

An Evaluation of the Program Objectives and Outcomes of the Business Administration Departments at Fifteen Turkish Universities and Their Compliance with the Bologna Process

ABSTRACT

Defining quality assurance in higher education as "a comprehensive, systematic, and regular assessment of an education institution's educational, research, and administrative services and improving their quality," Günay (2012) states that the efforts of the European countries to build a common European higher education area and research platform have been shaped by the "Bologna Process." The educational programs developed under the Bologna Process support not only the quality assurance but also the national standardization of these programs (Kavak, Seferoğlu, Kabasakal, Zeynep Şen ve Uludağ, 2015). This paper aims to research and evaluate the realization or compliance levels of Bachelor of Science level business administration programs at fifteen universities in Turkey with regard to the Bologna Process and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Turkey (NQF-HETR). In this regard, the information about the 2018-2019 Business Administration curricula, program objectives, program outputs, and course content of these selected universities was reviewed from their publicly available websites. To evaluate their adherence to the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council's rules, the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, and international accreditation standards, the collected results were tabulated to comparatively analyze these selected business programs. The results revealed that the selected business administration schools in Turkey provided their program information in a non-standardized manner and that there were inadequacies in complying with the Bologna Process as well as establishing globally accepted "program objectives" expected from an accredited business program.

Keywords: Quality Assurance in Higher Education, Turkish Business School Accreditation, Higher Education. Program objectives, Learning outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the important factors that increase the development level of a country. A significant part of this education is provided by universities, which serve as an area of knowledge production. Again, universities have quite an important role in reaching high technology, which is the most important feature of our age, going beyond the existing level of knowledge, and ensuring a highly qualified workforce. For this reason, the race between countries actually takes places between the universities (Dalyan, 2001). As of 2019, our country has a total of 206 universities, 129 of which are state, 72 are foundation universities, and 5 are foundation vocational schools (CoHE, n.d.). However, these universities are not among the top 200 universities in the world ranking. On the list prepared by the Times Higher Education University Ranking, no Turkish University is among the top 350 universities as of 2019, and there is no state university in the top 500. According to another organization included in the assessment criteria, the Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), it is seen that there is only one Turkish state university in the 401-500 rankings in the top 500 universities in the world and there are 12 universities as state or foundation universities among the first 1000 universities (ARWU, 2019).

Internationalization in higher education goes beyond academic activities, becomes part of a wider economic and political agenda, and turns into a strategic area. In the 2010s, internationalization became an important subject in higher education policy. In this regard, a vision of internationalization that also includes the Bologna process, but is more comprehensive than that, is put forward. It has been observed that national strategies for internationalization in higher education have started to be established, new organizations come into play in this regard, legal regulations are prepared, and programs are put into practice. It is also seen that academic studies on this topic have increased in recent years in Turkey (Yılmaz, 2014).

The most important tools of internationalization are quality and accreditation. If universities can assess themselves according to international criteria (academic staff, physical facilities, institutional support, decision-making processes, continuous improvement plans, etc.), that institution can be easily recognized anywhere in the world. If any program can assess itself through international assessment processes, it can easily establish relations with every part of the world and make changes easily. In ensuring quality assurance in education, other methods other than accreditation are supervision and benchmark. By using one or more of these methods, the institution or program can provide more qualified education (Danish Evaluation Institute, 2011).

For the objectives of the Bologna Process, the upper framework binding all higher education institutions in our country has been determined by completing the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Turkey. Qualifications of Fields of Education have been defined within the scope of NQF-HETR (CoHE, 2010).

Methodology

In order to better determine the level of quality in higher education in Turkey, this paper sought answers for what is the status of the quality level of bachelor of science level programs at Turkish business administration departments compared to the international standards. In this context, recent scientific articles on quality assurance in higher education, which are prominent both in Turkey and around the world, have been reviewed. With the findings obtained from these studies, twenty criteria that will help determine the quality assurance status of the bachelor of science level business administration departments of 15 universities that stand out with their business programs in Turkey have been defined. These criteria have been evaluated with the information obtained from the websites of these subjectively selected universities and other publicly available sources, and results have been obtained about the quality assurance level of the Turkish business administration schools according to international criteria.

1. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

When higher education is perceived as the production of a highly qualified workforce, the quality of education is proved by the performance shown in the field of employment, and when perceived as a research career, research capabilities become the measures of outcome. The priority issue in the quality assurance assessment of higher education institutions is to ensure that the student who starts the relevant educational program can reach the qualifications specified in the Bologna Process and NQF-HETR. In the education process quality assurance system, it is expected that program qualifications are determined according to the national requirements, developments in the world, and the institution's mission, the program design is made in accordance with these qualifications, targeted learning outcomes are achieved, and the cycle of continuous improvement is ensured by monitoring the graduates.

Quality is usually inspected at the end of production and undertaken by a person outside the workforce (Tam, 2001). Quality assurance is a system based on the premise that everyone in an institution has a responsibility to maintain and improve the quality of the product or service. And quality control is a system that checks whether the products or the services reach the pre-determined standards. The main problem with the quality measurement in higher education is that the general quality of a university is determined with the assumption that everyone working there is of the same quality. A complete transformation to quality requires an institutional approach, followed by detailed retraining of all staff. The transformation requires the effort and willingness of everyone in the institution to transform into a quality-oriented and ever-evolving culture. Quality assurance requires not only the detection of faults, as in quality control but also the prevention of them even before they occur. It requires the commitment of everyone in the institution to an organizational culture that rewards quality and improves constantly in search of excellence.

The education standard in Europe is determined by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). ENQA is an umbrella organization that is responsible for coordinating higher education quality assurance activities across Europe. This organization promotes cooperation in the field of quality assurance in higher education in Europe and contributes by disseminating knowledge and expertise among its members and stakeholders to develop and share good practices and to develop the European dimension of quality assurance (THEQC, n.d.).

The institution responsible for the accreditation of business administration programs in the USA, the AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) updated its standards in 1992 and highlighted the issue of continuous improvement. In 2003, the institution renewed its Learning Assurance Policies. It gave importance to the subject of Learning Assurance, which used to constitute 10% of the accreditation. In the past, universities generally measured this criterion by using indirect measurement methods (such as student surveys, employer surveys, etc.) as the assessment of learning outcomes was ambiguous. With the new policy, AACSB made it compulsory to conduct a more direct measurement in this regard. AACSB asks from the business administration schools that they set specific learning targets, assess with suitable methods whether these targets have been achieved, understand the current situation, and update their programs accordingly.

Although AACSB has not provided very clear documentation on "Learning Assurance" in line with these policies, it can be summarized that the following areas must be included in the learning experience of business administration students:

1. Communication Skills
2. Ethical understanding
3. Analytical Skills
4. Use of information technologies
5. A multicultural understanding
6. Reflective thinking ability
7. Ethical and legal responsibilities of organizations
8. Financial theory, analysis, reporting, and markets

9. Creating value with products, services, and information through their integrated production and distribution structures
10. Group and individual dynamics within the organization
11. Statistical data analysis and management that will support decision-making processes
12. Local and global economic circles of organizations
13. Other administrative issues and skills to be defined by the university (Supply Chain, Marketing, etc.)

What should be particularly emphasized here is that AACSB particularly requires direct measurement with the assessment. Direct measurement of learning can only be possible with the students demonstrating their knowledge and abilities (Vitulo and Jones, 2010).

Although the issue of quality assurance has become quite prominent in our country in recent years, a systematic structuring has just begun in this area. In assessing the higher education systems of the countries according to the Bologna Process, the part where we failed the most in the assessment as a country was quality assurance. Interest in quality assurance has increased in recent years with the works carried out by CoHE within the scope of the Bologna Process (Süngü and Bayrakçı, 2010).

Accreditation refers to the assessment and external quality assurance process that measures whether academic and field-specific standards that were pre-determined by an accreditation body in a particular field are met by a higher education program.

Within the scope of the first accreditation works, two programs of METU's engineering faculty were included in ABET (Accreditation Board of Engineering and Technology - the USA) assessment from our country in 1994. As of 2006, 45 programs from five universities (METU, Boğaziçi Univ., ITU, BİLKENT, and Eastern Mediterranean Univ.) were assessed and accredited by ABET. As a result of these joint works and assessments, similar quality assessment systems have also begun to be established in Turkey. First, consisting of the deans of engineering and architecture faculties of universities in Turkey and the TRNC, the Engineering Deans Council (MDK) was established in 2001. In the second stage, the Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Engineering Programs (MÜDEK) was established by the MDK in 2002. MÜDEK assessed 10 engineering programs from eight universities between the years 2003-2004. Besides accreditation, there are assessment, supervision, and benchmark methods for ensuring quality assurance in education (Aslan, 2009).

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION PROCESS IN TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION

The quality levels of education and research activities and administrative services of Turkish Higher Education institutions should be assessed according to national and international quality standards. In order to fulfill this task, the Regulation of Academic Evaluation and Quality Assurance for Higher Education was published on September 20, 2005. The regulation complies with the quality assurance standards and guidelines developed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education - ENQA, and the recommendations in the Berlin Communiqué. Again, pursuant to the Regulation of Academic Evaluation and Quality Assurance for Higher Education, YÖDEK (The Commission of Academic Assessment and Quality Improvement in Higher Education) was established in 2005 through Inter-University Council (ÜAK). YÖDEK is an independent board established for quality assurance management. It is responsible for defining standards, instructions, and principles related to internal and external quality assurance activities in higher education institutions (Süngü and Bayrakçı, 2010). The Higher Education Supervisory Board inspects the compliance of education and other activities in higher education institutions with the purpose and main principles specified in Law No. 2547 (YDK, n.d.)

Turkish Higher Education Quality Council's (THEQC) membership application to the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) was accepted by the ENQA Board dated February 21, 2019 (THEQC, n.d.). According to Aslan's research, quality assurance is the continuous assessment of a higher education institution or program according to pre-determined criteria (UNESCO- CEPES, 2004), and it is basically carried out to ensure that the institution or program provides qualified education. One of the methods used to provide quality assurance is accreditation. The Turkish Higher Education Quality Council is responsible for the authorization and recognition activities of accreditation bodies in Turkey. The authorization of national accreditation bodies and the recognition process of international accreditation bodies are carried out within the framework of the principles and criteria set by the THEQC.

Conducting the processes of internal and external quality assurance, accreditation, and authorization of independent external assessment institutions, the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council is an institution with administrative and financial autonomy, having a public legal personality and special budget. Quality supervision is carried out by both internal and external boards. Determining the principles needed for the supervision, assessment, and improvement of education and research activities in higher education institutions, the published regulation has ensured the assessment of education and administration practices (THEQC, n.d.). For the implementation of the Bologna Process in Turkey, ECTS is an important field of study. In this context, ECTS institution coordinators have been defined to be responsible both for the implementation of ECTS and informing the students about ECTS in higher education institutions, and individual ECTS coordinators for each faculty/department (CoHE, 2010).

Authorized Accreditation Bodies in Turkey

- Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Engineering Programs-MÜDEK
- Medical Education Programs Evaluation and Accreditation Association-TEPDAD
- The Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of University Programs in Mathematical, Natural and Social Sciences-FEDEK
- Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Educational Institutions and Programs of Veterinary Medicine-VEDEK
- Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Teacher Education Programs-EPDAD
- Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Nursing Education Programs-HEPDAK
- The Communication Research Association (Evaluation and Accreditation Board for Communication Education-İLEDAK)
- Association of Evaluation and Accreditation of Health Sciences Programs-SABAK
- The Association of Turkish Tourism Academics (Tourism Education Evaluation and Accreditation Board-TURAK)

- Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Pharmacy Education Programs-ECZAKDER
- Turkish Psychological Association
- Theology Accreditation Agency-İAA

UNDER PEER REVIEW

3. Results

Approach:

In this study, it was aimed to assess the quality levels of the business administration programs of universities in Turkey according to international criteria. For this purpose, 15 prominent universities of Turkey, where there are more than 200 universities, in the field of business administration were selected subjectively. These universities consist of both state and foundation universities giving education in the field of business administration. The identities of assessed universities have been kept confidential, and they were given codes as U01, U02, etc.

The following four-step approach of Suskie (2009) has been adopted to assess the quality assurance status of business administration schools. Suskie considers the quality assessment in higher education as measuring whether students achieve the targeted learning outcomes with a systematic approach. (Vitulo and Jones, 2010)

- STEP 1 - Establish clear and measurable learning outcomes
- STEP 2 - Ensure that all students have sufficient opportunities to achieve those outcomes
- STEP 3 - Gather evidence to determine how well student learning matches the expectations
- STEP 4 - Use the resulting information to understand and improve student learning

In the assessment formed within the framework of these steps, 20 criteria were established from the analyzed scientific articles. These criteria have been descriptively assessed under the following headings:

- General Information
- Review of Learning Outcomes
- External and Internal Assessment, Benchmark, and Continuous Improvement
- Student Admission and Development
- Erasmus Program and Accreditation

Also Blooms Taxonomy is used to evaluate the level of learning outcomes.

Bloom's Taxonomy is a structure for classifying educational objectives. Bloom's taxonomy was proposed by an educational psychologist Bloom and his colleagues in 1956 in which three domains of learning were identified. The domains included cognitive (mental), affective (emotional/feelings/attitude) and psychomotor (physical ability) skills. The cognitive domain is the most widely used in developing goals and objectives for student learning. Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive objectives describes learning in six levels in the order of: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. The taxonomy was later revised by Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001)

Program outcomes, learning outcomes, vision and mission, information packages, curriculum, and other published quality reports of these 15 universities selected for the assessment have been

examined. This information was accessed through the websites of the relevant universities. In order to evaluate some criteria, the "Introduction to Business Administration" course, which is usually taught in the business department of every university, has been selected and assessed.

The business administration programs of these universities were assessed through a benchmark with **Table No. 3**, which was prepared as a result of the evaluation of the legal regulations of the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council, the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area, and some basic criteria of the AACSB, which stands out in the accreditation of business administration programs in the world. In this context, the study sought answers to the following questions:

Regarding the 15 Turkish universities subjected to assessment;

- What is their general information, status, the total number of students, the total number of academicians, the number of students in the business administration department, and the program levels offered?
- Do their mission, vision and strategic goals match the goals and learning outcomes of the Business Administration Department?
- Do the business administration program learning outcomes adequately support the following sub-headings? Communication, Ethics and Social Responsibility, Critical Thinking, Technology Usage and Knowledge, Multiculturalism, Multi-Disciplinary, Teamwork / Human Relations, International Attitude, Business Administration Sub-Functions Knowledge, Financial Theory/Analysis, Statistical Decision-Making, Supply Chain and Marketing, Local/Global Economy
- Regarding the business administration departments,
 - a) What are the levels of learning outcomes in terms of Bloom's Taxonomy?
 - b) What is the extent of the compliance of program targets with the NQF-HETR?
 - c) Have the course objectives been matched with the learning outcomes?
- What is the compulsory/elective course balance, teaching methods used in courses, and measurement and assessment methods in business administration department educational programs? What is the defined ECTS minimum graduation credit? Has the ECTS workload calculation been made in detail?
- Has external assessment, self-assessment, and benchmark been performed?
- Are there continuous improvement practices?
- Are the student admission conditions and prior education credit calculations defined?
- Does it have a diploma supplement?
- Is there an Erasmus program?
- Is there a THEQC institutional report?
- Is it included in an accreditation body?

Table No. 1 - General Information on the 15 Turkish Universities Subject to Assessment

Business Administration Program Levels
--

University	Status	Total Number of Students 2018-2019 data*	Total Number of Academicians 2019 data*	Number of Students at the Business Administration Department 2019 data**	Associate degree	Bachelor of Science	Master's Degree	PhD
U01	STATE	16,140	982	674	X	X	X	X
U02	STATE	29,402	2,019	464	X	X	X	X
U03	STATE	305,630	5,659	768	X	X	X	X
U04	FOUNDATION	9,510	500	173	X	X	X	X
U05	FOUNDATION	23,739	707	167	X	X	X	X
U06	FOUNDATION	25,065	871	553		X	X	X
U07	STATE	77,492	3,215	3,595	X	X	X	X
U08	STATE	34,439	1,647	630		X	X	X
U09	STATE	39,256	2,284	518		X	X	X
U10	STATE	54,517	1,576	792		X	X	X
U11	FOUNDATION	13,696	469	61	X	X	X	X
U12	FOUNDATION	35,999	891	57	X	X	X	X
U13	FOUNDATION	2,745	185	37		X	X	
U14	FOUNDATION	5,448	527	-		X	X	
U15	FOUNDATION	12,025	596	109		X	X	X

Source: *(<https://istatistik.yok.gov.tr/>) **(<https://yokatlas.yok.gov.tr/lisans-anasayfa.php>)

And the following table presents the resulting assessment criteria and what factors are taken into account in the review:

Table No. 2 - Assessment Criteria and Methods Explanation Table

Steps	Assessment Criteria	Criterion No	Assessment Method Description	References
STEP 1	Alignment of Mission, Vision and Strategic Objectives and Targets with Learning Outcomes	1.1	It has been examined whether the mission, vision, and strategic objectives of the business administration department were defined. It has been studied that whether these objectives, which are best practices, are correlated with the learning outcomes or whether it is ensured that these objectives are achieved by matching them.	(Vitullo and Jones, 2010)
	Program Targets, Outcomes, and Objectives	1.2	It has been evaluated whether the business administration learning outcomes, which was determined in writing by the institution and published on the Internet, address the following sub-headings at a sufficient level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.2.1- Communication • 1.2.2- Ethics and Social Responsibility • 1.2.3- Critical Thinking • 1.2.4- Technology Usage and Knowledge • 1.2.5- Multiculturalism • 1.2.6- Multi-Disciplinary • 1.2.7- Team Work / Human Relations • 1.2.8- International Attitude • Business Administration Sub-Function Information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2.9- Financial Theory/Analysis 1.2.10 - Statistical Decision-Making 1.2.11- Supply Chain and Marketing 1.2.12- Local/Global Economy 	
	General Bloom's Taxonomy Level	1.3	A subjective assessment of which of the 6-level program learning outcome definitions that have been selected according to the revised Bloom's Taxonomy generally address. (1-Remember 2- Understand 3- Apply 4- Analyze 5- Evaluate 6- Create)	

Table No. 2 - Assessment Criteria and Methods Explanation Table

Steps	Assessment Criteria	Criterion No	Assessment Method Description	References
	Compliance of Program Objectives with the NQF-HETR	1.4	It has been evaluated that the standard learning outcomes of the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Turkey for Business Administration Bachelor of Science programs are matched with the program outcomes and met adequately.	National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Turkey (http://tyyc.yok.gov.tr/)
STEP 2	Matching Course Objectives with Learning Outcomes	2.1	It has been evaluated whether a match is made between the determined business administration learning outcomes and the program objectives of the courses in the curriculum and whether it is determined how much each course contributes to these learning outcomes.	www.tyyc.yok.gov.tr
	Course Distribution Balance of the Program * (Elective Courses/Total Courses)	2.2	It has been calculated whether the elective courses that will enrich the student's learning experience occupy at least 25% in total in addition to the compulsory courses.	(Yılmaz, 2014)
	Teaching Methods (Throughout the Program)	2.3	It has been evaluated what teaching methods will be applied for the student throughout the program and if they are defined. Fewer than 10 methods are rated Low, 11 to 15 as Medium, and 16 and above as Advanced Level.	(Vitulo and Jones, 2010)
	Exemplary Course Teaching Methods (Introduction to Business Administration)	2.4	The application rate of the above-mentioned methods on a course basis has been examined for an exemplary course (Introduction to Business Administration).	
STEP 3	Measurement and Assessment Methods	3.1	It has been evaluated what kind of techniques are used to measure the student's achievement of the course objectives; thus, the learning outcomes.	(Vitulo and Jones, 2010)
	ECTS Minimum Graduation Credit*	3.2	It has been examined whether the courses are given credit with ECTS in line with the Bologna Process and whether a minimum total ECTS credit has been determined for graduation.	(Süngü and Bayrakçı, 2010)
	ECTS Workload Calculation* (Out-of-Class Workload/Total Workload) (Exemplary Course- Introduction to	3.3	According to the ECTS credit system, the convenience of the out-of-class workload to the total workload ratio for an exemplary course selected while the student was in the business administration program has been evaluated.	

Table No. 2 - Assessment Criteria and Methods Explanation Table

Steps	Assessment Criteria	Criterion No	Assessment Method Description	References
	Business Administration)			
	Self-Assessment/Direct Measurement	3.4	It has been evaluated whether the institution carries out its own quality self-assessment based on the business administration program according to a quality or accreditation framework. Besides, it has been examined which direct measurements and assessments are made regarding whether the student is learning in line with the objectives during the courses and throughout the program.	(Aslan, 2009)
	External Assessment (Business Administration Department)	3.5	It will be checked whether the program has been subjected to any external assessment (by an independent structure).	(Aslan, 2009)
	Benchmark	3.6	It will be examined whether the institution's quality level has made any comparison studies.	
STEP 4	The Existence of Continuous Improvement Practices	4.1	It has been examined that whether the institution implements a continuous improvement in general and in the business administration program in line with the quality assurance cycle; i.e., whether improvements have been made in the program in the light of measurement data from previous steps (E.g. curriculum change, application of new education techniques, additional course applications, etc.)	(Vitulo and Jones, 2010)
	Student Admission and Recognition of Prior Education	4.2	It has been checked that whether the students to be included in the program have a process for the recognition of the course and education credits they have received from other institutions and their formal and non-formal gains (experience, course, professional certification, etc.).	

Table No. 2 - Assessment Criteria and Methods Explanation Table

Steps	Assessment Criteria	Criterion No	Assessment Method Description	References
	Diploma Supplement*	4.3	It is a document that is given to the graduates of the institutions affiliated to the Council of Higher Education (CoHE) together with their diplomas. It helps to make higher education qualifications easier to understand, especially outside the country in which they are awarded. Europass Diploma Supplement was developed jointly by UNESCO and the European Commission. It has been evaluated whether the diplomas of the business administration department are given with this Diploma Supplement.	(Süngü and Bayrakçı, 2010)
	ERASMUS Program*	4.4	Since it is an indication to follow the Bologna Process, it has been checked whether the university is included in the ERASMUS program and whether it makes student/lecturer transfers in this program.	
	THEQC Institutional Report	4.5	It has been examined whether the institutional report of the university has been prepared by the Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC) that is registered under the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). This report is important for identifying the deficiencies of universities in terms of learning qualities. In this report, it has also been checked whether a review that is specific to the business administration program is carried out.	THEQC (https://yokak.gov.tr/)
	Participation in an Accreditation Program	4.6	It has been examined whether the university's business administration or a unit close to that has a local or international accreditation. Accreditations with Particular Attention Paid To: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AACSB (USA): Accreditation body for Bachelor of Science level business administration programs • AMBA (UK): Accreditation body for graduate business administration programs. • CEMS (UK): Accreditation body for graduate programs for international business administration management. • EQUIS: Stands out as the European equivalent of 	aacs.edu fibaa.org aqas.eu associationofmbas.com cems.org efmdglobal.org (Süngü and Bayrakçı, 2010)

Table No. 2 - Assessment Criteria and Methods Explanation Table

Steps	Assessment Criteria	Criterion No	Assessment Method Description	References
			<p>AACSB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foundation for International Business Administration Accreditation (FIBAA) and Agency for Quality Assurance (AQAS) are other Germany-based accreditation bodies that are also recognized by the THEQC. • Association of Chartered Certified Accountants (ACCA): A UK-based accreditation for the accounting department. 	

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Table No. 3 - Finding Details Table

Step	Criterion No	U01	U02	U03	U04	U05	U06	U07	U08	U09	U10	U11	U12	U13	U14	U15
STEP 1	1.1	The 15 main strategic objectives of the university are available, the goals and objectives have been determined, and they are in line with the department's goals and objectives.	Vision and objectives have been defined. Strategic objectives have been defined. In line with the learning outcomes.	Vision and objectives have been defined. Strategic objectives have been defined. In line with the learning outcomes.	Mission and Vision parts are weak. Have strategic objectives. Not in line with the learning outcomes.	Mission and vision parts are present. The detailed 2019-23 Strategic plan is in line with the goals and objectives of the department.	The Vision and Mission are defined and in line with the learning outcomes.	The Vision and Mission are defined and in line with the learning outcomes. The strategic plan is also available in writing.	Vision and Mission are defined. In line with the learning outcomes.	Vision and Mission are defined. In line with the learning outcomes.	Vision and Mission are defined. In line with the learning outcomes.	The strategic goals and objectives of the university have been determined, and they are in line with the department's goals and objectives.	The goals and objectives are specified, and they are in line with the department's goals and objectives.	Program targets are specified. The goal is specified, and it is in line.	Vision and objectives have been defined. In line with the department's targets and goals.	The mission and vision are in line with the department's targets and goals. Strategic goals and targets are specified.
	1.2	Not reached	12 Learning Outcomes	16 Learning Outcomes	13 Learning Outcomes	15 Learning Outcomes	19 Learning Outcomes	15 Learning Outcomes	11 Learning Outcomes	13 Learning Outcomes	15 Learning Outcomes	19 Learning Outcomes	30 Learning Outcomes	15 Learning Outcomes	13 Learning Outcomes	11 Learning Outcomes
	1.2.1	Not reached	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available
	1.2.2	Not reached	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.3	Not reached	Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Partially Available	Partially Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Partially Available	Not Available
	1.2.4	Not reached	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Partially Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.5	Not reached	Available	Available	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Not available	Available	Not available	Not Available	Not Available
	1.2.6	Not reached	Available	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.7	Not reached	Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.8	Not reached	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.9	Not reached	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.10	Not reached	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Partially Available	Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.2.11	Not reached	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available	Partially Available	Partially Available	Available
	1.2.12	Not reached	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Available	Available	Available	Partially Available
	1.3	Generally in the first 4 levels - Provides solutions Analyzes Develops strategy	Generally in the first 4 levels - Provides solutions Analyzes Develops strategy	Generally in the first 3 levels - Knowledge Understanding Application	Generally in the first 3 levels - Knowledge Understanding Application	Generally in the first 3 levels - Knowledge Understanding Application	Generally in the first 3 levels - can demonstrate what understood can use can understand	Generally in the first 4 levels - Provides solutions Analyzes Develops strategy	Generally in the first 3 levels - can perform can use aware	Generally in the 4-6 levels - on skills and analytical abilities	Generally in the 3-4 levels - acquires knowledge questions analyzes	Generally in the 5th level - Provides solutions Analyzes, evaluates Develops strategy	Generally in the 4th level - Acquires knowledge, questions, Analyzes	Generally in the first 4th level - analyzes, can provide solutions, can develop a strategy.	Generally in the first 4th level - Acquires knowledge, questions, Analyzes	Generally in the 3-4 levels - acquires knowledge questions analyzes

Table No. 3 - Finding Details Table

Step	Criterion No	U01	U02	U03	U04	U05	U06	U07	U08	U09	U10	U11	U12	U13	U14	U15
	1.4	Unable to reach the NOF-HETR Matrix	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Unable to reach the NOF-HETR Matrix	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Unable to reach the NOF-HETR Matrix	Yes - Learning Outcomes and the NOF-HETR matrix have been prepared clearly	Received the certificate of excellence in 2013 regarding the compliance with the NOF-HETR by CoHE. Program goals, outcomes, and the program are in line with the NOF-HETR. Program goals have been defined, knowledge, skills, and competence (Ability to Work Independently and Take Responsibility, learning communication and social competence, Field-specific competencies) have been defined, and they are placed in an appropriate way for the Business Administration department.	Program goals, outcomes, and the program are in line with the NOF-HETR. Program goals have been defined, knowledge, skills, and competence (Ability to Work Independently and Take Responsibility, learning communication and social competence, Field-specific competencies) have been defined, and they are placed in an appropriate way for the Business Administration department.	Program goals, outcomes, and the program are in line with the NOF-HETR. Program goals have been defined, knowledge, skills, and competence (Ability to Work Independently and Take Responsibility, learning communication and social competence, Field-specific competencies) have been defined, and they are placed in an appropriate way for the Business Administration department.	Program objectives and outcomes, a matrix comparison of the educational programs, and a matching have not been made. A matrix has not been made with the NOF-HETR. Program and learning outcomes have been prepared for each course; however, the relationship matrix between them has not been made.	In the content of the educational program, each course contains the learning outcomes and sub-skills, the course's learning outcomes as well as the program competencies, and no match has been made with the NOF-HETR.
STEP 2	2.1	Not reached	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes	Outcomes and contributions are matched; however, there are differences between learning outcomes in the course content and the learning outcomes published for the entire program.	Not reached	Along with the ECTS workload analysis, each course has been matched with Learning Outcomes.	Not reached	Available	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes. There is also information on what percentage is supported in total.	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes. Learning outcomes of each course content and the learning outcomes are shown separately, and the matrix between them has been made.	Each course in the department is matched with each program learning outcomes. Learning outcomes of each course content and the learning outcomes are shown separately, and the matrix between them has been made.	Learning outcomes of each course content and the learning outcomes are shown separately, and the matrix between them has been made.	Learning outcomes of each course content and the learning outcomes are shown separately, and the matrix between them has been made.
	2.2	25%	37%	28%	20%	25%	19%	28%	18%	18%	25%	15%	20%	17%	44%	20%

Table No. 3 - Finding Details Table

Step	Criterion No	U01	U02	U03	U04	U05	U06	U07	U08	U09	U10	U11	U12	U13	U14	U15
	2.3	No information	Not specified	Medium Level-9 Methods Medium Level - Course, Case Study, Small Group Discussion, Seminar, Group Work, Trip, Laboratory, Homework, Survey Study	Medium Level - 8 Methods Face-to-Face Education, homework, presentation, project, trip, group activities, conference,	Low Level - 7 Methods Face-to-Face lecture, Question & Answer, internship, project assignments, presentation, technical visits, seminar.	Advanced Level - 20 methods: Course, Discussion Courses, Special Support, Role Play, Problem-Solving, Case Study, Brainstorm, Small Group Discussion, Demonstration, Simulation, Seminar, Group Work, Field Work, Laboratory, Homework, Viva, Survey Study, Panel, Guest Speaker, Student Club Activities	Not specified	Medium/Low Level - 13 methods. Attendance/Participation, Laboratory, Practice, Field Work, Course-Specific Internship, Quizzes/Studio Critiques, Homework, Presentation/Jury, Projects, Seminar/Workshop, Midterms, Finals (Defined but not applied for each course)	Not specified.	Advanced Level - 19 different methods have been specified. (Course, Discussion, Special Support, Role Play/Drama, Problem-Solving, Case Study, Brainstorm, Small Group Discussion, Demonstration, Simulation, Seminar, Group Work, Field Work, Laboratory, Homework, Viva, Examination/Survey Study, Panel, Guest Speaker) (Exactly the same content as some of the other universities)	Medium Level-14 methods: Field Work, Group work/homework, Vocational activity, Vocational trip, Student Club and council, Project preparation Report, Seminar Social activity, Practice, Internship	Advanced level - 18 methods: Course and In-Class Activities, Field Survey, Group work, Laboratory Reading, Homework, Project work, Seminar, Technical Internship, Visit/Web-Based Learning, Practice Working in the workplace, Vocational Activity, Social activity, Thesis, Field Work, Report preparation	Advanced Level - 18 methods: Course, Discussion, Case Study, Problem-Solving, Show and Have Them Made, Demonstration, Laboratory, Reading, Project Preparation, Thesis, Preparation, Peer Education, Seminar, Technical Visit, Lecture, Conference, Brainstorm, Question & Answer, Individual and Group Work	Not specified	Low Level - 7 methods have been specified. Lecture, question & answer, discussion, demonstration, case study, report preparation, and presentation
	2.4	Not reached	Verbal lecture, Case analysis, Video, project	Verbal lecture, Case study discussions	Lecture, Visual, Discussion, Question & Answer, Team/Group Work, Project Design/Management.	Not specified	1:Lecture, 2: Question & Answer, 3: Discussion	Lecture Method, Question & Answer Method, Discussion Method	Project, Midterms, and Finals	Not reached	1:Lecture, 2:Question & Answer, 3:Discussion, 4:Exercise and Practice, 9:Simulation, 10:Brainstorm, 12:Case Study, 14:Individual Work, 15:Problem-Solving	There are teaching and management methods but which one to use is not specified.	There are teaching and management methods. The course was selected from these.	Reading, Homework, Question & Answer, Individual and Group Work, Role Play, Animation-Improvisation	Not specified.	Lecture, discussion, question & answer, case study review, report preparation, and presentation

Table No. 3 - Finding Details Table

Step	Criterion No	U01	U02	U03	U04	U05	U06	U07	U08	U09	U10	U11	U12	U13	U14	U15
STEP 3	3.1	Midterms, homework, practice, Project, laboratory classes, and finals.	Midterms, homework, practice, Project, laboratory classes, and finals.	Midterms, homework, practice, Project, laboratory classes, and finals.	Midterms, homework, practice, Project, laboratory classes, and finals.	Pre-Test - Midterms - Finals	It is not specified how the measurement and assessment will be carried out on the basis of the program. Instead, it is specified that the assessment process of each course would be explained in that course's program. Exam, Homework, and Performance are listed as measurement and assessment for the selected Introduction to Business Administration course.	No measurement and assessment are specified except for the Midterms and Finals.	It is not stated what are the assessment approaches on the program basis; however, they are present in the course content.	Not reached	Midterms, quiz, finals (given on course basis; not available on program basis)	Midterm Peer Assessment, Computer-Aided Presentation, Document Presentation, Final Exam Observation Report, Quiz, Homework Assessment Report, Presentation, Verbal Assessment Thesis Presentation, Expert/ Jury Evaluation Case Presentation, Competition	Midterm Computer-Based Presentation, Final Exam Quiz Report, Presentation, Homework Assessment, Thesis Evaluation, Document Presentation, Expert Evaluation Board Exam Practice exam, Year-End Final Exam, Internship Exam	Midterm Presentation Semester Final Exam Quiz Report, Assessment Homework Assessment Viva Thesis Presentation, Jury Evaluation Practice Exam Assessment of the Practice Training in the Workplace Participation in Discussions	Not specified	Attendance Laboratory Application Field Work Course-Specific Internship (If Any) Homework Presentation Projects Seminar Quiz Listening Midterms Final
	3.2	249	253	242	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240	240
	3.3	Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	68%	71%	71%	Not specified	66%	Not specified	35%	Not specified	57%	45%	Not specified	82%
	3.4	Internal audit reports are available but not based on the business administration department.	Internal audit reports are available but not based on the business administration department.	Internal audit reports are available but not based on the business administration department.	Internal audit reports are available but not based on the business administration department.	Internal audit reports are available but not based on the business administration department.	Internal audit reports are available but not based on the business administration department.	N/A	It is said on their website that it has been made, but no report was found to confirm it. Also, approaches that measure learning directly could not be found.	N/A SPECIFICALLY FOR THE BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM - HOWEVER, there are QUALITY ACTIVITIES FOR UNIVERSITY-WIDE (ISO9001)	It has been noted that internal assessment reports are prepared in detail in quality activities carried out university wide.	It has been stated that it was made for the AACSB; however, the relevant document could not be reached. Also, approaches that measure learning directly could not be found.	2018 Institutional Self-Evaluation Report INTERNAL EVALUATION IS AVAILABLE.	(ISO10002) DOCUMENT (ISO27001:2013) (ISO9001:2015) 2018-2017 Institutional Self-Evaluation Reports Internal assessment is available July 2017 Self-assessment - Monitoring report is available.	2017 Institutional Self-Evaluation Report is available. Committed to Excellence Certificate (EFQM) (ISO9001:2008)	(ISO9001:2015) is available.

Table No. 3 - Finding Details Table

Step	Criterion No	U01	U02	U03	U04	U05	U06	U07	U08	U09	U10	U11	U12	U13	U14	U15
																the business administration department which are updated and developed.
	3.5	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not reached	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	Not available on a department basis	N/A	N/A	Not available on a department basis
	3.6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

STEP 4	4.1	AVAILABLE (Survey Meeting)	Available in the internal audit report	N/A (Available for ISO9001 general inst.)	Available in the internal audit report	Available in the internal audit report	N/A	N/A	N/A (Available for ISO9001 general inst.)	YES	N/A	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	N/A	AVAILABLE	
	4.2	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for Turkish and foreign students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified and used in practice.	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for Turkish and foreign students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified and used in practice.	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified and used in practice.	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified and used in practice.	In accordance with the provisions of the "Regulation on Principles of Undergraduate Transfer Between Higher Education Institutions", it is possible to be transferred from a department/program that is applying the equivalent educational programs to another department/program.	It is referred to the relevant regulation for the conditions, and it is stated that the preparations for the admission of informal experience and education are still ongoing.	It is referred to the relevant regulation of the university for the conditions.	It is referred to the relevant regulation of the university for the conditions.	Information Not Available	Information Not Available	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for Turkish and foreign students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified and used in practice.	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for Turkish and foreign students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified, but there is no regulation specific to the business administration department.	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for Turkish and foreign students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified, and there is a specific implementation for the business administration department.	The student admission conditions are clearly stated for Turkish and foreign students. Admission conditions of previous education are specified and used in practice.	The registration information booklet was prepared by the student affairs office. Information is contained in it. Admission conditions of previous education are not specified.	
	4.3	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	(Europass) Diploma Supplement	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	Information Not Available	Information Not Available	Information Not Available	Information Not Available	Information Not Available	AVAILABLE	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE, EUROPASS DOCUMENTS ARE ALSO AVAILABLE	Diploma Supplement is AVAILABLE	No information was found on the Diploma Supplement
	4.4	AVAILABLE, SUNY contract is also	AVAILABLE, SUNY contract is also	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE, MOU contract is also available	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE	AVAILABLE, MOU and MOA contracts	AVAILABLE

Table No. 3 - Finding Details Table

Step	Criterion No	U01	U02	U03	U04	U05	U06	U07	U08	U09	U10	U11	U12	U13	U14	U15
		available	available												are also available	
	4.5	The report dated December 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated December 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	N/A	N/A	N/A	The report dated November 30, 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated December 25, 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated December 6, 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated January 2018 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated February 22, 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated 2018 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	The report dated October 25, 2017 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.	N/A	N/A	The report dated December 12, 2018 is available and has been prepared for the entire university. There is no evaluation specific for the business administration department.
	4.6	ACCA	N/A	AACSB Accredited.	N/A	AQAS	N/A	AACSB Member and aims for an accreditation soon.	N/A	Has ABET Accreditation	AACSB Member and aims for an accreditation soon.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

UNDER PEER REVIEW

Discussion

The findings of this paper are presented by following the order of the questions in the research problem. First, general information of Fifteen Universities is presented in the findings. Then, the quality assurance steps of the business administration department have been reviewed by considering the evaluation criteria, and a course that is common to all of these selected universities has been selected, and the information packages of this course have been compared.

General Information

The status of the fifteen universities selected from Turkish universities, the total number of students in 2018-2019, the total number of academicians in 2019, and the number of business administration students, and the offered program levels have been examined. This information is presented in **Table No. 3**. Accordingly, U01, U02, U03, U04, U05, U07, U011, and U012 provide associate's degree, bachelor of science, master's and Ph.D. level educational programs; U06, U08, U09, U010, and U015 provide bachelor of science, master's and Ph.D. education; U013 and U014 provide bachelor of science and master's education.

Review of Learning Outcomes

It has been checked whether the vision and mission of the Business Administration Department of the fifteen universities examined within the scope of this study and the targets and outcomes of this department are aligned and if they have any strategic plans. From the fifteen universities reviewed, it has been seen that the vision and mission of the business administration departments are in line with their targets and outcomes, with the exception of U04. While the universities with the codes U01, U02, U03, U04, U05, U07, U11, and U15 have stated the strategic goals and targets in writing according to a plan, the others have not done it.

When the **learning outcomes** of the 15 universities are reviewed;

- Communication; information about communication is not available in the outcome of U04. While it is partially available in U07 and U10, it has been seen that it is available in the learning outcomes of the other 11 universities.
- Ethics and Social Responsibility; While not available in U03, U05, and U07, it is partially available in U13 and U15. The learning outcomes of other universities meet the criteria related to ethics and social responsibility.
- Critical Thinking criterion; The universities with the codes U05, U10, and U15 do not meet this criterion. The learning outcomes of other universities include outcomes related to critical thinking.
- Technology Usage and Knowledge; While not available in U02, U03, U04, and U08, and partially available in U06, U07, U12, U14, and U15, the others meet this criterion.
- Multiculturalism criterion; While the universities with the codes U04, U05, U07, U08, U10, U11, U13, U14, and U15 do not meet this criterion, U02, U03, U06, U09, and U12 meet.
- Multi-Disciplinary criterion; While the universities with the codes U02, U05, U06, U07, U09, U10, U11, and U12 meet this criterion, U13 and U15 partially have it; however, U03, U04, and U08 do not meet.

- Teamwork / Human Relations; Available in U02, U03, U04, U06, U07, U08, U09, U10, U11, U12, U13, and U14, and partially available in U15. It is not available in U05.
- International Attitude; While U06, U07, U08, U09, U11, U12, U13, and U14 meet this criterion, U15 partially meets. U02, U03, U04, U05, and U10 do not meet it.
- Business Administration Sub-Functions Knowledge: It is examined under four sub-headings.
 - Financial Theory/Analysis; Not available in U03, U08, and U10. While it is partially available in U13 and U15, the learning outcomes of other universities include this criterion.
 - Statistical Decision-Making; Not available in U03, U05, U06, U08, and U10. Partially available in U12 and U15. Others meet this criterion.
 - Supply Chain and Marketing; U03, U05, U06, and U08 do not meet this criterion. While U12, U13, and U14 partially meet it, other universities meet this criterion.
 - Local/Global Economy; While not available in U03 and U10, and partially available in U15, the learning outcomes of other universities include this criterion.

Information about the learning outcomes of U01 has not been obtained. For this reason, it is not included in the learning outcomes analysis.

The NQF-HETR ensures that different qualifications can be associated with each other in the whole system (NQF-HETR, n.d.). Based on this, when we look at the alignment of program goals with the NQF-HETR, it is seen that matching of learning outcomes with U01, U07, U09, U14, and U15 is not made. It is not clearly stated which and to what extent it meets the knowledge, skills, and competence criteria determined by the NQF-HETR. Universities with the codes U02, U03, U04, U05, U06, U08, U10, U11, U12, and U13 have defined their program goals, matched them with the knowledge, skills, and competence (ability to work independently and take responsibility, learning, communication and social competence, field-specific competencies) and placed them in accordance with the NQF-HETR criteria. Besides, the university with the code U11 received the certificate of excellence in 2013 regarding the compliance with the NQF-HETR by CoHE. In universities with codes U01, U07, and U09, the NQF-HETR matrix information could not be reached. For the program objectives and outcomes in the university with the U14 code, no matrix matching is made in general education programs. Also, no matrix has been made with the NQF-HETR. Program and learning outcomes have been prepared for each course; however, the relationship matrix between them has not been made. In the content of the educational program of the university with code U15, each course contains the learning outcomes and sub-skills, course's learning outcomes as well as the program competencies; however, no match has been made with the NQF-HETR.

The General Bloom's Taxonomy Levels when the learning outcomes of the 15 universities have been reviewed; While the universities with the codes U03, U04, U05, U06, and U08 correspond to the first three levels of the Bloom's Taxonomy, which are remember, understand, and apply, the universities U02, U07, U12, U13, and U14 correspond to its first level. While U01, U10, and U15 correspond to the first three-four levels, U11 corresponds to the first five levels. What is expected here is the ability to interpret and evaluate data, identify problems, analyze, and develop solutions based on research and evidence by using the advanced level of knowledge and skills acquired in their Fields in the 6th Level Bachelor of Science Level Education Competencies of the NQF-HETR (NQF-HETR, n.d.).

When the matching of the course achievements with the learning outcomes is observed, the information on this could not be reached for the universities with the codes U01, U07, and

U09. It has been determined that the universities with codes U02, U03, U04, U05, U08, U10, U11, U12, U13, U14, and U15 have made this matching. The university with the code U06; outcomes and contributions are matched; however, there are differences between learning outcomes in the course content and the learning outcomes published for the entire program.

External Assessment, Internal Assessment, Benchmark, and Continuous Improvement

THEQC Institutional Report is not available in universities with the codes U03, U04, U05, U13, and U14. It is available in other universities. An external assessment specific to the business administration; While this information cannot be reached in one of the universities, U06, it is not included in any of the others.

Internal assessment; Not available in U06, and available in U01, U02, U03, U04, U05, U07, U11, U12, U13, and U15. There is ISO9001 in U08 for quality activities. It is stated in U10 that it is made for the AACSB; however, the relevant document could not be reached. ISO9001:2015 is available in U14.

Benchmark; such information was not available in any of the fifteen universities. Continuous improvement and knowledge; Not available in U06, U07, and U10, and available in others.

Course Distribution Balance and ECTS

Within the scope of this study, the course content of business administration departments in these 15 universities has been reviewed. When the data on elective courses at these universities is checked, it has been seen that while the percentage of elective courses among all courses in the educational program is 25% in the universities with the codes U01, U05, and U10 as foreseen in the Bologna Process, the universities U04, U06, U08, U09, U11, U12, U13, and U15 are below this percentage. U02, U03, U07, and U14 are above this percentage, and it has been seen that the elective course rate of the U02 and U14 is higher than others. The reason for looking at this rate is the fact that the courses that consider the field and non-field balance, provide cultural depth and the opportunity to get to know different disciplines and ensure global and individual competencies in the educational programs must be at least 25% (THEQC, 2018-2019).

ECTS credit is a value based on the workload and that covers all the work that the student has to do (theory, practice, seminar, individual work, exams, assignments, etc.) in order to complete a course successfully. This value also indirectly indicates how much each course covers the total workload required to complete an academic year as full-time at a higher education institution (CoHE, 2010). Based on these determinations, a common course was selected from the Business Administration departments of these 15 universities, and it has been reviewed in terms of workload hours and ECTS value. An assessment has been made by calculating the in-class and out-of-class workload of the "Introduction to Business Administration" course taken as an example. The workload calculation of the sample course at universities with codes U01, U02, U03, U04, U07, U09, U11, and U14 has not been made in detail, and in-class workload and out-of-class workload are not known. While the in-class workload of U05 is 29%, the out-of-class workload is 71%. While the in-class workload of U12 is 47%, the out-of-class workload is 57%, and the in-class workload of U13 is 55% and the out-of-class workload is 45%. While the in-class workload of U15 is 18%, the out-of-class workload is 82%. While the in-class workload of U06 is 29%, the out-of-class workload is 71%. It has been observed that U08 in-class workload is 34% and out-of-class workload is

66%; U10 in-class is 65% and out-of-class is 35%; U12 in-class is 48% and out-of-class is 52%; U13 in-class is 55% and out-of-class is 45%; U15 in-class is 18% and out-of-class workload is 82%. In the information about the reviewed course, it is noted that the workload of the courses differs according to the universities. Since course credits are created based on student workload, they encourage out-of-class activities of the students and ensure that these activities are transferred to their degree (CoHE, 2010).

According to the Bologna Process, a student has to acquire 240 ECTS and be successful in order to graduate at the Bachelor of Science level (CoHE, 2010). It is seen that the universities with the codes U01, U02, and U03 exceed 240 ECTS. And the other 13 universities have 240 ECTS.

In the Business Administration departments of universities with codes U07, U09, and U14, there is no information on teaching methods (throughout the program). While the universities with the codes U08 and U11 use 13 to 14 teaching methods, the universities U05 and U15 use 1 to 7 methods, and the universities U06, U10, U12, and U13 use 18 and above. U01 and U02 have not specified this. It has been observed that U03 and U04 use 8 to 9 teaching methods. It has been determined that the teaching methods of the two universities examined within this context are identical to each other.

It was examined which teaching methods the Introduction to Business Administration course that was selected as the common course of the fifteen universities uses. U01, U05, U09, and U14 have not specified. It is seen that while U04 uses methods of lecture, visual, discussion, question & answer, team/group work, project design/management; U02 uses verbal lecture, video, case analysis, project methods; U06, and U07 use lecture, question & answer, discussion methods. While U08 uses project, midterms, and final methods; U03 uses verbal lecture and case study discussions; U10 uses lecture, question & answer, discussion, exercise and practice, simulation, brainstorm, case study, individual work, and problem-solving methods U11 has teaching and management methods but which one to use is not specified. U12 selected only the "course" from the teaching and management methods. U13 uses reading, homework, question & answer, individual and group work, role play-animation-improvisation methods.

For the measurement and assessment methods, U01, U02, U03, and U04 use midterms, homework, practice, project, laboratory classes, and final exam methods, U05 uses pre-test, midterm, and final exam methods. In U06 and U08, measurement and assessment methods are stated in the content of each course, not on the basis of the curriculum. U07 uses midterms and finals; U09 and U14 have no available information. And U11 uses more methods than others, which are: Midterms, peer assessment, computer-aided presentation, document presentation, final exam, observation report, quiz, homework assessment, report presentation, verbal assessment, thesis presentation, expert/jury evaluation, case presentation, competition. U12 uses the methods of midterms, computer-aided presentation, final exam, quiz, report presentation, homework assessment, viva, thesis presentation, document presentation, expert evaluation, board exam, practice exam, year-end final exam, and internship exam. U13 has also added different methods such as midterms, presentation, finals, quiz, report assessment, homework assessment, viva, thesis presentation, jury evaluation, practice exam, assessment of the practice training in the workplace, and participation in the discussions. U15 uses the methods of attendance, laboratory, practice, field work, course-specific internship (if any), homework, presentation, projects, seminar, quiz, listening, midterms, and finals. It is observed that while some of the reviewed universities use the same methods, some of them enrich measurement and assessment methods by adding other different methods.

Student Admission and Development

In this study, it is checked whether the student admission conditions of the fifteen universities are stated clearly, whether the conditions of prior learning, exemptions, and credits have been made. In addition, it has been examined whether the relevant institution has issued a diploma supplement.

The universities with the codes U01, U02, U03, U04, U05, U06, U07, U08, U11, U12, and U14 have clearly stated the student admission and prior learning conditions. U09 and U10 have not stated it, and U12 has stated but there is no regulation specific to the business administration department. U13 has stated it and there is a regulation specific to the business administration department. And U15 have stated the student admission conditions but not stated the prior learning conditions.

Regarding the diploma supplement; U01, U02, U03, U04, U05, U10, U11, U12, U13, and U14 have diploma supplements, and no information is available for U06, U07, U08, U09, and U15. U02 and U13 also have Europass documents. The diploma supplement is used to measure and assess the equivalence degree of the department studied or being studied in educational opportunities abroad (CoHE, 2018).

Erasmus and Accreditation

The 15 universities reviewed have an Erasmus program. U01 and U02 also have Suny contracts. U11 also has a Mou contract, and U14 also has Mou and Mao contracts.

From the fifteen universities reviewed according to whether they are members of a special accreditation body for the business administration department, U01 has AACAC accreditation and U03 has AACSB accreditation. U09 has ABET accreditation. U05 is a member of AQAS, and U07 and U10 are members of AACSB, and they aim for accreditation soon.

General Note:

Since this study is completely based on publicly available information, if there is any information that is not available on the websites of the universities, it is not included in this scope.

4. CONCLUSION

Since the early 2000s, it has become clear that measuring how much a student has actually learned would be more accurate for measuring and improving the real level of quality in higher education, rather than making sure what skills and knowledge are being taught to the student. This also applies to business administration programs that train qualified employees for the business world. After assessing the quality assurance levels of business administration programs of the Turkish universities that are the subject of this paper, the following results have been obtained:

Positive Sides:

The fact that three of the fifteen (15) business administration programs reviewed have international accreditation and the other two universities are actively in a similar accreditation process proves that Turkish universities have started to make positive progress in gaining international recognition. It can be said that these developments have gained priority especially in well-established state universities and foundation universities have just recently started to develop in this regard.

In addition, it has been observed that harmonization is generally achieved in most of the universities in subjects such as ECTS, program levels, Erasmus, and Diploma Supplement, which are the prominent subjects of the Bologna Process.

It can be seen from the published institutional reports that the THEQC, which was established in the recent past in Turkey, also had the opportunity to conduct a review in most of these universities. Even though these reports are not specific to business administration schools and refer to the overall quality assurance processes of the university, it can be seen as a positive start to the long journey of achieving quality. Again, although not specific to business administration schools, the fact that many universities carry out certification activities such as ISO 9001 on quality can be considered within this scope.

Areas That Can Be Improved:

The most important conclusion of this paper is the fact that the learning outcomes set forth by the business administration faculties of Turkish universities have not yet fully met the maximum expectations of international accreditation bodies. In this context, it is seen that many faculties, even the accredited ones, have not set learning outcomes or targets, especially in terms of preparing their students for a multicultural business world, using information technologies effectively, gaining critical thinking skills, and statistical decision making.

And another factor supporting this conclusion can be seen after the review of learning outcomes according to Bloom's Taxonomy. We see that in almost all business administration programs reviewed, the learning outcomes are defined by mainly corresponding to the first three steps of the Bloom Taxonomy, which are remember/understand/apply. And this proves that there will be deficiencies in raising individuals who can look at issues with a critical view in accordance with the expectations of both the business world and the academic world, and have the competence to analyze data and create value from it by using technology well, especially in the 21st Century.

There are also some problems standing out in terms of compliance of business administration schools to the Bologna Process. In particular, there are deficiencies in terms of a clear and

consistent explanation of the infrastructure of the ECTS system in the program information packages. The fact that elective course ratios are generally less than 25% and a clear calculation of in-class and out-of-class workloads is not possible points out that there may be problems in achieving the learning targets even in the design stage of the course. Besides, it is also worth noting that while complying with these processes, the way the business administration departments present the information published on their websites is not always with the same care and discipline.

Finally, there was no general reporting on whether "Direct Measurements" have been made in relation to whether the learning goals, objectives, and outcomes introduced in these business administration programs are actually realized and transformed into a real "learning" experience for the student. Reports on how the results of possible measurements are evaluated by the faculty and lead to an appropriate curriculum or learning technical changes cannot be found. And we can say that this is mainly due to the fact that the business administration programs have not undergone an international accreditation or quality assurance process.

Recommendations:

As a result of this study, the following recommendations can be given to the business administration schools:

1. Having international accreditation will be the right way to reassure all stakeholders about the quality of learning. Considering the place of Turkish universities in the rankings among all universities in the world, it is recommended that they should immediately start this process.
2. Universities will start contributing to the accreditation processes they will undergo in the future by reviewing the learning objectives and outcomes and updating them according to the criteria that will be accepted internationally and, if necessary, developing curricula and learning techniques accordingly.
3. Universities can enter a regular quality follow-up cycle by regularly reporting the measurements and assessments made for each learning outcome they put forward and measuring themselves on whether these outcomes have been achieved. Publishing these reports publicly will both contribute to the transparency of the university and encourage all university academics and employees to implement these developments. In this way, the measurement of whether the student has learned or not can be put forward objectively from the point of view of the university and the faculty.

REFERENCES

1. Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU, 2019). Access address: (<http://www.shanghairanking.com/ARWU2019.html>)
2. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives: Complete edition, New York : Longman.
3. Aslan, B. (2009). Accreditation of Higher Education In Different Countries And Improvements In Turkish Higher Education. Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Educational Sciences, 42(1), 287-310.
4. Dalyan, F. (2001). Growth Strategies in Higher Education Institutions, (Unpublished PhD thesis), Anadolu University, Eskişehir
5. Kavak, Y., Seferoğlu, S. S., Kabasakal, K. A., Şen, Z., & Uludağ, G. (2015). Changes in Education and Law Teaching: A Case Study Based on the Bologna Process. Journal of Higher Education & Science, 5(1), 1-13
6. QS World University Rankings (2020). Access address: (<https://www.topuniversities.com/university-rankings/world-university-rankings/2020>).
7. Suskie, L. A., (2009), Assessing Student Learning: A Common Sense Guide, 2nd Ed., Sanfrancisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.
8. Süngü, H. and Bayrakçı, M. (2010). Accreditation Studies in Higher Education after the Bologna Process. Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences Fall, 8(4), 895-912
9. Tam, M. (2001). Measuring Quality and Performance in Higher Education. Quality in Higher Education, 7(1) 47-54
10. The Danish Evaluation Institute (2011). Access address: https://backend.deqar.eu/reports/EQAR/EVA_External_Review_Report.pdf.
11. Turkey Higher Education Qualifications Framework (TYYÇ, n.d.). Access address: <http://www.tyyc.yok.gov.tr/?pid=33> access:08.02.2020
12. Vitullo, E., & Jones, E. A. (2010). An Exploratory Investigation Of The Assessment Practices Of Selected Association To Advance Collegiate Schools Of Business— Accredited Business Programs And Linkages With General Education Outcomes. Jge: The Journal Of General Education, 59(2), 85-104
13. Yılmaz, V. D. (2014). Internationalization in Higher Education: National Political, Institutional Strategies and Practices in Turkey, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Süleyman Demirel University, Isparta
14. Higher Education Council (YOK, 2018). Overseas higher education recognition and equivalence handbook. Higher Education Council, Ankara. Access address: https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/Yuksekogretim_tanima_ve_denklik_el_kitabi.pdf
15. Higher Education Supervisory Board (YDK, n.d.). Access address: <https://denetleme.yok.gov.tr>
16. Higher Education Quality Board (YOKAK, 2018-2019). Access address: (https://yokak.gov.tr/Common/Docs/Site_Activity_Reports/20182019DurumRaporuv3.pdf).
17. Higher Education Quality Board (YÖKAK, n.d.). Access address: <https://yokak.gov.tr/Uluslararasılasma/Uyeliks>
18. Higher Education Council (YOK, 2010). Restructuring in higher education: Bologna Process Applications in 66 questions. Council of Higher Education, Ankara Access address: <https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/yuksekogretimdeyeniden-yapikazan-66-soruda-bologna%20s%C3%BCreci-uygulamalari.pdf>

19. Higher Education Council (YOK, 2018). Overseas higher education recognition and equivalence handbook. Higher Education Council, Ankara. Access address: https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Yayinlar/Yayinlarimiz/Yuksekogretim_tanima_ve_denklik_el_kitabi.pdf
20. Council of Higher Education (YOK, n.d.). Access address: <http://statistik.yok.gov.tr/0000-0002-3116-7095> murat witness

UNDER PEER REVIEW