

## TSCF SERVICE QUALITY SCALE

Categories	Levels	Definitions
White	AA+ AA AA- A+ A A-	The organization offers quality services, possesses all the required skills and strives to develop a balanced, community-spirited and collaborative relationship with its users, its providers, and the environment.
Blue	BB+ BB BB- B+ B B-	The organization is genuinely dedicated to service adequacy and improvement, but lacks crucial resources or skills - both technological and relational.
Orange	CC+ CC CC- C+ C C-	The organization does not meet minimal standards of quality because of a lack of commitment, organization, consistency, professionalism and skills, be they technological, relational or ethical.
Red	DD+ DD DD- D+ D D-	The organization tries to dominate its clients or users, imposes on them unilateral and unfair conditions, attempts to render them technologically or economically dependent, and cartelizes the market, while being government- and third-party dependent.

<b>Black</b>	EE+ EE EE- E+ E E-	The organization instils abuse in the heart of its internal and external relationships. Criminal organizations, or organizations the activity, beliefs, and practices of which involve a serious blow to the common good, civil liberties, and the State of Law. The techniques they use may include at various degrees, threats, theft, blackmail, intimidation and the use of force.
--------------	-----------------------------------	--

■ The *TSCF service quality scale* (SQUAS) applies to all organizations, formal or not, be they private, public, or governmental - as long as they provide a good or service and implement or enforce policies directed towards the public. The way we insert these organizations in the scale is based on:

- Direct experience,
- Testimonies,
- Press reviews,
- Credible existing ratings,
- Incident-based observation,
- Analysis of their terms and conditions,
- Constitutional rules,
- Procedures,
- Communication styles and public declarations.

Only white and blue categories are trust-grade. The *rating levels* allow differentiating the levels of quality within a given category.

These ratings are not definitive; they depend on the development of the organization involved. Although they follow the levels of the main credit rating agencies, they do not have a financial or economic connotation, being indicative of a degree of organizational and societal performance.

■ *Air transport* is a highly competitive sector exposed to high fuel prices, security issues, and other variables. Our ratings of airline companies are based on the *following criteria*:

- Registration and administration,
- Flight performance and punctuality,
- Cabin space, comfort, and seat recline,
- Staff friendliness,
- Helpfulness and effectiveness,
- On-flight entertainment,
- Food and beverage,
- Airport registration,
- Baggage allowance and claim,
- Prices and refunds.

TSCF has suspended any work on airline evaluation due to the occurrence of covid-19. Air traffic has been affected worldwide by measures taken by governments such as closure of borders and passenger testing and quarantine. The sector endures considerable losses and shall be subject to intensified restructurings, concentrations and bankruptcies in the years to come.

■ The ailing *banking sector* (custodian banks) is a heavily regulated and government-dependent sector. Not only the range of the payment processing services offered by banks is poor, but under the pretext of combating 'money laundering' or other criminal activities, governments impose

increasing obligations on the average client. Governments even determine the products that are distributed by the sector, which is fairly unique in any industry. The sector is unlikely to rank high, because it depends on unpredictable third parties extrinsic to the client-provider relationship, and because the provider tends to take a leonine position toward the client on its own anyway. Closure of branches, staff layoffs and work process automation also affect the quality of the client-provider relationship.

*Our criteria for the banking sector* include:

- Bank safety (in terms of balance sheet and liabilities),
- Service range, accuracy and speed,
- Degree of dependence on government.

- *Evaluating Universities* can be tricky. Institutions can create a favourable environment for pedagogic performance, but it lies in a last resort on individual staff and students. In addition, performance evaluation in this sector is widely subjective, depending on the opinion of employers and families, the public image and fame of these organizations, the social class/cultural capital of the students they attract, and the involvement of these organizations in partnerships with other socio-economic actors.

The *purpose of a University* is first to transmit knowledge, even though it formalizes it by doing so. Producing new knowledge through research comes second - delivering cutting-edge research is an advantage, but not the primary goal. Producing externalities such as dissemination, application, social promotion and economic development comes third.

To *qualify for evaluation*, a University must offer the whole range of the degrees (undergraduate - graduate - PhD). Higher education institutions that focus on a particular segment of science or on the application of science are taken into account only if: - they cover a

sufficiently broad spectrum of disciplines and areas, - they practice fundamental research and teaching.

Our *evaluation criteria for Universities* include:

- Quality of education (student/faculty ratio, pedagogic methodology and research, logistics, income and budget) for 50%,
- Support to research (research budget, faculty involvement, patents, indexation and citation per faculty) for 25%,
- Organization development (HR policy, institutional income, collaboration with the economy, international outlook including faculty, research and programmes) for 25%.

Our approach, while it does not endorse as such the UN sustainable Development goals (SDGs) as some of them follow a policy agenda, does take into account reformulated *impact* areas such as quality education (SDG4), economic growth (SDG8), industry and infrastructure (SDG9), and partnerships (SDG17). Consensus within existing surveys is also taken into account, with exception of the Leiden ranking, which is based on limited and irrelevant criteria. As for the CHE ranking list, it is limited to German-speaking Universities, which makes international comparison very difficult.

Universities are evaluated against our scale levels. In addition to the classic TSCF evaluation class, a score in points is given. Ratings are attributed for 3 years, as such institutions are unlikely to implement and materialize new policies in a very short time.

- Nation-level evaluations will also be available in 2020. Our Index (the TSCF Social Capital Index), based on a wide set of data provided by a range of reputable institutions, offers a synthesis of several levels of analysis:

- Perceived corruption levels
- Economic freedom

- Freedom of press
- Human freedoms
- Trust in government and medias
- Civic engagement
- Direct social capital
- Population well-being (as a dependent control variable)

All these analysis levels are correlated. Our comparison bears mainly on countries that have similar economic development levels, such as OECD countries. It does not take the shape of a ranking, but the one of an evaluation in points. Our country ratings are to be released soon.