-university job descriptions for academic lecturers and various administration staff and officials.

3 a. *Question:* The employment and dismissal procedures for university lecturers and administrators :

3 b. *Answer:* The issue of hiring and firing procedures of university lecturers and administrators is governed by the Labor Code for the Law "On Education", the Law "On Joint Stock Companies", and the Law "On Technical Regulation". University teachers are recruited on the basis of qualifications in open competition for vacancies. A violation of the code of ethics should be one reason for the dismissal of teachers of the university. The terms and conditions of appointments and dismissals of lecturer contracts (only) are also determined in accordance with Article 24 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

4 a. *Question* the procurement of goods and services at the universities

4 b. *Answer:* The procurement of goods and services at the universities should be conducted on the basis of a **tender** among providers of universities.

Recommendation: Determine the purchase of goods based on required sets of qualifications and technical specifications (for example for text books, food, computer equipment, etc.) and selection of service providers based on specific technical licensing and certifications. Determination should also include factors such as reasonable pricing and terms of services.

5 a *Question* .at the student level

- conditions for university admission. based on high school grades, admission tests

5 b. *Answer:* Kazakhstan requires all high school students to complete standardized testing. This testing is the basis for admission to vocational training programs and higher academic institutions. These tests are based on the law, "On approval of the Model Regulations," by order of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan (December 19, 2007 № 638).

5 c *Question:* under the heading "conditions for university admission", related to the topic "employment procedures for university staff", reference is made to the call that "university administration should select more competent staff". This observation warrants some more elaboration.

5 d. *Answer:* University admission office is a part of the university administration. As with recommended university hiring and firing procedures for university teachers and administrators, the hiring of competent university admission office staff is governed by the Labor Code for the Law "On Education", the Law "On Joint Stock Companies", and the Law "On Technical Regulation".

Recommendation: University admission office staff should be recruited on the basis of qualifications in open competition for vacancies. A violation of the code of ethics should be one

reason for the dismissal of university registrar staff. Each university should develop performance requirements and ratings related to the registrar's job description, including professionalism. This provides that admissions are on a competitive basis and not related to nepotism or personal preferences of the university admission office staff. The terms and conditions of appointments and dismissals of registrar staff should be determined in accordance with Article 24 of the Labor Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

5 e. Question: *In an earlier draft of the report*, reference is made to the fact that "for a more effective fight against corruption the university administrations need to work together with teachers, students and undergraduates for the prevention and eradication of emerging evidence of extortion". This statement raises the question of what needs to be done to get a process in motion whereby all parties sit around the table and come up with specific recommendations for transparent and enforceable rules and regulations to fight against *corruption*. Also, it would be of interest to know whether in the Kazakh system students are allowed to organize themselves in some kind of student union system. If so, are the leaders of the student union allowed to send representatives to the university's decision making bodies and have the right to vote on behalf of students in these bodies?

5 g. AnswerA: The representatives of student unions, students and/or staff have the opportunity to express their views on the potential or actual cases of corruption at the university in many ways as mentioned earlier by use of:

- Direct mail messages to the university president, other administrative staff, teachers/lecturers and/or law enforcement officials;
- Informal meetings of students with the President of University, etc.;
- Informing a supervisor via the Questions & Comments webpage, blog, direct mail, etc.;
- Personally informing the dean, teacher/lecturer, and/or University administrators such as the president, vice president.

This matter is regulated by the Law "On Education", the Law "On the fight against corruption". Therefore all verbal complaints should include written format due to serious criminal implications.

Recommendation: University administration should consider and incorporate viable recommendations by their students union for improvements in quality educational services.

Further details might be incorporated in future university corruption study projects.

6 a. Question are the conditions for obtaining scholarships or other types of financial support in order to enroll in the university,

6 b. Answer: The conditions for obtaining scholarships and other types of financial support in order to enroll in a university are established and governed by the laws "On Education," "On Joint Stock Companies", and "On Technical Regulation" (all referenced above) as well as each university's private internal documents. Such offered scholarships and financial support are specific to individual universities.

7a Question are the criteria for university examinations: mid-term, final. PhD, etc.

7b Answer: have already been developed and are regulated by the laws "On Education", "On Joint Stock Companies", and "On Technical Regulation", as well as internal documents for requirements by each university.

8 a. Question *on ways and means to voice concern/launch complaints in case of corrupt behavior by university personnel*

8 b. Students and staff may voice concerns or launch complaints regarding potential corruption cases to university administration (for example, a Dean, advisor, lecturer, university president/vice-president, and/or law enforcement).

Anonymous complaints may be registered on the university webpage for Questions or Comments and blogs. Students and staff may also send anonymous mail to the university president, which is monitored by university administration. This matter is regulated by the Law "On Education", the Law "On the fight against corruption". For example, KAU has an interactive system for undergraduate and graduate students that may be used to inform the administration of the University of potential or existing facts of corruption. Students may also register complaints and recommendations for improvements to members of the student.

8 c. *Question:* The "completion report" will also have to address **whether** and in which way the conclusions and recommendations of the project have been discussed with the management of KAU and Kunaev, the Ministry of Higher Education, the Ministry of Interior or relevant Government department in charge of the fight against corruption. These discussions should also reflect how and in which way these institutions will use the project to more effectively address corruption at Kazakh higher education institutions.

8 d. *Answer:* In order to eradicate specific or potential corruption and establish a legal culture, the universities should develop and provide education for top administrators such as the university president and vice-president, and/or in-service training courses for teachers, administrative staff, students, and parents to establish legal literacy regarding anti-corruption legislation, procedures for reporting and preventing corruption, and legal protections for those who report. Establish, for example, a "Days of legal knowledge" week, concentrating on anti-corruption education, open to all university personnel and students. Speakers should include representatives with appropriate representatives to conduct training seminars on legal subjects that offer an explanation of anti-corruption laws, how to oppose and report corrupt behaviors. General project recommendations will be discussed with the Presidents/Deans of Kunaev and Kazakh American Universities. A general project recommendation will also be discussed with the representatives of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of the Interior in the format of Round Tables and conferences on anti-corruption at Kazakhstan's universities.

Recommendations:

Provide final recommendations of this report and discussion with university administrators. Such discussion should include a check list of recommendations with time lines for notification of actions taken on means for the determination and prevention of specific corruption and/or measurable responses.

Universities should arrange a legal knowledge week to introduce and increase legal awareness of corruption reporting and prevention. This week should provide seminars with representatives from courts, internal affairs, justice, prosecutors, and the National Security Committee as guest speakers regarding legal points, implications, reporting of potential corruption, and discussion of the issues.

Universities should provide students and parents with guidelines for dealing with reporting corruption and legal protections via a written brochure or handbook as well as via the university website.

11 a. *Question:* The draft Code of Ethics for Lecturers and Employees of Kazakh American University does not address "corruption" issues specifically. The only related section was Section 4.6 whereby "Lecturers and Employees of KAU have no right to accept from students the gifts/money which purpose is to influence on results of educational and scientific process, to appoint to students ad graduate students, undergraduates, doctoral candidates a monetary payment for examinations (tests)". Aside from the fact that the English translation of the code is not entirely clear, this provision nor any other provision of the code addresses "corruption" in a broader scope than "just" monetary means. Also, Kunaev University has apparently not yet adopted a Code of Ethics. What is the current status?

11 b. *Answer:* The adoption of a code of ethics in Section 4.6 of the Code of Ethics for Lecturers and Employees of Kazakh American University is an entirely innovative and first step for the Kazakh educational system. The 2012 school year has already started at the Kunaev University. The draft of ethics code is currently under consideration for approval within all Kunaev University departments. If a majority of departments agree to adopt the code of ethics, the university president will approve adoption.

12 a *Question:* the "list of criteria for ideal universities according to respondents is very general and does not touch upon "corruption" at all;

12 b. *Answer:* Draft questionnaire, summarized overall student responses regarding criteria for ideal universities based on student perception of the overall competitive nature of KAU and KU to other universities across Kazakhstan. We will edit this section to refer predominantly to those criteria related to potential and actual university corruption. This can include references to the areas already discussed such as strict regulations, obtaining university jobs, active and competitive attraction and selection of students, and selection of text books as to the establishment of strong responses to actual and potential university corruption.

*Overall recommendations resulting from data collection, surveys and interviews carried out during project:*

To university professors:

- Demonstrate a high degree of integrity throughout their careers as evidenced by strict adherence to the approved ethics code

To university administration:

- Hire university faculty and staff on the basis of open competition for new or vacant positions;
- Develop standardized job descriptions based on equivalent work experience and education;
- Possible development or adoption of competencies for evaluation such as psychological test(s) to determine personal ethics, integrity, and abilities to deal with students and stress;
- Ensure that classrooms are equipped with video cameras and employ videos during administration of tests, examinations, and defense of individual diplomas and theses of graduate and undergraduate students to ensure fairness of testing and defenses;
- Promptly report to the University administration and/or law enforcement agencies cases of real or suggested corruption in the university;
- Establish and publish consequences for failure to adhere to standards and reporting.

To students:

- Promptly report any and all existing or potential corruption to the University administration and/or law enforcement agencies;
- Refuse involvement with or initiation of bribe of any form for the exchange of grading, defense of the diploma, or the obtainment of goods or services;
- Establish and publish consequences for failure to adhere to standards and reporting.

To parents of students:

- Recommend prompt reporting of existing or potential university corruption to university administration and/or law enforcement agencies prior to the end of the current academic session via the established venues (e.g., university Question & Answer webpage, blogs, direct mail, etc.)
- Recommend parents attend training seminars on legal subjects that offer an explanation of anti-corruption laws, how to oppose and report corrupt behaviors and/or read university guidelines for dealing with reporting corruption and legal protections via a university produced written brochure or handbook as well as via the university website.

## **1. ВВЕДЕНИЕ**

В настоящем отчете изложены результаты исследования, проведенного в Казахско-Американском Университете (далее КАУ) и Университете имени Кунаева. Исследовательский проект осуществлялся в марте-июне 2012г. в два этапа: март-апрель и май-июнь. Методология и инструментарий разработаны социологом проекта.

Цель данного социологического исследования - изучение качества образования среди студентов и магистрантов, а также уровня прозрачности учебного процесса в КАУ и Университете имени Кунаева.

Основные задачи исследовательского проекта - выявление мнения целевой группы относительно:

1. *Постановка учебного процесса в КАУ и университете им. Кунаева;*
2. *Степени удовлетворенности целевой аудитории (далее ЦА) качеством образовательного процесса указанных ВУЗов;*
3. *Характеристик качественного образования КАУ и университета имени Кунаева;*
4. *Мер, принимаемых руководством ВУЗов по обеспечению прозрачности учебного процесса в КАУ и университете имени Кунаева;*
5. *Рекомендаций и пожеланий целевой аудитории в улучшении учебного процесса в КАУ и университете имени Кунаева, а также в предупреждении фактов коррупции;*

## **2. МЕТОДОЛОГИЯ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ**

### **2.1. ОПРОС ПРЕДСТАВИТЕЛЕЙ ЦЕЛЕВЫХ ГРУПП.**

Для получения информации по вопросам, были проведены полуструктурированные опросы, а также глубинные интервью со студентами, родителями студентов и преподавателями КАУ и Университета имени Кунаева. В качестве источника первичной информации был использован метод опроса (анкетирование).

Опрос был проведен по технике личного полуструктурированного интервью (с закрытыми и открытыми вопросами). Специалистами была разработана специальная полуструктурированная анкета. В анкету были включены вопросы, соответствующие целям и задачам данного исследовательского проекта. *Данная анкета включает в себя перечень вопросов и заранее вставленные варианты ответов, из которых респондент выбирает наиболее соответствующий его мнению. В отличие от глубинного интервью,*

*полуструктурированное интервью не требует больших временных затрат и занимает не более 15-20 минут на опрос 1 респондента.*

**Подобные проекты в рамках университетов способствуют в первую очередь акцентированию внимания всех участников исследования, в большей степени обучающихся, ключевым аспектам жизнедеятельности ВУЗа, а именно:**

- качество образования, предоставляемого ВУЗом на всех этапах учебного процесса.
- поднятие проблемы прозрачности деятельности ВУЗа на должный уровень, т.е. публичное проведение мониторинга/контроля степени коррумпированности среди студентов, магистрантов, педагогов, родителей и администрации ВУЗов.

- повышение информированности о возможности подачи на апелляцию во время сессий, обращений по прямой почте ректору; получения льгот/скидок, специальных стипендий в рамках ВУЗа, что способствует развитию правовой культуры и дисциплины среди нашей ЦА.

- повышение статуса студента в глазах ВУЗа путем изучения и принятия во внимание его рекомендаций и ожиданий в оценке/улучшении работы регистратора, декана и ректора ВУЗа, а также методов борьбы с коррупцией (установка дополнительных видеокамер, повышение з/п педагогам, привлечение иностранных преподавателей, жесткий конкурсный отбор персонала, проведение анонимных опросов и т.д.)

Основная суть проведенного проекта заключалась в подробном изучении качества образования (на всех этапах учебного процесса среди всех представителей ЦА, а именно: студентов, магистрантов, преподавателей, родителей и администрации) ВУЗов и его влияние на репутацию, имидж и степень прозрачности деятельности КАУ и университета имени Кунаева. Основные результаты проведенного опроса:

- около 85% опрошенных респондентов в КАУ и 75% в Кунаевском университете обучаются на платной основе. Остальная же часть обучается за счет грантов, кредитов и других источников финансирования.

Основные рекомендации по улучшению прозрачности деятельности ВУЗов на всех этапах учебного процесса, а также качества образования, предоставляемого ВУЗАми (КАУ и университет имени Кунаева).

**ОТНОШЕНИЕ К КАЧЕСТВУ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ СТУДЕНТОВ И МАГИСТРАНТОВ ВУЗов**

- основные источники информации о ВУЗе, которыми потенциальные студенты руководствовались при выборе университета: родственники/друзья/знакомые. Рекомендации данной категории людей оказывает решающую роль при выборе ВУЗа, нежели интернет, реклама и печатные издания (газеты, журналы и т.п.). ***Следовательно, ВУзам необходимо поддерживать достойный уровень имиджа среди студентов и магистрантов, а также преподавателей и администрации, так как результаты опроса показали, что именно эта аудитория является мощной рекламой ВУЗа среди своих близких и знакомых (в том числе через интернет).***

- на этапе поступления в ВУЗы основная доля опрошенных была ознакомлена лишь с перечнем документов, необходимых для поступления. Наблюдается недостаток в информации о возможностях получения софинансирования, стипендии (в КАУ о стипендии Scholarships) и спонсорской помощи. Лишь на этапе обучения, будучи студентами, респонденты были частично проинформированы о дополнительных преимуществах университета. ***Необходимо проводить «дни открытых дверей» для абитуриентов, организовывать работу в школах (в выпускных 11 классах) по распространению информации об университете. Приемной комиссии необходимо сделать акцент также и на дополнительных преимуществах университета, а***

***именно: поощрения для студентов, скидки при обучении, особые стипендии, гранты и т.д.***

- по результатам 2 волны исследований, среди студентов и магистрантов обоих ВУЗов, наиболее осведомленными о принятой системе оценки знаний являются обучающиеся в КАУ - в среднем 90% из всех опрошенных. В Университете имени Кунаева таковых оказалось 80%. В разрезе статуса респондентов в КАУ, наиболее осведомленными являются студенты 2 курса (73% опрошенных) и учащиеся 1 курса колледжа при КАУ (67%). Среди респондентов Университета имени Кунаева таковых оказалось 81% учащихся 1 курса колледжа и 72 % студентов 1 курса. Несмотря на достаточно высокую осведомленность, уровень адаптации данной системы по мнению ЦА очень низка. В Университете имени Кунаева по 70% студентов и родителей считают эту систему вполне адаптированной. Примерно одинаковое количество опрошенных преподавателей (в среднем около 42% респондентов) Университета имени Кунаева и КАУ также считают приемлемой систему оценки знаний установленной в ВУЗе. ***Существует необходимость усиленной работы со стороны администрации КАУ по улучшению восприятия и адаптации данной системы оценки знаний среди студентов.***

- результаты 1 и 2 волны исследований показали относительно высокую осведомленность о наличие прямой связи с ректором ВУЗа: большинство студентов и магистрантов КАУ (в среднем 62% опрошенных) и 42% Университета имени Кунаева считают процесс обращения к декану и регистратору легким, тогда как процесс обращения к ректору в КАУ считают доступным всего лишь 30% ЦА. ***Администрации обоих ВУЗов следует больше акцентировать свое внимание на работе со студентами (не только через интернет, но и путем проведения мини-конференций, семинаров, круглых столов, публичного обсуждения наиболее часто задаваемых вопросов и наиболее проблем), для установления более тесных и доверительных внутриуниверситетских диалогов с ректорами ВУЗов. Это предупредит такие нежелательные последствия, как чувство неуверенности и незащищенности у студентов в стенах ВУЗа, чувства игнорирования и избегания их нужд и потребностей.***