ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261, 2022-2.889, 2023-5.384, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

Indicators for assessing the competitiveness of educational institutions

Qudratova Gulzoda Mahmudovna – Asia international university, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The competitiveness of educational institutions is a critical factor in determining their ability to attract students, secure funding, and contribute to national and global knowledge economies. This article explores key indicators for assessing the competitiveness of educational institutions, focusing on metrics such as academic performance, financial stability, research output, student satisfaction, and technological integration. Drawing on empirical studies and international frameworks like the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) and Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), the paper evaluates how these indicators reflect institutional quality and global standing. Challenges such as resource constraints, governance issues, and regional disparities are also addressed. The findings emphasize the need for a balanced, data-driven approach to enhance institutional competitiveness while ensuring equity and quality in education.

Keywords: Educational competitiveness, key performance indicators, academic performance, research output, student satisfaction, technological integration, higher education.

The competitiveness of educational institutions has become increasingly vital in a globalized world where knowledge and innovation drive economic and social progress. Higher education institutions (HEIs) and schools compete not only for students and faculty but also for funding, research opportunities, and global rankings. Assessing competitiveness requires a robust framework of indicators that capture the multifaceted nature of educational quality and institutional performance. This article examines key performance indicators (KPIs) for evaluating the competitiveness of educational institutions, drawing on international benchmarks and empirical studies. It also addresses challenges and provides recommendations for enhancing institutional competitiveness.

Competitiveness in education is defined as an institution's ability to deliver high-quality education, foster innovation, and attract resources in a competitive global environment. The World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Index (GCI) includes higher education and training as a key pillar, emphasizing its role in national productivity and prosperity. Key indicators for assessing institutional competitiveness can be grouped into five broad categories: academic performance, financial stability, research and innovation, student and stakeholder satisfaction, and technological integration.

Academic performance is a cornerstone of institutional competitiveness. Metrics such as graduation rates, student retention rates, and standardized test scores (e.g., PISA and TIMSS) provide insights into teaching quality and learning outcomes. For instance, PISA assesses literacy in math, reading, and science among 15-year-olds, offering a comparative measure of secondary education quality across countries. In higher education, metrics like average GPA of admitted students, course completion rates, and employment outcomes of graduates are critical. A 2022 study found that institutions with higher graduation rates (above 80%) tend to rank better in global competitiveness indices due to their ability to produce skilled graduates. However, over-reliance on standardized tests can overlook socio-economic and cultural factors that influence performance, necessitating a balanced approach to assessment.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261, 2022-2.889, 2023-5.384, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

Financial stability is another key indicator, as it reflects an institution's ability to invest in infrastructure, faculty, and student services. KPIs such as cost per student, tuition dependency, and excess of fund revenue over expenditure are widely used. For example, a 2025 report highlighted that institutions with an excess of fund revenue exceeding $50 million annually can invest in advanced facilities, enhancing their competitive edge. Private institutions often track tuition dependency to ensure financial resilience, while public institutions rely on government funding and public-private partnerships, as seen in Scotland's school rebuilding programs. However, financial disparities between institutions in developed and developing countries can exacerbate inequities, limiting competitiveness for underfunded institutions.

Research and innovation are critical for higher education institutions, particularly universities, to maintain global competitiveness. Metrics such as research income, number of refereed publications, and patents filed indicate an institution's contribution to knowledge creation. For instance, a KPI example from a 2024 study set a target of increasing research income to $200 million by 2025 for a competitive university. The Times Higher Education World University Rankings emphasize research output, with institutions like those in Asia excelling due to strong performance in math and science publications. However, developing countries often face challenges in securing research funding, which limits their ability to compete globally.

Student and stakeholder satisfaction is a vital indicator of institutional quality. KPIs such as student attendance rates, retention rates, and satisfaction surveys provide insights into engagement and institutional effectiveness. A 2025 report suggested that a student attendance rate of 97% or higher correlates with high satisfaction and academic success. Additionally, employer satisfaction and alumni employment rates reflect how well institutions prepare students for the labor market. Parental involvement, as highlighted in a European report, also enhances educational quality by fostering community engagement. However, individual efforts by teachers or parents, rather than systematic institutional strategies, often drive these outcomes, particularly in diverse settings.

Technological integration has emerged as a crucial indicator in the digital era. Metrics such as WiFi bandwidth usage, adoption of e-learning platforms, and investment in educational technology reflect an institution's adaptability. Leading institutions leverage technology to enhance teaching and learning, with KPIs like the percentage of courses offered online or the availability of digital resources. A 2020 study noted that institutions with robust digital infrastructure attract more students and faculty, enhancing competitiveness. However, low digital literacy and infrastructure gaps in developing countries hinder progress, as seen in Uzbekistan's banking sector challenges, which share parallels with education.

Despite these indicators, assessing competitiveness faces several challenges. Institutional quality is influenced by external factors such as corruption, political instability, and socio-economic disparities, which reduce the effectiveness of public spending on education. For instance, a 2022 study found that corruption negatively impacts student achievement and school completion rates in developing countries. Additionally, standardized indicators like PISA may lack reliability in capturing school-level teaching quality, particularly for inquiry-based learning. Regional disparities also pose challenges, as institutions in wealthier regions often outperform those in resource-constrained areas, creating an uneven competitive landscape.

To enhance competitiveness, educational institutions should adopt a strategic approach to KPI tracking. First, institutions must set clear, measurable goals, such as reducing student-to-teacher ratios to 40:1 or increasing research publications by 5% annually. Second, integrating leading and lagging

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261, 2022-2.889, 2023-5.384, 2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

indicators provides a dynamic view of performance. Lagging indicators, like graduation rates, reflect past outcomes, while leading indicators, such as student absenteeism or faculty qualifications, predict future success. Third, benchmarking against peer institutions, as practiced in Australia, helps identify areas for improvement. Finally, fostering stakeholder engagement, including parental and industry involvement, enhances institutional accountability and quality.

In conclusion, assessing the competitiveness of educational institutions requires a comprehensive framework of KPIs that balance academic, financial, research, satisfaction, and technological metrics. While institutions in developed countries often lead in global rankings due to robust funding and infrastructure, those in developing nations face challenges like resource constraints and governance issues. By adopting data-driven strategies, investing in digital infrastructure, and aligning with international benchmarks like PISA and GCI, institutions can enhance their competitiveness. Continuous evaluation and policy reforms are essential to ensure equitable, high-quality education that drives global innovation and prosperity.

References:

1. World Economic Forum. (2015). *Global Competitiveness Report*.
2. OECD. (2025). *International Education Indicators: PISA and TIMSS*.
3. Cascade. (2024). *Key Performance Indicators Higher Education*.
4. ClearPoint Strategy. (2025). *Top 30 Key Performance Indicators for Education Management*.
5. Umarova, H. (2025). IN UZBEKISTAN, BANKRUPTCY RISKS ARE DECREASING ACCORDING TO RECOMMENDATIONS AND FORECASTS. *Journal of Applied Science and Social Science*, *1*(2), 527-531.
6. Raximova, L. A., & Qaxorova, J. (2025). XORIJIY INVESTITSIYALARNI JALB QILISH ORQALI MINTAQANI IJTIMOIY-IQTISODIY RIVOJLANTIRISH. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 634-638.
7. Djurayeva, M. S., & Davlatov, A. (2025). BUGUNGI KUNDA MENEJMENTNING JAHONDA TUTGAN O ‘RNI. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(3), 151-155.
8. Aslanova, D. (2025). CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTING MODERN MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES IN THE TOURISM INDUSTRY. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations*, *1*(2), 119-121.
9. Rajabova, D. (2025). INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL AND EFFICIENCY OF INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISES IN UZBEKISTAN. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *1*(4), 955-960.
10. Ibragimov, A. T., & Atoyeva, M. (2025). MOLIYA SOHASI: RIVOJLANISH TENDENSIYALARI VA ISTIQBOLLARI. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(3), 168-172.
11. Bobojonova, M. J. (2025). GREEN ECONOMY AND ITS DEVELOPMENT STATUS. *SHOKH LIBRARY*.
12. Jumayeva, Z. B., & Toshova, A. R. (2025). IQTISODIY O ‘SISH VA MILLIY BOYLIK. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(3), 226-231.
13. Bazarova, M. (2025). SANOAT KORXONADA KADRLARNI RIVOJLANTIRISH STRATEGIYASINING O ‘ZIGA XOS XUSUSIYATLARI. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(4), 555-560.

14. Naimova, N., & Bahronova, R. (2025). RAQAMLI MARKETING STRATEGIYALARI: BREND QIYMATINI OSHIRISH VA MIJOZLAR SADOQATINI SHAKLLANTIRISH VOSITASI SIFATIDA. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 875-878.
15. Shadiyev, A. (2025). THE IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL MECHANISMS IN INCREASING GROSS REGIONAL PRODUCT. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *1*(4), 1133-1136.
16. Ikromov, E. (2025). THE STATE BUDGET PROCESS IMPROVEMENT. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *1*(2), 740-743.
17. Azimov, B., & Nazirov, H. (2025). THE IMPORTANCE OF EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION STRATEGY IN MODERN CONDITIONS. *Journal of Applied Science and Social Science*, *1*(2), 3-5.
18. Toshov, M. H. (2025). KICHIK BIZNES VA XUSUSIY TADBIRKORLIKNI RIVOJLANTIRISH. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(4), 539-547.
19. Алимова, Ш. А. (2025). ОПТИМИЗАЦИЯ НАЛОГОВОЙ НАГРУЗКИ В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ: УРОКИ УЗБЕКИСТАНА. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 58-63.
20. Bahodirovich, K. B. (2025, April). BALANCE SHEET STATEMENT: CONCEPT AND PRINCIPLES. In *CONFERENCE OF MODERN SCIENCE & PEDAGOGY* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 314-319).
21. Sodiqova, N. T., & Yuldasheva, H. (2025). ISHLAB CHIQARISH XARAJATLARINI KAMAYTIRISH-IQTISODIY TARAQQIYOTNING HAL QILUVCHI OMILI SIFATIDA. *Modern Science and Research*, *4*(5), 713-720.
22. Qudratova, G. M. (2025). MINTAQAVIY ILMIY-TADQIQOT INSTITUTLARI: RIVOJLANISH YO'NALISHLARI VA TAQQOSLAMA TAHLIL. *IZLANUVCHI*, *1*(6), 6-12.
23. Jumayev, B. (2025). THE ROLE OF REGIONAL BANKS IN UZBEKISTAN'S SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: CHALLENGES AND INNOVATIONS. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations*, *1*(2), 523-526.
24. Izatova, N. (2025). ISSUES OF IMPROVEMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL QUALITIES OF STUDENTS IN THE PROCESS OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *1*(2), 294-296.
25. Gafarova, D. (2025). THE PROCESS OF LIBERALIZING THE FOREIGN EXCHANGE MARKET IN UZBEKISTAN—SUCCESSES, RISKS AND LESSONS. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, *1*(4), 933-937.