

ISSN 2518-1483 (Online),
ISSN 2224-5227 (Print)

2019 • 2

ҚАЗАҚСТАН РЕСПУБЛИКАСЫ
ҰЛТТЫҚ ҒЫЛЫМ АКАДЕМИЯСЫНЫҢ

БАЯНДАМАЛАРЫ

ДОКЛАДЫ

НАЦИОНАЛЬНОЙ АКАДЕМИИ НАУК
РЕСПУБЛИКИ КАЗАХСТАН

REPORTS

OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

PUBLISHED SINCE 1944



ALMATY, NAS RK

Бас редакторы
х.ғ.д., проф., ҚР ҰҒА академигі **М.Ж. Жұрынов**

Редакция алқасы:

Адекенов С.М. проф., академик (Қазақстан) (бас ред. орынбасары)
Величкин В.И. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Ресей)
Вольдемар Вуйцик проф. (Польша)
Гончарук В.В. проф., академик (Украина)
Гордиенко А.И. проф., академик (Белорус)
Дука Г. проф., академик (Молдова)
Илолов М.И. проф., академик (Тәжікстан),
Леска Богуслава проф. (Польша),
Локшин В.Н. проф. чл.-корр. (Қазақстан)
Нараев В.Н. проф. (Ресей)
Неклюдов И.М. проф., академик (Украина)
Нур Изура Удзир проф. (Малайзия)
Перни Стефано проф. (Ұлыбритания)
Потапов В.А. проф. (Украина)
Прокопович Полина проф. (Ұлыбритания)
Омбаев А.М. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Өтелбаев М.О. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Садыбеков М.А. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Сатаев М.И. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Северский И.В. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Сикорски Марек проф., (Польша)
Рамазанов Т.С. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Такибаев Н.Ж. проф., академик (Қазақстан), бас ред. орынбасары
Харин С.Н. проф., академик (Қазақстан)
Чечин Л.М. проф., корр.-мүшесі (Қазақстан)
Харун Парлар проф. (Германия)
Энджун Гао проф. (Қытай)
Эркебаев А.Э. проф., академик (Қырғыстан)

«Қазақстан Республикасы Ұлттық ғылым академиясының баяндамалары»

ISSN 2518-1483 (Online),

ISSN 2224-5227 (Print)

Меншіктенуші: «Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы» Республикалық қоғамдық бірлестігі (Алматы қ.)
Қазақстан республикасының Мәдениет пен ақпарат министрлігінің Ақпарат және мұрағат комитетінде 01.06.2006 ж.
берілген №5540-Ж мерзімдік басылым тіркеуіне қойылу туралы куәлік

Мерзімділігі: жылына 6 рет.

Тиражы: 500 дана.

Редакцияның мекенжайы: 050010, Алматы қ., Шевченко көш., 28, 219 бөл., 220, тел.: 272-13-19, 272-13-18,
<http://reports-science.kz/index.php/en/archive>

© Қазақстан Республикасының Ұлттық ғылым академиясы, 2019

Типографияның мекенжайы: «Аруна» ЖК, Алматы қ., Муратбаева көш., 75.

Главный редактор
д.х.н., проф., академик НАН РК **М. Ж. Журинов**

Редакционная коллегия:

Адекенов С.М. проф., академик (Казахстан) (зам. гл. ред.)
Величкин В.И. проф., чл.-корр. (Россия)
Вольдемар Вуйцик проф. (Польша)
Гончарук В.В. проф., академик (Украина)
Гордиенко А.И. проф., академик (Беларусь)
Дука Г. проф., академик (Молдова)
Илолов М.И. проф., академик (Таджикистан),
Леска Богуслава проф. (Польша),
Локшин В.Н. проф. чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Нараев В.Н. проф. (Россия)
Неклюдов И.М. проф., академик (Украина)
Нур Изура Удзир проф. (Малайзия)
Перни Стефано проф. (Великобритания)
Потапов В.А. проф. (Украина)
Прокопович Полина проф. (Великобритания)
Омбаев А.М. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Отелбаев М.О. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Садыбеков М.А. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Сатаев М.И. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Северский И.В. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Сикорски Марек проф., (Польша)
Рамазанов Т.С. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Такибаев Н.Ж. проф., академик (Казахстан), зам. гл. ред.
Харин С.Н. проф., академик (Казахстан)
Чечин Л.М. проф., чл.-корр. (Казахстан)
Харун Парлар проф. (Германия)
Энджун Гао проф. (Китай)
Эркебаев А.Э. проф., академик (Кыргызстан)

Доклады Национальной академии наук Республики Казахстан»

ISSN 2518-1483 (Online),

ISSN 2224-5227 (Print)

Собственник: Республиканское общественное объединение «Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан» (г. Алматы)

Свидетельство о постановке на учет периодического печатного издания в Комитете информации и архивов Министерства культуры и информации Республики Казахстан №5540-Ж, выданное 01.06.2006 г.

Периодичность: 6 раз в год.

Тираж: 500 экземпляров

Адрес редакции: 050010, г.Алматы, ул.Шевченко, 28, ком.218-220, тел. 272-13-19, 272-13-18

<http://reports-science.kz/index.php/en/archive>

©Национальная академия наук Республики Казахстан, 2019 г.

Адрес типографии: ИП «Аруна», г.Алматы, ул.Муратбаева, 75

E d i t o r i n c h i e fdoctor of chemistry, professor, academician of NAS RK **M.Zh. Zhurinov****E d i t o r i a l b o a r d:****Adekenov S.M.** prof., academician (Kazakhstan) (deputy editor in chief)**Velichkin V.I.** prof., corr. member (Russia)**Voitsik Valdemar** prof. (Poland)**Goncharuk V.V.** prof., academician (Ukraine)**Gordiyenko A.I.** prof., academician (Belarus)**Duka G.** prof., academician (Moldova)**Iolov M.I.** prof., academician (Tadjikistan),**Leska Boguslava** prof. (Poland),**Lokshin V.N.** prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)**Narayev V.N.** prof. (Russia)**Nekludov I.M.** prof., academician (Ukraine)**Nur Izura Udzir** prof. (Malaysia)**Perni Stephano** prof. (Great Britain)**Potapov V.A.** prof. (Ukraine)**Prokopovich Polina** prof. (Great Britain)**Ombayev A.M.** prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)**Otelbayv M.O.** prof., academician (Kazakhstan)**Sadybekov M.A.** prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)**Satayev M.I.** prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)**Severskiy I.V.** prof., academician (Kazakhstan)**Sikorski Marek** prof., (Poland)**Ramazanov T.S.** prof., academician (Kazakhstan)**Takibayev N.Zh.** prof., academician (Kazakhstan), deputy editor in chief**Kharin S.N.** prof., academician (Kazakhstan)**Chechin L.M.** prof., corr. member. (Kazakhstan)**Kharun Parlar** prof. (Germany)**Endzhun Gao** prof. (China)**Erkebayev A.Ye.** prof., academician (Kyrgyzstan)**Reports of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.****ISSN 2224-5227****ISSN 2518-1483 (Online),****ISSN 2224-5227 (Print)**

Owner: RPA "National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan" (Almaty)

The certificate of registration of a periodic printed publication in the Committee of Information and Archives of the Ministry of Culture and Information of the Republic of Kazakhstan N 5540-Ж, issued 01.06.2006

Periodicity: 6 times a year

Circulation: 500 copies

Editorial address: 28, Shevchenko str., of 219-220, Almaty, 050010, tel. 272-13-19, 272-13-18,

<http://reports-science.kz/index.php/en/archive>

**REPORTS OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
OF THE REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN**

ISSN 2224-5227

<https://doi.org/10.32014/2019.2518-1483.50>

Volume 2, Number 324 (2019), 135 – 143

UDC 332.6

D.Kuatova¹, A.Zhakupova², Zh. Malgaraeva³

Narxoz University Almaty, Kazakhstan

k.dilmina@mail.ru; al.zhakyp@gmail.com; zhanat.malgaraeva@narxoz.kz**PROFESSIONALISM OF THE TEACHING STAFF AS THE
SYNONYMOUS OF QUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES**

Abstract: This article sets out the criteria of professionalism of the teaching staff are outlined for use by state authorities, university management and consumers of educational services; measures are proposed to improve the professionalism of the teaching staff and thereby improve the quality of higher education.

Purpose – identification of professionalism criteria of the teaching staff of a higher school and development of improvement ways.

Methodology – methodological basis for the study are research works of home and foreign experts in the field of professional competence of university teachers, regulations and guidance documents governing the activities of a higher school in the Republic, results of student surveys.

Originality/value – results of the study can be used by the teaching staff and the management of universities to develop measures aimed at improving the quality of teaching in higher educational institutions.

Keywords: higher education, quality of education, professionalism of the teaching staff, criteria of professionalism, professional competence.

Introduction

Nowadays rapid changes are occurring in organizational and economic conditions of higher educational institutions. They are caused by a crisis in the economy, increase of competition in the market of educational services and labor market, as well as the reformation of the education sector of the country for the purpose of compliance with international standards. Under these conditions, requirement of a society for quality education rise.

First of all, the concept of quality starts with a personality of a human. Therefore, the quality of educational services directly depends on the professionalism of the teaching staff of a higher school. In particular, a teacher is a key figure at university. Formation of professional reasoning skills and the extent of professional training of future experts are directly dependent on a teacher's professional competence. Ultimately, all this is reflected in the ranking of a university and the students' desire to learn from a teacher.

Under the conditions of raising stringent requirements for professionalism of the teaching staff, the criteria for its determination are still blurred, indistinct and the means for their achievement are not always clear. In this regard, the relevance of this article emerges, in which the author tried to work out some improvements in this direction, without claiming for full completeness and comprehensiveness.

Main part

Professionalism of the teaching staff of a university is undoubtedly identified with the quality of educational services. Quality can be defined as the compliance of higher education to socio-economic needs: ones of a separate individual and interests of a society and the state. On this basis, the criteria of professionalism bear multiple characteristics and are nominated by: 1) direct consumers of educational services, i.e. students and their parents; 2) management of higher education institutions; 3) the state on behalf of the Government and, in particular, the Ministry of Education and Science.

Traditionally, the evidence of professionalism of a teacher at a Kazakhstani university in terms of university-employer relations (and therefore the Ministry of Education and Science) is served by the

possession of a scientific degree (doctors and candidates of sciences and more recently PhDs) and academic status (professor and associate professor). An academic title is awarded to a teacher possessing a scientific degree, work experience, written articles, textbooks, manuals or monographs. Therefore, it is assumed that its presence is an indication of real achievements of a teacher in the realm of research, methodological and pedagogical activities. And that is associated with professionalism. For those who do not hold a degree and academic status, presently there is a requirement of holding an academic Master's degree in order to be able to work in higher schools. According to the "Model qualification characteristics of positions of pedagogical employees and those equated to them" approved by the Order № 338 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated July 13, 2009, one of the basic requirements for the qualification of a teacher is the evidence of experience in research-educational activities and / or practical work experience in the majoring specialization (Table 1).

Table 1 – Qualification requirements to a teacher according to "Model qualification characteristics of positions of pedagogical employees and those equated to them" in the Republic of Kazakhstan

Position	Qualification requirement
Professor	Higher (or postgraduate) education, possession of an academic degree, academic title of a "professor" and work experience of at least 5 years in research-educational activities
Associate Professor	Higher (or postgraduate) education, possession of an academic degree and work experience of at least 5 years in research-educational activities
Senior Lecturer	Higher (or postgraduate) education, or possession of an academic Master's degree, work experience of at least 3 years in research-educational activities, including at least one year as a teacher or presence of practical experience for at least 2 years in the majoring specialization
Lecturer (assistant)	Higher (or postgraduate) education, work experience for at least 3 years in the majoring specialization and / or possession of an academic Master's degree

No doubt, possession of academic degrees and titles by a teacher is an important criterion of professionalism. They are assigned by the corresponding state agency (formerly - Higher Certifying Commission, and now - the Committee for Control of Education and Science, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan) one time and for entire life. However, they may not always reflect the possession of teaching skills by a teacher. This is especially true of a scientific degree, as it is awarded for certain research achievements in highly specialized fields of expertise. Each teacher annually submits a report of work completed in order to confirm the obtained qualifications. Implementation of educational, methodical, research, educational, vocational guidance and training activities are reflected in this report. Such a report is prepared when a teacher is competing to fill a certain position.

Apart from that, each teacher is ought to hold an open session during an academic year, which allows to theoretically identify the degree of pedagogical skills and knowledge of a subject. Thus, there is a number of evaluation criteria of professional suitability for a teacher of a Kazakhstani university.

At Kazakh Economic University named after T. Ryskulov, in accordance with the Model qualifying characteristics [1], the following scope of different activities are determined for a teacher for the upcoming academic year: 1) academic; 2) educational-methodical; 3) scientific-research; 4) educational; 5) vocational guidance; 6) improving pedagogical skills and academic qualifications. Starting from 2013-2014 academic year, organizational, methodological and socio-managerial activities were added as well.

It is clear that academic work implies conduction of direct teaching activities, i.e. lecturing, conducting practical and other types of classes, supervision of coursework, dissertations, masters' theses, various internships, holding exams etc. According to the "Instructions for planning the workload for the teachers of the JSC "Kazakh Economic University named after T. Ryskulov ", 21 types of academic teaching activities are outlined [2]. These are the essential educational services, which are offered to students in any educational institution as a market entity. In addition to that, 26 types of educational-methodical and 15 types of organizational-methodical activities are distinguished as well. The list of scientific-research and scientific-organizational work includes 16 and 8, educational and vocational guidance – 11 and socio-managerial – 27 types of activities respectively. In total, there are 103 types of activities, without the inclusion of direct workload in teaching.

Certainly, a hypothetical teacher may not be able to perform all types of activities, but it is obligatory to fulfill a substantial part of them. List of types of activities and tasks that face the teaching staff, shows

that a higher school teacher must possess the abilities of a researcher, an organizer, a speaker, a psychologist, be a highly qualified expert both in a specialized subject area and an erudite in other areas of expertise. No other occupation does not possess such an expanded qualification characteristics. Mastering the profession of a university teacher requires certain natural abilities and talents, enormous mental, physical, emotional and time-consuming commitment [3].

Based on the above-explained quantitative characterization of a teacher at the university, one can say that academic work, i.e. direct pedagogical activities are only a small part of a teacher's activities.

It is worth saying that the annual teaching workload of a Kazakhstani teacher in absolute terms by itself has never been small. In many universities of Kazakhstan planned academic teaching workload is calculated to be in the range of 700-800 hours per year. For comparison, for a professor of an American university it is only 250 hours [4]. It becomes clear that such a situation is not conducive to the achievement of high quality teaching.

In KazEU named after T. Ryskulov under the conditions of implementation of a pilot project in 2013-2014 academic year, annual teaching (pedagogical) workload for a teacher was reduced and varies in the range from 480 to 720 hours per year depending on the category of the teaching staff. However, fixed standard hours for other types of activities were introduced. As a result, entire annual workload for a teacher is expressed in hours and it is obligatory that they to accomplish it. It is clear that most types of teaching activities are of creative character. It is quite difficult to develop standard hours for them. So sometimes undeservedly little time is allocated for their achievement. For example, only 15 minutes instead of prior 3 hours are given to guide the writing of course works, including submission and defending; 12 minutes for examining the written paper works of distance learning students. This is definitely not sufficient when considering it in terms of realization and quality. The same can be claimed for allocated standard hours for a textbook and study guide preparation. For these purposes, 200 and 300 hours were designated respectively. So in order to complete the planned workload fully and fruitfully, a teacher is forced to reallocate time between different types of teaching. Consequently, it is usual that a teacher struggling to complete the plan finds little or no time and strength for creative approach to teaching, which sometimes affects the quality and, ultimately, the image of a higher school.

Since the Soviet times, it was considered that the “department with staff professors and teachers within a 6-hour working day was obliged to ensure that all types of educational and methodical activities were performed as dictated by the academic curriculum. Whereas the scope of academic activities which are prescribed by the curriculum must be considered as a maximum, exceeding of which is unacceptable” [5]. In actual practice, the workload is often not just over-fulfilled by a teacher, but unplanned activities such as opposition to dissertations and reviewing, advising students to sit for External Assessment of Academic Achievements, supervising exams and dormitories, writing various reports, memos, etc. are common to arise. The latter deserves more explanation. Preparation of large number of various reports and memos distracts from actual teaching work. Apart from that, it is worth to say that the work schedule of a teacher may not be always organized due to unforeseen circumstances: the schedule is sometimes compiled in such a way that a teacher is obliged to be on duty from 8-00 in the morning until 18-00 in the evening. In addition to this, there may be only 3-4 academic hours, with long gaps being in between, which are not always effectively utilized. All this, of course, detracts a teacher from the main job, which is teaching, in the truest sense of the word. Moreover, it is not reflected on the remuneration of a teacher. Generally, it is not a secret that currently the remuneration level of a teacher in a Republican higher school teacher is often not in line with the social usefulness of such work and does not provide incentives to increase the efficiency of the work.

The wages of a Kazakhstani teacher cannot be even compared with those of their colleagues' at foreign universities. For example, the newspaper "Moscow News" presented comparative data on wages of teachers of state universities from 28 countries, published in the book named “[Paying the Professoriate. A Global Comparison of Compensations and Contracts](#)”. The wages were assessed by the criterion of purchasing power and it was found that it was best to be a professor in Canada, Italy, South Africa, India, the United States, Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom. While the worst conditions for teaching at a university are in Ethiopia, China, Russia and Armenia [6]. It is believed that for obvious reasons, the situation with a Kazakhstani teacher in this sense is not very different from a Russian or Armenian one.

A university teacher in the United States comprises a combination of an academic expert in a specific professional area and a teacher: a requirement for securing an academic profession of a university teacher is the possession of a Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree or a Master's degree (MD). At the same time, many experts of American higher schools note that a large part of teachers at American universities do not conduct significant scientific research works. Most of those who are involved in scientific research rarely publish the results of their work [7]. For example, according to the survey conducted among US higher school teachers holding PhD degrees in 1989 by the Carnegie Foundation, showed that 28% of the surveyed have never had any scientific publications, 26% of have not published anything in the last 5 years, 57% of university teachers have never published monographs or books. Over 50% of the surveyed admitted that teaching is their main activity in a higher school, 27% were more inclined to teaching and only 6% said that research is their dominating activity at university. As it turned out, most of the university teachers were not able to engage in global scientific research due to substantial academic workload [7].

All these data allow us make an important conclusion that is associated with a focus on improving the professionalism of the teaching staff: the dominating majority of American teachers of higher education are "pure" teachers rather than researchers. At the same time, the combination of a high teaching workload of a home teacher and the necessity of planning other more activities and the fact of not always justified standard hours for their execution is not conducive to improving the quality of the educational process. This will lead to an even greater "atomization" of a teacher, who already "lives to work but not works to live".

It follows that the presented requirements imposed often distract a teacher from the educational process itself and are do not facilitate to fully enhance the professionalism and quality of education.

Having considered the criteria of professionalism of the teaching staff, based on which assessment is performed by university management and the state, let us pay attention to the criteria put forward to a teacher by direct consumers of educational services, i.e. students.

In order to define what professionalism of a teacher is from the view of students, the students of the 3rd and 4th year of study of certain professions at KazEU named after T. Ryskulov were asked to identify the criteria (requirements) which must be met by higher school teachers. As it turned out, there are quite a number of such criteria, namely sixteen of them (Table 2).

Table 2 – Criteria for teacher’s professionalism from the view of students at KazEU named after T. Ryskulov

No	Criteria for teacher’s professionalism from the view of students
1	Comprehensiveness and clarity of presenting a subject (a teacher is able to clearly and thoroughly explain a subject)
2	Logical and systematic presentation of a subject
3	Competence (knowledge of a subject and possession of up-to-date information on it)
4	Control over an audience (ability to attract the attention of students, induce and maintain interest in a subject, ensuring discipline in a classroom)
5	Conducting classes with a focus on the practical aspect of applying knowledge in a discipline of future profession (confirmation of theoretical calculations with actual practical examples)
6	Using different forms of conducting classes (in the form of trainings, business games, case studies, etc.)
7	Using computer or video demonstrations (presentations, training films, etc.)
8	Objectivity and impartiality in the assessment of students' knowledge (a teacher is demanding but fair, does not require more than presented, makes no distinction between the students)
9	Loyalty (patience, generosity on assessments; understanding of life situations faced by students)
10	Ability to listen to a student, answers questions, "does not dodge" from questions
11	Clear eloquent speech, diction (no monotony in the voice, liveliness of presentations of subjects, inspiration)
12	Kindness, tactfulness, respect for a student
13	Desire to share knowledge with students
14	Use of visual aids and handouts during practical sessions of (quizzes, flashcards for independent work, etc.)
15	Clear organization of the educational process, compliance with the timing of classes’ schedule (a teacher is accurate and responsible in timing)
16	Individual approach to each student

After the formulation of the criteria they were laid to the basis of the questionnaire. Students were asked to identify five most important criteria and rank them in the order of importance by means of

anonymous survey. The first rank was assigned to those criteria, which are the most preferred characteristics of professionalism of a teacher.

The results of the survey are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 – Ranking by students at KazEU named after T .Ryskulov of teacher professionalism criteria in the order of importance (the fractions of students who preferred a specific criterion in the total number of surveyed students are given in percentages)

Criteria for teacher's professionalism from the view of students	Rank				
	1	2	3	4	5
Comprehensiveness and clarity of presenting a subject (a teacher is able to clearly and thoroughly explain a subject)	60	15	10	15	–
Logical and systematic presentation of a subject		15	5		
Competence (knowledge of a subject and possession of up-to-date information on it)		10	20	15	
Control over an audience (ability to attract the attention of students, induce and maintain interest in a subject, ensuring discipline in a classroom)	10	5	10	5	20
Conducting classes with a focus on the practical aspect of applying knowledge in a discipline of future profession (confirmation of theoretical calculations with actual practical examples)		20	10	5	19
Using different forms of conducting classes (in the form of trainings, business games, case studies, etc.)		5		5	5
Using computer or video demonstrations (presentations, training films, etc.)			5		5
Objectivity and impartiality in the assessment of students' knowledge (a teacher is demanding but fair, does not require more than presented, makes no distinction between the students)	10	20	5	15	–
Loyalty (patience, generosity on assessments; understanding of life situations faced by students)		10	5		5
Ability to listen to a student, answers questions, "does not dodge" from questions			15	15	10
Clear eloquent speech, diction (no monotony in the voice, liveliness of presentations of subjects, inspiration)					
Kindness, tactfulness, respect for a student	15	10	15		15
Desire to share knowledge with students	5	5	5	5	
Use of visual aids and handouts during practical sessions of (quizzes, flashcards for independent work, etc.)		5		5	5
Clear organization of the educational process, compliance with the timing of classes' schedule (a teacher is accurate and responsible in timing)					5
Individual approach to each student		5		10	5

The results of the students' survey show that:

1) the vast majority, namely 60% of students, put the quality of both comprehensiveness and clarity of presentation on the first place of importance. Although 15% of the surveyed ranked it as the second or even the fourth. Other 15% of the surveyed prefer to all criteria kindness, tactfulness and respect for a student;

2) opinion on the second most important criterion of professionalism of the teacher got split: 20% of students believe that, secondly, a teacher should be demanding but fair; does not require more than presented; makes no distinction between the students, i.e. objective and impartial in the assessment of students' knowledge. Other 20% of the surveyed wish that comprehensiveness of a study subject is enforced by conducting classes with a focus on the practical aspect of applying knowledge in a discipline of future profession. We are talking about the importance of real-life practical examples for a better understanding of the theory. 15% of the surveyed see consistency and systematic teaching of a subject as the second most important criterion of professionalism. Almost the same fraction, as mentioned above, believe that a teacher should be able to comprehensively and clearly explain a subject;

3) the third "prize" place with 20% of the students (and this is the greatest fraction) chose competence, which means knowledge of a subject and possession of up-to-date information on it. 15 percent expressed that the third criterion by importance is the ability to listen to a student, answer questions and "not dodge" from questions;

4) on the fourth important criterion, opinions got split substantially: groups of 15% of the surveyed each chose one of the following as the fourth criterion:

- comprehensiveness and clarity of presenting a subject;
- competence;
- objectivity and impartiality in the assessment of students' knowledge;
- ability to listen to a student, answer questions and “not dodge from questions”;

5) in respect of the fifth rank, it can be said that the majority of students (20%) assigned it to the ability to control an audience, 19% - approach of a teacher to focus on the practical aspects of applying knowledge in a discipline; 15 percent of the surveyed outlined kindness, tactfulness and respect for students.

It should be noted that one of the five important chosen characteristics of professionalism of a teacher was control over an audience. By this, students understand it as the ability to get their attention, to cause and maintain interest in a subject, ensuring discipline in the classroom.

Thus, the survey allowed us to sketch a portrait of a teacher: he should be able to simply and clearly present knowledge in a discipline, with an emphasis on the practical aspect and this is the result of the competence, at the same time being demanding but friendly, objective, have a sense of tactfulness and respect to students.

Then, in order to identify the accordance of the teaching staff members at KazEU named after T. Ryskulov to the sketched by the students a portrait and satisfaction with the quality of teaching, they were asked to answer the question: "What do you not like in a teacher most?"

In this context, students expressed their dissenting opinion about the lectures. They noted that they do not like when a teacher does it literally, i.e. lecturing from a paper material, dictates from it to students and conducts classes with the help of obsolete materials. Alternatively, when a teacher uses the so-called presentation, which is a plain text in Word, but not an actual presentation in Power Point. A teacher explains it just by her reading, but does not always stress on the main points and does not provide illustrative examples from practice. It is known that "nowadays there is no single course presented at American universities without the help of PowerPoint or Black Board technology ... PowerPoint does not simply place pictures on a display or on a big screen, it requires a completely new perspective on the concept of lectures, their structure, bullet point character material presentation, including voice files, videos, etc. Most lectures are evaluated by students primarily visually, and therefore higher ratings are given to those teachers who are more successful at visual presentation of their courses" [4].

In addition, it should be noted that the use of presentations is encouraged by students, but the board must also be used actively, especially in the demonstration of practical examples. This allows students to follow the logic and track the course of problem solving process.

Most of the surveyed students indicated that they did not like the fact that not all teachers are demanding. Such a behavior is often a characteristic of poorly trained teachers. They become not demanding, too loyal and "kind".

Students are also not content with the situation when a teacher requires much more knowledge than actually shared. In this case, students may get an impression of a lack of training of a teacher. This is also evidenced by the opinion that some teachers do not like when students ask questions. In response, students may hear a confused puzzled monologue, or a refusal from a teacher to answer a question. As per student's understanding, this may mean that a teacher is not in the possession of actual information and a question causes difficulty for a teacher. As a result, students no longer motivated not to only ask questions, but even lose interest in the study of a subject.

Some students noted that it is important that a teacher should not enter a classroom in a bad mood. According to students' statements, sometimes it is felt that a teacher takes on to them his discontent, including dissatisfaction with the job, sometimes dropping out phrases about the inequality of teachers' salaries to the efforts, which are being made. Thus, a student is sometimes forced to see indifference, lack of interest in work by a teacher.

The survey was not aimed at specifically outlining such a criterion as the outer appearance of a teacher. However, students additionally noted that the appearance of a teacher bears considerable importance as well. In practice, a teacher with an unpleasant appearance, causes not just irrespective attitude from students, they may even lose interest in a subject and the learning process itself.

One of the comments in survey questionnaires was the statement of students was that they sometimes do not understand the importance and the need of a particular taught discipline for their future professional activities. This fact does not contribute to the perception of a subject and interest in learning. Therefore, an enquiry was expressed that a teacher as a professional should emphasize the importance of a subject and demonstrate the necessity of mastering knowledge in a subject in terms of its importance for future career. A teacher should mainly focus on the practical aspect of presenting knowledge. It is necessary that a teacher supports theoretical knowledge with good examples occurring in reality and also conduct classes in the form of practical training.

This is very important in the time of a crisis in the economy, rising unemployment and labor market competition, which consequently reduce the possibility for a young fresh expert - a former student, to find a decent job in the majoring specialty. Therefore, every teacher should be aware of this, as well as of competition in the educational market and build the process of teaching in this context.

Students generated the following idea: less theory, more practice and practical solutions. Practical orientation of teaching a discipline, development of practical skills in the classroom allow stimulate the activity of students, enforce interest in independent work. This occurs especially if its implementation implies not only receiving positive marks in the learning process, but also opportunities for student creativity. This is possible in the form of participation in competitions, internships in companies and organizations, apprenticeships and even taking up paid employment (e.g., consulting firms, research and business projects, tutoring schoolchildren). All this creates preconditions for successful employment in the future.

The vast majority of students indicated that the survey using the above-mentioned questions would help to undertake work aimed at improving the professionalism of the teaching staff. This would in turn contribute to improvement of the quality of educational services.

Thus, the results of the survey among students can reflect the degree of professionalism of a teacher, as they receive the direct impact of it.

We believe that the professionalism of teachers in higher education schools for each criterion should be assessed according to the scale used in the survey of Togliatti State University [8]:

- 5 marks – quality is demonstrated almost always;
- 4 marks – quality is demonstrated frequently;
- 3 marks – quality is demonstrated at the level of 50%;
- 2 marks – quality is demonstrated rarely;
- 1 mark – quality is demonstrated almost never;
- 0 mark – unable to assess.

It should be added that almost all students said that it did not matter to them who conducts classes: a professor, an associate professor or a teacher without any academic degree or academic title. The main attribute is the ability of a teacher to pass knowledge to students. Prejudice of a society that a great teacher is a successful researcher and award-winning professor who can a priori clearly and intelligibly present an educational material is not always the truth. Therefore, number of scientific papers, publications, their citation indices (which is very fashionable today to demand from a teacher), number of doctoral students trained, i.e. all indicators that are taken into account for certification and increases the rating of a university, is not a reliable indication of the professionalism of a teacher and is not a criterion for a student and his parents.

From all what was previously, it follows that the criteria to be met by the professionalism of the teaching staff by various subjects of market interest are ambiguous. The management of universities-employers and the relevant state authorities require the accomplishment of all types of work activities from a teacher. Students and their parents welcome such qualities as the knowledge of a subject, its logical and comprehensive presentation and ability to interest students, strengthen their independence and give the level of knowledge that will allow a student to develop as a specialist. Indeed, this is really what is called professionalism – “high level of psycho-pedagogical and subject scientific-research knowledge and skills combined with appropriate cultural and moral character, providing in practice socially demanded training of future specialists” [9].

The obtained results (conclusions)

I believe that, in order to meet the demands of students on the professionalism of teachers and focus on the systematic achievement of its growth is possible through the implementation of the following measures:

1) for the purpose of further development and improvement of the quality of training and the training sessions, it is necessary to reduce the individual workload of a teacher and establish effective control over the quality of his classes work;

2) implement individual approach to the determination of work duties, the scope of different types of activities performed by each teacher. It should be based on the objectives of a university and the reasonable and efficient use of a teacher, accounting for his habitudes, abilities to bring great benefits. It is more efficient to allocate some teachers for more academic work, others for research, and the rest for writing textbooks and manuals. Accordingly, the criteria of certification of teaching staff should be clarified and it is necessary to pay attention to important academic work and its direct support (preparation of textbooks, teaching aids, teaching materials, introduction of innovative technologies);

3) as the professionalism of a teacher assumes availability of many competencies, it requires constant work on their broadening and the acquisition of new ones. In this regard, it is necessary to provide a systemic and continuous process of training and control over that must be taken by the management of universities. Teachers must be directed to choose relevant courses, perform careful selection of both organizations providing similar services and candidate instructors for training. Such an approach is necessary to ensure that they can later share with and transfer new knowledge to colleagues;

4) revise certain standard hours for performing various activities by teachers for higher objectivity, reliability and validity;

5) facilitate the implementation of a clear and effective organization of work of a teacher by preparing a flexible schedule of classes, eliminating large breaks and unnecessary distractions for other types of activities;

6) implement a thorough selection of candidates for the position of a teacher on the basis of special tests and evaluation of an open trial lesson;

7) in order to retain existing and attract new qualified teaching staff, it is strongly recommended to reconsider the system of motivation for work. Work remuneration and stimulus must be performed in a realistic, tangible and systematic way, without plain standardization, accounting for each significant contribution to improving the professionalism. This will allow raise the status of a teacher at a university and the quality of education;

8) in order to improve pedagogical skills and ensure professional growth of young teachers, mentoring system must be established in a serious way and make it truly effective, as well as consider the implementation of such a mechanism and the remuneration system;

9) make public the results of students' survey to determine their satisfaction with the pedagogical activity of teachers. Today, a teacher is unable (and perhaps unwilling) to see their individual results in order to react and take actions to improve their professionalism;

10) in order to bring the content and quality of Kazakhstani education to international level, it would be reasonable to invite foreign teachers to run master classes in conducting various types of training undertaken in foreign higher schools.

Д.Куатова¹, А.Жакупова², Ж.Малгараева³

Университет Нархоз, Алматы, Казахстан

ПЕДАГОГИКАЛЫҚ ҚЫЗМЕТКЕРЛЕРІНІҢ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛИЗМІ БІЛІМ БЕРУ САПАСЫНЫҢ СИНОНИМЫ РЕТІНДЕ

Аннотация: Осы мақалада мемлекеттік органдар, университеттің басшылығы және білім беру қызметтерін тұтынушылар үшін оқытушылар құрамының кәсібилігі критерийлері келтірілген; профессорлық-оқытушылық құрамның кәсібилігін көтеру және сол арқылы жоғары білім сапасын арттыру жөнінде шаралар ұсынылады.

Осы мақаланың мақсаты - жоғары мектептің профессорлық-оқытушылық құрамының кәсібилігін анықтау және оны жетілдіру жолдарын дамыту. Зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізі университеттің оқытушы-

ларының кәсіптік құзыреттілігі саласындағы отандық және шетелдік сарапшылардың, елдегі университеттің қызметін реттейтін нормативтік-әдістемелік құжаттардың, студенттердің сауалнамаларының нәтижелерін зерттеу болып табылады.

Зерттеу нәтижелерін жоғары оқу орындарында білім беру сапасын жақсартуға бағытталған іс-шараларды әзірлеу үшін университеттің профессор-оқытушылар құрамы мен басшылығы пайдалана алады.

Түйін сөздер: жоғары білім, білім беру сапасы, профессор-оқытушылар құрамының кәсібилігі, кәсібилік критерийлері, кәсіби құзыреттілік.

Д.Куатова¹, А.Жақупова², Ж.Малғараева³

Университет Нархоз, Алматы, Қазақстан

ПРОФЕССИОНАЛИЗМ ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКОГО ПЕРСОНАЛА КАК СИНОНИМ КАЧЕСТВА ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНЫХ УСЛУГ

Аннотация: В данной статье изложены критерии профессионализма преподавательского состава, для использования органами государственной власти, руководством университета и потребителями образовательных услуг; предлагаются меры по повышению профессионализма преподавательского состава и, тем самым, повышению качества высшего образования.

Целью данной статьи является выявление критериев профессионализма профессорско-преподавательского состава высшей школы и разработка путей совершенствования. Методологической основой исследования являются научно-исследовательские работы отечественных и зарубежных специалистов в области профессиональной компетентности преподавателей вуза, нормативные и методические документы, регламентирующие деятельность вуза в республике, результаты опросов студентов.

Результаты исследования могут быть использованы преподавательским составом и руководством университетов для разработки мер, направленных на повышение качества обучения в высших учебных заведениях.

Ключевые слова: высшее образование, качество образования, профессионализм преподавательского состава, критерии профессионализма, профессиональная компетентность.

Information about authors:

Kuatova D. - Phd assoc. professor, Narxoz University, Republic of Kazakhstan , email : k.dilmina@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5272-5474>

Zhakupova A. - Senior lecture, Narxoz University, Republic of Kazakhstan, email : al.zhakup@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3527-7101>

Malgaraeva Zh. - Candidate of Economics, Associate Professor, Narxoz University, Republic of Kazakhstan , email : zhanat.malgaraeva@narxoz.kz, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4783-5438>

REFERENCES

- [1] Model qualification characteristics of positions of pedagogical employees and those equated to them, approved by the Order №338 of the Minister of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan dated July 13, 2009.
- [2] Instructions on workload planning for the teaching staff at JSC “Kazakh Economic University named after T. Ryskulov”. Almaty, 2013.
- [3] Nadvoretzkaya E. V. Improvement of higher school teachers on the basis of their assessment. Abstract of the thesis. Moscow, 2006. <http://nauka-shop.ru>.
- [4] Dосybaeyeva G. K. Features of higher education system in the US: Abstract of the thesis, candidate of pedagogical sciences: Almaty, 2009.
- [5] Letter of Instruction of the Ministry of Higher Education of the USSR on September 15, 1956, № И-100 “On the planning of work of higher school teachers” – <http://bestpravo.ru>
- [6] Mikhailov A. Teachers are doing worse in Russia than in Ethiopia. Moscow news: <http://www.mn.ru>
- [7] Kostina N. I. Professional and pedagogical preparation of higher school teachers in the US: Abstract of the thesis, candidate of pedagogical sciences: Belgorod, 2000.
- [8] Presentations: “Teachers from the view of students”. <http://www.myshared.ru/>.
- [9] Yegorova Y. A. Issues of professional competence of higher school teachers. – Social network of education workers: www.nsportal.ru.
- [10] Sarsenbayeva K.A., Utegenova Zh.S. Educational process and innovative management in modern pedagogy in higher school. Reports of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, № 6, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.32014/2018.2518-1483.40>

**Publication Ethics and Publication Malpractice
in the journals of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan**

For information on Ethics in publishing and Ethical guidelines for journal publication see <http://www.elsevier.com/publishingethics> and <http://www.elsevier.com/journal-authors/ethics>.

Submission of an article to the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan implies that the work described has not been published previously (except in the form of an abstract or as part of a published lecture or academic thesis or as an electronic preprint, see <http://www.elsevier.com/postingpolicy>), that it is not under consideration for publication elsewhere, that its publication is approved by all authors and tacitly or explicitly by the responsible authorities where the work was carried out, and that, if accepted, it will not be published elsewhere in the same form, in English or in any other language, including electronically without the written consent of the copyright-holder. In particular, translations into English of papers already published in another language are not accepted.

No other forms of scientific misconduct are allowed, such as plagiarism, falsification, fraudulent data, incorrect interpretation of other works, incorrect citations, etc. The National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan follows the Code of Conduct of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), and follows the COPE Flowcharts for Resolving Cases of Suspected Misconduct (http://publicationethics.org/files/u2/New_Code.pdf). To verify originality, your article may be checked by the originality detection service Cross Check <http://www.elsevier.com/editors/plagdetect>.

The authors are obliged to participate in peer review process and be ready to provide corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. All authors of a paper should have significantly contributed to the research.

The reviewers should provide objective judgments and should point out relevant published works which are not yet cited. Reviewed articles should be treated confidentially. The reviewers will be chosen in such a way that there is no conflict of interests with respect to the research, the authors and/or the research funders.

The editors have complete responsibility and authority to reject or accept a paper, and they will only accept a paper when reasonably certain. They will preserve anonymity of reviewers and promote publication of corrections, clarifications, retractions and apologies when needed. The acceptance of a paper automatically implies the copyright transfer to the National Academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The Editorial Board of the National Academy of sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan will monitor and safeguard publishing ethics.

Правила оформления статьи для публикации в журнале смотреть на сайте:

www.nauka-nanrk.kz

ISSN 2518-1483 (Online), ISSN 2224-5227 (Print)

<http://reports-science.kz/index.php/en/archive>

Редакторы *М. С. Ахметова, Т.А. Апендиев, Д.С. Аленов*
Верстка на компьютере *А.М. Кульгинбаевой*

Подписано в печать 12.04.2019.
Формат 60x881/8. Бумага офсетная. Печать – ризограф.
12,8 п.л. Тираж 500. Заказ 2.