



EDUCATIONAL PROFILE OF SCHOOL OF HEALTH AND FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES ADMINISTRATORS IN TURKEY

Assit. Prof. Dr. Nihal ALOĞLU

Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, nihalless@hotmail.com, orcid.org/0000 0003 4162 2845

Makale Gönderim- Kabul Tarihi (04.02.2021-05.03.2021)

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to explore educational background profile of School of Health and Faculty of Health Sciences administrators in Turkey. This research was conducted as descriptive and cross-sectional studies with administrators from School of Health and Faculty of Health Sciences in Turkey providing university level education. Total 130 schools, 85 School of Health and 45 and Faculty of Health Sciences, and 334 departments, were reached in the spring semester at 2014-2015 academic year. According to the study results, the director and dean of School of Health and FHS are 35 (29.7 %) undergraduate level, 44 (40.7 %) master's degree level and 47 (42.3%) doctorate (Ph.D.) level. The number of associate/vice administrators for nursing is 95 (59.4 %) undergraduate level, 89 (58.9 %) master's degree level and 83 (57.1%) doctorate (Ph.D.) level. The study found that It has observed that the administrators consist of the academicians of which only 32.1% license degree and 36% doctorate degree in the field. The supporting of these schools in terms of quantity and quality, and the selection of administrators among their own faculty staffs is valuable terms of their institutionalization-

Key words: Educational, profile, administrator, school, health.



ULUSLARARASI SAĞLIK YÖNETİMİ VE STRATEJİLERİ ARAŞTIRMA DERGİSİ

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGIES RESEARCH

Cilt/Volume : 7 Sayı/Issue : 1 Yıl/Year : 2021 ISSN -2149-6161

INTRODUCTION

There is great interest in school administrators in the early part of the twenty-first century. This is because of the widespread belief that the quality of administrators makes a significant difference to school and student outcomes. There is growing recognition that the quality of administrators is critical if schools are to produce the best possible outcomes for their learners, and their stakeholders. Several studies demonstrate the important effects of director and dean, vice director and associate dean and chief/head of department as an administrator on the professional work of teachers and the success of students (Short, 1997; White, 1998; Scoble and Russell, 2003; Kleinman, 2003; Heller, et al., 2004; Huston, 2008; Suber, 2012).

Why are school administrators so important? School administrators guide both the direction of the schools and the training of professionals. Managers are therefore in a key position. It has a wide sphere of influence in the profession. Because today's students are colleagues of the future. They are in an active position in their organizations as they directly affect students while performing the managerial functions of their roles and using various power bases (IOM, 2011; Leithwood, 2016; Roussel et al., 2016). They also have an impact beyond their organization through their research, publications and numerous professional activities. Especially the administrators of health schools should have good professional knowledge and equipment. The school administrator has become a priority in education agendas as well as health education (Smith, 2006; Shaffer et al., 2014; Turale, 2015).

School administrators have many responsibilities to fulfill. These may include; Shaping a vision of academic achievement for all students based on high standards of study, as well as creating a welcoming climate for education so that security, a collaborative spirit and other foundations of efficient interaction prevail. Teachers and other school staff need to be good role models to give students a vision. Educators should have a leadership vision, manage all processes in the school well and facilitate learning by creating a collaborative school climate. Because individuals imitate what they see, not what they read (Wallace Foundation, 2012)

In addition to the mentioned above school administrators, Health school administrator should have some unique core competencies due to the special condition of schools. These competencies include; communication and relationship management, knowledge of the health care environment, business skill and principles, professionalism and leadership. Nurse Executive Competencies (NEC) are designed by the American Organization of Nurse Executives (AONE). These competencies emphasize that on the future of masters and doctoral education was highlighted and innovative teaching strategies outlined (Herrin et al., 2006). They are used across the United States at the master's and doctoral levels in a number of programs that prepare nurse leaders. Some examples of programs that have been based on the AONE-NEC include the University of Memphis, University of Iowa, University of Hawaii at Manoa and many more (Waxman et al., 2017).

It is clear that health school administrators can play a central role in defining and sustaining collegial sub-cultures, by ensuring departments operate as socially cohesive communities where all members work collaboratively with a high degree of commitment. Within this management role, more than any other, is the real potential of organizational change and improvement (Stefl, 2008; Pillay, 2010; Paterson, et al., 2010; Wepner et al., 2011).

Regardless of the they administrator positions in school such as dean, director, vice dean, vice director, chairman of department as an administrator, School administrator is like the engines of a

131

ULUSLARARASI SAĞLIK YÖNETİMİ VE STRATEJİLERİ ARAŞTIRMA DERGİSİ

<http://dergipark.gov.tr/usaysad>

(ALOĞLU, N.)



train in that they are primary factors for school success (Leithwood and Seashore, 2012). With another word, administrator has the potential to unleash latent capacities in schools. Achieving school goals and optimum learning by students is all about school effectiveness. It plays a key role in improving school outcomes by influencing the motivations and capacities of teachers, as well as the school climate and environment (Wallace Foundation, 2012).

A profile of dean, director, vice dean, vice director and chairman of department could provide important knowledge for the administrators at present and future administrators of health schools. The purpose of this study is to explore educational background profile of School of Health (SH) and Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS) administrators in Turkey.

METHOD

Purpose and Research Design

The purpose of this research is to explore educational background profile (undergraduate, master's degree and doctorate levels) of SH and FHS administrators (director and dean, vice director and associate dean and chief/head of department) in Turkey.

Sample

In order to determine the schools to which the actively educating schools and departments are affiliated, The Student Selection and Placement Center OSYM programs and quotas (OSYM, 2014) were used. The populations of this work constitute the public and private nursing/health sciences/health schools in Turkey providing university level education. Due to not forming confusion, Nursing schools with different names with the same status are included in the number of SH, likewise health sciences, and nursing faculties are included in the number of FHS. In addition, 5 schools that have not yet received students have been included in the survey since managerial appointments were made. Schools without quota student are not included in the study. Finally, in total 130 schools, 85 SH and 45 FHS, and 334 departments were reached in the spring semester at 2014-2015 academic years.

Research Questions

The specific aim of this study was to investigate educational background of SH and FHS administrators. The research questions for this study were:

1. What are the educational profile of administrator? (undergraduate, master degree and doctorate level).
2. What are the are departmental profile of administrator? (nursing, midwife, social service, medicine, veterinary medicine, chemistry and etc.

No study has examined educational profile of SH and FHS administrators in Turkey. Therefore, this study was conducted.



Instruments

This study used both descriptive and cross-sectional studies. In this study, six traits, namely name of school, name of department, number of staff, gender, educational levels and administration positions are used to define the educational profile of health school administrators.

Educational background profile of administrators is divided into three categories namely (a) undergraduate, (b) master's degree and (c) doctorate degree levels.

Positions of administrators at these schools are divided into three categories namely (a) director and dean (b) vice director and associate dean (c) head/chief departments.

At the same time, departments of schools are divided into two general categories; (a) graduated departments and (b) graduated-non-field departments. If the department is in health school, it is called the main graduated department such as nursing, midwife, nutrition and dietetic (ND), physiotherapy and rehabilitation (RR), and social service and etc. otherwise department is called graduated-non-field department such as medicine, veterinary medicine, chemistry and etc.

Data collection process

The web pages of all schools in this study were examined by the researcher and the existing SH and FHS were taken into consideration. A standardized data form was created for each school. Research data is accessed through the school's websites. 11 SH and FHS, which are not available on the internet or lack sufficient information, have been reached by telephone and incomplete information has been completed. Relevant data were collected and made table by using Microsoft Excel.

Limitations of The Study

This study has several limitations. This research was conducted at only SH and FHS administrators in Turkey who may not represent the entire population of health school administrators such as medicine and veterinary medicine in the Turkey or around the world. It is suggested that studies that are similar to the present study be conducted at different health schools both nationally and internationally. In addition, data on educational level may or may not be accurate at any point in time. We assumed that data were valid at the time of analysis in 2014-2015 academic years.

Ethical aspect of the study: It is a running website scan. Direct human or does not contain any effects on animals. Therefore, there is no need for an ethics committee approval decision.

FINDINGS/RESULTS

Main features of SH and FHS are given in Table 1. These features are divided to three categories; school type, number of personal (academic staff) and number of department. There are total 130 schools. By school type, the majority (65.4%) were SH. However, about one-third (34,6%) FHS. There are total 1904 person. In terms of the number of personnel in these schools, the majority (71%) were academic staff with master's degree and doctorate (asst. Prof, assoc. Prof. and Prof) and only one-third (29%) were teaching staff (instructor/lecturer). There are total 334 department and 16 different department types in this study. By department type, 115(35%) nursing, 43(13%), nutrition-dietetics (ND), 36(11.7%) midwiferies, 35(11%) physiotherapy and rehabilitation, 33(10%) health care management, 20(10%) child development, 20(6.0%) social service, 10(6.0%) audiometry and 22(7%) other departments (Table 1).

Table 1: Some Descriptive Features of SH and FHS in Turkey

Descriptive characteristics	n	%
School of Health (SH)	85	65.4
Faculty of Health Sciences (FHS),	45	34.6
Personel (n=1904)		
Academic Staff (Asst. Prof. Assoc. Prof and Prof with master's degree and doctorate degree)	1357	71.3
Teaching staff (Instructor/Lecturer)	547	28.7
Departments(n=334)		
Nursing	115	34.4
Nutrition and Dietetics (ND)	43	12.9
Midwifery	36	10.7
Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PR)	35	10.5
Health management	33	9.9
Child Development	20	6.0
Social Service	20	6.0
Audiometry	10	3.0
Other (Worker's Health and Job Safety, Emergency and Disaster Management, Mouth and Dental Health, Occupational Therapy, Gerontology, Orthosis Prosthesis, Perfusion)	22	6.6

Table 2 shows that educational profile of SH and FHS director and dean at undergraduate level in Turkey. The total number of administrators included in the analyses is 130, of which 42 (32%) graduated departments of administrators and 88 (68%) graduated non-field departments of administrators. The number of administrators per graduated departments is 33 (25.3 %) nursing, 3 (2.3 %) PR and 6 (4.5 %) other departments. On the other hands, the number of administrators per graduated from non-field departments is 35 (26.9%) medical school, 9 (6.9%) veterinary medicine, 9(6,9%) biology and 10 (7.6%) other departments.

Table 2 shows that educational profile of SH and FHS director and dean at master's degree in Turkey. The total number of administrators included in the analyses is 109, of which 40 (37%) graduated departments of administrators and 69 (63%) graduated non-field departments of administrators. The number of administrators per graduated departments is 32 (29.6 %) nursing, 3 (2.8%) ND. and 4 (2.7%) other departments. On the other hands, the number of administrators per graduated from non-field departments is 44 (40.7%) medical school, 8 (7.4%) veterinary medicine and 15 (16.3%) other departments.

Table 2 shows that educational profile of SH and FHS director and dean at doctorate degree in Turkey. The total number of administrators included in the analyses is 111, of which 40 (36%) graduated departments of administrators and 71 (64%) graduated non-field departments of administrators. The number of administrators per graduated departments is 33 (29.7 %) nursing, 2 (1.8%) PR and 5 (4.5%) other departments. On the other hands, the number of administrators per graduated from non-field departments is 47 (42.3%) medical school, 6 (5.5%) veterinary medicine and 18 (17.4%) other departments.

In regard to departments characteristics, SH and FHS director and dean almost half graduated from medical school (26%) and nursing (22.3%) at undergraduate, master's degree and doctorate degree. According to number in table 2 the number of SH and FHS director and dean are 35 (29.7 %) undergraduate level, 44 (40.7 %) master's degree level and 47 (42.3%) doctorate degree respectively. On the other hands, the number of administrators for nursing is 33 (25.3%) undergraduate level, 33 (29.6%) master's degree level and 33 (29.7%) doctorate degree respectively.

Table 2: Educational Profile of SH and FHS Director and Dean

	Undergraduate		Master's degree		Doctorate degree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Graduated Departments						
Nursing	33	25.3	33	29.6	33	29.7
Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PR)	3	2.3	2	1.9	2	1.8
Nutrition and Dietetics (ND)	3	2.3	3	2.8	3	2.7
Social Service	2	1.5	1	0.9	1	0.9
Management of Health Institutions (MHI)	1	0.7	1	0.9	1	0.9
Graduated non-field Departments						
Medicine	35	26.9	44	40.7	47	42.3
Veterinary Medicine	9	6.9	8	7.4	6	5.5
Chemistry	3	2.3	4	3.7	5	4.5
Engineering	3	2.3	3	2.8	2	1.8
Biology	9	6.9	3	2.8	2	1.8
Business	4	3.0	4	3.7	4	3.6
Other (Sociology, pharmacy, educational science, foreign languages, seafood / fisheries, child development, psychology, theology, agriculture, physics)	25	19.2		2.8	5	4.5
Total	130	100.0	109*	100.0	111*	100.0

* There are managers who have not completed their master's or doctorate degrees.

Note: Percentages are based on the total values under the column. 130 in undergraduate, 109 in master's degree, 111 in doctorate.

Considering the undergraduate education of SH and SBD deputy directors and vice deans, it is seen that the total number of managers is 158 (Table 3). The number of managers per department was 95 (59.4%) nursing, 11 (7.1%) ND, 8 (5.2%) PR, and 11 (7.1%) in their departments. In addition, the number of managers graduated from off-site departments is 33 (21.2%).

When the distribution of SH and FSH vice director and vice dean by graduate education level is examined, 151 out of 158 licensed administrators have a master's degree. Of these, 110 (72.6%) graduated from their own field, 30 (27.4%) were outside of their field. The number of managers per graduated department is 89 (58.5%) nursing, 9 (6.0%) ND, 7 (4.8%) PR and 4 (2.8%) other departments. In addition, the number of managers graduated from non-field departments is 16

135

(10.7%) medical faculties, 5 (3.4%) veterinary medicine and 20 (13.3%) other departments (Table 3).

When educational background distribution of vice director and associate dean of SH and FHS is investigated at doctorate degree, it is seen that total number of administrators is 144, of which 105 (73%) graduated departments of administrators and 39 (27 %) graduated non-field departments of administrators. The number of administrators per graduated departments is 81 (57.1 %) nursing, 10 (7.0%) ND, 8(4.8%) PR and 5(3.3%) other departments respectively. Moreover, the number of administrators per graduated from non-field departments is 13(9.2%) medical school and 6 (2.8%) biology and chemistry and 20 (14.3%) other departments.

With regard to departments characteristics, SH and FHS vice director and associate dean more than half graduated from nursing (59%) at undergraduate, master's degree and doctorate degree. Accordingly, it can be said that more than half associate/vice administrators graduated from nursing department at various level of education. According to number in table 3 the number of associate/vice administrators for nursing is 95 (59.4 %) undergraduate level, 89 (58.9 %) master's degree level and 83 (57.1%) doctorate degree respectively (Table 3).

Table 3: Educational Profile of SH and FHS Vice Director and Associate Dean

	Undergraduate		Master's degree		Doctorate degree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Graduated Departments						
Nursing	95	59.4	89	58.5	83	57.1
Nutrition and Dietetics (ND)	11	7.1	9	6.0	10	7.0
Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PR)	8	5.2	7	4.8	8	5.6
Midwifery	6	3.9	2	1.3	1	0.7
Social Service	4	2.6	2	1.3	2	1.4
Management of Health Institutions (MHI)	1	0.6	1	0.7	1	0.7
Graduated non-field Departments						
Medicine	4	2.6	16	10.7	13	9.2
Veterinary Medicine	4	2.6	2	1.3	2	1.4
Chemistry	3	1.9	5	3.4	3	2.1
Engineering	3	1.9	2	1.3	1	0.7
Biology	5	3.2	3	2.0	3	2.1
Business	4	2.6	3	2.0	3	2.1
Other (Sociology, pharmacy, educational science, foreign languages, seafood / fisheries, child development, psychology, theology, agriculture, physics)	10	6.4	10	6.7	14	9.9
Total*	158	100.0	151	100.0	144	100.0

*The information of more than one assistant manager has also been added.

Note: Percentages are based on the total values under the column. It is 158 in undergraduate, 151 in master's degree and 144 in doctorate.



ULUSLARARASI SAĞLIK YÖNETİMİ VE STRATEJİLERİ ARAŞTIRMA DERGİSİ

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGIES RESEARCH

Cilt/Volume : 7 Sayı/Issue : 1 Yıl/Year : 2021 ISSN -2149-6161

Table 4 shows that educational profile educational levels of chief /head departments of SH and FHS at undergraduate level, it is seen that total number of administrators is 344, of which 241 (70%) graduated departments of administrators and 102 (30 %) graduated non-field departments of administrators (table 4). The number of administrators per graduated departments is 134 (38.9.4 %) nursing, 35 (10.2.1%) PR, 29 (8.4%) and 44 (11%) other departments respectively.

Table 4 shows that educational profile educational levels of chief /head departments of SH and FHS is inspected at master's degree, it is seen that total number of administrators is 343, of which 231(67%) graduated departments of administrators and 112 (33 %) graduated non-field departments of administrators. The number of administrators per graduated departments is 131 (38.2 %) nursing, 29 (8.4%) PR, 27(4.8%) ND and 44(10%) other departments respectively (table 4).

Table 4 shows that educational profile educational levels of chief /head departments of SH and FHS is investigated at doctorate degree, it is seen that total number of administrators is 338, of which 226 (67%) graduated departments of administrators and 112 (33%) graduated non-field departments of administrators. The number of administrators per graduated departments is 128 (37.9 %) nursing, 30 (8.9%) ND, 30(8.9%) PR and 38(10%) other departments respectively.

Table 4: Educational Profile of SH and FHS Head/Chief of Departments

Graduated Departments	Undergraduate		Master's degree		Doctorate degree	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Nursing	134	38.9	131	38.2	128	37.9
Midwifery	6	1.7	4	1.2	2	0.6
Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation (PR)	35	10.2	29	8.4	30	8.9
Nutrition and Dietetics (ND)	29	8.4	27	7.9	30	8.9
Social service	11	3.2	9	2.6	9	2.7
Management of Health Institutions (MHI)	9	2.6	13	3.8	11	3.3
Child Development	13	3.8	11	3.2	10	2.9
Audiometry	4	1.2	6	1.7	5	1.5
Work Health	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3
Graduated non-field Departments						
Medicine	26	7.6	58	16.9	62	18.3
Veterinary Medicine	19	5.5	14	4.0	12	3.5
Biology	16	4.6	5	1.5	5	1.5
Business	12	3.4	11	3.2	12	3.5
Educational Science	8	2.3	3	0.9	2	0.6
Engineering	4	1.2	2	0.6	1	0.3
Sociology	2	0.6	5	1.5	7	2.1
Other (journalism, pharmacy, educational science, foreign languages, political science, history seafood / fisheries, child development, psychology, theology, agriculture, physics)	15	4.3	14	4.1	11	3.2
Total*	344	100.0	343	100.0	338	100.0

* The information of inactive sections has also been added.

Note: Percentages are based on the total values under the column. 344 in Undergraduate, 343 in Y Undergraduate, 338 in Ph.D.

DISCUSSION

Despite the importance of school administration, administrators of health school are often less well prepared to administrator position for various reasons including; not giving the necessary importance and attention to school administration, lack of knowledge, skill and experience of management and lack of motivation, some of them

The profile of the deans or directors reflects an administrator who has made use of many routes to prepare for the role. Two studies are these subjects in health schools are noteworthy.



ULUSLARARASI SAĞLIK YÖNETİMİ VE STRATEJİLERİ ARAŞTIRMA DERGİSİ

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGIES RESEARCH

Cilt/Volume : 7 Sayı/Issue : 1 Yıl/Year : 2021 ISSN -2149-6161

Firstly, Bright and Richards (2001), presented view of the conduit to deanship. They suggest three patterns: The faculty citizen dean, the corporate dean and the accidental tourist dean. The faculty deans see themselves as “doing the right thing” and have usually travelled the scholar route in the same institution. The corporate dean is one whose emphasis is on academic work, focusing on policies and resources, and usually comes from another smaller institution. They concluded that the accidental tourist dean is the most common pattern in schools. Ülker et al., (2001) reached similar results. Of the 72 directors of HS, only 22 staff members are in their school or unit, while the others are in other schools or other units such as history or chemistry departments. Administrators from other schools or other units (69%) are fulfill the directorship of HS as a second task. This situation suggests directorship of HS is not considered enough at health schools. When two studies were considered together, the accidental tourist director is the most common pattern in health schools in Turkey.

Secondly, Wilkes et all (2015) founded that there are four distinctive pathways to becoming a nursing dean: same university pathway, different university pathway, different country pathway and health pathway. They also highlight the often-unplanned nature of the journey to deanship. They suggested that a need for formal education, and to identify prospective candidates as early as possible in their academic careers, so as to provide opportunities in administration and for formal leadership education.

Kleinman (2003), pointed out that although they are responsible for the achievement and operation of health school, administrators of health school are often less well prepared to manage the business activities than the clinical activities. She also emphasized that roles of administrators have evolved significantly in response to changes in the last two decades increasingly and characteristics for success in the health schools are based on competencies that require sophisticated business knowledge and skills. Another researcher achieves similar results. Powers (2014), pointed that the academic administrator, especially at the dean or department chair level, is not well prepared for this role; his appointment is more likely to be based on scholarly achievement than on management experience or skill. Administrators in the 21st Century at a country and organizational level are equipped with the knowledge, strategies and strength to lead and manage in health schools and through change and into a healthier future for all populations.

CONCLUSIONS

The study is to investigate the educational profiles of the Faculty of Health Sciences School of Health and managers in Turkey. Based on these findings, some advice for motivating administrators may be offered to administrators of health schools.

Health school curriculum should base on competences that are developed by AONE 2016 and World Health Organization (WHO). They are provided an excellent template for educating and socializing executive nursing practice and for future administrator. Health schools in Turkey should have embedded the competencies into their education curriculum for both undergraduate, master’s and doctoral programs.

Administrators of health school should have a master's degree or doctorate degree as essential for manager performance. Administrators with graduate degrees will be able to advance health science and contribute to the knowledge base on how nurses can provide up-to-date, safe patient care; participate in health care decisions; and provide the leadership needed to establish nurses as full partners in health school redesign efforts.



ULUSLARARASI SAĞLIK YÖNETİMİ VE STRATEJİLERİ ARAŞTIRMA DERGİSİ

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGIES RESEARCH

Cilt/Volume : 7 Sayı/Issue : 1 Yıl/Year : 2021 ISSN -2149-6161

Not all health workers at hospital or school begin their career with thoughts of becoming an administrator. Yet strong administrator will be required to transform the health schools. Not born as an administrator but can be an administrator. Administrator skills must be learned and mastered over time. The appropriate preparation of health school administrator is critical to the development of knowledge, skills and attitudes.

Administrators of health school are often less well prepared to administrator position for several reasons. Therefore, they must adopt a framework of continuous, lifelong learning and develop manager business knowledge that includes graduate degree programs, online programs, certificate programs, continuing education, in service education offerings, seminars, and mentoring activities.

Administrators of health school should have share experience, knowledge and skill with health school administrators of other countries on conferences, symposiums and other activities. This will bring mutual influence for effective health school manager.

Finally, the challenge for the health school administrator in the twenty-first century is to refine, adapt and promulgate a mission that fulfills the needs of the students, the professors and the society at large. The lessons of the past are a powerful force in crafting that vision, one that takes into account the dynamic forces of society, economics, technology and intellectualism in Turkey and other countries around the world. In these schools, the fact that the administrators are from the field is important in creating the professional vision. However, in cases where the directors cannot be from within the field, it is recommended that the dean or assistant directors should be than field.

REFERENCES

- American Organization of Nurse Executives. AONE Nurse Executive Competencies. 2005
[http://www.nurseleader.com/article/S1541-4612\(05\)00007-8/abstract](http://www.nurseleader.com/article/S1541-4612(05)00007-8/abstract). Accessed October 13, 2016.
- Bright, D.F., Richards, M.P., (2001). The Academic Deanship: Individual Careers and Institutional Roles. The Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. ERIC.
- Heller, B.R., Drenkard, K., Esposito-Herr, M.B., Romano, C., Tom, S., Valentia, N., (2004). Educating nurses for leadership roles. *Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing* 35(5), pp. 203–210.
- Herrin, D., Jones, K., Krepper, R., Sherman, R., & Reineck, C. (2006). Future nursing administration graduate curricula, part 2: Foundation and strategies. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 36 (11), pp. 498-505, DOI: 10.1097/00005110-200611000-00002.
- Huston, C., (2008). Preparing nurse leaders for 2020. *Journal of Nursing Management* 16(8), pp. 905–911.
- IOM, Institute of Medicine (2011) *The Future of Nursing: Leading Change, Advancing Health*, The National Academies Press, Washington, DC.
- Kleinman, C.S., (2003). Leadership Roles, Competencies, and Education: How Prepared Are Our Nurse Managers. *Journal of Nursing Administration* 33(9), pp. 451-455.
- Leithwood, K., (2016). Department-Head Leadership for School Improvement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 15(2), pp. 117-140, DOI: 10.1080/15700763.2015.1044538.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore L., K. (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- OSYM, (2014). *OSYM Higher Education Programs and Quotas Guide*. Student Selection and Placement Center. OSYM press, Ankara (in Turkish)



ULUSLARARASI SAĞLIK YÖNETİMİ VE STRATEJİLERİ ARAŞTIRMA DERGİSİ

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HEALTH MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGIES RESEARCH

Cilt/Volume : 7 Sayı/Issue : 1 Yıl/Year : 2021 ISSN -2149-6161

Paterson, K., Henderson, A., Trivella, A., (2010). Educating for leadership: a programme designed to build a responsive healthcare culture. *Journal of Nursing Management* 18(1), pp.78–83.

Pillay, R., (2010). Towards a competency-based framework for nursing management education *International Journal of Nursing Practice* 16(6), pp. 545–554.

Powers, M.J., (2014). A Management Information System for Academic Administrators. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 11(4) pp.97-106. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00011037.1978.11008230>

Roussel, L., Thomas, P., Harris, J., (2016). *Management and Leadership for Nurse Administrators*, 7th ed. Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Scoble, K.B., Russell, G., (2003). Vision 2020, part one: profile of the future nurse leader. *Journal of Nursing Administration* 33(6), pp.324–330.

Shaffer, F.A., Davis, C.R., Dutka, J., Richardson, D.R., (2014). The future of Nursing: domestic agenda, global implications. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing*, 4, pp. 388–94. doi: 10.1177/1043659614523474

Short, J.D., (1997). Profile of Administrators Part I: Resources for of Schools of Nursing, Goal Achievement. *Journal of Professional Nursing* 13(1) pp. 7-12.

Smith, J.P., (2006). Higher education and nursing. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 3(3), pp. 219-220.

Stefl, M. E., (2008). Common competencies for all healthcare managers: The Healthcare Leadership Alliance model. *Journal of Healthcare Management* 53(6), pp. 360-373.

Suber, C., (2012). Characteristics of effective principals in high poverty South Carolina elementary schools. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation* 7(1), pp. 1-15.

Turale, S., (2015). Preparing future nurses for global health. *International Nursing Review*, 62(2), pp. 143.

Ülker, S., Buldukoglu, K., Aksayan, S., Atalay, M., Kocaman, G., Oktay, S., Pektekin, C., (2001). Türkiye’de Hemşirelik: Temel Mesleki Eğitim ile İnsangücü’ne İlişkin Sorunlar ve Çözüm önerileri. Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı. 24 Mayıs 2001, Ankara, Retrieved June, 30, 2001 from www.yok.gov.tr/egitim/raporlar/hemşirelik/hemsire.pdf,

Wallace Foundation. (2012, January). The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning. New York: Author. Available at www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Pages/Te-School-Principal-asLeader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning.aspx.

Waxman, K.T., Roussel, L., Herrin-Griffith, Donna., D’Alfonso, Jim., (2017). The AONE Nurse Executive Competencies: 12 Years Later. *Nurse Leader* 15(2) 2, pp. 120-126.

Wepner, S. B., D’Onofrio, A., Willis, B., & Wilhite, S., (2011). The Leadership Dimensions of Education Deans. *Journal of Teacher Education* 59(2) pp. 153-169 DOI: 10.1177/0022487107313745

White, J. E., (1998). The perceived role of mentoring in the career development and success of academic nurse administrators. *Journal of Professional Nursing* 4, pp. 178-185.

Wilkes, L., Daly, J., Cross, W., Jackson, D., (2015). The Rise of the Nursing Academic Leader: Pathways to Deanship. *Nursing and Health* 3(2), pp. 31-38, DOI: 10.13189/nh.2015.030201