

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36719/2663-4619/115/168-176>

**İlahə Səidova**  
Xəzər Universiteti  
magistrant

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0095-168X>  
[ilahe.seidova@gmail.com](mailto:ilahe.seidova@gmail.com)

## **Karyera mərkəzləri nə dərəcədə effektivdir? Azərbaycanda universitetlərin akkreditasiya hesabatlarının təhlili**

### **Xülasə**

Bu tədqiqat Azərbaycanda universitetlərin karyera mərkəzlərinin tələbə və məzunların məşğulluq imkanlarını artırmaq qabiliyyətini qiymətləndirir. Təhlil 15 institusional akkreditasiya hesabatının məzmun analizinə əsaslanır. Araşdırma, universitetlərin “Karyera xidmətləri və məzunlarla davamlı əlaqə” (Kriteriya 3.10) üzrə milli keyfiyyət təminatı meyarını nə dərəcədə yerinə yetirdiyini müəyyənləşdirmək məqsədilə aparılıb. Nəticələr göstərir ki, ali təhsil müəssisələri arasında bu sahədə ciddi fərqlər mövcuddur: bəzi universitetlər peşəkar karyera məsləhət xidmətləri, integrasiya olunmuş karyera planlaşdırma dərsləri, güclü təcrübə proqramları, müntəzəm iş yarmarkaları və sistemli məzun izləmə mexanizmləri daxil olmaqla, hərtərəfli karyera dəstəyi strategiyalarına malikdirlər. Lakin digər bir çox universitetdə bu xidmətlər ya ilkin səviyyədədir, ya da lazımi resurslardan məhrumdur. Bir sıra ali məktəblər işəgötürənlərlə tərəfdaşlıq qurmaqda və məzun nəticələrinə dair məlumatlardan proqramların təkmilləşdirilməsi üçün istifadə etməkdə uğurlu olsa da, əksər hallarda karyera xidmətləri qeyri-bərabər şəkildə inkişaf edib və ən yaxşı təcrübələrlə tam uyğunluq təşkil etmir. Karyera mərkəzlərinin inkişaf səviyyəsindəki bu fərqlər ölkə üzrə məzunların məşğulluq nəticələrinin dəyişkənliyinə səbəb olur. Tədqiqatın nəticələri təhsil orqanları tərəfindən vahid qiymətləndirmə çərçivələrinin hazırlanması və monitorinqin gücləndirilməsinin vacibliyini vurğulayır.

**Açar sözlər:** karyera xidmətləri, tələbə məşğulluğu, universitet akkreditasiyası, Azərbaycan Ali Təhsili, karyera mərkəzlərinin effektivliyi, QAEE Hesabatları, tələbə karyera inkişafı, təlimdə keyfiyyət təminatı

**İlahe Saidova**  
Khazar University  
Master student

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0095-168X>  
[ilahe.seidova@gmail.com](mailto:ilahe.seidova@gmail.com)

## **How Effective Are Career Centers? Analysis of Universities Accreditation Reports in Azerbaijan**

### **Abstract**

This study evaluates the effectiveness of universities career centers in Azerbaijan in enhancing student and graduate employability, based on a content analysis of 15 institutional accreditation reports. The analysis focuses on the national quality assurance criterion for “Career Services and Ongoing Contact with Alumni” (Criterion 3.10) to identify how well universities implement career support structures and activities. The findings reveal substantial variability across institutions: while a few universities demonstrate comprehensive career center strategies – including dedicated career counseling, integrated career-planning courses, robust internship programs, regular job fairs, and systematic alumni tracking – many others have only rudimentary or under-resourced services. Several institutions excel in forging employer partnerships and using data on graduate outcomes to improve

programs, but in most cases career services remain uneven and only partially aligned with best practices. This disparity in career center development correlates with inconsistent graduate employment outcomes nationally. The study's conclusions underscore the need for standardized evaluation frameworks and stronger monitoring by education authorities

**Keywords:** *career services, student employability, university accreditation, Azerbaijan Higher Education, career center effectiveness, QAAE Reports, student career development, institutional quality assurance*

## Introduction

In recent years, the increasing number of graduates from higher education institutions in Azerbaijan has made graduate employment a priority issue for both universities and policymakers. Graduate employability is a critical concern for students, universities, employers, governments, and society at large. In response to this challenge, universities around the world have been expanding their career support services to bridge the gap between academic education and employment. University career centers are now recognized as key structures that offer career counseling, training, and employer engagement, playing a crucial role in preparing students for the labor market.

Research indicates that students who actively engage with career center services tend to achieve higher job offer rates and better employment outcomes compared to their peers who do not use such services. For instance, a recent study revealed that graduates who utilized the resources of career centers obtained significantly higher employment rates than those who did not (Van Derziel, 2022).

The urgent need to strengthen graduate employability in Azerbaijan is further emphasized by recent data provided by the State Employment Agency. A digital platform—*Graduate Employment Rating*—has been introduced to monitor graduate employment outcomes (State Employment Agency). According to the data that covers graduates from 11 major universities between 2018 and 2021, only 57% registered in the system were employed status under official labor contracts. Approximately 0.2% were classified as self-employed, while the remainder lacked any official employment indicator (State Employment Agency). These figures also varied across institutions, suggesting that some universities are more effective in preparing and supporting their students for the labor market. These differences also underscore the potential impact of career services on employment outcomes.

## Research

In this context, the present article analyzes successful strategies employed by career centers in Azerbaijani universities aimed at enhancing students' preparedness for the labor market. The study examines indicators related to the strategies of career centers at 15 Azerbaijan universities that undergone institutional accreditation evaluation based on criteria defined by Ministry of Science and Education in 2022 (Criteria for evaluation in the institutional accreditation of higher education institutions, 2022) and applied in coordination of the Quality Assurance Agency in Education *QAAE*

The primary objective of this research is to evaluate the impact of university career centers in Azerbaijan on students' and graduates' employability, based on accreditation reports. The study is structured around the following central research question: *How effective are university career centers in Azerbaijan according to accreditation evaluations?* Additionally, the research explores which successful practices and existing gaps are observed in this process. The study aims to investigate how career-focused initiatives affect employment outcomes and to identify the most effective elements within the local higher education context.

## Significance

This research has both practical and academic significance. From a practical standpoint, it provides Azerbaijani universities with evidence-based assessment and comparative insights. By highlighting both successful and underperforming areas, the findings can inform strategic decisions to improve career services, ensure efficient allocation of resources, and develop programs. In an era of increasing accountability for graduate outcomes, such insights are vital for aligning higher education with labor market needs. Previous studies have shown that involving employers and

graduates in career programs enhances their relevance to the labor market and equips students with in-demand skills (Karppinen, Moe, 2019).

The recommendations of this study—including strengthening partnerships between universities and employers, expanding internship opportunities, and enhancing career counseling and training services—are geared toward increasing the effectiveness of career services in the Azerbaijani context.

From an academic perspective, the research contributes to the literature on graduate employability and higher education policy in developing country contexts. While there is extensive research on career services in Western higher education systems, there remains limited knowledge on how these services function in Azerbaijan. This study aims to fill that gap by offering a systematic analysis of local career centers' operations and outcomes. Its findings provide not only feedback for national policy bodies (such as *QAAE* and the Ministry of Science and Education) regarding standards but also offer comparative perspectives for international education professionals on career center models applicable in different contexts.

In conclusion, the application of accreditation criteria to career services in Azerbaijan creates an important opportunity to analyze their actual effectiveness. Based on an analysis of accreditation reports and employment data, this study evaluates the current state of career services against global best practices and proposes a roadmap toward more impactful services—services that ultimately aim to enhance graduate employability and meet both student needs and the evolving demands of the labor market.

### Literature review

In response to the growing need to identify and support students' career aspirations, universities globally have increasingly institutionalized career centers to facilitate student engagement with the labor market. These centers serve as vital intermediaries, enabling students to explore their career interests, acquire job-relevant skills, and learn how to navigate the professional world after graduation. In U.S. universities, career centers primarily focus on post-graduation employment and emphasize the practical aspects of students' educational experiences in alignment with their potential careers. In other countries—especially those that have undergone significant political and social transitions—career centers are still in their developmental stages, and as a result, the graduate services provided are less focused on concrete career development (Ahmed, Naz, Khan, 2017).

Historically, career centers were regarded merely as “placement offices” responsible for helping graduates find jobs (Dey, Cruzvergara, 2014). However, in line with the expanded definition of career services, these centers now also bear the responsibility of educating students by proactively offering services that prepare them to seek and secure employment in their fields of interest (Popova-Hristova, 2018).

Career centers are institutions that provide job opportunities, internship programs, and skill development services to prepare students for professional life after graduation. Rather than having students search for jobs on their own, these centers are tasked with identifying appropriate job and internship opportunities for them (Popova-Hristova, 2018). With the increasing complexity of today's labor market, universities alone cannot guarantee employment through academic qualifications; skill development and career planning have become equally important. For example, the Careers Group at the University of London observed a marked increase in career service utilization during the 1960s, reflecting the growing integration of employability into higher education (The Careers Group, University of London, n.d.).

At the national level, the State Employment Service has proposed the establishment of a Council of Career Centers to coordinate and support the activities of university career centers. This initiative aims to standardize career services and enhance their effectiveness (Asia Pacific Career Development Association, 2021).

Graduate employability is defined as the set of achievements, skills, understandings, and personal attributes that increase the likelihood of graduates securing employment and succeeding in their chosen careers (Yorke, 2006). Over the past decade, research in higher education has explored employability in detail, particularly in the context of labor market changes and the massification of higher education. Tomlinson (Tomlinson, 2012), in examining the main dimensions of employability,

states that it is now a central issue in policy discussions and that graduates' transitions into working life depend on a complex interplay of individual, institutional, and economic factors. From the perspective of labor market supply and demand, student employability can be categorized into four dimensions: understanding and awareness of the external environment, career development skills, general skills, and professional skills (Hongjie & Zhenjia, 2019).

Studies conducted in different countries indicate that students who utilize career center services are more successful in securing employment. For instance, research by Van Derziel (2022) shows that students who actively engage with services such as career counseling, seminars, and internship programs find jobs more quickly and receive more job offers. A study by the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE, 2019) in the U.S. also found that graduates who completed internships or used career services were more likely to obtain full-time positions and had higher starting salaries. These findings underscore the importance of career centers as vital bridges that help students translate academic knowledge into labor market success (Kolb, 1984).

Moreover, Advance HE (Advance, 2019) emphasizes that employability should be embedded across all academic and institutional practices. Some universities now require internships or offer credit-bearing career development courses. For instance, ADA University mandates a "Career Development Skills and Strategies" course and internship experience for all undergraduate students, thereby integrating career services directly into the educational framework (ADA University. Academic Catalogue 2023–2024).

From a policy perspective, employability is increasingly regarded as an indicator of institutional quality. In the United Kingdom, the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) incorporates graduate employability into its evaluation criteria. Under the Bologna Process, universities are required to ensure that graduates possess market-relevant skills (Bologna Working Group, 2007). In Azerbaijan, this trend is echoed in national accreditation standards. QAAE includes career service functionality, regular career guidance, graduate tracking mechanisms, alumni feedback, and alumni relations as core accreditation requirements, thus promoting both the presence and quality of career services.

### **Methodology**

This study uses a qualitative document analysis approach to evaluate the effectiveness of career centers at Azerbaijani universities, drawing data from the accreditation reports of 15 universities. The primary focus is on determining the level of career services provided and identifying the key strategies in this area.

### **Research Design**

This study employs a qualitative research design to systematically investigate how the criteria related to career centers are met in Azerbaijani higher education institutions. Document analysis is chosen as the primary method, as the accreditation reports of the Higher Education Quality Assurance Agency (QAAE) are available and carry an official character, serving as authoritative evaluations of the institutions' performance.

### **Data Collection**

For the first part of the research, data was collected from official documents. Karppinen and Moe (2019) note that in the context of higher education and public policy, official documents include legal texts, policy papers, protocols, and reports produced by government institutions or other stakeholders – essentially, documents that “influence the public decision-making process”. In this regard, accreditation reports serve as official records of university quality indicators and are an ideal source for evaluating the performance of career centers. Taking into consideration the institutional accreditation reports issued by the QAAE were analyzed.

The QAAE document covers 30 criteria under 7 key areas and includes a total of 277 indicators. These criteria assess core university functions such as teaching and learning, scientific research, infrastructure and facilities, governance, internationalization, and student support services (QAAE, 2022). Each accreditation report outlines the extent to which the university meets these criteria. For the purposes of this research, special attention was given to Criterion 3.10 – “Career Services and Ongoing Contact with Alumni”, as it directly relates to the functioning of career centers and alumni engagement, aligning closely with the research topic (State Employment Agency (Azerbaijan).

*Criterion 3.10 – Career Services and Ongoing Contact with Alumni* consists of five specific indicators that outline the expected provisions and activities a university should have in place. These were the focal points of the document analysis. The five sub-indicators (as defined in the accreditation criteria documentation) (QAAE A, 2022) are:

3.10.1 – Existence of a Career Centre: Whether the university has established a dedicated career center that provides services to students and graduates.

3.10.2 – Provision of Career Guidance: The extent to which the institution organizes regular career counselling, career planning workshops, and other advisory services for students and alumni.

3.10.3 – Mechanisms to Monitor Alumni Employment: The presence of tools and processes (such as graduate tracking systems, employer partnerships, or career databases) to monitor alumni participation in the labor market and their employment status.

3.10.4 – Alumni Feedback on Programmed Quality: Whether the university gathers feedback from graduates – for instance through alumni surveys – to assess their satisfaction with the competencies acquired during their studies and the quality of the academic program.

3.10.5 – Sustained Alumni Communication: The existence of a system for ongoing contact with alumni, such as formal alumni networks, online alumni platforms, or regular alumni events, to maintain communication after graduation (QAAE, 2022).

The study reviewed the accreditation reports of 15 universities through the lens of Criterion 3.10 was examined to determine the presence and effectiveness of the career center, the services offered, and the mechanisms for tracking and engaging alumni.

### **Data Analysis**

The collected documents were analyzed using Qualitative Document Analysis (QDA) techniques. QDA is a research method for rigorously and systematically examining the content of documents, often through coding and thematic analysis. It involves *finding, selecting, appraising,* and synthesizing information from texts (Bowen, 2009) treating the documents as data to be analyzed in much the same way as interview transcripts or observation notes. Within the scope of this study, each accreditation report was thoroughly analyzed, and content related to the criteria concerning career centers was contextually coded. Relevant sections of the reports (such as descriptions of career services, graduate employment statistics, and mechanisms or examples of alumni engagement) were identified and categorized according to the five sub-criteria of Criterion 3.10. In addition to Criterion 3.10, **thematic coding** was applied to the remaining accreditation criteria. For this method, information under each criterion was carefully read and coded based on recurring themes. This approach allowed for the classification and analysis of different universities' practices and strategies according to the themes identified (National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE), 2019).

As a result of the analysis, institutional performance indicators were synthesized and grouped thematically. A **comparative analysis** was then conducted to identify the strategic approaches adopted by different universities. These strategies were examined in relation to accreditation outcomes, allowing for a cross-institutional evaluation of practices aligned with employability and career service effectiveness

### **Findings & Discussion**

This study investigates the impact of career centers on student employability based on the accreditation reports published by the Education Quality Assurance Agency (QAAE) of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

The main analytical framework of the study is Criterion 3.10 – “*Career Services and Ongoing Contact with Alumni*” from TKTA’s institutional accreditation standards. This criterion assesses the presence and effectiveness of career centers, the range of services offered, and the mechanisms for maintaining alumni relations across five sub-indicators. The findings related to the five criteria are as follows

#### **Criterion 1: Existence of Career Centers**

This section analyzes the organizational presence of career centers at 15 universities based on their accreditation reports.

**Table 1. The presence of Career Centers in Azerbaijani Universities**

University Name	Career Center Status
ATMU	Exists
WCU	Exists
BBU	Exists
ASOIU	Partially Exists
Khazar University	Exists
LSU	Partially Exists
AUAC	Exists
UNEC	Exists
AMU	Partially Exists
BEU	Exists
BSU	Exists
ATU	Exists
ASPU	Exists
ADA	Exists
SSU	Exists

According to the overall findings, fully functioning career centers are present at 12 out of the 15 universities examined (80 %), while in the remaining 3 institutions (20 %), these services exist only partially.

The analysis reveals that in some universities, career centers are either poorly structured or not established as independent entities at all. For example, at the Azerbaijan State Oil and Industry University (ASOIU) and Lankaran State University (LSU), career-related activities are not carried out within a clear structural framework but are instead managed under other departments, such as public relations, internship coordination, or academic affairs. This leads to fragmented operations and a lack of focused attention. In some cases, the number of staff at career centers is insufficient. At Western Caspian University (WCU) and Azerbaijan Medical University (AMU), having only one staff member significantly limits both the scale and continuity of the services provided. Furthermore, in some universities, students are unaware of the available services. For instance, a survey conducted at WCU found that 75% of students had never used the services of the career center. This raises concerns about the visibility and functionality of the center (Popova-Hristova, 2018).

#### **Criterion 2: Provision of Career Counseling Services to Students and Graduates**

This study analyzed the organization and delivery of career counseling services across five key areas: accessibility of career centers, career-oriented courses, internship programs, job fairs, and professional development activities. Some universities, such as ADA, ATMU, and UNEC, have well-established career centers offering individualized counseling, internships, and seminars. Others lack dedicated structures or offer limited services. Collaboration with employers is a common strategy. For instance, UNEC and Western Caspian University have signed numerous partnership agreements, and Baku Business University (BBU) and Sumgayit State University (SDU) maintain active ties with industry to support graduate employment. Internship programs and job fairs are widely implemented. ADA makes internships mandatory, and UNEC organized 72 career events in one academic year. Institutions like ADA, BBU, BEU, ATMU, UNEC, and Khazar University regularly host or participate in job fairs, often attracting major employers. Career-related training sessions and soft skills workshops are also held, with institutions like BBU, BEU, and Khazar University actively supporting student development. ADA stands out by offering a mandatory “Career Development Skills and Strategies” course, integrating career preparation into the formal curriculum. Differences in service quality are notable. Modern private institutions such as ADA, Khazar, and Western Caspian have more systematic and innovative approaches, while traditional universities like BSU are still

developing in this area. The effectiveness of services often correlates with institutional capacity, staffing, and partnerships.

In conclusion, while some universities demonstrate strong, integrated career support systems, others still offer fragmented and underdeveloped services, highlighting the need for more consistent and structured approaches across the sector.

### **Criterion 3: The status of mechanisms for monitoring graduates' participation in the labor market**

This section examines how universities monitor graduates' integration into the labor market, based on accreditation reports. Findings show significant variation: some universities have systematic mechanisms, while others rely on informal or underdeveloped methods. ADA University conducts regular surveys 6 months to 3 years post-graduation, assessing both employment rates and job relevance. UNEC uses its "Virtual Labor Exchange" and data from the Ministry of Labor to track outcomes, including separate analysis for master's students. Khazar University also conducts annual graduate surveys, though recommendations suggest expanding the analysis.

In contrast, institutions like ATMU, LSU, ATU, and ASOİU mainly rely on informal channels (e.g., social media or WhatsApp) with limited data analysis or systematic tracking. The differences largely stem from disparities in technological infrastructure and institutional prioritization. Universities with advanced digital systems (e.g., ADA, UNEC) demonstrate more professional approaches, while others treat monitoring as a formal requirement rather than a strategic tool. Importantly, the usefulness of collected data depends on how it's analyzed and applied. When used effectively, graduate employment data can inform program improvements and enhance career services (Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan, 2022).

### **Criterion 4: The state of measuring competency-based outcomes and satisfaction of the educational program.**

Analyses indicate that the approaches and methods used to measure graduates' competencies acquired through educational programs and their satisfaction with the quality of these programs vary significantly across universities. ADA University demonstrates relatively advanced practices in this area. The university assesses graduates' employment status—whether in their field of study or another sector—through surveys and uses the findings to inform and integrate changes into academic programs. Considering the rapidly evolving demands of the labor market, faculties maintain continuous dialogue with employers and implement flexible modifications to curriculum accordingly. At UNEC, certain initiatives have also been undertaken in this direction. Courses such as "Career Planning," "Soft Skills," and "Hard Skills" are taught with the participation of labor market representatives. Online surveys are conducted to measure graduates' satisfaction; however, these surveys are noted to lack the desired objectivity and effectiveness. While data collection channels exist, the analysis of survey results and their integration into academic programs are not yet conducted systematically. At Khazar University, although regular online surveys are carried out, difficulties arise in engaging graduates who are either serving in the military or living abroad. A dedicated unit functions to assess graduate satisfaction, and the results are analyzed. However, there is limited information regarding the direct impact of these findings on the teaching and learning process. On the other hand, in universities such as Azerbaijan Tourism and Management University (ATMU), Western Caspian University, Baku Business University (BBU), and Azerbaijan Technical University (ATU), these activities tend to be more formal in nature. Surveys are either rarely conducted or not systematically implemented. In some cases where surveys are conducted, the mechanisms for analyzing results and implementing changes in academic programs based on these findings are weak. For instance, at ATMU, only two or three surveys have been conducted in the past six years, and the results have not been adequately analyzed. Similarly, at AzTU and Azerbaijan State Oil and Industry University (ASOİU), there is no available information regarding feedback collection from graduates or evidence-based decision-making based on such data.

### **Criterion 5: The Existence of Sustainable Alumni Engagement Systems**

Analysis shows that alumni engagement varies widely across universities. While some institutions have developed structured strategies, others rely mainly on informal methods like social media and

personal networks. UNEC has taken significant steps by establishing the Alumni Association and the “Extern” center, using the EDUMAN platform to manage alumni data and collaboration. Its “Endless Fairs” virtual job fair also supports graduate employment. ADA University maintains long-term alumni contact through a formal Alumni Association, online forums, and regular surveys and events, including outreach to international graduates. Khazar University integrates alumni engagement early by involving students in Career Center activities from their first year. It provides ongoing support such as CV writing, interview prep, and internship opportunities, while maintaining active communication through events and social media.

Conversely, universities like ASOIU, AMU, LSU, and BSU primarily rely on informal communication channels, with limited structural or technological support. This lack of infrastructure limits the ability to sustain meaningful alumni relationships and track graduate outcomes systematically (Tight, 2023).

## Conclusion

An analysis of accreditation reports from 15 Azerbaijani universities (by TKTA) shows that while career centers are recognized as essential, their implementation varies significantly. Some universities, like ADA and UNEC, operate well-structured, proactive centers with integrated career courses, industry partnerships, internship programs, and graduate tracking systems. These institutions use data to continually improve services. In contrast, others offer only basic, fragmented services with limited staffing, resources, and student engagement—sometimes lacking dedicated centers entirely.

**Limitations and Cross-Case Compatibility:** The analysis is limited by inconsistencies in the accreditation reports. Some provide rich, evaluative data, while others are vague or incomplete, making cross-institutional comparison difficult. In some cases, effective practices may be underreported. Moreover, as these reports are designed for accountability, they emphasize compliance over impact.

**Implications and Recommendations for Practice:** Underperforming universities can learn from better-performing peers by adopting structured strategies such as mandatory career development courses, stronger employer partnerships, and alumni tracking systems. Leadership must treat career centers as strategic assets and allocate proper resources. Universities should set measurable goals (e.g., internship placements) and use data to assess and improve outcomes. More robust tracking of graduate career paths is also essential.

**Future Research:** Future studies should move beyond document analysis to include case studies, interviews, and direct observation of career center operations. This would provide deeper insights into effective practices, institutional strategies, and long-term outcomes. Longitudinal data on graduate employment would also help quantify impact.

**Policy Implications for National Bodies:** For national bodies like QAAE and the Ministry of Education, standardizing the format and criteria for evaluating career services in accreditation is crucial. Clearer guidelines and required indicators (e.g., counselor-student ratio, number of employer events) would improve report consistency and accountability. A centralized graduate tracking system should also be developed. Minimum standards—such as requiring every university to maintain a fully functioning career center—should be set, supported by training, funding, and knowledge-sharing across institutions. Benchmarking international practices can help align Azerbaijan’s universities with global employability standards.

## References

1. ADA University. (2023). *Academic catalogue 2023–2024*. Baku, Azerbaijan: ADA University.
2. Advance, H. E. (2019). *Enhancing graduate employability: A case study compendium*. York, United Kingdom: Author.
3. Ahmed, K. Z., Naz, F., & Khan, A. (2017). Career services in transition economies: A comparative perspective. *Journal of Education and Work*, 30(7), 741–758.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2017.1315224>



4. Asia Pacific Career Development Association. (2021). *National career services strategies in Asia-Pacific countries: Policy brief*.
5. Bologna Working Group. (2007). *Bologna process stocktaking report 2007: Achievements and challenges*. London, United Kingdom: Department for Education and Skills.
6. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
7. Careers Group, University of London. (n.d.). *Our history: How The Careers Group came to be*. University of London. <https://www.careers.lon.ac.uk/about-us/our-history>
8. Dey, F., & Cruzvergara, C. Y. (2014). Evolution of career services in higher education. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2014(148), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.20087>
9. Hongjie, Y., & Zhenjia, L. (2019). Dimensions of graduate employability: A Chinese university perspective. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 38(5), 971–985. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1602282>
10. Karppinen, P., & Moe, E. (2019). Official documents in higher education policy research. In *The Palgrave handbook of education policy research* (pp. 329–347). Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95765-1\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95765-1_16)
11. Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
12. Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Azerbaijan. (2022). *Criteria for evaluation in the institutional accreditation of higher education institutions (Annex No. 1 to Decision No. KQ-05, 30 September 2022)*. <https://e-qanun.az/framework/52566>
13. National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). (2019). *First-destination survey: Class of 2018*. Bethlehem, PA: NACE.
14. Popova-Hristova, M. (2018). The changing role of university career centers: From placement offices to employability hubs. *Journal of Career Development*, 45(6), 502–519. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845317739921>
15. State Employment Agency (Azerbaijan). (n.d.). *Graduate employment rating platform*. Baku, Azerbaijan: Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of Population. <https://e-social.gov.az/graduates-emp-rating>
16. Tight, M. (2023). Employability and the transformation of higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 77(1), 20–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12352>
17. Tomlinson, M. (2012). Graduate employability: A review of conceptual and empirical themes. *Higher Education Policy*, 25(4), 407–431. <https://doi.org/10.1057/hep.2012.5>
18. Van Derziel, H. (2022). Career center impact: How guidance programs boost employment outcomes. *Career Services Review*, 34(2), 112–129.
19. Yorke, M. (2006). *Employability in higher education: What it is – what it is not*. York, United Kingdom: Higher Education Academy.

Received: 18.01.2025

Accepted: 06.04.2025