

# **PertevMUN'25**

## **Ministry of Education**

### **Study Guide**

**Agenda Item:** Shaping the Future of Higher Education  
Assessment.

**Co-Under Secretaries General**  
Haktan Efe Özgür & Zeynep Yavuz

**Co-Chair**  
Ela Çakır

**Co-Chair**  
Saniyar Safari

## Table of Contents

<b>Letter from Co-Secretaries General.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Letter from Co-Under Secretary General (Haktan Efe Özgür).....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Letter from Co-Under Secretary General (Zeynep Yavuz).....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Rules of Procedure.....</b>	<b>7</b>
1. Roll Call.....	7
1.1. Quorum.....	7
2. Opening Speeches.....	7
3. General Speakers' List.....	7
3.1. Yields.....	7
3.2. Priority.....	8
4. Points.....	8
4.1. Point of Information.....	8
4.2. Point of Eminent Clarification.....	8
4.3. Point of Personal Privilege.....	8
4.4. Point of Order.....	8
4.5. Point of Parliamentary Inquiry.....	8
5. Motions.....	9
5.1. Moderated Caucus.....	9
5.2. Semi-Moderated Caucus.....	9
5.3. Unmoderated Caucus.....	9
5.4. Extension Motion.....	9
5.5. Termination Motion.....	10
5.6. Suspension or Adjournment of the Meeting.....	10
6. Right to Reply.....	10
6.1. Motion to Follow Up.....	10
7. Departments.....	10
7.1. Lecture Departments.....	10
7.2. Curriculum Specialists.....	10
8. Department Meetings.....	11
9. Commission Paper.....	11
<b>Introduction to the Committee.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Agenda Item: Shaping the Future of Higher Education Assessment.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Introduction to Agenda Item.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Key Terms and Definitions.....	14
• Higher Education Assessment.....	14
• Standardized Testing.....	14
• Formative Assessment.....	14
• Summative Assessment.....	14
• Competency-Based Assessment.....	14
• Modular Learning System.....	14

• Digital Assessment Tools.....	14
• Academic Integrity.....	14
• Holistic Assessment.....	15
• Student-Centered Learning.....	15
• Learning Outcomes.....	15
• Blended Learning.....	15
• Micro-Credentials.....	15
• Accreditation.....	15
• Lifelong Learning.....	15
• Alternative Assessment Methods.....	15
Historical Background.....	16
1. ÖSS (Student Selection Exam) – 1981-2010.....	16
2. LYS (Lisans Yerleştirme Sınavı) – 2001-2017.....	16
3. YGS (Yükseköğretime Geçiş Sınavı) – 2010-2017.....	17
4. YKS (Yükseköğretim Kurumları Sınavı) – 2018-Present.....	17
Key Issues and Challenges.....	18
Stakeholders and Perspectives Regarding the Topic.....	20
Case Studies and Existing Curricula.....	21
Research-Oriented Education in the United States.....	21
The UK’s Tutorial System and Its Impact on Assessment.....	21
Finland’s Holistic Assessment Approach.....	21
Singapore’s Skills-Based Education System.....	21
The Bologna Process in Europe.....	22
Roles of the Major Departments:.....	22
1. Council of Higher Education (YÖK).....	22
2. Higher Education Quality Council (YÖKAK).....	22
3. Universities and Internal Units.....	22
• Rector's Office.....	22
• Senate.....	22
• Faculties and Departments.....	22
4. Measurement, Selection, and Placement Center (ÖSYM).....	22
5. Vocational Qualification Authority (MYK).....	22
6. Accreditation Agencies.....	23
7. Student Evaluators.....	23
Questions to be Answered:.....	23
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>24</b>

## Letter from Co-Secretaries General

Esteemed Delegates and Distinguished Guests,

First of all we are more than honored to welcome you all to the second annual session of PERTEVMUN, which will take place at our precious home, Pertevniyal Anatolian High School on 18th, 19th and 20th of April 2025.

Since the beginning of high school, as your Co-Secretary Generals, we have been doing literally everything together. We started doing MUNs together, we were Co-Director Generals at PERTEVMUN'24, moreover we are currently and proudly standing here as the club presidents and Co-Secretaries General. We can not thank enough to our school and our advisors, Gülşah Teacher and Yaprak Teacher for providing us the opportunity to organize this conference.

Throughout our committee preparations, we have the chance to meet with excellent MUNers and expand our knowledge. Accordingly, your USG's Haktan and Zeynep were two of these amazing people. We simply do not know how to express our gratitude for them!!

Last but not least we could not forget our excellent organization team and their hard work. Our Co-Director Generals İnci and Yiğit have worked so hard to prepare you for the most unforgettable conference.

We know that the best is soon, see you in rewinded springs.

Yağmur Raife APAYDIN & Beyzanur ÖZSİĞİNAN  
Co-Secretaries General of PertevMUN'25

## Letter from Co-Under Secretary General (Haktan Efe Özgür)

Hello, Distinguished Delegates of PertevMUN'25!

I am Haktan Efe Özgür, a sophomore student at Florya Tevfik Ercan Anatolian High School and I am pleased to serve as the Co-Under Secretary General of the Ministry of Education,

Before we proceed, I would like to take a moment to express my sincere gratitude to our esteemed Co-Secretary Generals, Yağmur Raife Apaydın and Beyzanur Özsiğınan, for granting me the opportunity to serve as the Co-Under Secretary General of this distinguished committee. I would also like to extend my heartfelt thanks to my Co-Under Secretary General, Zeynep Yavuz for her dedication and hard work.

However, a special note of appreciation goes to one of my Co-Chairs, Ela Çakır, whose support has been invaluable. She has been one of my closest friends since the start of my MUN journey, and I'm glad we haven't grown apart ever since. She slayed fr fr.

Many of you are attending this conference as your first MUN conference, so we have aimed to make this Study Guide as accessible as possible. I know being in an MUN conference can be very intimidating at first, but in actuality, it's not as intimidating as many make it out to be. This is your chance to expand your social circle and improve your communication skills. I believe that we will have three amazing days within our committee and in general. Furthermore, I would like to remind you that there are still many other sources beyond this study guide, so I encourage you to research more. If you have any questions regarding the study guide or any questions in general, feel free to reach me at [haktanefeozygur240@gmail.com](mailto:haktanefeozygur240@gmail.com).

Best Regards,

Haktan Efe Özgür, Co-Under Secretary General of the Ministry of Education

## Letter from Co-Under Secretary General (Zeynep Yavuz)

Dear Delegates,

I am Zeynep Yavuz. I am a 10th grade IB Biology student at Prof.Dr.Mümtaz Turhan Social Sciences High School. I attended my first MUN in 2023 and I am continuing to make MUN as well.

I would like to appreciate your motivation to choose the second edition of PertevMUN'25! PertevMUN has a special place in my heart due to our dearest academy(Especially both Secretary-Generals). I hope you will enjoy this conference as well.

If you are reading this, probably you are a delegate in this committee that has never done this before. I believe that you will overcome this committee as well. I do not want you to be concerned about anything in this committee, that's why me and Haktan wrote this precious STG for you. I encourage you to discuss, be a part of this committee during these 3 days.

If you need any assistance do not hesitate to contact me via email:  
[zeynep.yavuz2108@gmail.com](mailto:zeynep.yavuz2108@gmail.com)

# Rules of Procedure

## 1. Roll Call

In the Ministry, there are two ways for Representatives to express their presence: saying “Present” or “Present and Voting”. The difference between the two is that Representatives who state they’re “Present and Voting” cannot abstain during the voting procedure within that session.

### 1.1. Quorum

Each session starts with the Chairboard taking the roll call to see whether or not the Quorum has been met. The Quorum of the Ministry of Education simply dictates that  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the Committee is present to open debate. If the Quorum is met, the Chairboard will announce that the Committee can proceed with the debate.

## 2. Opening Speeches

In the first official session of the conference, all Representatives are called onto the floor alphabetically in order to give their opening speeches. The Representatives are expected to give short speeches on their party’s views and past actions regarding the Agenda Item and briefly introduce their country to the other Committee members.

## 3. General Speakers’ List

The Committee has to have an open General Speakers’ List (GSL) on the Agenda Item at all times. The GSL is the default activity of the Committee, so if there aren’t any motions on the floor, the debate automatically turns to the GSL. The General Speakers’ List entertains speeches about anything as long as it relates to the Agenda Item at hand. Those wishing to be added to the GSL should either send the Chair Board a message paper stating their request or raise their placards when the Chair calls for members that wish to be added to the list. Representatives added to the GSL have a limited time to speak and are required to yield the floor if they have remaining time.

### 3.1. Yields

Representatives granted the right to speak on a substantive issue may conclude their speeches by yielding in one of three ways: to another Representative (“We yield the floor to the Representative of ...”), to questions from the floor (“We invite the assembly to pose questions”), or to the Chair (“We yield the floor to the Chair”).

### **3.2. Priority**

Within the General Speakers' List, Curriculum Specialists hold priority over regular representatives, granting them the right to make speeches before other speakers if they are on the list. However, only 2 Curriculum Specialists can simultaneously be on the General Speakers' list.

## **4. Points**

### **4.1. Point of Information**

A Point of Information is a request made by a Representative to ask for clarification or additional information regarding a statement or a proposal presented within the committee.

### **4.2. Point of Eminent Clarification**

A Point of Eminent Clarification is a request made by a Representative to ask for clarification or additional information regarding a statement or a proposal presented within the committee made by a Representative within a motion.

### **4.3. Point of Personal Privilege**

If something prevents a Representative from fully engaging in committee proceedings, they may request to give a Point of Personal Privilege. The chairboard will make an effort to resolve the cause of impairment successfully. A speaker may only be interrupted by this point.

### **4.4. Point of Order**

A Representative may rise to a Point of Order if a rule of procedure is not properly observed by a Representative or by the Chairboard. The Chairboard will rule on the validity of the point. The Chairboard may rule out of order those points that are dilatory or improper. Such a decision cannot be appealed. A Point of Order may only interrupt a speaker when the speech itself is not following proper parliamentary procedure.

### **4.5. Point of Parliamentary Inquiry**

When the floor is open, a Representative may rise to a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry to request an explanation of the Rules of Procedure from the Chairboard. This point may not interrupt a Speaker.



## **5. Motions**

### **5.1. Moderated Caucus**

A Moderated Caucus serves to promote focused debate during key points of discussion. A motion for a Moderated Caucus may be introduced whenever the floor is open, prior to the closure of debate. The Representative proposing the motion must briefly explain its purpose, specify a total duration not exceeding twenty minutes, and set a time limit for individual speeches. The motion will be voted on immediately, requiring a simple majority for approval.

If no Representative wishes to speak during the Moderated Caucus, it will conclude immediately. The caucus may be extended only once, and only after it has ended. However, the total duration of the caucus, including the extension, must not exceed twenty minutes. Representatives are not permitted to yield any remaining speaking time during a Moderated Caucus.

### **5.2. Semi-Moderated Caucus**

At the Chair's discretion, Representatives may propose a motion for a Semi-Moderated Caucus, allowing for informal discussion within the committee room. During this period, Representatives not actively speaking are expected to remain seated and show respect to those addressing the committee.

### **5.3. Unmoderated Caucus**

The purpose of Unmoderated Caucuses is to provide the Representatives with a chance to discuss freely, offering a suspension of rules. A Representative may raise a motion for an Unmoderated Caucus at any time when the floor is open, before closure of debate. The Representative making the motion must specify a time limit for the caucus, not to exceed twenty minutes. The motion will immediately be put to a vote and will pass given a simple majority. An Unmoderated Caucus may be extended only once, and the combined length of an Unmoderated Caucus and its extension may not exceed twenty minutes.

### **5.4. Extension Motion**

An extension motion is employed when a Representative requests a continuation of the previously approved motion. However, a motion may be extended only once and the extension must not surpass the original duration specified in the initial motion.

### **5.5. Termination Motion**

A termination motion is introduced when the Chairboard opens the floor for motions after all designated speakers have concluded their statements on the current motion. It is proposed when the Members of the European Parliament (Representatives) collectively decide to conclude discussion on the motion.

### **5.6. Suspension or Adjournment of the Meeting**

The suspension of the meeting means the postponement of all committee functions until the next meeting. The adjournment of the meeting means the postponement of all committee functions for the duration of the conference. Once the floor is open for points and motions, any Representative can move to suspend or adjourn the meeting and the Chairboard will decide whether it's in order according to the meeting schedule. When in order, such motions will not be debatable but will be immediately voted upon, barring any motions taking precedence, and will require a simple majority to pass.

## **6. Right to Reply**

The Right to Reply may be invoked when the national integrity of a Representative (Representative) is infringed upon and must be submitted to the Chairboard via message paper. The Chairboard retains the discretion to overrule the invocation of the Right to Reply.

### **6.1. Motion to Follow Up**

A motion to follow up is made when a representative requests the opportunity to provide a response to a Right to Reply.

## **7. Departments**

### **7.1. Lecture Departments**

The lecture departments, categorized under 'Humanities,' 'Science,' 'Foreign Language,' and 'Mathematics,' will engage in discussions regarding the current curricula and assessment methods within their respective areas. The purpose of these discussions is to evaluate existing practices and collaboratively establish new guidelines and policies.

### **7.2. Curriculum Specialists**

Curriculum specialists are responsible for determining whether the proposed rules will be implemented in schools. They possess the authority to amend these rules or to veto them entirely. If even one curriculum specialist chooses to veto a proposed rule, it will not move forward or be put into effect.

## **8. Department Meetings**

A department meeting occurs when a department professor formally requests a private meeting either with their own department, another party, or the curriculum specialists via a message paper. If the request is directed toward another department, the Chairboard communicates the request via message paper and seeks confirmation from the receiving department regarding their acceptance of the meeting proposal.

## **9. Commission Paper**

A commission paper is a formal written document presented during a debate or negotiation to push a specific agenda or position. It outlines a representative's proposed course of action, supported by evidence or rationale, with the aim of influencing the committee's direction or decision-making. The commission paper is often used to clarify a representative's stance on an issue and advocate for particular outcomes in the deliberations. Every clause of the commission will be voted upon by the Curriculum Specialists after a private meeting taken by them, this voting will be done by roll call voting. Once the commission paper is done as a whole it will be voted upon the whole committee.

## Introduction to the Committee

The Ministry of Education is a governmental body, it differs in every country as each has unique policies and assessment rules. However, in this annual session of PertevMUN, we will be discussing Türkiye's education evaluation system. This committee's main job is to review and suggest better assessment methods for a more effective and fair schooling system.

Groups of representatives will be formed based on their assigned duties and tasks. Every group will hold talks aimed at designing a fresh, enhanced evaluation structure. Tertiary or higher education evaluations such as the YKS (Higher Education Institutions Entrance Exam) will receive special focus, with inputs from educators like teachers and professors at universities. Furthermore, the committee will discuss the methods of evaluation for younger students. The goal is to make the overall assessment process better from primary school till secondary education. These conversations are meant to give a full study about the good and bad points of our current system along with looking at different models of evaluation that could help improve student's study and personal growth more effectively.

When the discussion has elapsed, the representatives will work together to prepare a resolution paper. This has their shared understandings, suggestions and possible policy changes written in it. The document will be like a guide for making Turkey's student evaluation system better so that it matches up with modern educational rules and is effective at getting students ready for next steps in learning or career pathways. Through promoting active sharing of thoughts within the group, we hope to help move education forward while also creating an alternative approach to evaluating students which includes everyone and is equitable too.



## **Agenda Item: Shaping the Future of Higher Education Assessment.**

### **Introduction to Agenda Item**

Shaping the future of Higher Education Assessment is a very common issue in the national curriculum, due to some students' success in other subjects not supported by the government. Higher education assessment is important for measuring student learning, maintaining academic standards, and preparing graduates for jobs. However, as the world changes, traditional assessment methods may no longer be the best and only way to evaluate students. In this agenda item, delegates will discuss creating a new assessment which requires more equality to every student.

In recent years, there has been growing concern that standardized testing and rigid grading systems may not accurately reflect a student's true abilities, particularly for those with diverse learning styles or talents that fall outside of conventional academic areas. This has led to calls for more flexible, inclusive, and comprehensive assessment models that recognize a wider range of skills, including creativity, collaboration, critical thinking, and digital literacy.

Representatives will explore alternative assessment approaches such as project-based evaluations, peer assessments, and portfolio submissions that can provide a more balanced representation of student performance. The goal is to design an assessment framework that not only ensures academic fairness and integrity but also supports the diverse paths students may take in their personal, academic, and professional lives.

## Key Terms and Definitions

- **Higher Education Assessment**

The structured process of evaluating students' academic performance, learning progress, and institutional effectiveness in universities and colleges. It helps measure educational quality, ensure accountability, and guide policy decisions.

- **Standardized Testing**

Exams that follow a uniform structure and scoring system to fairly evaluate students' knowledge across various subjects. These tests help compare educational performance at national or international levels.

- **Formative Assessment**

Ongoing assessments conducted throughout a course, such as quizzes, assignments, and peer feedback, to help students and instructors identify areas for improvement before final evaluations.

- **Summative Assessment**

A final evaluation at the end of an academic term or course, including exams, projects, or dissertations, designed to measure students' overall learning achievements.

- **Competency-Based Assessment**

A modern approach that evaluates students based on their ability to demonstrate practical skills and knowledge rather than relying solely on traditional grading methods. This is often used in vocational and technical education.

- **Modular Learning System**

A flexible educational framework where coursework is divided into separate modules, allowing students to learn at their own pace and customize their education based on personal interests and career goals.

- **Digital Assessment Tools**

Online platforms and software that facilitate exams, assignments, and grading, often incorporating features such as automated scoring, plagiarism detection, and real-time feedback.

- **Academic Integrity**

The ethical standard in education that upholds honesty, originality, and fairness in assessments, ensuring that students do not engage in cheating, or other dishonest practices.

- **Holistic Assessment**

A comprehensive evaluation method that considers various forms of student work, such as essays, portfolios, oral presentations, and practical applications, rather than relying solely on traditional written exams.

- **Student-Centered Learning**

An educational approach that places students at the core of the learning process, encouraging active participation, critical thinking, and personalized learning experiences tailored to their needs and interests.

- **Learning Outcomes**

The specific knowledge, skills, and competencies that students are expected to acquire by the end of an academic program, serving as a measure of educational effectiveness.

- **Blended Learning**

A hybrid teaching model that combines traditional in-person instruction with online learning components, providing accessibility while enhancing student engagement.

- **Micro-Credentials**

Short-term certifications or digital badges awarded for completing specialized courses or skill-based training programs, often recognized by employers and higher education institutions.

- **Accreditation**

The official process by which educational institutions and programs are evaluated against established quality standards to ensure they provide a recognized and credible education.

- **Lifelong Learning**

The ongoing pursuit of education and skill development beyond formal schooling, enabling individuals to adapt to changing job markets and technological advancements throughout their careers.

- **Alternative Assessment Methods**

Non-traditional evaluation techniques such as project-based assessments, oral exams, peer reviews, and self-assessments, which focus on practical skills and creativity rather than standardized tests.

## Historical Background

### 1. ÖSS (Student Selection Exam) – 1981-2010

**Description:**

The ÖSS (Öğrenci Seçme Sınavı) was introduced in 1981 as Turkey's first centralized university entrance exam. It was designed to assess students' general knowledge and abilities for university admissions.

**Exam Structure:**

ÖSS typically consisted of four main sections:

- **Turkish Language:** Grammar, reading comprehension, and literature.
- **Mathematics:** Basic arithmetic, geometry, and analysis questions.
- **Science:** Physics, chemistry, and biology.
- **Social Sciences:** History, geography, philosophy, and sociology.

**Assessment:**

In the ÖSS, candidates received points based on correct answers, and the placement was done according to these points. Incorrect answers would deduct from the total score.

### 2. LYS (Lisans Yerleştirme Sınavı) – 2001-2017

**Description:**

In 2001, the LYS (Lisans Yerleştirme Sınavı) replaced the ÖSS system, as a more detailed and specialized exam to assess students' abilities for specific academic areas.

**Exam Structure:**

The LYS consisted of five different exams, each focusing on specific fields:

- **LYS-1:** Mathematics and Geometry
- **LYS-2:** Science subjects (Physics, Chemistry, Biology)
- **LYS-3:** Turkish and Literature
- **LYS-4:** Social Sciences (History, Geography, Philosophy, Psychology, Sociology)
- **LYS-5:** Foreign Languages (English, German, French, etc.)



**Assessment:**

Each exam had its own scoring system, and students were placed in specific university programs based on their performance in the relevant subject areas.

### 3. YGS (Yükseköğretime Geçiş Sınavı) – 2010-2017

**Description:**

In 2010, the **YGS** (Yükseköğretime Geçiş Sınavı) was introduced as the first stage of university entrance. The YGS was designed to assess students' basic knowledge and general ability to progress into higher education.

**Exam Structure:**

The YGS consisted of two main parts:

- **Basic Proficiency Test (TYT):** Questions from Turkish, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies.
- **Field-Specific Proficiency Tests (AYT):** Specialized questions based on the students' chosen field of study.

**Assessment:**

The YGS exam measured students' basic proficiency for higher education, and students could apply to certain university programs with their YGS score.

### 4. YKS (Yükseköğretim Kurumları Sınavı) – 2018-Present

**Description:**

In 2018, the **YKS** (Yükseköğretim Kurumları Sınavı) replaced the YGS and LYS systems. YKS aims to provide a more comprehensive and flexible approach to university admissions, with a more inclusive evaluation system.

**Exam Structure:**

The YKS is composed of three main sessions:

- **TYT (Basic Proficiency Test):** This session includes questions from Turkish, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. All students are required to take this session.
- **AYT (Field-Specific Proficiency Test):** This session is tailored to students' chosen field of study, with specialized questions based on their intended university program.
- **YDT (Foreign Language Test):** Students who wish to pursue a degree requiring a foreign language must take this session, which includes questions in languages such as English, German, or French.

**Assessment:**

The YKS evaluates students' general and specific knowledge and provides scores that are used to place students into university programs. Both the TYT and AYT scores are crucial for determining eligibility for university placements.

## **Key Issues and Challenges**

It requires surmounting tricky challenges to create a new assessment model for tertiary education. Perhaps the greatest challenge is finding a balance between standardization and individualization. Standard tests are required so that equity and homogeneity across large numbers of students can be determined and that a levelling field can be given to all candidates. But these tests usually do not test a whole range of student talent, including creativity, problem-solving skills, and critical thinking that students need in order to thrive academically and in the workplace. Individualized testing, for instance, projects, or portfolios may provide a better assessment of these skills but lack equity and consistency to place students on a wide scale. It's the balance of these approaches in the appropriate ratio that will result in a holistic and fair assessment system.

Embedding technology into the assessment process is another enormous challenge. With the rapid growth of digital solutions for education, it's prudent to consider how emerging technologies can be leveraged to propel the assessment process. This includes testing on digital platforms, utilizing learning management systems to track progress, and employing artificial intelligence to deliver customized assessments. However, the extensive use of technology in assessment also poses danger in terms of access to information, security, and privacy. Technology can be inaccessible to everyone, and over-reliance on the internet may unintentionally put some categories of individuals in a disadvantageous position. Moreover, the ever-changing nature of technology necessitates that the testing system be equally agile and dynamic to support continuously changing devices and processes, which will certainly make it increasingly difficult to engineer a new system.

Also, the provision of reliability and validity in the new test system is a basic concern. The more differentiated tertiary education systems require the assessment to also show a range of diversity of skills and knowledge such as academic performance alongside softer skills such as leadership, teamwork, and communication. The non-academic skills are not typically measurable by traditional metrics, and it is necessary to incorporate newer approaches, such as peer assessment, self-assessment, or experience-based tests. Having such approaches tested and validated in multiple arenas and cultural settings imposes another level of sophistication on the model-building.

Fairness and equity is likewise a highly salient concern. With more diverse students, tests need to be equitable to all students regardless of background, learning capacities, or learning styles. Standardized tests tend to benefit students who are stronger test-takers or have particular education backgrounds. To assist with this, the new models will need to integrate a number of various kinds of tests, i.e., oral presentations or team work, which could potentially more accurately gauge the true ability and potential of the student.

Finally, being open-minded with regards to the times is a crucial component. Higher education's role is not only to prepare students for success academically but to equip them with the skills required to succeed within the labor market and society as well. As the industries themselves evolve and so along with them the nature of work, the metrics in education also have to evolve so as to discover what skills are needed most in the future, i.e., technical competency, flexibility, and the ability to work internationally, diversely. It is crucial that the model of assessment itself evolves with these changing needs so that the graduates are strong enough to meet the challenges of the future.

In conclusion, the development of a new model of the assessment of higher education is a task of resolving some problems interrelated with one another, from balance between individualization and equity to technology application, stability, and adaptability to the change of society. The effective model must be universal, inclusive, and responsive to the entire range of students' capabilities to equip them for success at the university as well as in life.

## **Stakeholders and Perspectives Regarding the Topic**

Governments and policymakers are primarily interested in the fact that the higher education system produces graduates who can respond to the labor market's needs and support the economy. They typically demand aligned assessment systems with national or international standards to guarantee transparency, accountability, and efficient use of public funds. In addition, governments desire to improve national league tables and international competitiveness by embracing reforms that increase the quality of education and improve the system's efficiency in preparing workers for the economy.

Universities and institutions of higher learning may respond differently to new systems of assessment. They probably see the need for accountability and control of quality but are worried about mandating standardized methods that are not appropriate for addressing the unique needs and objectives of specific institutions. Universities might be apprehensive that they can stifle intellectual freedom, autonomy, and capacity to provide different learning experiences. They may also be interested in the cost of complying with these new requirements and yet remaining in a position to make strides toward their basic educational goals.

Students are the other key party in the equation. They would prefer to see an assessment system that rewards and celebrates a broad range of talents, including critical thinking, creativity, and employment experience, alongside academic success. Students will also most likely fear the pressure of sitting for the tests and how this will impact their college careers and professional careers thereafter. Students will also fear greater inequality since some will most likely have greater access to machinery and preparation for the tests than others.

Employers and industry leaders will ensure that the labor market is populated with adequately skilled and talented graduates. They have the option to use higher education tests that highlight practice skills, employability, and industry opinion. Employers will select tests that clearly indicate a graduate's contribution level to the labor market, enhancing the education system's responsiveness to the industry's and economy's needs.

Accreditation organizations and teams of education are responsible for setting and enforcing standards of higher education tests. They aim to make systems of tests rigorous, inclusive, and adhere to the best education practices. The organizations guarantee the integrity and credibility of higher education systems by providing guidelines, which provide equivalence and homogeneity among institutions and geographical regions.

Finally, parents and the general public also have a stake in higher education tests since they seem to view education as a means of better economic opportunities. They may want the new tests to enhance the general level of education, which translates to better employment prospects and career development for graduates. However, they may also be concerned about the stress such tests bring to students and the potential curtailment of learning experiences.

## **Case Studies and Existing Curricula**

### **Research-Oriented Education in the United States**

In the United States, schools such as Harvard and MIT have had a high level of research-oriented education and application traditionally. Curriculum in such institutions has evolved over time to include case studies of real-life cases from across all disciplines so that students do not only learn theories but also get an opportunity to implement them practically. Such case studies are then included in patterns of examination to test the ability of students to analyze problems from real life and provide recommendations based on principles gained.

### **The UK's Tutorial System and Its Impact on Assessment**

The UK provides another intriguing example. Oxford and Cambridge universities have adopted a tutorial system, with a focus on individual learning and critical thinking from direct contact with tutors. This allows students to explore complex case studies in-depth and develop very good analytical and writing skills. The model of assessment, often in the form of written and oral tests, exactly suits this category by focusing on the student's ability to demonstrate knowledge, synthesize, and apply in real-life contexts.

### **Finland's Holistic Assessment Approach**

Finland is much known for its forward-thinking education system that gives a lot of importance to overall learning and the development of students. Different from many nations that put great weight on standardized exams, Finland holds off implementing these large-scale examinations until the concluding years of high school. Instead, they evaluate student advancement using formative assessments, teacher's observations and evaluations based on projects. Teachers are very important in evaluation, giving customized comments based on each student's requirements and making sure learning is interesting and supportive. This method encourages thinking skillfully, being creative, and solving problems while decreasing the stress and worry students have about tests that carry a lot of weight.

### **Singapore's Skills-Based Education System**

Singapore is gradually changing its education system, moving away from a strict focus on exams and towards one that values skills more. In the past few years, there has been less dependence on important exams, particularly at lower levels of schooling. Instead, it now favors assessments highlighting practical abilities, creativity, and real-world knowledge application. The government also enhances industry partnerships by including skill-based evaluations into higher education programs to make sure that students are adequately ready for work requirements in the future. This change matches Singapore's more extensive plan to stimulate continuous learning, flexibility, and readiness for work among students.

## **The Bologna Process in Europe**

The Bologna Process is an important program with a goal to make the higher education structure in Europe consistent and comparable. Started in 1999, its main focus is on standardizing degrees, assessment rules, and ensuring quality across countries that are part of this process. An important feature of the Bologna Process is putting into use a system based on credits for learning; students gather credits from finished coursework instead of just depending on final exam results only. Methods of continuous assessment, including research projects, internships, and evaluating coursework, are now at the heart of what makes up academic life. The Bologna Process, in addition to increasing student movements within Europe, also guarantees that educational credentials get recognized beyond borders. This contributes to creating a workforce which is more connected and adaptable.

## **Roles of the Major Departments:**

### **1. Council of Higher Education (YÖK)**

YÖK was established in 1981 as the state government body to administer universities in Türkiye. It supervises university budgets, recommends rector candidates to the President, and reviews university activity reports.

### **2. Higher Education Quality Council (YÖKAK)**

YÖKAK provides quality assurance in universities and evaluates accreditation procedures. It was under YÖK initially but became an autonomous body in 2017. It ensures that universities conform to national and international quality standards.

### **3. Universities and Internal Units**

- **Rector's Office**  
Offers overall administration of the university and coordination of academic and administrative units.
- **Senate**  
Ultimate decision-making body for academic matters, responsible for education, research, and evaluation policy-making.
- **Faculties and Departments**  
Develops educational programs, decides course content, and conducts student exams.

### **4. Measurement, Selection, and Placement Center (ÖSYM)**

ÖSYM conducts entrance exams to enter higher education and places the students in universities. It ensures the security, impartiality, and reliability of the exams.

### **5. Vocational Qualification Authority (MYK)**

MYK regulates the Turkish Qualifications Framework (TQF) and develops and implements national qualifications. It ensures that the qualifications meet European standards.

## 6. Accreditation Agencies

Individual academic programs are evaluated by autonomous accrediting agencies in order to ensure their national and international standards. They help to improve the quality of higher education programs.

## 7. Student Evaluators

Students participate in quality assurance through feedback and contribution to university evaluation processes. They help to improve the learning experience by providing their views.

## Questions to be Answered:

- What is the general purpose of the new higher education assessment system?
- Why has the system been proposed, and what problems is it meant to solve in the current education system?
- What will be the impact of the new assessment system on the quality of education?
- Will it improve education outcomes and prepare the students better for work?
- Who are the key stakeholders affected by the new assessment system, and what are they interested in?
- What do students, universities, lecturers, employers, and governments think about the new system?
- What are the benefits of moving away from traditional exams to more holistic or sophisticated competency-based assessments?
- How can continuous assessment, portfolios, or project-based evaluation improve learning outcomes?
- What are some of the potential challenges to universities in implementing the new framework for assessment?
- How will the curricula and teaching methods need to be modified in order to fit into the new system? What resources will be needed?
- How will issues of equality and access in higher education be addressed with the new assessment system?
- Will the new system ensure that all students, regardless of background or resources, are equally evaluated?
- What is the role of technology in the new assessment system?
- How will digital platforms and tools contribute to assessment, and what will be the challenge of including them?
- How will the new system affect student motivation and well-being?
- Will student stress be lessened or exacerbated? How will constant assessments or competency-based models impact student motivation?
- Are there other education systems where the same type of change has been successful, and what can be learned from them?

## Bibliography

▶ Değerlendirici Eğitim Seti | 03 Türkiye’de Yükseköğretimde Kalite Güvencesi Sistemi

[https://www.ksu.edu.tr/depo/belgeler/Y%C3%BCksek%C3%B6%C4%9Fretim%20Kurumlar%C4%B1nda%20Kalite%20S%C3%BCre%C3%A7leri\\_1811091618392397.pdf](https://www.ksu.edu.tr/depo/belgeler/Y%C3%BCksek%C3%B6%C4%9Fretim%20Kurumlar%C4%B1nda%20Kalite%20S%C3%BCre%C3%A7leri_1811091618392397.pdf)

[Yükseköğretimde Kalite Güvencesi Sistemi: Kurumsal Akreditasyon Raporları Üzerinden Bir Değerlendirme](#)

[Kalite Güvencesi: Türkiye Yükseköğretimi için Stratejik Tercihler\\* - Quality Assurance](#)

[DEĞERLENDİRME PROGRAMLARI KILAVUZU](#)

[TÜRKİYE’NİN YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM STRATEJİSİ](#)

[https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/quality-assurance-higher-education\\_en](https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/national-policies/eurydice/content/quality-assurance-higher-education_en)

<https://www.meb.gov.tr/sample-assessment-tools-for-formative-evaluation-were-published-in-place-of-exams/haber/31029/en>