DOI: https://doi.org/10.31874/2309-1606-2022-28-1-6
UDC 342.9:378(73)



Steve Parscale Lester C. Reams Tatiana Andrienko-Genin

US Accreditation as a World-Class Education Quality Indicator

On the turning point of the European and world's history, it is extremely important to unveil and effectively utilize the potential of effective high-quality education to make the future better for generations to come. Higher education quality management through accreditation has a long history of development in the United States, and time-proven standards, stimulating accredited institutions to continually improve academic quality.

The concepts, systems, principles and practices of accreditation arouse in the United States out of the need to meet the demands for quality, and evolved over decades, to form a coherent set of standards and frameworks of continuous improvement in all meaningful directions of the educational institutions' life, striving for teaching excellence and high learning outcomes. At present, accreditation principles and processes, as exemplified by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) programmatic accreditation, are implemented in the US and numerous countries of the world, to ensure high standard and continuous improvement of business education quality, to raise the competitiveness of educational institutions in response to the expectations of public (primarily, students and their families), governments, employers, universities/colleges, academics, and broader communities.

This study establishes the correlation of the quality management system via ACBSP accreditation with the continuous improvement of business education quality. This study also provides statistical evidence that the application of quality management principles at institutions of higher education with accredited business programs did result in the association with enhanced student learning outcomes.

Higher education quality management leads to higher employability of the institution's graduates. Since the quality of education is crucial for the country's economic growth and prosperity, the business education institutions and programs in Ukraine and other Central and Eastern European and Eurasian countries may benefit from implementing quality management through ACBSP accreditation for their undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate (doctoral) business programs, to satisfy ever rising expectations of candidates for top managerial and leadership positions.

The research suggests that 51% of the institutions of higher education with business programs in the United States, and 93% of the institutions of higher education worldwide could benefit from implementing accreditation principles and processes to maintain and enhance their education quality and competitiveness in the world business education market, for the sake of highest recognition of their graduates' diploma on the global job markets and significant increase of their employability.

***Keywords**: education quality, accreditation, quality management, business education, student learning outcomes assessment, teaching excellence, continuous improvement, ACBSP.*

Introduction

At the turning point of the world history, quality of education is crucial for economic competitiveness and the future technological, managerial and industrial growth. When the world's attention is focused on the future of Ukraine which in its turn will determine the future of the entire region, and even the world order, it is important to unveil and effectively utilize the potential of high-quality education for the better future of the new generations.

As well as other Eastern European, Central European and Eurasian countries, Ukraine had inherited its highly centralized and standardized educational system from the Soviet Union and had continuously implemented educational reforms to deliver educational quality and respond to the expectations of the stakeholders including the governments, prospective employers, students, educators and scholars. As an instrument of ensuring conformity of educational programs and institutions to the state standards, accreditation of programs and institutions was enacted.

Historical, legal and political foundations underlying the accreditation principles and processes in the US and Ukraine have both commonalities and differences. In the view of today's conceptual overhaul of Ukrainian higher education system towards its maximal coherence with the world's standards in terms of student learning outcomes, a clear understanding is needed of the specificity of accreditation as the quality management tool in the United States, the renowned leader of business education.

In Ukraine, the accreditation of higher education institutions is regulated and controlled by the government. Initially, the Law of Ukraine on Higher Education (2002) defined accreditation with the focus on (1) legal right

to provide educational services, and (2) conformity to the standards and requirements: "…accreditation – the procedure of granting a higher educational institution of a certain type the right to conduct educational activities related to obtaining higher education and qualifications, in accordance with the requirements of higher education standards, as well as state requirements regarding personnel, scientific-methodical and material-technical support" [Verkhovna Rada, 2002: art. 1]

As the next step towards quality, the 2014 Law of Ukraine on Higher Education (2014) provided the definition of the accreditation of a program and included, as the purpose of accreditation, "the purpose of ensuring and improving the quality of higher education" [Verkhovna Rada 2014: art. 1]. Under this Law, a state body The National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance (NAQA) was established, whose mission is "to catalyze positive changes in higher education and to shape its quality culture" [NAQA 2019], which proves the growing understanding of the need for quality education. The Law also provided that NAQA "…shall engage international experts, representatives of leading foreign higher educational institutions and/or experts in higher education quality assurance from other countries" [Verkhovna Rada 2014: art. 19.8].

The current Law on Education (2017), defines accreditation in terms of conformity to the standards, but with consideration of achieving education outcomes, as: "…an assessment of the educational programme for its compliance with the educational standard, as well as the ability of the educational institution to ensure that education seekers achieve the learning outcomes provided for in the educational programme" [Verkhovna Rada 2017: art. 44.1], providing also that "The educational programme of the corresponding level of education shall be accredited by the body for ensuring the quality of education, determined by a special law, and/or accredited public professional associations or other accredited legal entities that independently assess the quality of education and educational activities of educational institutions" [Verkhovna Rada 2017: art. 44.3].

To transform accreditation as a tool of sanctioning educational activity and control of conformity, into a real instrument of ensuring, managing and enhancing education quality which is so important for the economic growth [Aslund 2012], the educators in Ukraine, Eastern and Central Europe and Eurasia, may find it useful to learn from the best practices and experiences of the world's leader of education for business – the USA.

The **aim** of this article is to trace the formation of accreditation philosophy and procedures through its history, providing conclusive evidence of the positive effects of accreditation (in particular, performed by the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)), on education quality.

The study is using mixed **methodology**, combining qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative research methods, such as conceptual, historical and comparative analysis, were used to understand the reasons of the most essential standards and principles of accreditation, and establish causal relations between accreditation of business programs and education quality. Quantitative research methods which involved data collecting and statistical analysis utilizing bivariate analysis, measures of association (sample size determination, Spearman's Rank-Order correlation coefficient, with the estimate of significance), were used to establish the correlation between the implementation of ACBSP accreditation principles and the growth in quality of student learning outcomes.

Understanding and implementing the principles underlying the accreditation of business programs in the United States, as exemplified by ACBSP accreditation, would be of great benefit for fostering business education in Ukraine and other Eastern European, Central European and Eurasian countries.

US Accreditation: History and Philosophy

The discussion of higher education accreditation in the United States follows the rich history of the inception of the United States higher education system. One aspect that must be pointed out is that the American colonization played a key role in shaping the United States' higher education identity. Each immigrant that came to the American Colonies and later the United States whether fleeing religious or political persecution, because of slavery or as punishment for crimes played a pivotal role in shaping the United States education system.

What has made the United States a unique country has been and continues to be the bringing together of different nationalities, religious and political beliefs, and financial status. The diversity of the United States is one of its strengths. Hence, the creation of an education system that captures this diversity has been the challenge for the past 200 years. What has helped to strengthen the success of diversity is the standards set by the accreditation process. This process forces the institution to provide a quality education that is valid, consistent, and reliable enough to educate each generation. This historical causal and comparative analysis will discuss the US: (a) University origins, (b) accreditation structure and process and (c) the ACBSP Unified Standards and Criteria for Demonstrating Excellence In Business Programs.

A. United States Universities System Origins

The origins of the United States university system will cover the periods of 1600–1800, 1801–1900 and 1901 to the present.

1600–1800

During the early American colonies of 1600–1700, the focus was on establishing the colonies. Each group of immigrants brought with them their traditions and culture that was used to educate their people. Any aspect of higher education mirrored their country of origin. These universities were modeled after Oxford and Cambridge universities in England. [Potts 1971]. Hanford (n.d.) stated that at this time the schools and universities were nonprofit and for-profit established by religious denominations, colonial governments and entrepreneurs who started teaching practical skills and trade, since there weren't enough places for people to get formal education, so, as well as reading and writing (Hanford, n.d.). The colonial states consisted of Virginia, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire. Collier (2021) indicated that these universities consisted of Harvard University established in1636 (chartered in 1650), The College of William and Mary established in (1693), St. John's College established in (1696), Yale University established in 1701, University of Pennsylvania established in 1740 (chartered in 1755), Moravian College established in (1742), University of Delaware established in (1743), Princeton University established in (1746), Washington and Lee University established in (1749) and Columbia University established in (1754). After the Unites States became an independent nation, religious denominations, colonial governments, and entrepreneurs continue to establish schools and universities.

1801–1900

During this period the United States began its westward expansion from the east coast to the west coast. This expansion allowed religious denominations and the new establish states to create their own public and private state colleges and universities. Nearly all of these universities taught in the English language, although there were a few German language seminaries and colleges [Geiger 2014].

1901 – the present

At this time in addition to religious denominations and states continuing to establish public and private colleges and universities, Private individuals such as Andrew Carnegie who established Carnegie Melon University, establish universities of their own. After World War II, the government assisted veterans returning from the war by creating the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the G.I. Bill – a law that provided benefits to some veterans. Under the GI Bill veterans were given funds which allowed them to attend colleges/universities [O'Brien 2021]. This opened the door for the US government's future involvement in higher education as it related to university accreditation. Later in 1965, as part of President Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" of progressive reform, the Higher Education Act of 1965 was amended so that for-profit colleges could receive Pell Grants and federal

student loans [ACSC n.d.]. The amended act led to the growth of for-profit colleges. During this time new modes of instructions pioneered by nonprofit and for-profit colleges and universities were added to the traditional face-to-face mode of instructions. These new modes consisted of online, hybrid and directed study, to accommodate working adults.

B. Accreditation Structure and Process

The establishment of the accreditation process was a gradual process. The accreditation process developed as the United States colleges and universities expanded across the nation. Wlodarski (2021) indicated that in the United States, there is no federal regulation of higher education regarding academic quality and standards. Accreditation is handled by each state which maintains its own policies (ibid.). This development will be discussed through: (a) First Accreditation agencies, (b) Federal Government Involvement, (c) Types of Accreditations and (d) Business Schools and Accreditation.

First Accreditation Agencies

The first accreditation agencies appeared in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Accreditation began as a voluntary process, with the federal government playing no role in quality assurance. Kelchen (2017) asserts that difficulties that were faced at this time, were the following:

1. *Different Admission Requirements*: There was a wide range of colleges and universities with differing admissions requirements, curricula, and required lengths of study to earn a degree
2. *Lack of a Universal Standard*: There was a lack of universal standards making it difficult for institutional administrators to determine the differences between programs of secondary schools, colleges, and graduate schools.
3. *No Process of Distinction*: There was no process for colleges and universities with high academic standards to distinguish themselves from institutions that claimed to be colleges but had curricula similar to many high schools.

Federal Government Involvement

Prior to World War II, the federal government was not involved in higher education until the passing of the GI Bill. The GI Bill allowed the Federal Government to get involved with higher education as a source of student funding. The GI Bill also allowed veterans to use federal funds to attend any qualified college of their choice. With passage of the GI Bill, Kelchen (2017) identified the following challenges:

1. *Reliance on State List*. The government was not involved in the establishment of colleges and universities, nor did it develop a process of oversight over the colleges and universities. Hence, it had to rely on the states to create the lists of approved colleges.

2. *Misuse of Funds*. Flores (2015) stated that with the creation of the GI Bill "almost 6,000 for-profit schools sprung up after World War II and took advantage of the new GI Bill federal funding. This led to the concern that these new schools and some universities would focus on collecting veterans' tuition grants but would use poor business practices to lure veterans to their institutions only to provide a low quality of education. Because of this, several federal government agencies conducted investigations for potential fraud and abuse" [Flores 2015].
3. *Government Choices.* Kelchen (2017) added that in 1951 the House Select Committee was faced with two choices:

Choice 1: The federal government would create its own list of universities and colleges which would be monitored to ensure there was no abuse of federal funds or

Choice 2: The federal government would rely on the existing private sector accreditation system that operated separately from the states to serve as a gatekeeper for federal financial aid.

In 1952 the federal government enacted the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act, by which lawmakers chose to rely on the existing private sector accreditation system to ensure minimum quality standards because they were satisfied with accreditors' ability to assure educational quality. This act secured that accreditation remained a necessary condition of receiving federal financial aid [Kelchen 2017].

Types of Accreditations

Kelchen (2017) indicates that there are three main types of accrediting agencies in the

United States. They are as follows:

1. Institutional Accreditation (previously known as regional accreditation)

United States institutional accreditation is focused on the institution's academic quality as a whole. There are seven (7) institutional accreditation agencies that accredit degree-granting colleges and universities in specific regions of the country, with each region being served by a particular agency (except for California and Hawaii, which have separate accreditors for two-year and four-year colleges). The regional agencies accredit about 39 percent of colleges and 85 percent of universities nationwide, including most public and private nonprofit colleges and universities, as well as some of the largest for-profit college and university chains [Kelchen 2017].

2. National Accreditation (now known as institutional and the same category as regional)

In addition, there are 10 national accreditation agencies. Four (4) small faith-related accreditors serve small, religiously oriented institutions, while

six career-related accreditors (excluding ACICS) serve mainly for-profit colleges with a strong vocational education focus [Kelchen 2017].

3. Programmatic Accreditation

Programmatic accreditation agencies assess individual programs, departments and schools housed within a larger academic institution. There are 55 programmatic accreditation organisations designed to assess programs relevant to a specific industry, job role or skill. Some examples of the types of programmatic accreditation include: business, education, engineering, and other specializations [Wlodarski 2021].

Business Schools and Accreditation

Creation of business departments and schools

Prior to the development of the field of business, college and universities in the 17th and 18th centuries provided a liberal arts education. The field of business did not exist. This was because per Adam Smith business was considered a part of human nature and relegate to merchant and manufacture. Smith stated, "the propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another is part of human nature" [McNamara 2015: 2]. Smith did not view businessmen in a positive light due to the nature of the work done and how it was complete. Therefore, he was skeptical of the creation of business schools. However, in France, where the very first business school École Spéciale de Commerce et d'Industrie (Ecole) was created in 1819, business schools were viewed differently [McNamara 2015]. The business communities supported the creation of the school because of a desire to improve France's economic performance and to improve the standing of the business community in the French society. Although there were challenges and hardships, Ecole proved to be a success and laid down the foundation for future business schools.

The United States' first business school was created in 1881 and was the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, but it didn't offer graduate studies. The Haas School of Business at the University of California in Berkely was founded in 1898 within a few years of Wharton, providing students on the west coast with the same opportunities [McNamara 2015]. As mentioned earlier, prior to the development of the actual business school men and some women still received a liberal education so that they could be well-rounded. The number of business schools and departments expanded at the same time as the colleges and universities expanded across the nation.

Accreditation Process for Business Schools and Programs

The accreditation process in the United States begins with the institutional accreditation. The institutional accreditation is required for the university's business department and/or business schools to qualify for a programmatic accreditation [Online Education Research n.d.]. There are three accreditation

agencies in the United States that grant a business programmatic accreditation [Online Education Research n.d.]:

1. Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

The AACSB was founded in 1916 and began accrediting business schools in 1919. The AACSB accredits undergraduate, master's, doctoral, and executive education programs. The focus of the AACSB is on the published research being generated from the school [Online Education Research n.d.].

2. Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP)

The ACBSP, founded in 1988, accredits associate, bachelor's, master's and doctoral programs in various business-related disciplines. It rewards excellence in teaching and was the very first to offer specialized business accreditation for every degree level [Online Education Research n.d.]. The ACBSP accreditation will be discussed in the next section.

3. International Accreditation Council for Business Education (IACBE)

The IACBE is the newest of the three primary organizations offering accreditation to baccalaureate and masters programs and other types of business programs. When it was founded in 1997, its stated goal was to provide accreditation to business programs based on criteria that prioritize a school's mission and the performance of students within those programs [Online Education Research n.d.].

C. ACBSP Accreditation Standards for Business Departments and Schools

For business departments and schools to achieve the ACBSP accreditation, the business department and/or school must complete the following seven standards. These standards are modeled on the Education Criteria for Performance Excellence, Baldrige National Quality Program. This accreditation process will help the business department/school candidate identify any strengths and weaknesses which will allow the candidate to make the needed improvements [AACSB vs. ACBSP 2015]. The description of each of the seven standards are as follows.

Standard 1: Leadership

The business unit must have systematic leadership processes that promote performance excellence and continuous improvement. Leadership is crucial because it sets how tone for the business school. The success of a business is dependent on leadership's active involvement and of devising, implementing, promoting, monitoring, and evaluating strategies and creating a culture of performance excellence and continuous improvement [ACBSP n.d.].

Standard 2: Strategic Planning

The business unit must have a systematic process for developing a strategic plan that leads to continuous improvement. Often business department/school candidates may or may not have strategic plan of their own. With some universities the departments are required to follow the universities strategic

plan only or create a separate plan that mirrors the university strategic plan. By taking this approach the business department/school is able to create goals and objectives that lead to a successful business program [ACBSP n.d.].

Standard 3: Student and Stakeholder Focus

The business unit must have a systematic process to determine requirements and expectations of current and future students and other key stakeholders. This standard provides a unique opportunity for the business department/school to include stakeholders such as students, faculty, staff and the business community to be involved in measuring the success of it programs and identifying where improvements are needed [ACBSP n.d.].

Standard 4: Student Learning Assessment

The business unit must have a systematic student learning outcomes assessment process and plan that leads to continuous improvement. This standard enables the business department/school to develop specific outcomes that will be used to measure whether outcomes are not met, met, or exceeded. If the outcome is not met, it required that an improvement plan is created to meet the goal. This process supports and fortifies the ACBSP mission of continuous improvement [ACBSP n.d.].

Standard 5: Faculty Focus

The business unit must have a systematic process to ensure current and qualified faculty members by:

1. Fostering teaching excellence
2. Aligning faculty credentials and skill sets with current and future program objectives
3. Evaluating faculty members based on defined criteria and objectives
4. Ensuring faculty development including scholarly and professional activity

This standard enables the business department/school candidate to evaluate it existing process and whether faculty meet specific qualifications. It also provides the business department/school to make improvements [ACBSP n.d.].

Standard 6: Curriculum

The business unit must have a systematic process to ensure continuous improvement of curriculum and program delivery. This standard allows the business department/school candidate to assess it curriculum review and improve the process or encourage the candidate to develop one. The ultimate outcome is that the business program presents the latest concepts and theories in business [ACBSP n.d.].

Standard 7: Business Unit Performance

The business unit must have a systematic process to identify and track key student performance measures for the purpose of continuous improvement. An example of student performance consists of graduation rates, increased

use of web-based technologies, use of facilities by community and retention rates by program [ACBSP n.d.].

As may be seen from the description of the Standards, the main pathos of ACBSP accreditation is "performance excellence and continuous improvement" [ACBSP n.d.], which is absolutely necessary for an educational institution to thrive in a competitive environment. Thus, seeking ACBSP accreditation, business education units benefit from complying with its standards, because the accreditation actually ensures the success of the educational process, employability of their graduates, and as a result, high reputation and overall prosperity of the institutions.

Notably, the criterion for accreditation is continuous improvement on all the standards, rather than meeting specific norms or performance indicators. This stimulates even highly performing institutions to be in continuous search for the ways and methods to enhance their quality, making the entire business education system agile, flexible, and always open to opportunities and positive changes.

Since the aim of accreditation is to serve a stimulus and framework for ensuring continuous improvement and enhancement of educational quality, the next step is to verify the correlation of implementing ACBSP accreditation standards with the actual growth of quality in education.

ACBSP Accreditation as a Quality Management Tool

Quality Management Theory and Assessing Student Learning Outcomes in Higher Education

Accreditation is a leadership tool that facilitates improving academic quality. This study relates quality management theory, using accreditation as a framework, and student learning outcomes assessment results at institutions of higher education.

As the government becomes more involved in accreditation which has historically been a private sector process [Eaton 2010], the consequence for administrators and faculty members are far-reaching and as serious as diminishing academic freedom through the loss of authority to make judgments on curriculum and academic standards [Eaton 2010].

Researchers concluded that quality management was beneficial to institutions of higher education [Emiliani 2005; Imran & Mahmood 2011]. Empirical evidence indicated there were statistically significant differences in efficiency and effectiveness between quality management firms and non-quality management firms [Ahire et al. 1996]. Spearman's Rank-Order correlation coefficient was statistically significant ($r = .72$), suggesting there is an association between the application of quality management and enhanced student learning assessment results. Even though correlation did not mean

causation, the high correlation coefficient indicated a clear association of quality management to enhanced student learning results and was significant at the .01 level. This would imply the need for business schools, programs, and departments to implement quality management through the accreditation processes.

There were 15,731 institutions of higher education that had business programs worldwide in 2021 according to AACSB's *Business school data guide, 2021* [Business school data guide 2021]. Between AACSB and ACBSP there were 1064 institutions of higher education that had implemented quality management through accreditation as of February 2021. That was less than seven percent worldwide. Therefore, 93% of the institutions of higher education with business programs worldwide could yet benefit from business program accreditation.

The 2020 COVID-19 pandemic was a major disruptive force to the world and markedly to higher education. For decades, higher education strived to continually improve academic quality via evolutionary change or evolutionary improvement. 2020 has been a time of revolutionary change in life and revolutionary change in higher education.

Higher education adapted revolutionary changes to survive. Revolutionary changes touched everything from teaching and learning, to assessing student learning, accreditation, and recognition, to classes and graduation ceremonies, or lack of classes or graduation ceremonies. Academic quality in this new paradigm is on a steep learning curve. The mission of accreditation agencies is to align the revolution in higher education, with the revolution in academic quality.

As the marines would say, we in higher education and quality are improvising, adapting, and overcoming!

Organizations worldwide shifted from in-person meetings to virtual "everything" to overcome the pandemic. People learned how to present and how to attend virtual conferences, virtual peer review site visits, virtual board meetings and virtual team meetings, learning totally new communications tools to continue to improvise, adapt, and overcome. There is no immediate end in sight for this revolutionary learning curve in higher education, and the future will never look the same.

Statement of the Problem

There were regulatory requirements from multiple stakeholders to report student learning outcome assessment in higher education, with government officials demanding evidence of student learning to justify federal funding expenditures in higher education [Culver 2010]. Duque and Weeks (2010) noted the importance of student learning outcomes assessment in response to the requirements from external stakeholders, such as the government.

However, there was a lack of guidance on how to assess student learning outcomes to meet the requirements of the regulators.

Ohia (2011) noted that administrators, faculty, and staff members were still struggling to identify useful models that allow them to assess and report effective student learning outcomes. The problem was that there were no standardization, no systematic process, and there was no consistent guidance on how to develop, implement, evaluate, and report student learning outcomes [Gehart 2011; Kelley, Tong & Beom-Joon Choi 2010; Muñoz, Jaime, McGriff & Molina 2012; Petropoulou, Vassilikopoulou, & Retalis 2011; Sidney & Chad 2010]. Administrators, including deans and department chairs, which were responsible for student learning outcome assessment, had no uniform or standardized guidance in directing their efforts to meet the needs and expectations of multiple external stakeholders [Middaugh 2012]. This signified the need to develop scientifically-based principles and tools for quality management and uniform quality measuring in higher education.

Accreditation was the primary tool used by the government to determine whether or not institutions of higher education are qualified to receive federal funding, government officials demanding evidence of student learning, through accreditation for their investments [Culver 2010]. Duque and Weeks (2010) noted the importance of student learning outcomes assessment in response to requirements from external stakeholders such as the government.

Researchers indicated that administrators in higher education struggle to identify useful models or standardized measures to assess student learning outcomes [Middaugh 2012; Ohia 2011; U.S. Department of Education, Committee on Measures of Student Success 2011]. Administrators who develop student learning outcome assessment data and information only to satisfy stakeholder requirements may not have data and information as valid or reliable as it could be if they used a systematic approach such as the practice of quality management [Ahire, Waller, & Golhar 1996]. Therefore, the building of a coherent quality measurement theory in higher education, and studying the effects of quality management on student learning outcomes [Parscale et al. 2015] is a way to provide effective tools for higher education quality measurement and improvement.

Quality Management Theory Development

Pioneers in the field of management established a foundation for the field to evolve from the industrial age to the quality management age [Ahire et al. 1996; Dobyns & Crawford-Mason 1991; Lewis 2011; Waller & Golhar 1996; Wyld 1996]. The Hawthorne studies investigated what made employees more productive [Scott 2005], evaluating time and motions studies that would improve business operations. Management theory evolved through new knowledge and building on existing knowledge into quality management

theories [Carrigan 2010; Pryor, Humphreys, Taneja, & Toombs 2011; Shiraz, Rashid, and Riaz 2011; Smothers 2011].

Three well-known quality management gurus were Edward Deming, Joseph Juran, and Philip Crosby [Fred 2012]. Edward Deming traveled to Japan and taught the Japanese statistical process control after Sarashn and Protzman laid the foundation for the Japanese into quality management [Dobyns & Crawford-Mason 1991; Fathi 1995]. Deming went on to develop his 14 points of management and, most importantly, a continuous improvement process known as Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA). Walter Shewhart originally developed the PDCA wheel and also developed Statistical Process Control (SPC) in the late 1920s. For this reason, the PDCA cycle is sometimes referred to as the "Shewhart Cycle" [Michael et al. 2013].

Many notable quality management experts, such as Juran, Crosby, and Deming have written handbooks that have been used as the main reference by quality managers around the world for many years [Porter 2011; Klefsjö 2011; Sedlock 2010; Smith 2011]. Juran has been called the father of quality, and many refer to him as the greatest quality giant of the 20th century [Smith 2011].

Quality Management in Higher Education

Quality management principles and concepts can be beneficial to institutions of higher education [Emiliani 2005; Imran & Mahmood 2011; Keller 1992; Man & Kato 2010]. There are three immediate apparent examples (a) quality management principles can help institutions of higher education be more competitive against the for-profit, continuing education, and the traditional public and private institutions of higher education [Man & Kato 2010]; (b) there has been more support for quality management in higher education, and statistical analysis of sample data has indicated a positive association between quality management and organizational effectiveness [Man & Kato 2010]; and (c) quality management in higher education improved morale, reduced costs, and improved performance [Elmuti, Kathawala, & Manippallil 1996].

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Peter Ewell, a leading expert on student learning outcome assessment, noted the start of the assessment movement in 1985 at the First National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education in Columbia, South Carolina [Baepler 2010; Culver 2010; Curtis & Wu 2012; Kallison & Cohen 2010]. Quality experts such as Deming and Juran were faculty members who provided research regarding quality management in higher education. Their histories as faculty members at universities made it easier for some administrators to buy into the work of other people [Spangehl 2012]. Deming, Juran, and Crosby may be given the credit for developing the vocabulary on quality management and higher education; other institutions can learn a great deal from their ideas (Sanjaya, 2006).

The U.S. Department of Education formed a committee to report to the Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, on measures of student success [U.S. Department of Education, Committee on Measures of Student Success 2011]. The committee noted that data and measures of student learning are being collected for numerous stakeholders, but there are few standardized measures that stakeholders agree on that can be used internally or externally in institutions of higher education (Ibid.). This problem is important because student learning outcomes are now some of the most important criteria for accreditation and government funding [Ohia 2011].

The Baldrige Performance Excellence Program (BPEP)

BPEP provides a management model with a systems perspective for managing higher education institutions and their key processes to achieve results (Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, 2013). The criteria also serve as the basis for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. First published in 1999, the education criteria have been used by postsecondary institutions across the United States for more than a decade. Most states and numerous countries in the world have established similar criteria and award programs based on the Baldrige criteria.

The BPEP was the foundation for the quality management studied in this research and was used to answer the research question. The BPEP includes seven categories that are linked and integrated as quality management principles: (a) leadership, (b) strategic planning, (c) customer focus, (d) measurement, analysis, and knowledge management, (e) workforce focus, (f) operation's focus, and (g) results [NIST 2012].

A set of interrelated core values and concepts, including visionary leadership, learning-centered education, and systems perspective make up the education criteria. Within the Baldrige framework, a systems perspective is defined as the senior leadership focus on strategic directions and students. It means the senior leadership team monitors, responds to, and manages performance based on results, both short-term and strategic. A systems perspective also includes using information and organizational knowledge to develop core strategies while linking these strategies with key processes and resources to improve both student and institutional performance.

One of the core values of the Baldrige educational criteria is learning-centered education [Walters 2011]. Students and stakeholders are the ones who determine the quality and performance of educational processes [Brown-Bulloch 2011]. High performance educational process contributes value to students and stakeholders, leading to positive benefits including institutional stability [BPEP 2012].

Learning-centered education is a decisive model that has been strategic in its application in order to be constantly aware of changing needs with the consumer as well as in the marketplace. The Baldrige educational criteria list

the key characteristic of learning-centered education. The criteria integrate these key characteristics into quality management principles [Walters 2011].

- The Education Criteria consider several important education concepts and the specific needs of education organizations. These include the following:
- The Education Criteria place a primary focus on teaching and learning because these are the principal goals of education organizations.
- While the Education Criteria focus on student learning for all education organizations, individual organizational missions, roles, and programs will vary for different types of organizations (e.g., primary and secondary schools, trade schools, engineering schools, or teaching and research organizations).
- Students are the key customers of education organizations, but there may be multiple stakeholders (e.g., parents, employers, other schools, and communities).
- The concept of excellence includes three components: (1) a well-conceived and well-executed assessment strategy; (2) year-to-year improvement in key measures and indicators of performance, especially student learning; and (3) demonstrated leadership in performance and performance improvement relative to comparable organizations and to appropriate benchmarks [BPEP 2012].

Theoretical Framework

The concept of quality management tools in theory should help improve the results of student learning outcome assessments Corporate Finance Institute 2020].

Management theory building must include factors responsible for observed patterns and in specific management contexts [Dierksmeier 2011; Klefsjö 2010; Prabhu 2011]. The research studied student learning outcome assessment results as factors responsible for observed patterns. The other requirement of management theory building was the specific management context [Prabhu 2011]. The specific management context studied was quality management systems (accreditation) at accredited business schools in higher education.

Pioneers in the field of management contributed new knowledge and built on existing knowledge [Ahire et al. 1996; Dobyns & Crawford-Mason 1991; Lewis 2011; Waller & Golhar 1996; Wyld 1996]. In addition, a few pioneers in the field stand out in management books. Fredric Taylor was considered the father of scientific management. Henri Fayol and Max Weber studied management as a bureaucratic and administrative approach [Lewis 2011]; Frank and Lillian Gilbreth conducted time and motion studies [Chattopadhyay, Ghosh, Maji, Ray & Lahiri 2012]. Mary Parker Follet, Hugo Munsterberg, and Chester Barnard studied management from the humanistic approach [Scott 2005].

This study built on this evolutionary foundation of knowledge in the field of quality management. The quality management system at accredited business schools was accreditation. Accreditation provided the specific management context needed to help expand the knowledge in the field of management theory [Dierksmeier 2011; Klefsjö 2010; Prabhu 2011]. Therefore, this study was conducted from the context of quality management systems, accreditation applied in business schools. The results could help consolidate knowledge and increase consensus in the field of quality management.

Purpose of the Quantitative Analysis

The **purpose** of this quantitative method study was to determine if the application of quality management at institutions of higher education resulted in enhanced student learning outcomes assessment results.

Research Question

Q1. Does the application of quality management principles envisaged by accreditation standards at institutions of higher education enhance student learning assessment results?

Hypotheses

$\mathbf{H1_0}$. The application of quality management principles at institutions of higher education does not enhance student learning outcomes assessment results. $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$

$\mathbf{H1_a}$. The application of quality management principles at institutions of higher education enhanced student learning outcomes assessment results. $\mu_1 = \mu_2$

Quantitative Research Methods and Design

This quantitative methods study was used to evaluate the relationship between quality management and student learning outcome assessment results at institutions of higher education. The research design included primary data from a population of 370 institutions of higher education. The population represented baccalaureate, graduate, associate degree institutions in and outside of the United States.

A random sample was selected using a GPower 3.1 computer application. The application tested for the difference between two means (matched pairs) to determine the random sample size. A two-tailed test with an effect size of 0.5 and a sigma error probability of .05, a 1-beta error probability of .95, and critical t of 1.6802300 resulted in a random sample size of 45. The actual power 0.9512400 produced a total sample size of 45 (Bodnar, 2011). The power analysis from GPower 3.1 required a random sample of 45 to conduct the research. The random sample generator identified a random sample of 45 institutions. The random sample institutions of higher education provided primary data through self-study reports that were submitted to verify they meet quality management standards.

There were two constructs scored for each random sample. Quality management using the process guideline scoring rubric (Appendix A) and student learning outcome assessment results using the results guideline scoring rubric (Appendix B). The two scoring guideline rubrics met the criteria of construct validity and content validity.

The mean of the quality management constructs and the mean of the student learning outcome assessment result constructs for each random sample institution provided scores that were statistically analyzed. The means for quality management were tabulated in one column, using SPSS statistical analysis software and the means for student learning outcome assessment results were tabulated in an adjacent column in the SPSS statistical analysis program.

The scoring of the data resulted in ordinal scaled numbers for each construct. The mean of the constructs produced an ordinal number for the variables. Spearman's rank-order correlation was a non-parametric measure of association that used ordinal numbers and was used for this study.

Non-parametric measures of bivariate relationships statistically analyzed the results from the data collected. Spearman's rank-order correlation was performed on the results from the data collected from the random sample of 45 schools [Zikmund 1994]. The random sample represented the population.

Materials/Instruments

The quantitative effectiveness of the quality management system implemented was scored with a scoring guideline rubric developed by the Baldrige Performance Excellence Program [BPEP 2012]. BPEP was managed by the American Society for Quality (ASQ) through the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST).

The process scoring guideline rubric is in Appendix A. Scores from the process scoring guideline rubric reflected the business unit's overall progress and maturity in quality management. The results scoring guideline rubric is in Appendix B. Scores from the results scoring guideline rubric reflected the business unit's overall progress and maturity in student learning outcomes assessment results.

The scoring guideline rubrics meet the criteria of construct validity and content validity. The scoring guideline rubrics established content validity through agreement among professionals in the field of quality management. The scale accurately reflected what it was supposed to measure, and the content of the scales were adequate [Zikmund 1994]. The theory of quality management as studied through the BPEP provided evidence of construct validity with both scoring rubrics.

Spearman's rank correlation coefficient is a useful measure when evaluating monotonic relationships [Piggot-Irvine & Youngs 2011]. The literature review validated the application of Spearman's rank-order correlation with similar

studies when researching Spearman's rank-ordered correlation with quality management and Spearman's rank-ordered correlation with student learning outcomes [Ruihley & Greenwell 2012; Wahab & Rahman 2012].

Data Collection, Processing, and Analysis

The population of 370 institutions of higher education with accredited business units was used to gather a random sample of 45 business units using an Excel random sample generator. An Excel spreadsheet documented the 370 institutions with accredited business units. The name of the second column was Random Number. In the first cell under the heading, the function =RND() was entered. The first cell was copied and pasted into the cells next to the population of 370. Then, the records were sorted by the Random Number column. This produced the random sample.

There were two statistical assumptions for this study. The first assumption was that the data from this study employed an ordinal scale which allowed statistical analysis using Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient [Zikmund 1994]. The data resulted in categories on an ordinal scale that had ordered relationships to each other, but the data did not provide any specific, measurable amount of differences [Wang & Dey 2011].

The second statistical assumption was there was a monotonic relationship between variables. A monotonic relationship exists when the value of one variable increases, the value of the other variable increased or when the value of one variable decrease while the value of the other variable decreases [Reiss 2009]. Thus, a monotonic relationship was required to use Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation.

Results

SPSS statistical software computed the means of the two variables for each of the random sample 45 institutions. The correlation coefficient was subjected to test of significance at 0.01 level. Therefore, the statistical analysis determined whether the correlations were sufficiently different from chance expectations and not due to random sampling error [Zikmund 1994].

Non-parametric measures of bivariate relationships statistically analyzed the results from the data collected. SPSS statistical software was used to perform Spearman's rank-order correlation on the results from the quantitative data collected from the random sample of 45 schools. Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation test resulted in a correlation coefficient of .722. The correlation was significant at the 99 percent confidence interval, or the 0.01 significance level. The correlation coefficient of .722 showed that it was unlikely that the null hypothesis was true.

Table 1 *Spearman's Rank-Ordered Correlation Results* provided data that the correlation coefficient was .722. In addition, the statistical analysis provided evidence that the information was significant at the 0.01 level, or 99 percent confidence interval.

Table 1. Spearman's Rank-Order Correlation Results

Correlations

			Student Learning Outcome Results	Quality Management Standards Mean
Spearman's rho	Student Learning Outcome Results	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.722**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	45	45
	Quality Management Standards Mean	Correlation Coefficient	.722**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	45	45

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Evaluation of Findings

The findings produced a correlation coefficient of .722. This positive correlation added data and information to the existing knowledge in management theory by providing evidence that implementing quality management (accreditation) correlates positively to enhanced student learning outcomes assessment results.

The correlation coefficient from Spearman's Rank-Order correlation was significant at the 0.01 level. The results of this study show that it is unlikely that the null hypothesis is true. There does appear to be an association between quality management (accreditation) and student learning outcome assessment results. Therefore, the research question was answered: the statistical analysis resulted in high a correlation between the variables associated with the research question.

Implications and Discussion of Results

The quantitative analysis proved that there is a strong positive association between the implementation of quality management envisaged by ACBSP accreditation, and student learning outcome assessment results, thus suggesting a positive impact of accreditation on business education quality.

The findings are in line with the studies which prove that quality management systems had positive impacts on performance outcomes such as student learning, student retention, and graduation rates in higher education [Elmuti et al. 1996]. Researchers concluded that quality management principles and concepts were beneficial to institutions of higher education [Emiliani 2005; Imran & Mahmood 2011], thus proving their positive association with

business education quality and benefits of undergoing accreditation process for the educational institutions.

The theory of why and how quality management (accreditation) worked is related to the principle of synergism. Significant synergism occurred through the linkage and integration of the application of quality management [Deming 1982]. The synergism of quality management (accreditation) enhances student learning outcome assessment processes. It works through the faculty and staff members developing, deploying, evaluating, and reporting robust processes to follow assessment standards and to maintain accreditation [Stivers & Phillips 2009].

Quality management helped faculty, staff, and administrators at institutions of higher education improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their educational processes. The association with this process of implementing quality management met the needs and demands of internal and external stakeholders to provide evidence that students were learning more effectively through the process of assessing student learning outcomes.

Recommendations

As this study has established a strong positive correlation between quality management and student learning outcome assessment (Spearman's Rank-Order correlation of .722 significant at the 0.01 level), based on the research findings, all business schools, programs, and departments may be recommended to implement quality management through the deployment of accreditation processes.

In addition to the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), there were two other organizations in the United States that were recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) to accredit business degree programs using quality management processes. The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, International (AACSB) had 694 institutions of higher education that were accredited as of January 2021 according to their website. AACSB was no longer CHEA recognized in 2020. The International Assembly for Collegiate Business Education (IACBE) had 169 institutions of higher education that were accredited as of January 2021 according to their website.

There were 15,731 institutions of higher education that had business programs worldwide in 2021 according to AACSB's *Business School Data Guidebook 2021* [Business school data guide 2021]. Between AACSB and ACBSP there were 1064 institutions of higher education that had implemented quality management through accreditation as of February 2021. That was less than seven percent worldwide. Therefore, 93% of the institutions of higher

education with business programs worldwide could benefit from the results of this study.

There were approximately 1,624 institutions of higher education with business programs in the United States [Business school data guide 2021]. Between AACSB and ACBSP 788 institutions of higher education implemented quality management through accreditation as of February 2021. That was 48.5%. That means that 51% of the institutions of higher education in the United States that had business programs may be able to benefit through the application of quality management.

Conclusions

The concept, system, principles and practices of accreditation arouse in the United States out of the need to meet the government's and other stakeholders' demands for quality, and evolved along with the university system itself over decades, to form a coherent set of standards of continuous improvement in all meaningful directions of the educational institutions' life, striving for teaching excellence and high learning outcomes. At present, accreditation principles and processes, as exemplified by ACBSP programmatic accreditation, are implemented in the US and numerous countries of the world, to ensure high standard and continuous improvement of business education quality, to raise the competitiveness of educational institutions in response to the expectations of public (primarily, students and their families), governments, employers, universities/colleges, academics, and broader communities.

Grounding on the evolutionary foundation of knowledge in the field of quality management, this study established the correlation of the quality management system via ACBSP accreditation with the continuous improvement of business education quality to meet the demands of prospective employers, business units and other stakeholders. The research provided statistical evidence that the application of quality management principles enshrined in ACBSP accreditation standards at institutions of higher education with accredited business programs did result in the association with enhanced student learning outcomes.

This study fulfills the need for more information about the influence that quality management systems had on performance indicators such as student learning outcomes. At the same time, it suggests implications that 51% of the institutions of higher education with business programs in the United States, and 93% of the institutions of higher education worldwide could benefit from implementing accreditation principles and processes to maintain and enhance their education quality and competitiveness in the world business education market.

Higher education quality management results in better satisfaction of the stakeholders' expectations and higher employability of the institution's graduates. Since the quality of education is crucial for the country's economic growth and prosperity, the business education institutions and programs in Ukraine and other Eastern/Central-European and Eurasian countries may benefit immensely from implementing quality management through ACBSP accreditation for their undergraduate (bachelor), graduate (masters), and postgraduate (doctoral) programs or graduate business programs, to satisfy ever rising expectations of candidates for top managerial and leadership positions in companies, startups and organizations.

Nowadays when employers in US, Ukraine, and all countries of the world pay undiverted attention to the global credibility and reputability of accreditation of business schools/ programs, and accordingly, the real value of job candidate's business diploma, it is difficult to overestimate the value of ACBSP programmatic accreditation. It is a ticket to the higher realms of today's fast-growing and innovatively changing business world.

References:

AACSB vs. ACBSP (2015): The Importance of Finding an Accredited Business Program. https://www.aiuniv.edu/blog/2015/april/aacsb-vs-acbsp

ACBSP (n.d.) Accreditation Standards https://acbsp.org/general/custom.asp?page=accreditation-standards

Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs. (2012). *ACBSP standards and criteria for demonstrating excellence in baccalaureate/graduate degree schools and programs.* http://www.acbsp.org/download.php?sid=29

Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs. (2012). *Quality assurance report template.* http://www.acbsp.org/download.php?sid=1193

ACSC (n.d.) Higher Education Act 1965, The Great Society of Congress http://acsc.lib.udel.edu/exhibits/show/legislation/higher-education-act

Ahire, S. L., Waller, M. A., & Golhar, D. Y. (1996). Quality management in TQM versus non-TQM firms: An empirical investigation. *The International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management 13*(8), 8-27. http://search.proquest.com/docview/197606505?accountid=28180

Aslund, A. (Oct. 4, 2012). Outdated educational system translates into lagging economy. Kyiv Post. https://www.kyivpost.com/article/opinion/op-ed/why-ukraine-keeps-falling-behind-educationally-economically-313833.html

The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, AACSB International. (2021). Business school data guide 2021. retrieved from: http://www.aacsb.edu/~/media/AACSB/Publications/data-trends-booklet/2021-business-school-data-guide.ashx

Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, (2013). *2013–2014 Education criteria for performance excellence.* http://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/criteria.cfm

Baldrige Performance Excellence Program, (2012). *2011–2012 Education criteria for performance excellence.* http://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/criteria.cfm

Bodnar, J. W. (2011). *Bayesian item response theory: Statistical inference and power analysis.* (Order No. 3496351, Western Michigan University). *ProQuest Dissertations*

and Theses, 383. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/920881388?accountid=2818. (920881388)

Brown-Bulloch, L. (2011). *Alignment and integration for strategy execution in Baldrige award winning organizations.* (Order No. 3480392, University of Phoenix). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,* 594. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/899229759?accountid=28180. (899229759)

Carrigan, M. D. (2010). Economic uncertainty and the role of organizational development. *Journal of Business & Economics Research 8*(4), 99-104. http://search.proquest.com/docview/194950950?accountid=28180

Chattopadhyay, A., Ghosh, R., Maji, S., Ray, T., & Lahiri, S. (2012). A time motion study in the immunization clinic of a tertiary care hospital of Kolkata, West Bengal. *Indian Journal of Community Medicine, 37*(1), 30-33. doi:10.4103/0970-0218.94019

Corporate Finance Institute. (2020). *Management Theories.* https://corporatefinanceinstitute.com/ resources/careers/soft-skills/management-theories/

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). (2014, June 22). *Accreditation serving the public interest*. [Web log post]. http://www.chea.org/pdf/chea-at-a-glance_2012.pdf

Culver, S. (2010). *Educational quality, outcomes assessment, and policy change: The Virginia example*. http://search.proquest.com/docview/848230496?accountid=28180

Curtis, R. S., & Wu, W. (2012). Learning and assessment: The application of ePortfolios. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice 12*(3), 66–74. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1024140287?accountid=28180

Deming, E. W. (1982). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, Massachusetts. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for Advanced Educational Services.

Dierksmeier, C. (2011). The freedom-responsibility nexus in management philosophy and business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics 101*(2), 263-283. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0721-9

Dobyns, L., & Crawford-Mason, C. (1991). *Quality or else: The revolution in world business*. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Duque, L. C., & Weeks, J. R. (2010). Towards a model and methodology for assessing student learning outcomes and satisfaction. *Quality Assurance in Education 18*(2), 84–105. doi:10.1108/09684881011035321

Eaton, J. S. (2010). Accreditation and the federal future of higher education. *Academe 96*(5), 21–24, 5. http://search.proquest.com/docview/757456300?accountid=28180

Elmuti, D., Kathawala, Y., & Manippallil, M. (1996). Are total quality management programmes in higher education worth the effort? *The International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management 13*(6), 29–44. http://search.proquest.com/docview/197613077?accountid=28180

Emiliani, M. L. (2005). Using kaizen to improve graduate business school degree programs. *Quality Assurance in Education 13*(1), 37–52. http://search.proquest.com/docview/213734338?accountid=28180

EFQM. The need for a model. (2014, January 15). *Who does the organization work for?* [Web log post]. http://www.efqm.org/efqm-model/the-need-for-a-model

Fathi, Y. (1995). Managing for total quality: From Deming to Taguchi and SPC. *The Engineering Economist 40*(3), 308–308. http://search.proquest.com/docview/206731089?accountid=28180

Fred, A. F. (2012). Impact of quality management practices on the performance and growth of small and medium sized enterprises (SMES) in Ghana. *International Journal of Business and Social Science 3*(13), n/a. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1022656953?accountid=28180

Gehart, D. (2011). The core competencies and mft education: Practical aspects of transitioning to a learning-centered, outcome-based pedagogy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy 37*(3), 344–54. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/881055505?accountid=28180

Geiger, R. L. (2014) *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hanford, E. (n.d.) A Brief History of For-Profit Higher Education in the United States, American Public Media. https://americanradioworks.publicradio.org/features/tomorrows-college/phoenix/history-of-for-profit-higher-education.html

Imran, M., & Mahmood, Z. (2011). Sustainable adaptation of TQM programs in higher educational institutions of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business 3*(7), 102–111. http://search.proquest.com/docview/923786866?accountid=28180

Kallison, J. M., & Cohen, P. (2010). A new compact for higher education: Funding and autonomy for reform and accountability. *Innovative Higher Education 35*(1), 37–49. doi: 10.1007/s10755-009-9123-2

Keller, G. (1992), Increasing quality on campus -- on Q: Causing quality in higher education by Daniel T. Seymour. *Change 24*, 48-48. http://search.proquest.com/docview/208059923?accountid=28180

Kelley, C., Tong, P., & Beom-Joon Choi. (2010). A review of assessment of student learning programs at AACSB schools: A dean's perspective. *Journal of Education for Business 85*(5), 299–306. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/746427728?accountid=28180

Klefsjö, B. (2010). Quality management: Theory and application. *Quality Progress 43*(10), 61–61. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/762506615?accountid=28180

Klefsjö, B. (2011). Juran's quality handbook: The complete guide to performance excellence. *Quality Progress 44*(3), 68–69. http://search.proquest.com/docview/866830230?accountid=28180

Lewis, A. M. (2011). One hundred years later: What would Frederick w. Taylor say? *International Journal of Business and Social Science 2*(20), n/a. http://search.proquest.com/docview/904530688?accountid=28180

Man, M. M. K., & Kato, I. (2010). Japanese management and total quality management (TQM) -the application in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Management and Innovation 2*(2), 1–8. http://search.proquest.com/docview/885422767?accountid=28180

McNamara P (2015) Why Business Schools Exist: On the Intellectual Origins of Business Schools in Nineteenth Century France and America, Voegelinview https://voegelinview.com/business-schools-exist-intellectual-origins-business-schools-nineteenth-century-france-america/

Michael, J. T., Chris McNicholas, Chris Nicolay1, Ara Darzi1, Derek Bell and Julie E Reed (2013): Systematic review of the application of the plan–do–study–act method to improve quality in healthcare. *The international journal of healthcare improvement*, http://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/early/2013/09/11/bmjqs-2013-001862.full

Middaugh, M. F. (2012). Introduction to themed PHE issue on accreditation in higher education. *Planning for Higher Education 40*(3), 5–7. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1021195372?accountid=28180

Muñoz, E., A., Jaime, A. M., McGriff, D. L., & Molina, A. H. (2012). Assessment of student learning: Estudios Chicana/o cultivating critical cultural thinking. *Teaching Sociology 40*(1), 34–49. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/918716628?accountid=28180

National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce. (2012). 2011-*2012 Education Criteria for Performance Excellence.* http://www.nist.gov/baldrige/publications/upload/2011_2012_Education_Criteria.pdf

NAQA (Ukraine). (2019). Strategy of The National Agency for Higher Education Quality Assurance to 2022. https://en.naqa.gov.ua/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Strategy-to-2020.pdf

O'Brien, C (2021)A brief history of the GI Bill, Military Times https://www.militarytimes.com/education-transition/2021/03/10/a-brief-history-of-the-gi-bill/nineteenth-century-france-america/

Ohia, U. O., PhD. (2011). A model for effectively assessing student learning outcomes. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research 4*(3), 25–32. http://search.proquest.com/docview/865045144?accountid=28180

Online Education Research (n.d.) Question: Who Accredits MBA (Master's in Business dministration) Programs? https://www.onlineeducation.com/business/faqs/who-accredits-mba-programs

Parscale, S. L., Dumont, J. F., & Plessner, V. R. (2015). The effect of quality management theory on assessing student learning outcomes. *SAM Advanced Management Journal 80*(4), 19–31.

Petropoulou, O., Vassilikopoulou, M., & Retalis, S. (2011). Enriched assessment rubrics: A new medium for enabling teachers to easily assess student's performance when participating in complex interactive learning scenarios. *Operational Research 11*(2), 171–186. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12351-009-0047-5

Piggot-Irvine, E., & Youngs, H. (2011). Aspiring principal development programme evaluation in New Zealand. *Journal of Educational Administration 49*(5), 513–541. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09578231111159520

Porter, W. R. (2011). Stability by design. *Journal of Validation Technology 17*(3), 82–96. http://search.proquest.com/docview/896470349?accountid=28180

Potts, D.B. (1971). American colleges in the nineteenth century: From localism to denominationalism. *History of Education Quarterly*: 363–380 in JSTOR

Prabhu, N. K. (2011). Human resource management at the crossroads. *The International Business & Economics Research Journal 10*(8), 23–34. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/886545236?accountid=28180

Pryor, M. G., Humphreys, J. H., Taneja, S., & Toombs, L. A. (2011). Where are the new organization theories? evolution, development and theoretical debate. *International Journal of Management 28*(3), 959–978. http://search.proquest.com/docview/888689759?accountid=28180

Reiss, J. (2009). Causation in the Social Sciences: Evidence, Inference, and Purpose. In W. Paul Vogt (Ed.), *SAGE Quantitative Research Methods.* (Vol. 39, pp. 21–691). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. http://srmo.sagepub.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/view/sage-quantitative-research-methods/SAGE.xml

Ruihley, B. J., & Greenwell, T. C. (2012). Understanding the league sport participation experience utilizing the critical incident technique. *Sport Marketing Quarterly 21*(1), 32–42. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/1008913845?accountid=28180

Sanjaya, M. (2006). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education: An introduction*.

Bangalore, India, National Printing Press

Scott, J. (2005). *The concise handbook of management: A practitioner's approach*. Binghamton, New York: The Haworth Press, Inc.

Sedlock, R. (2010). TREAT your customers. *Quality Progress 43*(12), 80–80. http://search.proquest.com/docview/846790060?accountid=28180

Shiraz, N., Rashid, M., & Riaz, A. (2011). The impact of reward and recognition programs on employee's motivation and satisfaction. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business 3*(3), 1428–1434. http://search.proquest.com/docview/887726475?accountid=28180

Sidney, R. C., & Chad, J. M. (2010). An analysis of student self-assessment of online, blended, and face-to-face learning environments: Implications for sustainable education delivery. *International Education Studies, 3*(3), 36–40. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/821817327?accountid=28180

Skocpol, T (2001) Delivering for Young Families: The Resonance of the GI Bill. prospect.org. December 19, 2001. February 18, 2022. https://prospect.org/topics/theda-skocpol/

Smith, J. (2011). The lasting legacy of the modern quality giants. *Quality 50*(10), 40–42, 44–47. http://search.proquest.com/docview/901902150?accountid=28180

Smith, J. (2011). A tribute to Dr. Joseph M. Juran. *Quality 50*(3), 20–20. http://search.proquest.com/docview/855438927?accountid=28180

Smothers, J. (2011). Assumption-based leadership: A historical post-hoc conceptualization of the assumptions underlying leadership styles. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship 16*(3), 44–59. http://search.proquest.com/docview/889143981?accountid=28180

Spangehl, S. D. (2012). AQIP and accreditation: Improving quality and performance. *Planning for Higher Education 40*(3), 29–35. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1021195391?accountid=28180

U.S. Department of Education, Committee on Measures of Student Success, A Report to Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. (2011).

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2002). Law on Higher Education. [In Ukrainian]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2984-14#Text

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2014). Law on Higher Education. [In Ukrainian]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1556-18#Text

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2017). Law on Education. [In Ukrainian]. https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2145-19#Text

Wahab, N. A., & Rahman, A. R. A. (2012). Efficiency of zakat institutions in Malaysia: An application of data envelopment analysis. *Journal of Economic Cooperation & Development 33*(1), 95–112. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/1426793097?accountid=28180

Walters, D. D. (2011). *Graduate perceptions of customer service in institutions of higher learning.* (Order No. 3458446, Kansas State University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 186. http://search.proquest.com.proxy1.ncu.edu/docview/875560065?accountid=28180. (875560065).

Wlodarski, J (2022) College Accreditation: *The Basics, Best Colleges*. https://www.bestcolleges.com/blog/accreditation/

Wyld, D. C. (1996). The rhythm of the saints: A generational perspective on management history. Management Research News, 19(7), 37–37. http://search.proquest.com/docview/223541954?accountid=28180

Zikmund, W. (1994). *Business Research Methods.* Fort Worth, Texas: The Dryden Press.

Appendices

Appendix A Process Scoring Guidelines (For Use with Categories 1–6)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
1	2
0% or 5%	• No systematic approach to item requirements is evident; information is anecdotal. (A) • Little or no deployment of any systematic approach is evident. (D) • An improvement orientation is not evident; improvement is achieved by reacting to problems. (L) • No organizational alignment is evident; individual areas or work units operate independently. (I)
10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%	• The beginning of a systematic approach to the basic requirements of the item is evident. (A) • The approach is in the early stages of deployment in most areas or work units, inhibiting progress in achieving the basic requirements of the item. (D) • Early stages of a transition from reacting to problems to a general improvement orientation are • evident. (L) • The approach is aligned with other areas or work units largely through joint problem solving. (I)
30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%	• An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the basic requirements of the item, is evident. (A) • The approach is deployed, although some areas or work units are in early stages of deployment. (D) • The beginning of a systematic approach to evaluation and improvement of key processes is evident. (L) • The approach is in the early stages of alignment with the basic organizational needs identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)
50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%	• An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the overall requirements of the item, is evident. (A) • The approach is well deployed, although deployment may vary in some areas or work units. (D) • A fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement process and some organizational learning, including innovation, are in place for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of key processes. (L) • The approach is aligned with your overall organizational needs as identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)

Appendix A continuation

1	2
70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%	• An effective, systematic approach, responsive to the multiple requirements of the item, is evident. (A) • The approach is well deployed, with no significant gaps. (D) • Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning, including innovation, are key management tools; there is clear evidence of refinement as a result of organizational-level analysis and sharing. (L) • The approach is integrated with your current and future organizational needs as identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)
90%, 95%, or 100%	• An effective, systematic approach, fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the item, is evident. (A) • The approach is fully deployed without significant weaknesses or gaps in any areas or work units. (D) • Fact-based, systematic evaluation and improvement and organizational learning through innovation are key organization-wide tools; refinement and innovation, backed by analysis and sharing, are evident throughout the organization. (L) • The approach is well integrated with your current and future organizational needs as identified in response to the Organizational Profile and other process items. (I)

2013–2014 Criteria for Performance Excellence

Appendix B Results Scoring Guidelines (For Use with Category 7)

SCORE	DESCRIPTION
1	2
0% or 5%	• There are no organizational performance results, or the results reported are poor. (Le) • Trend data either are not reported or show mainly adverse trends. (T) • Comparative information is not reported. (C) • Results are not reported for any areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's • mission. (I)
10%, 15%, 20%, or 25%	• A few organizational performance results are reported, responsive to the basic requirements of the item, and early good performance levels are evident. (Le) • Some trend data are reported, with some adverse trends evident. (T) • Little or no comparative information is reported. (C) • Results are reported for a few areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's • mission. (I)

Appendix B continuation

1	2
30%, 35%, 40%, or 45%	• Good organizational performance levels are reported, responsive to the basic requirements of the item. (Le) • Some trend data are reported, and most of the trends presented are beneficial. (T) • Early stages of obtaining comparative information are evident. (C) • Results are reported for many areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's • mission. (I)
50%, 55%, 60%, or 65%	• Good organizational performance levels are reported, responsive to the overall requirements of the item. (Le) • Beneficial trends are evident in areas of importance to the accomplishment of your organization's • mission. (T) • Some current performance levels have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or • benchmarks and show areas of good relative performance. (C) • Organizational performance results are reported for most key customer, market, and process • requirements. (I)
70%, 75%, 80%, or 85%	• Good-to-excellent organizational performance levels are reported, responsive to the multiple requirements of the item. (Le) • Beneficial trends have been sustained over time in most areas of importance to the accomplishment of • your organization's mission. (T) • Many to most trends and current performance levels have been evaluated against relevant comparisons and/or benchmarks and show areas of leadership and very good relative performance. (C) • Organizational performance results are reported for most key customer, market, process, and • action plan requirements. (I)
90%, 95%, or 100%	• Excellent organizational performance levels are reported that are fully responsive to the multiple requirements of the item. (Le) • Beneficial trends have been sustained over time in all areas of importance to the accomplishment of • your organization's mission. (T) • Industry and benchmark leadership is demonstrated in many areas. (C) • Organizational performance results and projections are reported for most key customer, market, • process, and action plan requirements. (I)

2013–2014 Criteria for Performance Excellence

Стів Парскейл, Лестер К. Рімс, Тетяна Андрієнко-Геніна. **Акредитація у США як показник якості освіти світового класу**

На переломному етапі європейської та світової історії надзвичайно важливо розкрити та ефективно використати потенціал високоякісної вищої освіти, заради кращого майбутнього для прийдешіх поколінь. Управління якістю вищої освіти за допомогою акредитації має довгу історію розвитку в Сполучених Штатах, а також перевірені часом стандарти, що стимулюють акредитовані установи постійно покращувати академічну якість.

Концепції, системи, принципи та практики акредитації склалися у Сполучених Штатах через потребу відповідати вимогам якості, і розвивалися протягом десятиліть, щоб сформувати узгоджений набір стандартів та засад постійного вдосконалення у всіх значущих напрямках освітньої діяльності навчальних закладів, задля високих показників освітньої діяльності та результатів навчання. На даний момент принципи та процеси акредитації, прикладом яких є програмна акредитація Ради з акредитації бізнес-шкіл і програм (ACBSP), впроваджуються в США та багатьох країнах світу, щоб забезпечити високий стандарт і постійне покращення якості бізнес-освіти, щоб підвищити конкурентоспроможність навчальних закладів у відповідь на очікування громадськості (насамперед, студентів та їхніх сімей), уряду, роботодавців, університетів/коледжів, науковців та ширшої спільноти.

У цьому дослідженні встановлено взаємозв'язок системи управління якістю вищої освіти через акредитацію ACBSP з постійним підвищенням показників якості бізнес-освіти. Це дослідження також надає статистичні докази того, що застосування принципів управління якістю у вищих навчальних закладах з акредитованими бізнес-програмами асоціаціюється з покращенням результатів навчання студентів.

Управління якістю вищої освіти веде до підвищення успішності працевлаштування випускників закладу. Оскільки якість освіти має вирішальне значення для економічного зростання та процвітання країни, навчальні заклади та програми бізнес-освіти в Україні та інших країнах Центральної та Східної Європи та Євразії можуть виграти від впровадження управління якістю через акредитацію ACBSP для студентів бакалаврських, магістерських та докторських бізнес-програм, на задоволення дедалі зростаючіх очікувань від лідерів та кандидатів на керівні посади.

Дослідження показує, що 51% вищих навчальних закладів з бізнес-програмами в Сполучених Штатах і 93% вищих навчальних закладів у всьому світі можуть отримати користь від впровадження принципів і процесів акредитації для підтримки та підвищення якості своєї освіти та конкурентоспроможності на світовому ринку бізнес-освіти, заради найвищого визнання дипломів випускників на світових ринках праці та значного підвищення їх затребуваності до працевлаштування.

Ключові слова: *якість освіти, акредитація, управління якістю, бізнес-освіта, оцінювання результатів навчання студентів, досконалість навчання, постійне вдосконалення, ACBSP*

Steve Parscale, PhD in Business Administration, Chief Accreditation Officer of the American Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP), conducts the accreditation process and a continuous review of the accreditation standards to assure relevance.

Dr. Parscale was appointed by the United States Department of Commerce, National Institute of Standards and Technology as a member of the Board of Examiners of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. He is the United States Air Force veteran, was the Director of Quality at Lee Aerospace, Inc. and a Certified Quality Manager, the American Society for Quality (ASQ).

E-mail: sparscale@acbsp.org

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8176-4162

Lester C. Reams, Doctor of Public Administration, Juris Doctor, Professor of Business Law, Statistics, Organizational Assessment, and Market Assessment. Mount Saint Mary's University, Los Angeles Business Administration Department's ACBSP Co-Champion for accreditation; ACBSP Mentor assisting ACBSP members in achieving their ACBSP accreditation, ACBSP National Legislative Advisory Committee Member monitoring all legislation that regulates college and university policies and programs.

E-mail: lreams@msmu.edu

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6883-7072

Tatiana Andrienko-Genin, PhD, Doctor of Science, accreditation expert, former Associate Dean of the School of Business and Economics, Professor of Intercultural Business Communication, Leadership and Dissertation Research Methods. Author of 8 books and numerous scholarly publications focusing on academic quality of higher education. VP, Global Academic Mobility, Kyiv International University, Ukraine. Professor, Faculty Senate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee Chair, Westcliff University, California, USA.

E-mail: tandriienko-genin@westcliff.edu

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0235-6839

Стів Парскейл, доктор філософії з ділового адміністрування, головний спеціаліст з акредитації Американської ради з акредитації бізнес-шкіл і програм (ACBSP), керує процесом акредитації та веде постійний перегляд стандартів акредитації щодо їх відповідності. Доктор Парскейл був призначений Національним інститутом стандартів і технологій Міністерства торгівлі Сполучених Штатів членом експертної ради Національної премії якості Малкольма Болдріджа. Він є ветераном військово-повітряних сил США, був директором з якості в Lee Aerospace, Inc. і сертифікованим менеджером з якості Американського товариства якості (ASQ).

E-mail: sparscale@acbsp.org

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8176-4162

Лестер К. Рімс, доктор державного управління, доктор юриспруденції, професор підприємницького права, статистики, експертної оцінки організацій та оцінки ринків. Уповноважений представник ACBSP з акредитації кафедри ділового адміністрування Університету Маунт-Сент-Меріс, Лос-Анджелес. Куратор кандидатів на отримання акредитації ACBSP, член Національного консультативного комітету з питань законодавства ACBSP, який контролює всі законодавчі акти, що регулюють політику й програми коледжів та університетів.

E-mail: lreams@msmu.edu

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6883-7072

Тетяна Андрієнко-Геніна, доктор філологічних наук, експерт з акредитації, колишній заступник декана факультету економіки та бізнесу, професор міжкультурних ділових комунікацій, лідерства та методів дисертаційного дослідження. Автор 8 книг і численних наукових публікацій, присвячених академічній якості вищої освіти. Проректор з міжнародної академічної мобільності, Київський міжнародний університет, Україна. Професор, голова комітету Вченої ради з питань різноманітності, справедливості та інклюзії, Університет Вестклiфф, Каліфорнія, США.

E-mail: tandriienko-genin@westcliff.edu

https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0235-6839