

STRATEGIC PLANNING IN THE MANAGEMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: THEORETICAL AND APPLIED APPROACHES (ON THE EXAMPLE OF TÜRKIYE AND AZERBAIJAN)

*KHALIDE HAMIDOVA**

*Corresponding author: hamidovakhalide@gmail.com

Abstract. This article examines the role of strategic planning in the governance of higher education institutions through a comparative analysis of Türkiye and Azerbaijan. The study explores how strategic planning is conceptualized, institutionalized, and implemented within higher education systems, with particular attention to governance structures, policy frameworks, managerial capacity, and organizational culture.

Using a qualitative and conceptual research design, the study draws on a systematic analysis of national higher education policy documents, institutional strategic plans, regulatory frameworks, and relevant academic literature. The analytical approach is grounded in comparative governance perspectives and focuses on identifying patterns of convergence and divergence in strategic planning practices across the two national contexts. The findings demonstrate that Türkiye has developed a relatively advanced and structured approach to strategic planning, supported by regulatory mechanisms, performance-based management principles, and integrated quality assurance systems. In Turkish universities, strategic planning serves not only as a formal administrative requirement but also as an operational tool that guides decision-making, resource allocation, institutional differentiation, and innovation-oriented development.

In contrast, strategic planning in Azerbaijani higher education remains at an early and uneven stage of development. Although certain institutions have introduced strategic documents and actively participate in international cooperation programs, planning practices often remain fragmented, symbolic, and weakly integrated into everyday governance processes. Limited managerial capacity, insufficient stakeholder involvement, and weak links between strategic planning and budgeting continue to constrain effective implementation.

The comparative analysis highlights that strategic planning is most effective when embedded in participatory governance structures, supported by institutional autonomy, and reinforced by continuous monitoring and organisational learning. The study concludes that strengthening strategic planning practices can significantly enhance governance capacity, policy coherence, and the sustainable integration of higher education institutions into the global academic environment.

Keywords: Strategic planning, higher education governance, university reforms, Turkey, Azerbaijan.

JEL Classification: I23, I28, H83, M10

1. INTRODUCTION

Strategic planning has become an indispensable pillar of governance in complex organisations, particularly in the higher education sector. In an era characterised by rapid globalisation, technological

advancement, and intensifying competition, universities are increasingly expected to operate not only as educational institutions but also as strategic actors that contribute to national development, innovation ecosystems, and societal resilience. Unlike traditional bureaucratic management models, which tend to focus on routine administrative functions and short-term operational stability, strategic planning introduces a forward-looking, systematic, and goal-oriented approach to institutional governance.

In the context of higher education, strategic planning enables universities to articulate long-term visions, define measurable objectives, allocate resources effectively, and respond proactively to internal and external challenges. Global trends such as digital transformation, internationalisation, demographic change, and shifting labour market demands have significantly reshaped the expectations placed on universities. As a result, higher education institutions are increasingly required to adopt governance models that emphasize adaptability, accountability, and sustainability (Gutterman, 2023; Earnst, 2024).

Profound structural and functional transformations mark the contemporary higher education landscape. Universities are no longer insulated academic entities; rather, they operate within complex networks involving governments, industries, civil society, and international organizations. This evolving environment has intensified competition for students, research funding, and global recognition. Consequently, strategic planning has emerged as a critical mechanism for universities to maintain relevance, enhance institutional performance, and strengthen their societal impact.

In Turkey, strategic planning has gradually evolved from a formal administrative requirement into a more institutionalized and policy-driven process. Since the early 2000s, national reforms led by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) have mandated the preparation of strategic plans aligned with national development goals, quality assurance frameworks, and performance-based budgeting systems. These reforms have encouraged universities to integrate strategic planning into their governance structures, linking institutional missions with measurable outcomes, innovation agendas, and accountability mechanisms. As noted by Tosun (2019) and Ericok and Arastaman (2022), Turkish universities increasingly perceive strategic planning not merely as a bureaucratic obligation but as a central instrument for shaping institutional identity and long-term competitiveness.

In parallel, innovation has become a defining dimension of contemporary higher education governance. Beyond technological advancement, innovation encompasses organizational restructuring, pedagogical transformation, research capacity building, and the development of entrepreneurial ecosystems within universities. However, innovation cannot be sustained without coherent strategic planning. As emphasized by Hamidova (2022) and Coşkun and Ünal (2013), the failure of many reform initiatives stems not from a lack of ideas but from insufficient strategic coordination, limited institutional capacity, and weak implementation mechanisms. Strategic planning thus plays a critical role in translating innovative aspirations into actionable policies and measurable outcomes.

The global disruptions triggered by the COVID-19 pandemic further underscored the necessity of strategic foresight in higher education governance. Universities worldwide were compelled to rapidly transition to digital learning environments, reorganize academic processes, and ensure continuity of research and student support systems. These experiences highlighted the importance of flexible, resilient, and data-informed strategic planning frameworks capable of responding to uncertainty and crisis (Hakan, 2020).

While Turkey has made substantial progress in institutionalizing strategic planning practices, the situation in Azerbaijan remains comparatively nascent. Although several Azerbaijani universities have initiated strategic development processes and engaged in international cooperation programs, the integration of strategic planning into everyday governance structures remains uneven. Challenges such as limited managerial capacity, weak stakeholder engagement, and insufficient linkage between planning and budgeting continue to constrain the effectiveness of strategic initiatives. Consequently, strategic planning in many Azerbaijani institutions remains symbolic rather than transformative.

Against this background, a comparative examination of strategic planning practices in Türkiye and Azerbaijan offers valuable insights into the dynamics of higher education governance in transitional

contexts. Such a comparison allows for the identification of shared challenges, divergent trajectories, and opportunities for mutual learning. It also contributes to a broader understanding of how strategic planning can function as a catalyst for institutional transformation within diverse socio-political and cultural settings.

Accordingly, this article aims to explore the theoretical foundations and practical applications of strategic planning in higher education, with a particular focus on the experiences of Turkey and Azerbaijan. By analyzing policy documents, institutional practices, and relevant academic literature, the study seeks to (1) examine the role of strategic planning in enhancing institutional effectiveness and innovation, (2) assess the extent to which strategic planning has been institutionalized in both national contexts, and (3) identify opportunities for strengthening strategic governance through comparative learning and regional cooperation.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK / LITERATURE REVIEW

Strategic planning, as a managerial and institutional development instrument, has its conceptual roots in military strategy and corporate management theories. Over time, it has evolved into a central component of governance within public-sector institutions, including higher education organisations. In the university context, strategic planning is a systematic, continuous process by which institutions define their mission, assess internal and external environments, formulate long-term objectives, allocate resources, and monitor performance to ensure sustainable development and institutional effectiveness (Gutterman, 2023; Balanced Scorecard Institute, n.d.).

From a theoretical perspective, strategic planning draws upon multiple conceptual traditions, including systems theory, rational planning models, and contingency theory. Systems theory emphasises the interdependence of organisational subsystems—such as academic units, administrative structures, research infrastructure, and external stakeholders—highlighting the necessity of coordinated and integrated planning processes. Universities, as complex adaptive systems, must continuously align their internal capacities with external environmental demands to maintain equilibrium and relevance (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Rational planning models conceptualise strategic planning as a sequential, structured process that involves environmental scanning, problem identification, goal formulation, strategy selection, implementation, and evaluation. Within higher education, this model facilitates evidence-based decision-making and encourages transparency, accountability, and performance monitoring. As noted by Earnst (2024), such models enable institutions to translate abstract visions into measurable objectives, thereby strengthening institutional coherence and operational efficiency.

In addition to rational approaches, contemporary strategic planning in higher education increasingly incorporates principles of participatory governance and adaptive leadership. Rather than functioning as a purely top-down administrative exercise, strategic planning is now understood as a collaborative process involving academic staff, students, administrative personnel, and external stakeholders. This participatory dimension enhances institutional legitimacy, fosters ownership of strategic goals, and improves the quality of decision-making (Coşkun & Ünal, 2013). Through inclusive engagement, universities can better align their strategic priorities with societal expectations and labor market needs.

Central to the theoretical framework of strategic planning is the concept of organizational learning. Universities are not static entities; they evolve through continuous reflection, feedback, and adaptation. Strategic planning thus serves not only as a managerial tool but also as a learning mechanism through which institutions interpret environmental signals, reassess priorities, and refine institutional practices. According to Budnik et al. (2023), effective strategic planning enables organizations to transform uncertainty into opportunity by fostering reflexivity, innovation, and long-term resilience.

Key components commonly associated with strategic planning in higher education include formulating institutional vision and mission statements, conducting environmental scanning using tools

such as SWOT analysis, prioritising strategic objectives, developing implementation plans, and establishing monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. These elements collectively support informed decision-making and enhance organizational coherence. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2011) emphasise that systematic data collection and analysis are essential to ensure that strategic decisions are grounded in empirical evidence rather than intuition or political expediency.

In recent decades, strategic planning has also become closely linked to performance management and quality assurance frameworks. The growing emphasis on accountability, transparency, and outcomes-based funding has compelled universities to adopt performance indicators, benchmarking tools, and internal quality assurance mechanisms. As noted by Tosun (2019), performance-based management systems increasingly influence institutional priorities, resource allocation, and organizational behavior within higher education systems.

Furthermore, the concept of innovation occupies a central position in contemporary strategic planning discourse. Innovation in higher education extends beyond technological advancement to include pedagogical innovation, curriculum reform, governance restructuring, and the development of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Strategic planning provides the structural foundation necessary for coordinating these diverse innovation processes. Without coherent planning frameworks, innovative initiatives risk fragmentation and limited sustainability (Hakan, 2020).

In the context of globalization, strategic planning also serves as a key instrument for navigating internationalization processes. Universities are increasingly required to position themselves within global knowledge networks, engage in cross-border collaborations, and respond to international quality standards. Strategic planning enables institutions to articulate internationalization goals, allocate resources strategically, and assess global engagement outcomes in a systematic manner (Ericok & Arastaman, 2022).

Constructivist perspectives further inform the theoretical foundation of this study on organizational development. From this viewpoint, strategic planning is understood not merely as a technical exercise but as a socially constructed process shaped by institutional culture, power relations, and contextual dynamics. Planning processes both reflect and shape organizational identities, influencing how institutions interpret challenges and envision future trajectories (Budnik et al., 2023).

In sum, the theoretical literature underscores that strategic planning in higher education functions as a multidimensional and dynamic process. It integrates managerial rationality with participatory governance, supports institutional learning, and enables universities to respond effectively to complex and rapidly changing environments. This theoretical foundation provides the analytical lens for examining how strategic planning is conceptualized and operationalized in the higher education systems of Türkiye and Azerbaijan.

3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE, METHODOLOGY AND DATA

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of strategic planning in the governance of higher education institutions through a comparative perspective, focusing on Türkiye and Azerbaijan. By analysing how strategic planning is conceptualised and implemented in these two national contexts, the study seeks to reveal both common patterns and structural differences that shape institutional governance, decision-making processes, and long-term development strategies.

The research is guided by the assumption that strategic planning is not merely a technical managerial instrument, but rather a multidimensional governance mechanism influenced by historical legacies, institutional cultures, and national policy environments. In this sense, the study aims to explore how strategic planning contributes to institutional effectiveness, innovation capacity, and sustainability, while also identifying the constraints that limit its practical implementation. Particular attention is given to the extent to which strategic planning has become embedded in organisational routines and to whether it functions as a genuinely transformative tool or remains largely symbolic.

Methodologically, the study adopts a qualitative and conceptual research design grounded in document analysis and comparative interpretation. Instead of relying on primary empirical data such as surveys or interviews, the analysis is based on a systematic examination of existing policy documents, institutional strategies, and scholarly literature related to higher education governance and strategic management. This approach allows for an in-depth understanding of institutional practices while maintaining analytical flexibility and contextual sensitivity.

The analytical framework is informed by the principles of qualitative content analysis as outlined by Tavşancıl and Aslan (2001). Through this approach, key themes and patterns related to strategic planning—such as institutional vision, governance structures, stakeholder engagement, and performance monitoring—are identified and interpreted within their respective national contexts. The comparative dimension of the study enables a nuanced examination of how similar governance instruments operate under different political, administrative, and cultural conditions.

In line with a constructivist perspective, strategic planning is understood as a socially embedded and dynamic process rather than a fixed administrative procedure. Institutional strategies are shaped by interactions among actors, organizational norms, and external pressures, including regulatory frameworks and international expectations. This perspective allows the analysis to move beyond formal policy documents and to consider how strategic planning is practiced, interpreted, and internalized within higher education institutions.

The data used in this study consist of official strategic plans, national higher education policy documents, academic publications, and analytical reports produced by both domestic and international organizations. These sources were collected from academic databases, institutional repositories, and publicly accessible governmental platforms. Priority was given to recent, relevant materials to ensure the analysis reflects current developments in higher education governance.

Through this methodological approach, the study seeks to provide a coherent and context-sensitive understanding of strategic planning practices in Türkiye and Azerbaijan. By combining theoretical reflection with comparative analysis, the research aims to contribute to ongoing scholarly debates on higher education governance while offering practical insights for policymakers and institutional leaders operating in transitional and reform-oriented educational systems.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of strategic planning practices in higher education institutions in Türkiye and Azerbaijan reveals both converging tendencies and structural divergences shaped by historical trajectories, governance traditions, and institutional capacities. While both countries acknowledge the importance of strategic planning as a governance tool, the depth of its institutionalisation and practical application differ significantly.

Strategic Planning in Turkish Higher Education: Institutionalization and Performance Orientation.

In Turkey, strategic planning has gradually evolved into an integral component of university governance, largely due to systemic reforms initiated in the early 2000s. These reforms, driven by national development strategies and coordinated by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK), have established strategic planning as a mandatory, structured process within public universities (Ikizer, 2024; Cevher & Yüksel, 2015). As a result, Turkish higher education institutions have developed relatively mature planning mechanisms that align institutional objectives with national policy priorities and performance-based management systems (Spur Reply, n.d.).

One of the defining features of the Turkish model is the formal integration of strategic planning into administrative and financial decision-making. Universities are required to prepare multi-year strategic plans that include clearly articulated missions, visions, performance indicators, and implementation timelines (Spur Reply, n.d.; Cevher & Yüksel, 2015). These plans are closely linked to budgeting processes, enabling institutions to align resource allocation with strategic priorities. Such alignment has

contributed to greater organizational coherence and accountability, reinforcing the role of strategic planning as a functional management instrument rather than a symbolic document.

Another notable characteristic is the increasing emphasis on performance measurement and quality assurance. Turkish universities employ key performance indicators (KPIs) to monitor academic output, research productivity, internationalization efforts, and societal engagement. This performance-oriented approach has encouraged institutions to adopt data-driven decision-making practices and to continuously assess their progress toward strategic objectives (Cevher & Yüksel, 2015). As highlighted by Tosun (2019), this shift has strengthened institutional capacity and fostered a culture of evaluation and continuous improvement.

Moreover, strategic planning in Türkiye has become closely intertwined with innovation and digital transformation. Universities have increasingly incorporated digitalization strategies into their strategic plans, particularly in response to technological advancements and the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic (Saridas & Nayir, 2022; Caymaz et al., 2024). The expansion of online education platforms, digital research infrastructures, and data management systems reflects a broader institutional commitment to adaptability and resilience. These developments have reinforced the role of strategic planning as a tool for navigating uncertainty and sustaining organizational effectiveness in rapidly changing environments.

At the same time, the Turkish experience also reveals certain limitations. Despite formal compliance and institutional maturity, strategic planning processes may still exhibit elements of bureaucratic rigidity. In some cases, planning remains heavily top-down, with limited participation from academic staff and students. This can constrain innovation and reduce the sense of ownership among key stakeholders (Saridas & Nayir, 2022). Nevertheless, compared with many transitional systems, Turkey demonstrates a relatively advanced, operationalised model of strategic planning in higher education.

Strategic Planning in Azerbaijani Higher Education: Emerging Structures and Persistent Challenges.

In contrast, strategic planning in Azerbaijani higher education remains at an earlier and more fragmented stage of development. Although policy reforms and international cooperation initiatives have introduced elements of strategic thinking into the sector, the institutionalization of strategic planning practices is uneven and often limited in scope (Voronovska & Chi, 2023).

A small number of leading universities—particularly those with stronger international linkages—have begun to develop strategic documents, mission statements, and long-term development plans. These initiatives are frequently driven by participation in international programs, accreditation processes, or partnerships with foreign institutions (Voronovska & Chi, 2023). In such cases, strategic planning serves to align institutional goals with global standards and enhance international visibility.

However, for many higher education institutions in Azerbaijan, strategic planning remains largely symbolic rather than operational. Strategic documents are often developed to meet formal requirements rather than to guide everyday decision-making. Several structural challenges contribute to this situation. First, there is a limited institutional capacity for strategic management, including a shortage of specialized staff trained in policy analysis, planning, and evaluation (Caymaz et al., 2024). Second, stakeholder engagement remains relatively weak; faculty members, students, and external partners are seldom meaningfully involved in strategic deliberations. This limits both the relevance and legitimacy of strategic plans (İkizer, 2024).

Another significant constraint is the weak linkage between strategic planning and resource allocation. In many cases, institutional budgets are misaligned with strategic priorities, undermining implementation feasibility and accountability mechanisms. Without clear performance indicators and monitoring systems, strategic plans risk becoming static documents with minimal practical impact.

Comparative overview of strategic planning in higher education institutions in Türkiye and Azerbaijan

Dimension	Turkey	Azerbaijan
Governance model	Semi-autonomous governance with centralized coordination through the Council of Higher Education (YÖK)	Highly centralized governance with a gradual transition toward institutional autonomy
Legal framework	Strategic planning is mandatory and regulated through national legislation and performance-based budgeting	Strategic planning is encouraged through policy initiatives, but not uniformly regulated
Planning culture	Institutionalized and embedded within administrative and academic processes	Emerging and often formalistic, with limited operational integration
Stakeholder engagement	Increasing involvement of academic staff, students, and external partners	Limited participation, mainly restricted to administrative leadership
Digitalization and innovation	Integrated into strategic plans with measurable performance indicators	Present at the policy level but weakly institutionalized
Link between strategy and funding	Strong alignment through performance-based budgeting mechanisms	Weak linkage between strategic objectives and financial planning

Source: Compiled by the author based on national policy documents and comparative analysis

Furthermore, historical governance traditions continue to shape institutional behavior. The legacy of centralized decision-making and hierarchical control has limited the development of participatory and adaptive governance models. As a result, strategic planning often lacks the flexibility and responsiveness required to address rapidly changing educational, technological, and labor market conditions.

Comparative Insights and Implications.

A comparative analysis of Turkey and Azerbaijan highlights both convergence and divergence in their approaches to strategic planning in higher education. While both systems recognise the importance of strategic planning as a governance tool, they differ significantly in institutional capacity, policy coherence, and implementation depth.

Turkey's experience demonstrates how sustained policy support, regulatory frameworks, and performance-based management can facilitate the institutionalization of strategic planning. Over time, this has enabled universities to integrate strategic thinking into daily operations and long-term development agendas. Azerbaijan, by contrast, remains in a transitional phase, where strategic planning is increasingly acknowledged but not yet fully embedded within institutional governance structures.

Despite these differences, the two countries share important commonalities that create opportunities for mutual learning and cooperation. Shared historical and cultural ties, combined with similar developmental challenges, provide a foundation for exchanging best practices and adapting successful governance models. Regional platforms, such as cooperation mechanisms within the Organisation of Turkic States, offer promising avenues for collaborative capacity building and policy learning.

Importantly, the findings suggest that strategic planning should not be treated as a standardised technical exercise but rather as a context-sensitive and adaptive process. Effective strategic governance requires not only formal planning tools but also institutional cultures that value participation, transparency, and continuous learning. Without these elements, strategic planning risks remaining superficial and disconnected from organizational realities.

In this sense, the comparative analysis underscores the importance of aligning strategic planning with broader governance reforms. Strengthening leadership capacities, enhancing stakeholder engagement, and integrating planning with budgeting and quality assurance systems are essential steps toward making strategic planning a meaningful driver of institutional transformation.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study has examined the role of strategic planning in the governance of higher education institutions through a comparative analysis of Turkey and Azerbaijan. By situating strategic planning within broader institutional, political, and cultural contexts, the research has demonstrated that strategic planning is not merely a technical management instrument but a multidimensional process shaped by governance traditions, institutional capacities, and policy environments.

The findings indicate that Turkey has achieved a relatively advanced level of institutionalization in strategic planning. Supported by national regulatory frameworks, performance-based budgeting mechanisms, and quality assurance systems, Turkish universities have increasingly embedded strategic planning into their organizational routines. This has enabled them to align institutional missions with national development priorities, enhance accountability, and respond more effectively to global challenges such as digital transformation, internationalization, and competitiveness. Although certain limitations remain—particularly regarding participatory decision-making and flexibility—the overall trajectory reflects a mature and operational planning culture.

In contrast, strategic planning in Azerbaijani higher education remains in a formative stage. While policy reforms and international cooperation initiatives have introduced strategic thinking into institutional discourse, implementation remains uneven and often symbolic. Structural constraints, including limited managerial capacity, weak stakeholder engagement, and insufficient integration between planning and resource allocation, continue to restrict the transformative potential of strategic planning. As a result, many strategic initiatives fail to translate into sustainable institutional change.

The comparative analysis highlights that the effectiveness of strategic planning is closely linked to governance structures, institutional autonomy, and organizational culture. Strategic planning cannot function as a stand-alone administrative exercise; it must be embedded within a broader framework of participatory governance, accountability, and continuous learning. Without these enabling conditions, strategic documents risk becoming formal compliance tools rather than drivers of institutional development.

At the same time, the shared historical background and regional proximity of Türkiye and Azerbaijan create significant opportunities for mutual learning and collaboration. Platforms for regional cooperation—particularly within the framework of the Organisation of Turkic States—can facilitate the exchange of best practices, joint capacity-building initiatives, and the development of shared quality-assurance mechanisms. Such cooperation has the potential to strengthen strategic governance across higher education systems and contribute to the emergence of a more integrated regional academic space.

From a broader perspective, this study underscores that strategic planning should be understood as a dynamic and adaptive process rather than a static administrative requirement. Effective strategic planning depends not only on formal structures and documentation but also on leadership commitment, institutional culture, and the active engagement of academic communities. Universities that successfully integrate these elements are better positioned to navigate uncertainty, respond to societal needs, and contribute meaningfully to national and global development agendas.

In conclusion, strategic planning represents a critical instrument for enhancing the governance capacity of higher education institutions in both Turkey and Azerbaijan. While their trajectories differ, both systems stand to benefit from deeper institutionalisation of strategic planning practices, increased collaboration, and sustained investment in organisational learning. Future research may build upon this study by incorporating empirical data, stakeholder perspectives, and longitudinal analyses to illuminate

further the evolving role of strategic planning in higher education governance.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Data curation: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Formal analysis: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Investigation: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Methodology: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Project administration: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Supervision: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Validation: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Visualization: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Writing –original draft: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Writing –review & editing: K. Hamidova Aydin.

Acknowledgement: This research did not receive any outside support, including financial support.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- [1] Balanced Scorecard Institute. (n.d.). Strategic planning basics. URL: <https://balancedscorecard.org/strategic-planning-basics/>
- [2] Budnik, O., Kravchenko, O., & Zhuravlova, L. (2023). Strategic management as a tool for sustainable development in higher education institutions. *Educational Studies Journal*, 15(2), 45–58.
- [3] Caymaz, E., Akyon, F. V., & Erenel, F. (2024). Afetlerde kaos yönetiminde Türk Silahlı Kuvvetlerinin rolü. *Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/sisad/article/1471503>
- [4] Cevher, E., & Yüksel, H. (2015). In regards to higher education strategy, assessment of educational activities in public universities: The case of Türkiye. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 61, 237–256. <https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2015.61.13>
- [5] Coşkun, A., & Ünal, G. (2013). Higher education in Türkiye: Trends towards self-steering public universities. URL: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f9da/8c484f66ff0c34c3f11db32af72260cf4fa1.pdf>
- [6] Earnst, C. (2024). The five essential elements of strategic planning. URL: <https://edtechcollective.org/news/the-5-essential-elements-of-strategic-planning>
- [7] Ericok, B., & Arastaman, G. (2022). Understanding the internationalization of higher education in Türkiye: The meaning and current policies. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 14(4), 1107–1124.
- [8] Gutterman, A. (2023). Introduction to strategic planning. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/369737695_Introduction_to_StrategicPlanning
- [9] Hakan, K. Ö. (2020). Digital transformation in higher education: A case study on strategic plans. *Higher Education in Russia*, 29(3), 9–23. <https://doi.org/10.31992/0869-3617-2019-29-3-9-2>
- [10] Hamidova, R. (2022). Pedagogical conditions of forming the professional competence of future teachers in the field of arts. *Bulletin of Baku Slavic University*, 16, 45–52.
- [11] İkizer, İ. (2024). Strategic planning in Turkish local administrations: How participatory is it? *Current Perspectives in Social Sciences*, 28(2), 147–157.
- [12] Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.17169/fqs-9.3.996>
- [13] Saridas, G., & Nayir, F. (2022). Examining culturally responsive education in Türkiye through strategic plans. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 31, 85–111. <https://doi.org/10.14689/enad.31.1604>
- [14] Spur Reply. (n.d.). Six elements of effective strategic planning. <https://spur-reply.com/blog/the-6-elements-of-effective-strategic-planning>
- [15] Tavşancıl, E., & Aslan, E. (2001). *Content analysis and application examples for verbal, written and other materials*. Istanbul: Epsilon Publishing House.
- [16] Tosun, H. (2019). A performance assessment model recommended for higher education system in Türkiye and a case study. *Psychology Research*, 9(10), 420–431. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5542/2019.10.003>

- [17] Voronovska, O., & Chi, X. (2023). Musical-performing interpretation as a means of forming artistic and analytical skills of future musical art teachers. *Scientific Bulletin of South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University Named after K. D. Ushynsky*, 3, 7–13. <https://doi.org/10.24195/2617-6688-2023-3-1>
- [18] Yavuz, K. (2009). The applicability of strategic planning in state universities in Türkiye according to their managers (Doctoral dissertation). YÖK National Thesis Center. URL: https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/bitstream/handle/20.500.12812/702887/yokAcikBilim_10227835.pdf
- [19] Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods in social sciences* (8th ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing House.

Khalide Hamidova Aydın, PhD, Head of the Training Center, Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, Postdoctoral Fellow, Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan;

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-6873-2353

Address: Uzeyir Hajibeyli, Sabail, AZ1000, Baku, Azerbaijan.

E-mail: hamidovakhalide@gmail.com

Received: July 30, 2025; **revised:** January 07, 2026; **accepted:** January 25, 2026; **published:** June 30, 2026.

Хамідова Халіде. Стратегічне планування в управлінні вищими навчальними закладами: теоретичні та прикладні підходи (на прикладі Туреччини та Азербайджану). *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 13 (2) (2026), 52-61.

У статті досліджується роль стратегічного планування в управлінні закладами вищої освіти на основі порівняльного аналізу досвіду Туреччини та Азербайджану. У дослідженні аналізується концептуалізація, інституціоналізація та практична реалізація стратегічного планування в системах вищої освіти з особливим акцентом на моделі управління, нормативно-правові рамки, управлінську спроможність та організаційну культуру.

Методологічною основою дослідження є якісний концептуальний підхід, що передбачає аналіз національних стратегічних документів у сфері вищої освіти, інституційних стратегій університетів, регуляторних механізмів та сучасної наукової літератури. Порівняльний аналіз дозволяє виявити спільні та відмінні риси впровадження стратегічного планування в обох країнах. Результати дослідження свідчать, що Туреччина сформувала відносно розвинену та структуровану модель стратегічного планування, інтегровану з механізмами державного регулювання, результативного управління та системами забезпечення якості. У турецьких університетах стратегічне планування виконує не лише формальну адміністративну функцію, а й слугує практичним інструментом прийняття управлінських рішень, розподілу ресурсів, інституційної диференціації та інноваційного розвитку.

Натомість у закладах вищої освіти Азербайджану стратегічне планування перебуває на початковому та нерівномірному етапі становлення. Попри наявність стратегічних документів та участь окремих університетів у міжнародних програмах співпраці, планувальні практики часто залишаються фрагментарними та слабо інтегрованими в повсякденні управлінські процеси. Обмежена управлінська спроможність, недостатнє залучення стейкхолдерів і слабкий зв'язок між стратегічним плануванням та бюджетуванням істотно знижують ефективність їх реалізації.

Зроблено висновок, що стратегічне планування може бути дієвим лише за умови його впровадження в рамках партисипативного управління, інституційної автономії та систематичного моніторингу й організаційного навчання. Посилення стратегічного планування здатне суттєво підвищити управлінську спроможність закладів вищої освіти та сприяти їх сталому включенню до глобального академічного простору.

Ключові слова: стратегічне планування, управління вищою освітою, університетські реформи, Туреччина, Азербайджан.