

**ANADOLU UNIVERSITY**

***EUA EVALUATION REPORT***

***September 2008***

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Institutional Review of Anadolu University	3
	2.1 Process	3
	2.2 Review visits	4
	2.3 Reading the Report	4
3.	Institutional Context	5
	3.1 History	5
	3.2 Two universities in one	5
4.	External Constraints	5
	4.1 Autonomy	5
	4.2 Budgetary policy	6
5.	Specific Aspects of the University	6
	5.1 Mission and Strategic Plan	6
	5.2 Governance and Management	8
	5.3 Financial Management	9
	5.4 Human Resource Management	10
	5.5 Teaching / Learning and Student Services	12
	5.6 Research	15
	5.7 Cooperation with Industry and with Society in General	16
	5.8 Internationalisation	17
	5.9 Quality Culture	18
6.	Special Focus: Distance Education Mission	19
	6.1 Background	19
	6.2 Comparison with the UK Open University	20
	6.3 Some issues	20
	6.4 Governance	21
7.	In Summary: the Review Team Recommends	22
8.	Final Words	25
	Bibliography	26

## **1 Introduction**

The Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) of the European University Association is now well known in European higher education. Two hundred and thirty universities and similar institutions of higher education in Europe, and in countries across the world, have been evaluated within the IEP to date. As for others, the aim of this evaluation is to support the development of Anadolu University (AU) by examining its decision-making processes, its institutional structures, the effectiveness of its planning and the intensity and effectiveness of its internal quality processes. So far 17 Turkish universities have been reviewed since 1998 and in 2008 four more will be added to the list.

The basic methodology of the EUA's evaluation programme for universities is guided by four central strategic questions. These questions are:

- What is the University trying to do?
- How is the University trying to do it?
- How does the University know that it works?
- How does the University change in order to improve?

## **2 Institutional Review of Anadolu University**

### **2.1 Process**

Following a formal request from the Rector of Anadolu University (AU), Professor Doctor Fevzi Sürmeli, the Steering Committee of the IEP appointed a review team for the evaluation of AU. The Rector designated the 'Distance Education mission' of AU as a special focus for this review. This influenced the composition of the Team, which was:

- Professor Jarmo Visakorpi, former Rector of the University of Tampere as chair;
- Professor Richard Lewis, former Pro Vice Chancellor of the Open University (UK);
- Professor Sokratis K. Katsikas, former Rector of the University of the Aegean;
- Professor Jim Gosling, Director of Quality, National University of Ireland - Galway, as secretary.

The EUA Team used the strategic questions mentioned in the introduction as fundamental references when evaluating governance, management, capacities, student issues and development at AU, within the wider Turkish national and international strategic contexts.

In accordance with EUA methodology and guidelines, and in advance of the preliminary visit, AU sent a 32 page Self-Evaluation Report (SER) signed by the Rector to the EUA Team. The associated appendices included campus maps and diagrams explaining institutional structures and organisation, information on student performance and budgetary data. The Review Team also received further relevant documents such as a draft strategic plan for years 2009-2013 during its visits to AU and after the preliminary visit.

Self evaluation was conducted under the leadership of Vice-Rector Atila Barkana assisted by Vice-Rector Ali Ekrem Özkul, and the Self Evaluation team included academic staff from the main academic fields of the University, student representatives, and administrative and service staff as represented by the Secretary General Güven Tuncel.

Consultation within the University in general was conducted by sending an advanced draft of the SER to 1836 persons representing academic staff, administration, service and support staff, and students; and the SER was then modified according to feedback, which included some 40 responses. However no further information on this feedback was supplied to the Review Team. In addition, although a SWOT-analysis was carried out in all the faculties,

schools and vocational schools, and the results taken into account during preparation of the SER, this process was not clearly described in the SER.

Overall, the Team appreciated the hard and effective work done in preparing the SER and considered it to be a good report, in terms of the comprehensive information provided. The report itself was very clear and easy to read and demonstrated a commendable self-critical approach.

Importantly, in the Review Team's discussions with those involved in self-evaluation and others, it was clear that the self evaluation process itself was highly beneficial for the University. The self evaluation team had met about once per week for five months and the individual members expressed a wide range of positive views on their experience.

*"I now see the University as a whole; I understand my own role better."*

*"I understand the main issues much better, but see what we did as just a beginning."*

*"We discussed everything and I understand other points of view much better."*

*"I am proud of AU but see opportunities for improvements."*

The Review Team greatly appreciated becoming aware of this because it is a major objective of the self-evaluation process.

## 2.2 Review Visits

The Team travelled to AU for a preliminary visit on 2 to 4 March 2008 and for a main visit from 9 to 12 June 2008. Following its first visit, the EUA Team requested further information and data, which was readily and efficiently supplied.

The Chair and members of the Review Team thank especially Rector Prof. Dr. Fevzi Sürmeli for his warm welcome and hospitality, and wholehearted and frank engagement with the review process. The Team would also like to thank the vice rectors, faculty deans, other managers, academic staff, administrators, the external partners and the many students involved, for their engagement and welcomes. The Team met in private with groups of students from all the relevant faculties and units visited. During the Teams main visit, special arrangements for meeting the distance education students by means of video-conference arrangements were efficient and successful.

The Team conveys special recognition for efforts beyond any call of duty to Prof. Dr. Atila Barkana, Vice Rector and Liaison Person for the Review, for excellent preparations for the review, and kind attentions in ensuring smooth arrangements for the visits and all their constituent meetings and events. Special care was taken with logistics of the Review Team.

During the EUA Team's visits, management, staff and students were welcoming, candid and anxious to explain their situations, and convey their understanding of AU and their roles and experiences. The inputs from students were articulate and frank in praise and criticisms, and the comments of outside partners also included valuable commendations and advice. The different units across the University were aware of the background to the review and were prepared for the meetings, at which the discussions were always informal and lively. Overall, interactions were wholly agreeable and constructive. For so many staff and students to communicate so well in a difficult foreign language — English — was especially impressive.

## 2.3 Reading this Report

Because the management and staff of AU know their University very well, they should not find many ideas or issues that surprise them in this Report. Rather, most of the comments of the Review Team and recommendations in this Report arise from issues already identified in the SER. The intention is to be encouraging and thought-provoking, with each section culminating in a series of more focused recommendations. Hopefully, taken together, these recommendations will assist in the further successful development and eventual international as well as national acceptance of AU as one of the key principal players in Turkish tertiary education.

## **3. Institutional Context**

### **3.1 History**

The Review Team learned with interest about the history of AU, including that economics and commercial sciences were the initial subjects for higher education in Eskisehir in 1958, from which the University counts the 50-years history that it is currently celebrating. Then, 24 years later (1982), most of the other academic branches as well as distance learning and many vocational schools were established. In 1987 Western European Distance Education programmes were initiated in Cologne, Germany. Between 1992 and 2007, however, the then large and relatively widespread multi-campus University was split altogether into five universities including AU.

### **3.2 Three higher education institutions universities in one**

However, AU is still very large by international standards and it has very clear characteristics of a university consisting of three parts: an on-campus University operating at three different campuses in Eskisehir, a Distance Education University, and a provider of vocational education. The Team have received many metric indicators of the activities of the University such as the numbers of students in the various faculties, but found it still difficult to comprehend the implications of serving 1.1 million 'distant' students in comparison with 23,000 on-campus students.

It could have been decided in advance that these two aspects needed separate evaluations but, in accord with the original plan, the Review Team have approached this review as a single institutional evaluation with the Distance Education mission of the University as an area of special focus. Therefore in this Report, Distance Education, while touched upon in some other sections, is discussed separately in Section 6. Fortunately, one member of the Review Team, Professor Richard Lewis is a highly respected expert on this topic and he, assisted by another member of the team, devoted much time during our visits to the Distance Education faculties, and their staff and students. The Team also visited the impressive modern printing facilities where the huge numbers of textbooks and other printed self-learning materials are produced.

However, if and when applying for future institutional evaluations at AU, the University should even more clearly underline in advance this dual model of its function, so that this can be taken into account from the very beginning of the organisation of the process.

## **4. External constraints**

### **4.1 Autonomy**

The institutional autonomy of universities is seen by many as essential to the attainment of their full potential and, within a range of legal frameworks, university autonomy is well established in most European countries. The Turkish system is among a small and diminishing number of systems in this respect because, while the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) guarantees great autonomy in relation to State officials and politicians, it binds the public universities very tightly within a single administrative system. YÖK is the central regulatory body for Higher Education and two thirds of its members come from the universities.

Thus:

- A public university like AU is not free to organise its internal governance and management systems and there are several important minor regulations, e.g. the number of vice rectors is limited.

- A university is not free to organise its internal structures without permission: e.g. to establish new faculties or close them.
- Final appointment of many leaders such as rectors and deans is done by YÖK.
- New degrees and non-degree study programmes need the approval of YÖK.
- Hiring of new staff is regulated by YÖK.

Although there are so many regulations, which in other countries would be seen to violate the autonomy of universities, this situation seems to be rather well tolerated by the Turkish public universities because often the real basic decisions are made in universities and only final approval is necessary. It is written in the SER that "the University can take relatively full advantage of its autonomy in educational areas."

However, there appear to be a number of ways in which this system may impact significantly on the effectiveness of a university, such as:

- Regulations on hiring of new administrative staff (in order to reduce the total number of state employees which is seen to be much too large) inhibit or seriously delay the development of important new functions related to modernisation or strategic developments.

## **4.2 Budgetary policy**

In addition, budgetary regulations determined by the Ministry of Finance are very strong even if currently they are undergoing a process of development. The newer budgeting method introduced in the last few years is performance-based with judgement of performances related to strategic planning. The present state budget is still a very restrictive 'line-budget', rather than a so-called 'lump sum budget', which is today the standard in most Western European countries. This limits autonomy because significant budgetary changes need to be negotiated line-by-line.

# **5 Specific Aspects of the University**

## **5.1 Mission Vision and Strategic Plan**

As referred to above, according to the evaluation methodology of EUA, the first question to be considered is "What is the University trying to do?" The university's vision and mission statements, core values and strategic objectives which are to be found in the SER, constitute a reply to this question.

The vision statement says that the University wants to become one of the top three universities in Turkey but there are no further specifications of what it means to be a top university in Turkey and what the present status of AU is. Even so, it is not appropriate for the Review Team to participate in a ranking exercise. The means to reach this status are, however, mentioned in a general form: "high level educational activities both on-campus and in distance learning enriched with interactive multimedia technologies and research at the universal level".

However, during the preliminary visit the Review Team received a draft version of a new University Strategic Plan for the years 2009-2013, which is a systematic presentation of those same ideas in ten chapters, and which the Team considers to be a valuable basis for further development.

The statements of vision, mission and core values in the SER are presented in very general terms: too many could apply to all universities and the distinctive features, impressive strengths and essential functions of AU are not clearly enough evident. For example, Distance Education is a principal mission of the University and has an important national role, but in AU's mission statement it is only mentioned in combination with on-campus education as follows:

*"...implements information and communication technologies in on-campus and distance education, and life-long learning".*

In many other respects also, AU has a quite special academic profile. For example, it has the very impressive School of Civil Aviation that covers a wide range of aviation disciplines, specialist schools for teachers of the handicapped and a comprehensive range of study programmes covering the hospitality/tourist sector. The potential roles of AU's stronger research groups and institutes in valuable economic development and in supporting new specialist study programmes are also of regional and national significance. All of these (and others) could be alluded to in a balanced way across a set of statements of vision, mission, core values and strategic objectives that would embody the ambitions and intentions of a clearly unique institution. This is also important because there are many indications that, like in many other countries, higher education policy in Turkey will increasingly support university developments which will result in a national set of universities with diversified profiles.

The present draft plan also leaves open some questions concerning the academic development of AU, such as:

- Does the University have plans for the enlargement of some academic activities, such as new disciplines, degrees or programmes, or not?
- What are the University's intentions with respect to the balance between levels of academic activities? What could be good ratios in numbers between undergraduate and graduate students and between taught postgraduate and research students?
- The expansion of faculty level education vis-à-vis vocational school education is another important issue. Is the present situation good? Are changes desirable; and in which directions should AU be going? The role of the vocational schools is an important national issue at this time when a great expansion of Turkish Higher Education is being planned.

### *The Review Team recommends:*

1. That AU develop revised statements of vision, mission, and strategic objectives linked to a further revision of the new University Strategic Plan, which taken together will present a distinctive and ambitious profile for the University.
2. University strategic objectives should be evidence-related and parallel measures should provide recognition and incentives for units that meet or exceed strategic targets.
3. AU should develop specific strategic plans for Distance Education and Vocational Education that inform and are consistent with the University's global Strategic Plan.

## **5.2 Governance and Management**

### *Central government*

As mentioned above, in Turkey, national laws determine the structure of university governance. At AU the overall governing structure is composed of two bodies: the University Senate and the Executive Council. The Senate is the highest policy making body; it has 50 members and meets at least twice per semester, but sometimes monthly.

The Executive Board is the highest decision making body; it has 16 ordinary members (mainly the deans of the faculties) and 19 non-voting members including directors of the schools, giving 35 members in total; and meets once per week.

However, it is obvious that (in accord with national law) the executive power at the University level is very much in the hands of the Rector. The Rector works closely with, and is supported by, the vice rectors, the general secretary and the directors of schools and research centres, who are appointed by him, and other central leaders. The deans are recommended by the Rector but appointed by YÖK. AU is special in having 5 vice-rectors due to its special position as provider of the large Distance Education function. In addition there are several other

committees or commissions that are important. In particular, the role of the Board for Academic Assessment and Quality Improvement (ANADEK) is clearly of growing importance with respect to the facilitation of change, and it has much potential. There is not, however, any official small 'management team' or 'officers group' at the top level.

Both of the formal central management bodies are rather large. The Executive Board is meant to be smaller for the sake of practical decision-making but, especially in the absence of an academic council, its official membership could not represent fully the University, so observers or non-voting members were added to it. Other distinctive features of both bodies are the absence of external members and the limited participation of students. Therefore, the power of the faculties, which are represented by voting members on both governing bodies, is significant.

Because national law determines these governance structures, it would be unrealistic for the Review Team to expect that they can be revised or changed in the short-term. However, the Team considers this kind of governance structure to be basically unsuitable for the management of strategic activities in a modern university, but especially in AU, which (as mentioned already) has inside the same university three main systems:

- Campus based university,
- The national Distance Education system and
- Vocational schools.

It is now a common trend in Western Europe to reform the governance of universities to have at the top of a university a governing board or council with a rather small number of members (20 or less) with a majority (or a large minority) from outside of the university. This body largely replaces (or supplements) the traditional university senate. In Turkey the governing board of YÖK, the national body controlling higher education, already has this kind of board structure with at least one third of members being external. Although it could be argued that external representation on this national body removes the need to have local external experts to participate in individual university governance, the Team believes that each university needs direct representation from outside society for a multitude of reasons, many related to maintaining constant awareness of the needs of society. One way in which this could possibly be achieved within the present law would be the establishment of a high level 'advisory board' to advise the rector on major strategic issues and on choices facing the University.

The representation of students at all levels of administration with full voting power is also desirable to ensure that all relevant decisions are fully informed. This is implied clearly in the Bologna agreement, which stresses student participation. The Team has confidence that the governance of Turkish higher education will develop in this direction. In the meantime, AU should support and develop its student representative systems to provide feedback and inputs to management, and, equally importantly, to give the student body more experience of representative and democratic systems.

### *Governance and management at the operational level*

AU is a large university with many units including 12 faculties with 75 departments, 9 graduate schools and research institutes, 9 schools including 2 vocational schools and 30 active centres of other kinds (including service and support centres and 4-5 significant research centres). Together this adds up to about 140 different units, many of which have more or less complete governing systems on a smaller scale, but similar in some respects to that of the central university system. The rationale for grouping together 36 'research and support centres' in the documentation supplied to the Review Team is unclear and could benefit from reconsideration.

To the Review Team this seems to be a rather complicated system that has grown organically without advance planning, with new centres apparently being added piecemeal when a need was demonstrated. However, it was impossible for the Team, in the short time that was available, to assess the effectiveness of all the interactions inside the University; and it

appears to be working reasonably well for some people in AU because 'structure' is not cited as a particular weakness in the SER.

Nevertheless, in the draft Strategic Plan there is a statement that the university should "analyze the organizational structure and take the necessary steps towards improvement". Since AU has a very large number of discrete units and decreasing the number of internal units to improve institutional effectiveness is a trend in European universities today, significant "improvement" may depend on mergers to give a smaller number of faculties and or departments. On the academic front, more structural integration promotes multi-disciplinarity in research and education.

#### *The Review Team recommends:*

4. The establishment of a high level 'advisory board' to advise the rector on major strategic issues and on choices facing the University.
5. That AU as a matter of priority seek means to improve its student representative systems.
6. Careful management of the roles and membership of ANADEK to ensure that it can meet its great potential to facilitate strategic change and improvement.
7. That AU take the necessary steps to simplify its organisational structures to facilitate planning and management across its three internal educational systems (campus based 'faculty' education, vocational, and distance) by proceeding to "analyze [its entire] organizational structure and take the necessary steps towards improvement".

### **5.3 Financial Management**

#### *Funding*

Insufficient funding is one of the greatest constraints on the development of public universities in countries across the world, and greater diversification of funding streams is usually suggested as at least part of the solution. In such cases, a direct grant from government to support educational activities is usually the dominant income category, and the challenge is to increase funding from other sources. However, when important alternative sources of funding are available, the ideal is that these should also be diverse to guard against sudden income fluctuations.

In some ways Turkish public universities are fortunate because, in the form of 'revolving funds', direct grants from government are often supplemented very significantly. This diversification is functioning well in AU as the revenues coming from tuition fees and other corresponding fees, and services for society are large. The fruits of these supplementary sources of income are clearly evident in the fine academic staff, administrative, service and support staff, and the visible resources of AU.

The Review Team hopes that in the future, as student intake grows in line with state plans to increase greatly participation in higher education, direct government funds will grow in proportion. This is especially important for AU where, at less than 50%, direct government funding of AU is rather low as compared to most public universities in Europe.

Correspondingly, as more than 50% of income is coming from revolving money, the maintenance and development of these sources of income are very important to the financial management of the University. In particular, since a very large proportion of the revolving funds comes from the Distance Education enterprise of the University, it is important for AU to grow (and to increase the number of) the other activities that contribute to its revolving funds, thereby diversifying the source of these funds.

#### *The Review Team recommends:*

8. That AU monitor closely all sources of income and explore all opportunities to diversify its revolving funds.

## 5.4 Human Resource Management

More than most other kinds of organisation, a university is an intellectual endeavour that depends on the intelligence, motivation and energy of a diverse range of very talented and skilled people. Therefore, human resource management and development are among the most effective means of developing an advanced university. AU is already paying much attention to its human resources and in the draft strategic plan they are integral to many of the various stated objectives, e.g.

*“to improve the motivation and loyalty of academic and administrative staff”.*

One of the most important potential threats to a university is the loss of financial attractiveness of academic careers, especially for the best and most qualified young doctoral graduates, and experienced teachers and researchers. The present situation in Turkey is not ideal and it may become even more difficult in the future as the Turkish HE- system expands rapidly.

Presently, public university staff are mainly civil servants with very low basic salaries. Therefore, the availability of additional income from within the University is essential.

In addition, national regulations constrain manpower development by controlling advancement in the most important fields of university activities. These regulations inhibit also the development of administrative staff.

Therefore, in order to meet its institutional and local objectives and to take advantage of every single viable opportunity for flexibility and innovation within the regulations, the University certainly needs a comprehensive strategy for human resource management and development.

### *Academic staff*

The number of teachers at AU seems to be satisfactory, although, because of the human resources (on and off campus) devoted to distance education, it is difficult to compare AU to other universities in this respect. Calculating the number of students per teacher from the overall figures for 2007–08 (23,347 on campus students and 1836 academic staff) gives a ratio of 12.7; as compared to the average in 2003 in OECD countries of 15.5. Of course many of these teachers are contributing substantially to the education of 1.1 million other students and this must be taken into account. From a rough ‘guesstimate’ that the academic staff contribution to Distance Education is equivalent to 200 ‘full-time-equivalent’ staff, the student to teacher ratio for on-campus activities would be 14.3. (See Chapter 6 for a discussion of resources for Distance Education.)

### *Qualifications*

The level of specialist qualifications required for professors at AU is regulated and the qualifications of the total cohort of teachers appears to be good, or at least adequate. In many countries, and particularly for universities located away from capitals and other major national centres, ‘inbreeding’ (with respect to qualifications) of academic staff is sometimes mentioned as a potential problem. From a report given to the Review Team, 33% of the members of academic staff at AU received all their academic degrees from AU. This does not seem to be a rather high proportion (perhaps in comparison with some elite universities which regard themselves and their own graduates very highly); although the Team does not know of any reference data for other European universities.

However, it is clear to the Team that some of the most exciting innovations and initiatives to be seen at AU are associated with personnel who have significant foreign experience and contacts.

### *Recognition and Incentives*

Many of the most valuable academic staff in any good university teach well, research effectively, and contribute significantly to the organisation of the university and to society. All of these aspects of a balanced academic career should be recognised and rewarded appropriately, while allowing some latitude for individuals excelling in some ways but

contributing less in others. How this is done, and to what degree, is a reflection of the core aims of an institution.

Promotional procedures in Turkish universities must take into account the national system for approval that must be satisfied before internal decisions to promote can be taken. The national system itself can take no accurate account of actual pedagogic performance and other measures of suitability that may be central to an entirely independent promotion process. The Review Team understand also that making payments from 'revolving funds' dependent on teaching quality would be particularly complicated.

Therefore in the shorter term, other incentives and public recognition of excellence may offer the best means to motivate, recognise and reward good teaching at individual and programme levels. In many universities teaching staff are encouraged to develop 'teaching portfolios' in which they record and document the 'core values' and principles that shape their approach to teaching and learning; the reflection, reading and training they have done to improve their effectiveness; and the methods they use and innovations they have tested to promote student engagement, and 'active' or 'deep' learning. A team of teachers contributing to a study programme could also assemble a 'programme portfolio'. Such portfolios, and other evidence from students and colleagues, can form the bases for evaluations leading to special awards and other incentives.

AU is already very active in providing support and incentives for a range of academic activities. Extra payments are made for extra teaching, for contributions to distance education, and for research publications in different categories of journals or by different 'grades' of publisher. Valid travel to make presentations at national and international conferences is always supported.

Since AU has not yet attained a reputation as a research-intensive university, the establishment of a successful, University-wide research culture is a particular challenge. It is particularly important if AU is to attain its strategic objective of becoming one of the top three universities in the nation. To be successful at research (while making other important contributions), academic staff must have 'protected time' for research. For the relevant staff this must be taken into account as administrative duties are assigned, courses are allocated and as timetables for teaching and examinations are set. Where the potential benefits are evident, the workloads of academic staff in a department should be differentiated to reflect the strengths of individuals with respect to contributions to teaching (including new programme development and innovation), research (including the preparation of major applications for funding, supervision, direct contributions and interactions with external partners) and administration (in all its manifestations). Where this is done, all contributions should be acknowledged explicitly as being important, and individual performances should be monitored according to the workload mix.

### *Administrative staff*

According to the figures supplied to the Review Team, at AU the ratio of administrative, service and support staff to teaching staff is 1.3. This is rather high compared to figures for European public universities where it is usually close to 1. However, as with the absolute number of academic staff, many extra administrative and other staff are employed fully in supporting Distance Education, an activity that is absent or relatively small in most universities.

Because of Government policy to restrict the number of civil servants, AU, like all Turkish universities, is particularly constrained in the appointment of new administrative, service and support staff, even highly skilled or specialist staff that may be necessary for new initiatives and innovation. There are also restrictions on the incentives that can be given legally to administration, service and support staff.

### *Staff training and development*

Supporting academic staff development is one of the main strategic objectives of the new draft strategic plan, where allowance is made for in-service training programmes to improve teaching competencies, research capacity and foreign language competencies.

Expansion of the programmes offered by the Centre for Academic Development and the Project Development Centre will be essential if these objectives (and the many others that depend on enhanced staff competencies) are to be achieved. Even though each doctoral candidate must take two courses on teaching methods/skills and some foreign language training is provided for teachers, some degree of pedagogic education will be necessary for all teachers in the coming years.

Because in many respects the skills they need are more diverse, and because re-training can ameliorate limitations on recruitment; administrative, service and support staff require an investment in training at least as great as for academic staff. In particular, support staff trained in newer teaching technologies are needed to assure the reform and improvement of teaching.

### *The Review Team recommends:*

9. That AU develop a comprehensive strategy for human resource management and development in support of its strategic objectives and “to improve the motivation and loyalty of academic and administrative staff”.
10. That AU develop a system of awards to recognise publicly and reward good teaching at individual and programme levels. Judgements for awards could be based on teaching portfolios and other evidence from students and colleagues.
11. That AU provide published guidelines to academic departments by which the workloads of academic staff may be differentiated to reflect the strengths of individuals with respect to contributions to teaching, research and administration.
12. That the programmes offered by the Centre for Academic Development and the Project Development Centre be expanded to meet the pedagogic education of all teachers in the coming years.
13. The training provisions for administrative, service and support staff be augmented to growing requirements for diverse skills and to provide re-training to ameliorate national limitations on recruitment.

## **5.5 Teaching / Learning and Student Services**

### *Planning*

As a major provider of education it is appropriate that five of the ten chapters in AU's draft Strategic Plan are more or less directly concerned with the development and enhancement of the teaching/learning activities of the University. The objectives listed in these chapters cover measures for improving the quality and efficiency of teaching processes, advancement of academic development of the teaching staff, support of social and academic development of the students and expansion of the use of information and communication technologies. Of course such technologies are a particular specialty of AU for which Distance Education is a nationwide special task.

### *Programme development*

The evaluation of a proposal for the development of a new programme includes assessment of the needs of potential employers and estimation of the new programme's attractiveness to prospective students. This may then be followed by more detailed curriculum development for all years and all course components, which is now normally dependent on predefined learning outcomes. Finally there is scrutiny, feedback and approval by a university body. This planning phase is one of the most important stages in higher education delivery.

At AU, the faculties have full responsibility for internal programme approval before national permission to launch the programme is sought. However, due to the regulations imposed by YÖK and the pertinent procedures external to the University, the development of a new programme at AU is a very complicated and slow procedure.

Overall, AU supports a diversity of programmes, many of which are now multidisciplinary. In many programmes, flexibility is supported because students are allowed to take courses from other programmes and even courses from other universities (and vice versa), so that a system of credit accumulation is functioning. (However, this is not yet the case for distant students, see below).

### *Programme improvement*

Constant changes in the needs and expectations of society and in technology have the effect that study programmes need regular monitoring and adjustment and, when necessary, serious reform. Information on developments across Turkey and around the world, and feedback from a wide range of sources, and from different perspectives, are essential to this process.

At AU course evaluations by students of the teaching they receive and of programme organisation are conducted and the results correlated by the new Statistical Information Centre (SIC). However, there may be much room for improvement in how these results are taken into consideration when existing programmes are being monitored and improved, and when new programmes are being planned. There are significant benefits to both students and the University when students have significant roles on programme boards and on planning committees.

The potential value of feedback from employers of the graduates of particular programmes is sometimes as important as that from students, not least because their perspective is quite different. However, because employers are very busy people and are located elsewhere, obtaining such feedback regularly demands much effort. Representative employers can also contribute much to programme boards. At AU, data on the employability of graduates is obtained regularly by means of surveys, and the role played by the Career Office in keeping contact with employers is very valuable.

### *Teaching innovation*

During both visits the Review Team was informed that AU is heavily committed to moving the teaching of all study programmes in the direction of techniques that support strongly student-centred learning. Many teaching innovations are envisaged that will be supported by training in the new Centre for Academic Development, and such reforms are seen also to be part of the complete implementation of the Bologna-process. The first project of ANADEK is the implementation of defined learning outcomes for all study programmes and modules, which will facilitate greater emphasis on student-focused learning and its effective assessment, and also contribute substantially to compliance with the Bologna-process.

Up-to date didactic technologies are also being actively studied and applied as quickly as facilities become widespread and as staff are trained.

### *Foreign language skills of the students*

Improving the foreign language skills for both staff and students is already a clear strategic objective for AU, and much has been achieved. This was clear to the Review Team during all their meetings at AU, which were almost entirely conducted in English. The School of Foreign Languages provides year-long intensive programmes in English, French or German languages, and some courses are taught completely or partially in English.

### *Bologna-process*

It is clear that AU is seriously engaged with the introduction of the Bologna reforms as they apply at the level of individual universities.

- The implementation of the Bologna degree structure with a four-year first cycle and a two-year second cycle is not quite in accord with the initial Bologna guideline, but the four-year initial stage, which is the traditional Turkish basic degree, accords well with the system in its present more evolved form.
- The University has been very active in defining all programmes and modules in terms of ECTS units. This should continue in spite of the difficulties created by slowness to do so in other institutions.
- The diploma supplement (DS) is given to all graduates automatically.

### *Academic performance of students*

Non-completion or 'drop-out' rates for on-campus students are rather low in comparison with many western European universities and, for the students who continue, the mean times to completion and graduation are not remarkably long. In accord with what one would expect, for distance education programmes the 'drop-out' rates are significantly higher. However, the Review Team is satisfied that AU continues to try to improve these important performance indicators.

### *Library and Computer services*

Because of the very wide range of issues to be considered, the University Library was one of the sites that the Review Team did not have sufficient time to visit. However, all references to the Team by students and staff with respect to library services were positive.

Efficient and effective computer services and IT services are especially important for a University with a very extensive Distance Education system. The Computer Centre employs 295 specialists of which 19 are computer engineers. Given that it is contributing to the implementation of all examinations for the Distance Education system in Turkey, the performance data supplied to the team on what Computer Services delivers to distance education is very impressive. There is also good availability of computer services for on-campus students including 78 computer labs having altogether 2400 computers for students, giving a computer to student ratio of about 1/10.

### *Social facilities:*

With respect to modern universities in Europe, the United States and elsewhere that the Team have visited, the Yunus Emre campus, compares very favourably in layout, design and standards of maintenance. It is a very complete campus that also has a comprehensive weekly cultural programme, of which both students and teachers are proud and with good reason.

All other student services, transportation, healthcare, accommodation, food, sport etc. appear to be well organised. The Team can easily understand why all the 'on campus' students that they interviewed were completely satisfied with, and even proud of, these services.

### *The Review Team recommends:*

14. That maximum use be made of the student feedback on teaching obtained via the SIC when existing programmes are being monitored and improved, and when new programmes are being planned.
15. That feedback from employers of the graduates of particular programmes is also valued and is obtained through surveys and representative employers who are members of programme boards.
16. That AU continue to promote in all faculties and schools the adoption of new teaching/learning methods such as project learning, cooperative learning, tutorial supervision and other active learning methods, and appropriate new types of examinations.

17. That AU actively and continuously encourage everyone to achieve complete compliance with the Bologna process, leading to a permanent transformation of how students learn and how teachers facilitate learning.

## 5.6 Research

### *A priority at AU*

Given AU's strategic objective to become recognised as one of the top universities in Turkey, its subsidiary objective with respect to research are entirely appropriate. Prominent among the strategic goals listed in the draft Strategic Plan are 'to increase the quality and the quantity of the scientific R&D projects and publications'. However, it is clear to the University and to the Review Team that much has to be done before, in the words of the vision statement, research "at a universal level" can be reached.

This is also understandable because:

- the number of graduate students is relatively low, at about 7 % of the on-campus students, and
- as cited in the SER, of the lack of a widespread research culture that is due to many historical and external constraints, including limited internal resources for research, bureaucratic limits that constrain University initiatives, and lack of experience among potentially research-active staff of national and international application procedures for research funding.
- The balance of academic fields in the University is such that only a minority of staff and students (~25% of students) are in areas with the greatest potential for the large scale expansion of externally funded research projects, such as the sciences and engineering. However, given this balance it is important that the development of research, scholarship and creative activities in the arts, humanities, social sciences etc. should also be supported (with realistic if ambitious targets in all appropriate areas). In this way, AU could be seen as contributing to research and development related to all aspects of regional and national society.

Nevertheless, the data supplied by the University gives many grounds for optimism and indicates that much can be achieved in a relatively short time. In the areas of technology and science, research activity has increased significantly during the past few years, as indicated by increased numbers of international publications and numbers of PhD degrees awarded.

### *Research management*

In the structure of the University the management of research is at the level of the faculties and their constituent departments and the small number of institutes and centres that are currently research-active. The University's Commission for Scientific Research Projects was established to have a very important University-wide role in research strategy, and to work alongside the Centre for Advanced Technology Research, which promotes interdisciplinary research. Ideally, these bodies should be accompanied by a substantial 'research management and support office'. The possibility of creating 'research professorships' (with very light teaching loads) in some areas could also be considered, to provide leadership and act as catalysts for development.

### *Graduate schools*

Given a sufficient cohort of research-competent academic staff, the expansion and improvement of PhD education is one of the most important and effective ways to promote University research. At AU, five graduate schools have been established to administer and coordinate graduate studies, both master degrees and PhD's. They do not act as research centres and have no laboratories or other research infrastructure. Cooperation between the graduate schools and the related faculty and departments is very close.

Administratively, there are two types of doctoral students, research assistants and 'separate' students. Research assistants also participate in teaching and they work in an academic department from where they receive their salaries, whereas 'separate' students work through their research supervisor(s) and graduate school. They do not get a salary or a grant because there is no general grant scheme for PhD students. The directors of the graduate schools see that the greatest limitation on the expansion of PhD training is the low number of applicants to the graduate schools.

AU also has some 76 research assistants who are externally funded, which is a good indicator of research and development activity.

### *The Review Team recommends:*

18. That the University designate priority themes for research and scholarship that draw on all sectors of its academic spectrum (humanities, social sciences, creative arts as well as the sciences), and set quantitative strategic research objectives for each in the context of the new Strategic Plan.
19. That AU analyse what is needed to meet its strategic research objectives and consider the value of a central 'research management and support office' (perhaps led by a designated vice rector for research and scholarship) to work in support of the Commission for Scientific Research Projects, the Centre for Advanced Technology Research and other relevant bodies.
20. That the following actions be strengthened and further developed
  - Early access of students taking undergraduate degrees to active research and scholarship to promote their motivation for careers as researchers.
  - Structured careers that enhance opportunities for young researchers to continue in research after obtaining a PhD.
  - Sabbatical and other kind of periods free of other duties, for suitable researchers to spend in AU, elsewhere in Turkey or abroad.
  - Grants for foreign academics, perhaps on sabbatical leave themselves, to work for periods in AU.

## **5.7 Cooperation with Industry and with Society in General**

### *Background*

AU is obviously committed very strongly to cooperation with the city of Eskisehir and the local region in their cultural, social, and artistic activities. AU is equally committed to cooperation with regional and national industry. Two out of the ten main chapters of the draft Strategic Plan are dedicated to these areas. Thus AU believes strongly, not just in its roles with respect to education and research, but also in the so-called third function of universities: to work with and support society, both socially and economically.

### *Cooperation with industry*

Cooperation with industry is clearly one of the main elements of the research strategy of the University and obviously it has been successful in certain fields. The representatives of local and regional industry that the Review Team met expressed strong appreciation of AU's initiatives and activities.

One very successful example of this cooperation is the Ceramics Research Center, which has very strong modern technical resources that enable it to make important contributions to industry, and which is very well known nationwide. The Ceramics Research Center represents ten years of cooperation between AU and industry with initial support from the national state agency TÜBİTAK. This model may be appropriate to other technical areas and other faculties. An industrial doctorate programme has also been developed with good success.

### *Cooperation with society*

The University supports and interacts regularly with many different sectors of surrounding society, including public services. AU is home to important cultural institutions and activities such as museums, exhibitions, concerts, TV, a public educational system. There is a special emphasis on handicapped students and education of the handicapped, and of course with civil aviation.

### *Life long learning*

Life long learning has two important aspects. One is the preparation of today's students for careers during which they regularly will have to learn new skills and competencies. The second is appropriate to this chapter on contributions to society because it has to do with enhancing the education and skills of persons already in society, who are often in mid-career or perhaps have been made redundant from an enterprise. This aspect of Life long learning includes adult education and continuing education.

Life long learning is one of the most important services to society that a university may offer. For Turkish higher education, Life long learning is a major challenge because so great a part of the present adult population does not have the competences that are needed to contribute fully to Turkish society. AU's long involvement and experience in distance education mean that it already contributing greatly to Life long learning for Turkish speakers everywhere, and also make it a highly suitable place for the further development of systems and partnerships in this area which already include:

- e-Certificate Programmes
- Second University
- Turkish Language Programme
- Occupational Training Programmes
- Yunus Emre Project
- TV Broadcasts and Textbooks
- Online Graduate Programmes e.g AU-SUNY e-MBA Program

### *The Team recommends:*

21. That the model of Ceramics Research Centre should be expanded also to other technical fields and maybe also to other faculties.
22. That AU continue to enhance and diversify its valuable contributions to Life long learning in its region and nationally.

## **5.8 Internationalisation**

### *Most important for AU*

In line with its fundamental strengths and ambitions, greater internationalisation in all its activities is one of the main strategic objectives of the University. A central international office is an essential function for all large modern universities, because many international activities (such as European mobility programmes) are so complicated that effectiveness requires certain special competencies to be collected in one place. The international office at AU appears to meet current student needs but certainly could benefit from more resources.

During the past few years international mobility programmes at AU have advanced very well. Impressively, in 2006-2007 the University was the leader in Turkey in international student mobility and the Review Team congratulates the University and the International Office on this important achievement. However, there is a clear imbalance between the number of outgoing and incoming students and, while there are many underlying reasons for this that may be outside the University's control, continuing efforts to correct it should be made. Systems that

promote the mobility of academic staff are also well developed and very successful by national standards.

From the data supplied, it is clear that the majority of student exchange is through the Erasmus programme and the incoming students consistently come from Poland, Lithuania, Germany and the Netherlands. The outgoing Turkish students go to most of the above countries in significant numbers but also favour Belgium, Czech Republic, Austria, Spain and Hungary and Norway. Returned students met by the Review Team had clearly benefited from the experience.

In addition to the above incoming students, there are about 400 students from the Turkic speaking countries of western Asia and the Middle-East. They also contribute to the internationalisation of the University community and should be taken into account as appropriate.

Activities other than exchanges are important also and should be expanded, for example the joint online graduate study programme with the State University of New York (SUNY) leading to an MBA.

### *The Review Team recommends:*

23. That AU continue to develop a set of interlocking policies and action plans to support internationalisation including:
  - Continued development of the already impressive languages and cultural awareness activities for students and teachers.
  - Support for incoming international students, e.g. Turkish language, culture and social activities with local students.
24. That the performance and resource needs of the International Office and the supporting coordinators in the faculties be reviewed to ensure that the high performance by AU with respect to student exchange and other areas is maintained and enhanced.

## **5.9 Quality Culture**

### *Objective of EUA evaluations*

The EUA Institutional Evaluation Programme (of which this review of AU is a part) does not attempt to evaluate the quality of teaching, research, administration and services, and community contribution. At best, general impressions are gained from the documentation supplied and meetings with management, staff, students and stakeholders that inform the Review Team as they prepare their comments and recommendations related to each area. Therefore, the focus of this section on 'Quality Culture' at AU is on the University's policies and systems to do with quality assessment and quality improvement, and on the effectiveness of these systems.

### *Quality assurance and quality improvement*

Systematic quality assurance of campus-based programmes at AU is rather new but is developing quickly. It was expanded soon after the establishment nationally of YÖDEK, and is now becoming more systematic through the activities of ANADEK, which has a developing programme of projects. The Statistical Information Centre has important new roles for student feedback on teaching. Training support is now available from the Centre for Academic Development. Individual faculties have taken initiatives also, for example the Faculty of Engineering and Architecture has had activities in accord with the European Framework for Quality management (EFQM) model since 2005. Others are pursuing the accreditation of study programmes.

After the Team's first visit, the membership of ANADEK was enlarged with the incorporation of staff who contributed so well to the work of the Self Evaluation Group. In line with its work

programme, ANADEK has established working groups to drive forward particular reforms. The Team commends the commitment by the Rector and ANADEK to the Bologna process and to reforms in study programmes and teaching methods.

The Statistical Information Centre was established in 2006 to organise systematic feedback on teaching by coordinating surveys of classes and graduates. The work of SIC is essential to the continuous evaluation and improvement of teaching quality. However, its potential (as suggested by its name, and with increased resources) to contribute to evidence-based planning and to oversee the supply of accurate and complete data to external university ranking groups should be explored.

The Centre for Academic Development is essential for quality improvement and the Review team congratulates the University on its establishment and development. In many universities, centres like the Centre for Academic Development have become a major player in the kind of substantial changes planned at AU.

The Review Team commends the draft Strategic Plan of Anadolu University for dealing directly with the need for continuous quality improvement and in particular the commitment in Section 1.5.3 “*To establish an internal evaluation system.*”

Change and reform are frequently difficult and there is always a risk that they may be so slow as to be ineffective. Learning from others, which can help to avoid unwise decisions, and catalyse and accelerate change, sometimes takes the form of ‘benchmarking’. Therefore, AU should examine regularly equivalent policies, structures and practices in other universities in Turkey and abroad.

### *The Team recommends:*

25. That ANADEK continue in its developing roles in support of strategic change throughout the University.
26. That the roles and resources of the Statistical Information Centre are reviewed to ensure that it can support more effective University (and faculty) management, through contributions to planning and quality assurance and improvement.
27. That the roles and resources of the Centre for Academic Development are reviewed to ensure that it is capable of meeting the many needs for training and supports that already exist and that will arise as curricular and teaching reforms are implemented.
28. That the planned, internal evaluation system have external and (where appropriate) international and stakeholder involvement and that each study programme (or group of related programmes) and each appropriate academic unit is evaluated formally by this system every 5–6 years. There should also be external involvement in the evaluations of proposals for new study programmes.
29. That, as the quality culture at AU is developed, the Rector and relevant University officers should examine regularly equivalent policies, structures and practices in universities with which AU would like to be compared.

## **6. Special Focus: Distance Education**

### **6.1 Background**

As outlined in Section 3.2 above, the University itself designated the Distance Education mission of AU as an area deserving a special focus during this review. Therefore in this Report, while Distance Education is touched upon in many other sections (e.g. 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 and 5.7), this Chapter is devoted to it.

The Review Team is of the opinion that the systematic and continuing provision of a respected level of higher education to over 1.1 million students in all parts of Turkey and in many countries in Europe and elsewhere is a remarkable achievement. The students the Team

members spoke to on campus and (by video) at four distant locations confirmed the worth of the Distance Education services provided by AU.

## 6.2 Comparison with the UK Open University

The use of another university as a comparator does not imply that it is worthy of emulation in every way. Rather, such an exercise may show up disparities that could help identify areas where extra resources are justified or where development and innovation could be appropriate.

By international standards higher education in the UK is well funded and this must be taken into account, but the level of the resources devoted to Distance Learning at AU is very modest in comparison with the UK Open University. The Open University has about 185,000 students who take a large number of study programmes, and electives and specialisation are available for many of these. The programmes are delivered and supported by the following staff:

- 1,200 Academic staff, with 900 designing and writing the courses (and undertaking research as in a standard university) and about 300 who manage academic support to the students.
- 1,500 Academic related, librarians, IT specialists, senior administrators etc.
- 1,900 Support staff.
- 8,800 Associate lecturers, part-time staff who provide academic support directly to the students.

The 4,600 full-time staff of the Open University provide the contexts in which the associate lecturers can operate effectively. Given that the *total* full-time academic and administrative staff employed by AU is about 4,100, the human resources available to support distance education are dramatically less at AU than at the Open University. However, presently AU delivers just eight bachelors and 24 associate degree programmes to its 1.1 million distance education students. Other offerings through the 'Second University' and 'e-Certificate' programmes are relatively very small but, in some cases at least, have great potential, either directly or as models. Some of these were mentioned also under 'Life Long Learning' in Section 5.7 above.

## 6.3 Some issues

While the Review Team commends AU on the size and general effectiveness of its distance education provision and is very impressed by the new initiatives that have commenced or are being considered in this area, a number of opportunities for significant improvements were apparent. The Team is aware also that the scale and potential resource implications of many potential reforms are daunting.

### *Computer marked examinations*

The fact that, for most study programmes, all examination papers are computer-marked is a significant weakness as it means that the abilities, learning and skills of the students cannot be assessed as fully as in the case of on-campus students, or of students of Distance Education institutions elsewhere. AU is fully aware of this and thought is being given to including a tutor-marked examination in the final year of all of the degree programmes, or more than 150,000 'manual' assessments per year. The Review Team strongly supports Draft Strategic objective 10.2.2 "*To diversify and disseminate assessment strategies and tools.*"

### *Range of study programmes and flexibility*

AU also recognises that, in line with social and technical development, the needs of Turkish society for distance higher education are becoming more diverse. Therefore the value of the University's distance learning provision would be even greater if it could extend the range of its programmes. The Team strongly supports draft Strategic Aim 10.1.1, which relates specifically to distance education, "*To offer new programs and courses*".

Another issue is that Distance Education students do not benefit from the sophisticated credit transfer system that is available to campus based students. This seems unfair and something that may be feasibly implemented. Part of the cost might be defrayed by charging students for the service.

### *Meetings with students*

Two members of the Review Team met locally-based distance education students on campus during the preliminary visit and had video meetings with a total of about 40 students located at four sites (Ankara, Cologne, Istanbul, Northern Cyprus) during the main visit. While together these students represent less than 0.01% of all distance education students, the opinions that they expressed may provide important insights.

- They spoke very positively of the academic support they receive on-line and, appeared satisfied with the personal contacts they had made, albeit often electronically.
- In contrast to the ease which they received academic support, many of the students said that it was very difficult to communicate with “the University” and to raise concerns about “the system.” It may be worth commenting on some of these needs and concerns:
  - Having some elective courses as part of their programmes (Relevantly, draft strategic objective 10.2.1 reads “*To allow students to choose the courses in their programs*”.
  - More flexibility in the number of courses they can take in a year so they can plan in advance to study for their degree over more than four years without uncompleted components being recorded as failures. Although individual failures have no consequences in the system, any hint of failure can be very significant to conscientious mature students.

### *Systematic student feedback*

The Review Team understands that a systematic model for obtaining feedback from distance education students was recently introduced but that response rates were very low. Factors like timing may have been important and these are being reviewed. A system that records and analyses all comments and complaints received from students is also being introduced. These systems could usefully be supplemented by a programme of independently facilitated focus groups (not unlike the Team’s own video meetings with students) that would enable students, albeit a very small percentage of the total students, to directly convey their views on topics that they may choose themselves and enlarge upon within the group.

## **6.4 Governance**

As the leaders and managers of AU work, they are surrounded at all times by lively campus-based students whose needs are varied and important. Because of this alone, although much greater in number and of great importance to the University, the specific needs of distance education students risk being overshadowed. The scale of any task associated with distance education as a whole may accentuate this risk. However, nearly all of the issues raised above were identified as important in the SER, and in its new draft Strategic Plan the University has outlined a substantial programme of activities in relation to Distance Education to be undertaken over the next few years.

Nevertheless, to maintain a constant focus by the University on this aspect of its mission, the Review Team suggests that serious consideration be given to establishing a special advisory board for Distance Education that would provide a forum for discussing important related issues and its future development and reform. Such a board would have no executive powers but would just supply advice to the Rector, the Senate and other relevant bodies.

The Team also propose that Distance Learning be discussed regularly at meetings of the University Senate.

### *The Review Team recommends:*

30. That all the measures related to Distance Education in the draft Strategic Plan of the University be implemented as soon as is feasible, including:
  - “10.1. To increase the variety of the programs and courses”.
  - “10.2. To increase the flexibility of the distance education system”
    - i. To allow students to choose the courses in their programs”
    - ii. “To diversify and disseminate assessment strategies and tools.”
31. That feedback systems for Distance Education students continue to be enhanced and, in addition, a system for regular audio and video assisted focus groups of students be established to focus on how the services offered by AU as a whole may be improved.
32. That AU create a special advisory board for Distance Education to discuss important issues related to Distance Education and its future development and reform, and advise to the Rector, the Senate and other relevant bodies.
33. That Distance Learning is a standing item on the agenda for all meetings of the University Senate.

## **7 In Summary, the Review Team recommends:**

### *Mission Vision and Strategic Plan*

1. That AU develop revised statements of vision, mission, and strategic objectives linked to a further revision of the new University Strategic Plan, which taken together will present a distinctive and ambitious profile for the University.
2. University strategic objectives should be evidence-related and parallel measures should provide recognition and incentives for units that meet or exceed strategic targets.
3. AU should develop specific strategic plans for Distance Education and Vocational Education that inform and are consistent with the University’s global Strategic Plan.

### *Governance and Management*

4. The establishment of a high level ‘advisory board’ to advise the rector on major strategic issues and on choices facing the University.
5. That AU as a matter of priority seeks means to improve its student representative systems.
6. Careful management of the roles and membership of ANADEK to ensure that it can meet its great potential to facilitate strategic change and improvement.
7. That AU take the necessary steps to simplify its organisational structures to facilitate planning and management across its three internal educational systems (campus based ‘faculty’ education, vocational, and distance) by proceeding to “analyze [its entire] organizational structure and take the necessary steps towards improvement”.

### *Financial Management*

8. That AU monitor closely all sources of income and explore all opportunities to diversify its revolving funds.

### *Human Resource Management*

9. That AU develop a comprehensive strategy for human resource management and development in support of its strategic objectives and “to improve the motivation and loyalty of academic and administrative staff”.

10. That AU develop a system of awards to recognise publicly and reward good teaching at individual and programme levels. Judgements for awards could be based on teaching portfolios and other evidence from students and colleagues.
11. That AU provide published guidelines to academic departments by which the workloads of academic staff may be differentiated to reflect the strengths of individuals with respect to contributions to teaching, research and administration.
12. That the programmes offered by the Centre for Academic Development and the Project Development Centre be expanded to meet the pedagogic education of all teachers in the coming years.
13. The training provisions for administrative, service and support staff be augmented to growing requirements for diverse skills and to provide re-training to ameliorate national limitations on recruitment.

### *Teaching / Learning and Student Services*

14. That maximum use be made of the student feedback on teaching obtained via the SIC when existing programmes are being monitored and improved, and when new programmes are being planned.
15. That feedback from employers of the graduates of particular programmes is also valued and is obtained through surveys and representative employers who are members of programme boards.
16. That AU continue to promote in all faculties and schools the adoption of new teaching/learning methods such as project learning, cooperative learning, tutorial supervision and other active learning methods, and appropriate new type of examinations.
17. That AU actively and continuously encourage everyone to achieve complete compliance with the Bologna process, leading to a permanent transformation of how students learn and how teachers facilitate learning.

### *Research*

18. That the University designate priority themes for research and scholarship that draw on all sectors of its academic spectrum (humanities, social sciences, creative arts as well as the sciences), and set quantitative strategic research objectives for each in the context of the new Strategic Plan.
19. That AU analyse what is needed to meet its strategic research objectives and consider the value of a central 'research management and support office' (perhaps led by a designated vice rector for research and scholarship) to work in support of the Commission for Scientific Research Projects, the Centre for Advanced Technology Research and other relevant bodies.
20. That the following actions be strengthened and further developed
  - Early access of students taking undergraduate degrees to active research and scholarship to promote their motivation for careers as researchers.
  - Structured careers that enhance opportunities for young researchers to continue in research after obtaining a PhD.
  - Sabbatical and other kind of periods free of other duties, for suitable researchers to spend in AU, elsewhere in Turkey or abroad.
  - Grants for foreign academics, perhaps on sabbatical leave themselves, to work for periods in AU.

### *Cooperation with Industry and with Society in General*

21. That the model of Ceramics Research Centre should be expanded also to other technical fields and maybe also to other faculties.

22. That AU continue to enhance and diversify its valuable contributions to Life long learning in its region and nationally.

### *Internationalisation*

23. That AU continue to develop a set of interlocking policies and action plans to support internationalisation including:
  - Continued development of the already impressive languages and cultural awareness activities for students and teachers.
  - Support for incoming international students, e.g. Turkish language, culture and social activities with local students.
24. That the performance and resource needs of the International Office and the supporting coordinators in the faculties be reviewed to ensure that the high performance by AU with respect to student exchange and other areas is maintained and enhanced.

### *Quality Culture*

25. That ANADEK continue in its developing roles in support of strategic change throughout the University.
26. That the roles and resources of the Statistical Information Centre are reviewed to ensure that it can support more effective University (and faculty) management, through contributions to planning and quality assurance and improvement.
27. That the roles and resources of the Centre for Academic Development are reviewed to ensure that it is capable of meeting the many needs for training and supports that already exist and that will arise as curricular and teaching reforms are implemented.
28. That the planned, internal evaluation system have external and (where appropriate) international and stakeholder involvement and that each study programme (or group of related programmes) and each appropriate academic unit is evaluated formally by this system every 5–6 years. There should also be external involvement in the evaluations of proposals for new study programmes.
29. That as the quality culture at AU is developed, the Rector and relevant University officers should examine regularly equivalent policies, structures and practices in universities with which AU would like to be compared.

### *Special Focus: Distance Education*

30. That all the measures related to Distance Education in the draft Strategic Plan of the University be implemented as soon as is feasible, including:
  - “10.1. To increase the variety of the programs and courses”.
  - “10.2. To increase the flexibility of the distance education system”
    - i. To allow students to choose the courses in their programs”
    - ii. “To diversify and disseminate assessment strategies and tools.”
31. That feedback systems for Distance Education students continue to be enhanced and, in addition, a system for regular audio and video assisted focus groups of students be established to focus on how the services offered by AU as a whole may be improved.
32. That AU create a special advisory board for Distance Education to discuss important issues related to Distance Education and its future development and reform, and advise to the Rector, the Senate and other relevant bodies.
33. That Distance Learning is a standing item on the agenda for all meetings of the University Senate.

## **8 Final Words**

Finally, the Review Team wish to thank again the Rector and all the staff and students of AU for the excellent arrangements provided for the Team. The University leadership is to be congratulated on its serious intention to introduce systematic strategic planning as a good basis for the development and reform of the University. The Team hopes that its Report will support the Rector and assist the University to build on its many strengths and to alleviate its shortcomings, most of which are clearly recognised in the SER.

By participating in this review programme the University became automatically eligible for a 'Follow-up Review' and to be a Member of the 'IEP Alumni Forum'. This meets on the occasion of major EUA conferences and provides an occasion for representatives from all reviewed universities to discuss common problems in strategic management and related topics.

## **Bibliography**

*Standards and guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area; report approved at ministers meeting in Bergen, 2005.* Published by ENQA ([www.enqa.eu/](http://www.enqa.eu/) main documents).

*Research strategy development and management at European Universities.* Sybille Reichert. EUA Publications 2006. ([www.eua.be](http://www.eua.be))

*10 Years On: Lessons Learned from the Institutional Evaluation Programme.* Dr Stephanie Hofmann, EUA Publications 2005, European University Assocation ([www.eua.be](http://www.eua.be)).