GLOBAL QUALITY EDUCATION CHALLENGES BETWEEN THE LOCAL LANGUAGE AND GLOBAL MINDS IN THE

GLOBALISATION PROCESS
(Case Study, Jeddah Training Centre- MBA Program)

Rashad Alsaed
Nitham Sweedam

Abstract

The Global success of Quality Education (GQE) in the new millennium will require superior performance in both product and service provision. Product quality is a given in today's global arena-it is a basic requirement to compete. The universities that will excel will be those that truly 'delight' the students and provide 'added' value as defined by the student. Quality service may be provided by helping student's lower costs or by otherwise improving the ability to provide better service to their students.

Learning to excel at both quality local language and quality global mind is challenging even in a national environment. Attempting to excel on a global basis requires a different teachership global mind, the development of a unified global quality vision, special skills training for all staff, and the evolution of a worldwide quality culture throughout the organisation. The roles of senior lecturers, staff and students all change dramatically in this new environment. Students must develop a new understanding of how work processes are similar /dissimilar on a global/national basis. The importance of both vertical functional work processes and horizontal cross-functional work processes must be clearly understood and accepted. (Jeddah training Centre- International Business Centre) interested to join of working with the Arabic Academy of Science & Technolo & Maastricht School of Management (MBA Program) that is the global program, so, must see itself as a learning organisation, one that is in the process of gaining a knowledge of change focused on continuous improvement and innovation. This program needs known locally language and global minds challenges and quality vision.

Keywords: Global Quality Education (GQE), local language, global mind, Product/Service quality, Jeddah training Centre.

Introduction

Learning to teach - like teaching itself- is always the process of becoming; a time of formation and transformation, of scrutiny into what one is doing, and who one can become. ''The goal of this Jeddah training Centre- International Business Centre is to facilitate development of educators who "demonstrate excellence through continual, lifelong, reflective processes of learning". This goal is articulated in the Conceptual Framework developed by The Arabic Academy of Science & Technology and Maastricht School of Management (MBA Program) and affirmed by a majority of the Centre. Discussion about how to authentically assess this Framework resulted in the implementation a global review procedure as an admission requirement for Internships I and II. This process posed not only GQE problems, but as with most innovations, the expected debate, dissension, and disequilibrium of "learning something new". The purpose of this paper is to briefly describe how GQE assessment was implemented and to focus on how this process impacts centre, students, and program development. This research clearly reveals that professional GQE are constructive instruments for authentic assessment of students and that this among process has provided a substantive catalyst for professional dialogue and development of faculty.

Background & Limitation of study

Members of the Arabic Academy of Science & Technology and Maastricht School of Management (MBA Program) are elected to represent all programs in the Jeddah training Centre- International Business Centre. The role of this team is to collaborate for congruence and relevance to the needs of the larger educational community. In 1995, Jeddah training Centre- International Business Centre began the process of an external program review and the role of this committee became one of documenting congruence between the Conceptual Framework and The Arabic Academy of

Science & Technology (MBA Program). Simultaneously, in 2001Jeddah Training Centre-(MBA Program in Jeddah), recommended to the instrument with Maastricht School of Management (MBA Program) the chair of Jeddah based on the Center Conceptual Framework, should be an application requirement for both Internships, Traditionally, students applying (full-time, 16 week experience with a certified training) were required to complete an application form, document the required GQE, and write a brief autobiography. It was determined that quality assessment offers a more effective way to examine both the breadth and depth of preservice teacher thinking and behavior prior to actual teaching in global. It was also agreed that this process would provide a vehicle for internal program review.

Literature Review
Teachership Global Mind
Lecturers responsible for GQE understand that the complexities of mastering quality excellence in a global arena require added dimensions as compared with a national program. The School identified six key minds required of global lecturer (Stephen, 1992):

1. Teachership with global minds focuses on the broader picture and is constantly looking for context. They are never content with one explanation for an event.

2. Teachership with global minds understands that the world is complex and that life is constantly presented with contradictory forces and outlooks. Conflict management is a key skill needed for all global lecturers.

3. Teachership with global minds placed greater trust in organisational processes than in formal hierarchical structures. Organisational processes such as information and decision-making processes as well as norms of behavior are valued highly by global lecturers.

4. Teachership with global minds value, multi-cultural teamwork and diversity are requiring flexibility and sensitivity.

5. Teachership with global minds view change as an opportunity and are comfortable with ambiguity and surprises.

6. People with global mindsets continually challenge their own paradigms, experiences and assumptions. They are constantly seeking to improve themselves and those around them.

Teaching Portfolio Guidelines
The Arabic Academy of Science & Technology and Maastricht School of Management (MBA Program) as a guide for students as they prepare their Professional Portfolios. The sections selected for the Professional Portfolio were derived from the College of Education Conceptual Model. The sections include Commitment; Collaboration; Communication Skills; Ethical Standards; Knowledge of Content; Knowledge of Pedagogy; Reflective Practice; Diversity and Technology. The Portfolio Guidelines provide suggestions for evidence, and examples of reflections. Students are instructed that the reflections must be more than descriptive statements, and they are given a guide that describes technical, practical and critical reflections.

GQE: Evolutionary phases
The phases of evolution of GQE directly mirror the phases of evolution in the global quality education. It is a basic premise of business that program leaders will rise to meet the expectations of the marketplace; so it is true of the evolutionary phases of GQE

Phase One: 1945-1975
The three decades spanning the end of World War II were characterised by a newly freed world with an unquenchable thirst for education. In the early years of this era emphasis was placed on quantity graduation and programmes of universities. As competition increased, universities improved efficiencies through focused learning planning that complemented market needs

Phase Two: 1975-1985
The universities of the world experienced a major shift in education focus during the mid-1970s. Surplus supply and over-capacity developed in many programmes. The learning options for students improved dramatically. Value rather than availability became the norm. This dramatic reversal inaugurated the birth of the quality initiative in research centres around the globe. Universities focused intensely inward to improve the quality of the modules they produced. Emphasis on just-in-time (JIT) learning, meeting specifications and 'school' became the norm to millions of students.

Phase Three: 1985-2000
The 1980s saw tremendous gains in the quality of modules produced. Many of those universities that failed significantly to improve their quality were forced out of business, absorbed by other universities or became marginal players in the global arena. Students grew to demand superior quality as a given.

59

Programs that will be flourishing as we entered the year 2000 were those that embrace the catch-phrase 'delighting the Student'. Those universities that live by a philosophy that regards students, students and subsidiaries as equal partners in their GQE process will enjoy success in the remainder of the period. (Patrick, 1992)

Phase Four: 2000-2010:

GQE requires world-class Universities to be simultaneously internally focused (conforming to requirements) and externally focused (excelling in student satisfaction). Many universities around the world are still catching up with the internal requirements of GQE. Universities will be required to develop a significant paradigm shift to achieve GQE. Developing the motivation and skills to focus simultaneously internally on processes and externally on 'delighting' the student, and to create a single unified global vision with a globally diverse workforce, will be a major determinant of success in this decade.

Criteria for success

In order to prepare for these challenges, senior management must understand the criteria for success via GQE. These include:

Global information	Knowledge	Culture /languages
- Need for a 'global minds' - Formal and informal organisational structural dynamics - GQE mission and vision - Cultural change requirements with GQL - The role of senior lecturers, staff and line workers - The value of training	- Process improvement - Learning processes and business processes - Benchmarking	- Focus on the student - Quality-conformance to requirements - Speed - Flexibility - Service quality - Focus on results

Local language and global minds: needs and goals. Executives engaged in

Local language and global minds: needs and goals. Executives engaged in global program quality initiatives need to pay careful attention to the similarities and differences of perceived local language and global minds the needs and goals among their various subsidiaries and headquarters. A unified global strategic vision and common focus are essential if the universities goals are to be achieved. Throughout this research we will refer to various recent studies that compare the attitudes of Jeddah Training Centre from a variety of Staff with the critical components of GQE (Knight 1990).

A recent study by focused on the emerging quality issues of 2003. We highlighted the following as key demands for change in the new program of Arabic Academy of Science & Technology and Maastricht School of management MBA program in Jeddah:

♦ MBA program in future should respond to the survey said they are currently conducting quality improvement programs.

♦ MBA program in future should report that the demands for quality and service have never been higher.

♦ MBA program in future should state that quality problems are central issues-not-just production issues.

♦ MBA programs in future should benchmark themselves against program rivals.

♦ MBA programs in future should have a formal process to measure their students' perceptions of quality.

♦ MBA programs in future should focus greater emphasis on the task of controlling logistics.

♦ MBA programs in future should have initiated customer awareness programs in their companies.

♦ MBA programs in future should benchmark themselves against universities in other programs.

♦ Business performance: Virtually all programs in the survey view quality as a critical success factor in their strategic performance. The use of quality performance as a criterion for compensating senior management has been used sparingly in the past but will rise significantly across all countries.
♦ Student focus: Less than 50 per cent of the surveyed programs make student input an integral part of the strategic planning process.

♦ Competitors in the strategic process: Benchmarking competitive activity currently occurs more frequently in Saudi Arabia and Dutch universities.

♦ Process improvement: Saudi Arabia Centres consistently outperform UK, Dutch, US and Canadian universities in their use of routine process simplification.

♦ Employee involvement: Saudi Arabia Centres maintain the highest rate of routine student participation in scheduled meetings about quality.

Since 2003, senior management participated in comprehensive, in-depth interviews. The findings indicate that Arabic Academy of Science & Technology & Maastricht Staffers see themselves as moving toward parity with their non-Maastricht competitors. The senior management analysed factor determinants of competitiveness, and those factors were rated as critical by at least 74 per cent of them (Table 1) (Kearney, 1992). The relatively high ratings given to such a large number of factors is indicative of the senior management s' recognition of the complexity of GQE.

Global Quality Teachership

Uncertainty and the rapid rate of change in today's GQE require that universities develop a solid foundation in the core elements of GQE. Global universities will not be successful in developing world-class quality products and services that 'delight' the student without first establishing the five core elements on which GQE is founded ((Fig. 1):

1. Shared global vision of the School's strategic mission
2. Organisational dynamics that clearly identifies the roles of senior lecturers, staff and line workers
3. Organisational hierarchy that supports the strategic mission
4. Corporate quality culture development needed to produce world-class quality
5. Global quality training requirements

Fig. 4.1 Global quality teachership (GQT): core foundation elements

Table 1 Jeddah Training Centre learning competitiveness: top 15 determinants of competitiveness

Determinants of competitiveness
- Finished module exam quality
- Focus on learning quality processes by total module
- Marketing
- Student service provided
- Learning production
- Course price
- Education/skills
- Staff commitment and continuity
- Process or learning technology
- Product engineering
- Investment in R&D
- Product technology
- User economics
- Learning engineering/process engineering
- Productivity

It is essential for corporations to master the five core elements that form the basis for GQE before becoming too involved with implementation programs such as JIT, quality circles, total quality control, process improvement projects, school and inventory reduction. All of us can cite examples of failure or of only modest success with 'quality' programs that focused extensively on implementation of programs and made insufficient preparations for attention to the core elements of GQE (Ernst & Young, 1991).

Shared vision of the School's strategic mission

A successful GQE program requires all personnel of the school to develop a shared 'global strategic vision' of the school and of its quality initiative. This is a monumental task when one considers the problems of communicating and gaining acceptance of such a concept across multiple cultures and geographic locations.

A well-designed shared global strategic vision of the school clearly defines the knowledge the school will be concerned with in the future. A quality vision statement will clearly explain how the school will work after quality improvement thinking has occurred. It will describe how things will get done and who will be responsible for what. Most importantly, it will embrace the values and beliefs that will motivate all staff to pursue quality excellence in a united, focused manner. (Huge190) & (David, 1993)

The quality vision statement must be developed with a clear view to the future and must be based on a set of quality principles that are understood and embraced by all employees. It is important that the senior lecturers that develop the quality vision statement focus on the end-results desired without allowing themselves to be limited by current perceived obstacles to their success. (Huge, 1990) & (Alexander, 1992)

Learning organisation dynamics

The roles of senior lecturer, staff and line workers require new focus and skills for programs pursues GQE (Fig. 2). Many problem-solving decisions and responsibilities will be driven downward. The organization will begin to see that the previous number of layers of management is no longer needed to successfully accomplish unit goals.

Role of senior lecturers: The focus of senior lecturers activity is to create a clear, unified strategic vision of the future direction of the school. Senior lecturers must also develop an appropriate strategy to achieve the unified vision while balancing both short-term and long-term school needs. Some of the senior lecturers decision-making responsibilities will be transferred to lower levels of management.

61

Role of staff: Middle staff's role evolves from one focused primarily on directing to one with an emphasis on coaching. This evolutionary change requires special training and is a difficult transition for many first-line supervisors. A major responsibility of staff is to assimilate and transfer the school's quality vision statement and strategies into everyday tactical activities. Staff must develop an atmosphere that encourages student's work-teams and group problem solving. They must assist line student-workers in identifying key problem areas, and they must empower student-workers to develop and initiate solutions.

Role of line workers: Those closest to the work have always been the most knowledgeable concerning what actions are needed to improve efficiency. Under a GQE program, empowered line workers are encouraged to work closely with cross-functional teams to develop process improvement and product innovation.

Restructuring the learning team hierarchy
Learning team restructuring is a powerful tool of the GQE team. Programs can develop strategic competitive advantage by continuously adapting the team's hierarchy when the changes are focused on achieving its 'quality vision'. Unfortunately, very few restructuring decisions are based on a clear vision of the long-term goals of the team. Few schools carefully assess their global strategic vision and modify their organizational structures to best align themselves with the long-term needs of the team. Many universities restructure as a reactive mechanism to short-term pressures and tend to organise to achieve short-term objectives.

No.	Quality Local languages responsibility	No.	Quality Global minds responsibility
1.	Quality is the responsibility of line staffs and first line supervisors		Senior lecturer is responsible for quality and must establish a unified quality vision complementary to cultural and geographic differences
2.	Quality is the responsibility of the quality control department		Quality is everyone's responsibility
3.	Line staff follow directions from senior lecturer on quality initiatives		Line workers are empowered to initiate quality improvements and to improve learning processes
4.	Training is formalised, generic and focused on line workers		Training starts with senior lecturer; training programs are developed locally and focus on local needs while supporting the 'quality vision'
5.	Vertical staff processes and hierarchical control dominate; unit goals take precedence over student needs		Cross-functional module processes are viewed as the critical focus of how work is done and focused on the student's needs
6.	The degree of emphasis on quality varies by department and subsidiary		Emphasis on a corporate 'quality culture' with all staff focused on the needs of the student

Fig(2) The evolving paradigm for the new GQE era: Organisational hierarchy and dynamics

The classic example is those universities that reduce head count and expenses equally among units and divisions. Although many staff may view this as 'fair', the better decision would be to carefully examine the future global strategic vision of the school, and reorganise human and financial assets in a way that will maximise the long-term goals of the school.

GQE: Quality culture change
Successful universities of the future will demonstrate the ability to develop and embrace changes in senior lecturer accountabilities, staff focus and line worker acceptance of responsibility and empowerment. The evolution of these new roles is difficult to develop in a national environment; developing these changes in a global environment is even more challenging. Corporations Practicing GQL will need to be successful in developing a global attitude and a global culture focused on superior quality and student service.

Universities engaged in quality initiatives should carefully scrutinise educational and training programs to ensure that they actively account for national cultural differences. One program rarely fits all.

Several excellent recent studies have documented cultural differences towards quality and student service. A recent study focused on Jeddah training centre attitudes toward quality. (Knight 1990), it found that:
◆ Arab students were perceived to be more influenced by price compared with Dutch students.

◆ Arab students were seen to be influenced by quality compared to Dutch customers.

◆ Jeddah training center and Maastracht School of Management planned to change the way they organised student service activity compared with only of Dutch programs.

A clear and unified culture among all workers in all geographic locations is needed to meet the competitive pressures of the 2000s. This common culture, spearheaded by a shared global strategic vision, will be a basic requirement to compete successfully in the remaining years of this decade. Peter Drucker has noted:

Because the modern organisation is composed of specialists, each with his or her own narrow area of ex-

pertise, its mission must be crystal clear. The organisation must be single-minded, or its members will become confused. They will follow their own speciality rather than apply it to the common task. They will each define results in terms of their own speciality and impose its values on the organisation. Only a focused and common mission will hold the organisation together and enable it to produce. Without such a mission, the organisation will soon lose credibility and, with it, its ability to attract the very people it needs to perform. (Peter, 1992)

The cultural change required in GQE focuses on common, shared values. Implementing a change in quality culture requires a program of well-signed education and coaching. All employees must share in the same experience and develop a common business language and a common focus based upon shared values with a common mission. (Macdonald, 1990)

GQE: Global quality training

Appropriate training measures are necessary to ensure a smooth transition in culture and to enable the quality revolution to develop in a predictable fashion.

According to Jeddah training centre should include the entire hierarchy of the school and should begin with senior lecturers. Jeddah training centre recommends a training program that is designe by broadly based task forces rather than prefabricated commercially available courses. The basic purpose of quality training should be to change behavior, and line staff should participate in the planning of the training program.

Programs that will be rolled out to subsidiaries require early input from senior subsidiary management. These training programs should be written at the subsidiary level while using the corporate program as a prototype. This will allow for proper cultural adaptation and proper language translation.

World-class training programs will enable workers to:

1. Understand the need for quality improvement and not rebel against it

2. Develop a sense of unified global vision and mission which will be reflected in increased productivity

3. Utilise new tools to solve problems

4. Identify customers' true needs

5. Show how each employee fits into the organisational structure

6. Help create a culture devoted to problem-solving and to continuous improvement

7. Develop new organisational models based on employee initiative, teamwork and multi-skills (Joseph, 1989)

Conclusion

Our research has alerted us to our own roles in this process and to the pitfalls of making assumptions about GQE. Frequent discussions and personal experiences of GQE resulted in shared understanding of the purposes and uses of portfolios and the value of reflections. We then assumed that the Arabic Academy of Science & Technology & Maastricht School of Management (MBA Program) had similar understandings. We also overlooked the risk involved in the review process itself when students select evidences that result from coursework; it is then shared with all of the faculty review committee members. In addition, the committee members who organised the portfolio underestimated the resistance to change and the disequilibrium often experienced by those who do not share the same visions. While this process was initiated and supported by Maastracht School of Management (MBA Program) and administrators who caution teachers about making assumptions about their students, we found that we were 'guilty' of making assumptions about our colleagues and that these assumptions have resulted in building some barriers to change.

References
Alexander, Hiam, Closing the Quality Gap: Lessons from America's Leading Companies,
Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1992, :p. 44-5.

A summary of a recent European Quality Study conducted by Knight Wendling, 'Logistics/quality and service', is reported by John Macdonald and John Piggott, Global Quality, Mercury Books, London, 1990, pp. 20-1.

A. T. Kearney, 'US manufacturing competitiveness', Chicago, Ill., 1992.

David L. 'Get your mission statement working', Management Review, January 1993, :p. 54-7.
5. Described by E. C. Huge in a book developed by

the Ernst & Young Quality Improvement Consulting Group, Total Quality: An Executive's Guide for the 1990's, Business One Irwin, Homewood, Ill., 1990, :p. 59.

6. Ernst & Young and the American Quality Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio 'International Quality Study', 1991.

7. Huge, op. cit., pp. 59-60.

8. Knight Wendling, op. cit., pp. 22-3.

9. Joseph, M. Juran, on Leadership for Quality, Free Press, New York, 1989.

10. Macdonald and Piggott, op. cit., p. 36.

11. Drucker, p (1992). 'The new society of organizations', Harvard Business Review, September-October, :p. 100

12. Patrick M. Byrne(1992)., 'Global leaders take a broad view', Transportation and Distribution, February, :p. 61-2

13. Stephen H. (1992)., 'Global mindsets for global managers', Training and Development, October , pp. 63-8.

Dr. Rashad Alsaed
Associate professor
International Business Department
Skyline University College

Dr. Nitham Sweedan
Associate professor
College of Economics & Administrative Sciences
Petra University