

ATILIM UNIVERSITY

EVALUATION REPORT

July 2012

Team:

Sokratis Katsikas, chair

Bente Kristensen

Gheorghe Popa

Gintare Alaburdaite

Andy Gibbs, coordinator

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
1.1. The Institutional Evaluation Programme.....	3
1.2. Atılım University and the national and international context.....	3
1.3. The Self Evaluation process.....	5
1.4. The Evaluation Team.....	6
2. Mission and vision.....	7
3. Strategic development.....	8
4. Governance.....	9
5. Financial management.....	10
6. Human resource management.....	11
7. Learning and Teaching.....	12
8. Research.....	14
9. Cooperation with society, industry and business.....	15
10. Internationalisation.....	16
11. Quality assurance.....	17
12. Conclusions.....	18
13. Recommendations.....	19
14. Envoi.....	21

1. Introduction

This report is the result of the evaluation of Atılım University. It was undertaken at the request of the University as part of the European University Association Institutional Evaluation Programme. The evaluation took place between March and May 2012.

1.1 The Institutional Evaluation Programme

The Institutional Evaluation Programme (IEP) is an independent membership service of the European University Association (EUA) that offers evaluations to support the participating institutions in the continuing development of their strategic management and internal quality culture.

The distinctive features of the Institutional Evaluation Programme are:

- A strong emphasis on the self-evaluation phase
- A European and international perspective
- A peer-review approach
- A support to improvement

The focus of the IEP is the institution as a whole and not the individual study programmes or units. It focuses upon:

- Decision-making processes and institutional structures and the effectiveness of strategic management
- Relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision making and strategic management, as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms.

The evaluation is guided by four key questions, which are based on a 'fitness for (and of) purpose' approach:

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

1.2. Atılım University and the national and international context

Atılım University is a Foundation University located in Ankara, the capital city of Turkey. It was established in 1996 under the Turkish National Higher Education Law. As a Foundation University, Atılım operates on a non-profit basis in the non-state Higher Education sector. In common with all Turkish universities, its autonomy is still considerably constrained by the regulatory practices put in place by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) but is more than is

available to state universities. YÖK coordinates higher education institutions' activities related to research, education, administration, planning and organisation. Nevertheless, as far as the legal requirements are met, academic programmes can be arranged in line with the decisions of the University Senate which evaluates proposals from academic units. The University is autonomous in managing its financial resources and hiring academic and administrative staff. Furthermore, the University is to a large extent free to cooperate with academic and non-academic organisations at local, national, and international levels.

The main campus is located 20 kilometres from Ankara city centre where a Social Sciences Graduate School is located. The main campus is located in Gölbaşı, a developing area which is seeking to be an education town and already houses three universities, with plans for more in the near future. The campus houses a range of educational, social, cultural and research facilities with constructions underway for more facilities, such as a well-equipped, modern Library.

Ankara provides a labour market in the public sector and has a developing large scale industrial base, with since the 1990s a continuing rise in high tech industries. Government policies are stimulating growth in business clusters in regions other than Istanbul which previously dominated the market. Atılım University notes the growing impact of globalisation on the labour market and seeks to reflect this in its preparation of graduates who are able to communicate in different languages, use advanced technology and adapt to changing environments. The University reports that the low level of English language skills demonstrated by high school leavers is an impediment to its attempts to develop linguistically and has direct consequences on internationalisation.

The University is also aware of and plans for the influence of reputation, cost and geographic location on student choice and seeks to maximise its advantageous geographic location with supportive regional development and proximity to the capital with a wide ranging scholarship scheme. Nevertheless, the National Entrance Exam system has considerable impact on the University, not only in terms of student numbers, but also in terms of the diverse range of ability and educational backgrounds. Consequently this is a major consideration in strategic planning for the University.

In 2012, the University is celebrating its 15th anniversary. When it was established it had two faculties, three academic departments and 259 students. It now has grown to have five faculties offering 38 academic programmes and several research centres, with 5 500 students and employing 372 full time academic staff, 175 part time academic staff and 307 administrative staff. The University therefore has a record of consistent growth but faces some challenges in coming years.

Turkey is a signatory of the Bologna Process and has signed and ratified the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Membership of the European Higher Education Area brings both opportunities and challenges in harmonising educational systems, not only for the national education system, but also for the University.

According to the SER, in recent years the University priorities have been set for excellence in teaching and research. The drive for excellence in University activity is, in part, fuelled by strong competition in the Turkish HE sector. According to the Bologna National Analysis document (2009) regarding institutional structures, as of March 2006 there was a total of 93 Universities (68 state and 25 non-profit foundations) in Turkey. As of 2008, there were 130 Universities (94 state and 36 non-profit foundations) and by 2011 a further increase to 166. This significant increase in the number of universities has raised some challenges and increased competition. At the same time, amendments to the legal framework governing Turkish higher education have changed the nature of competition significantly. In the context of matched supply and demand, national provision of higher education places is expected to exceed demand in the next five years.

1.3 The Self Evaluation process

A study group responsible for preparations to the EUA IEP application process was established in October 2010. The group was initially composed of 13 academics, expanded to become the Self Evaluation Group. This group, established in June 2011, included students, academic and administrative staff. It met regularly once every two weeks.

The communication and collaboration among the members were supported by the creation of an online platform. The group collaborated with almost all academic and administrative units of the University in order to gather information for the Self-Evaluation Report. Each unit prepared a report, including brief descriptions of their activities, facilities and services. The information received from these reports is integrated into the relevant parts of the Self Evaluation Report (SER). This process also provided a natural forum for discussing some parts of the report. Following the completion of the draft version of the report, it was published on the University website and feedback was invited from the University Community. The report was then updated, based on the feedback received.

The University has reflected on the Self Evaluation process and reports that it has had several positive impacts. It provided a picture of the University that included its strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities, while the appendices provided details in a systematic way. The discussion process fostered an awareness of the importance of data gathering, quality assurance, organisational communication and participatory decision making in line with the goal of institutional development. This gave an opportunity to propose necessary measures and policies. The Self Evaluation process also improved cooperation and information exchange among the units of the University. The biggest challenge encountered was in data gathering from multiple sources, and another problem was the arrangement of suitable meeting times for all group members. Overall, it has been a rewarding experience for participants.

The Self Evaluation Report presents the process, findings, and conclusions of a comprehensive self-evaluation study performed at Atılım University as part of its preparation for evaluation by the European University Association's Institutional Evaluation Programme. The

Report, along with the appendices, was sent to the Evaluation Team in March 2012. The team's visits to Atılım University took place in March and May 2012. In between the visits the University provided the evaluation team with some additional documentation on the strategic plan, key performance indicators, research performance and staff development policies.

The evaluation team found the Self Evaluation Report to be very informative, detailed, and supported by good and easily readable data. The amount of information provided in the SER and appendices was challenging for the Team to make sense of in the time available, and perhaps reflects a tendency by the University to provide all information rather than identify and prioritise key information. Nevertheless, the Team found the document helpful and could clearly see that the University had engaged with and benefitted from the process.

1.4 The Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team consisted of:

- Sokratis Katsikas, chair, former Rector, University of the Aegean, Greece
- Bente Kristensen, former Deputy President, Copenhagen Business School, Denmark
- Gheorghe Popa, former Rector, Al.I.Cuza University, Romania
- Gintare Alaburdaite, Quality Assurance Expert, European Students' Union, Lithuania
- Andy Gibbs, team coordinator, Director of International Relations, School of Nursing Midwifery and Social Care, Edinburgh Napier University, United Kingdom

2. Mission and vision

The University's mission is "to raise highly capable individuals who will be able to produce and apply scientific knowledge in high performance areas at the national and global levels with social responsibility". The University's vision is "to be a university that aims to leave its mark on the future and to raise skilled and competent individuals who will contribute to original scientific and scholarly works". Additionally the SER reports that in 2006, the vision of Atılım University was set to be a research University, while maintaining high standards in teaching and learning. At that time each unit was invited to plan to achieve excellence in research and education by 2017.

The IEP team noted the vision and mission expressed within the SER and enquired about this with various groups of managers and academics during the site visit. In particular the Evaluation Team considered the mission and vision to be somewhat vaguely stated without offering any unique points or indications that differentiated it from the majority of higher education institutions. In discussion with the Board of Trustees and Senior Management regarding the future development of the University, it became apparent that there was clarity in this group of a shared vision, which was more clearly expressed than in the SER. They expressed their view that the University should continue to grow in size, expand its links with businesses and focus on widening access, flexible programme delivery, Life Long Learning (LLL) and internationalisation. This strongly reflects the general drivers within the European Higher Education Area and additional focus on these issues will address many of the points subsequently raised in this report.

This clarity was not evident amongst the academic community which was more focused on day to day academic life. Despite the notion of excellence which pervaded the SER and with each unit having a vision and mission, frequently citing terms such as excellence, highest international standards, perfectionist, leading in education and research, highest reputation, high class, leading the world, there appeared to be no consistent view of what exactly this excellence was or what it would look like once achieved. This is not to undermine the efforts of staff who are working towards excellence and high standards in their own way, but rather to point out the diversity and gradation of viewpoints which detract from a shared vision that can maximise collective effort.

3. Strategic development

This will in part be addressed by an increasing expertise and focus on strategic development which has already enabled the creation of a strategic plan, the implementation of which is guided by key performance indicators. Furthermore the plan is supported by the presence of monitoring mechanisms. The process by which the strategic plan was developed reflects a collegiate, decentralised approach which appears to have fostered a fruitful collaborative approach. To this extent the planning process is sound and will increasingly promote widespread involvement and ownership.

The IEP team considered that this process was likely to facilitate the University's capacity to change and noted three areas in which Strategic Management could be strengthened further. Firstly, the inclusion of action plans which signpost the way to achieving strategic objectives would be beneficial to staff by informing them of expected actions and behaviours that would support these achievements. Secondly, the team noted that there was a discrepancy between the actual objectives articulated by the Board of Trustees and senior management with those stated in the strategic plan. This may have contributed to the third issue, which was a lack of prioritisation in strategic objectives, leading to the articulation of objectives without consideration or resources to achieve them. In particular the strategic aim of enhancing research is apparently unsupported by either actions or resources within planning documents.

4. Governance

The formal structure of Atılım University meets the general requirements of the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) and is essentially similar to other universities in Turkey. Generally this means that it enjoys more autonomy than State Universities. The University has maximised this by facilitating the Faculties to propose their own curricula which are reviewed for approval at Faculty (or Graduate School) level and the University Senate. New programmes are proposed by the University and need to be approved by YÖK. The University intends to further expand this autonomy to promote cross-disciplinary working. The structure also aims to promote active participation in decision making by academic and administrative staff as well as students, and sets to achieve this through the effective flow of information, feedback and improvement practices.

The Evaluation Team found that there was a clear system of Governance within the University, evidenced by clear lines of reporting and responsibility and that there is a satisfactory autonomy of academic units in decision making and resource allocation. It noted the appointment of a Provost in 2010 to support the University's goals and capacity to change and it was evident that this position had strengthened and accelerated strategic planning capacity.

This being said, the Evaluation Team gained the impression that the predominant form of communication is "top down" and identified a need for improvement in communication between senior and middle management. Whilst the processes are in place to promote involvement in decision making, engaging middle managers could be enhanced. In addition, the Evaluation Team gained the impression that, perhaps due to the age profile of middle managers and academic staff, there is a potential risk of a skills and experience gap at middle management level.

Coupled with this, the potential benefits of engaging students in University life and decision making is not maximised. Across all levels of Governance, student participation is very low. This is reflected in two ways. Firstly, the Governance structures do not facilitate participation and, secondly, the student body was noted to be utterly uncritical. Whilst on one hand this may reflect absolute satisfaction, the Evaluation Team found it remarkable that a level of critical analysis that would be expected amongst a population of graduate and undergraduate students was not evident.

Finally, the Committee structure is, in parts, unnecessarily complex and promotes duplication and lack of role clarity. This was exemplified by the work of the Steering Committee for Academic Assessment and Quality Improvement which appeared to report data required by YÖK and not, as the title seems to indicate, to be responsible for all the internal and external quality work undertaken at Atılım University. The consequence of this is that this group duplicated work that was undertaken and considered elsewhere while, at the same time, essential parts of the overall quality assurance and improvement process are ambiguously owned and, perhaps, ineffectively carried out due to shortage of resources.

5. Financial management

The University has autonomy in managing its financial resources. Decisions are made by the Board of Trustees on advice from the Rector, following inputs and requests from Academic and Administrative Units.

The Evaluation Team was presented with information that demonstrated that the University is in good financial health. No shortage of resources was reported by academic units. Financial management reports directly to the Board of Trustees.

With the exception of the Centre for Metal Forming Excellence, university income derives almost exclusively from tuition fees and this is highlighted within the SER as a concern for the University, not least because it presents difficulties in financial and academic planning. To a large extent the vision articulated by the Board of Trustees is geared towards generating income streams from increased internationalisation, Life Long Learning, flexible delivery and research. However clearly this vision may be shared among the members of the Board of Trustees, it is not fully communicated and shared by the academic community at large. Hence, the link between academic development in these areas and creating new income streams is key to the University mission and achieving the goals set in these areas is of paramount importance for the University's financial security and growth. Therefore, clearly articulated operational plans aiming at achieving these goals are necessary.

The introduction of steps to make the University budget more transparent to all academic units will assist in enabling academic staff to appreciate these links. Such a step was trialled this year when the Chair of the Board of Trustees presented an income and expense study of all academic units and asked them to propose action items to improve their efficiency and growth potential.

6. Human resource management

A Human Resources Coordination Office has been established within the University which reflects the growing importance of HR issues within the University's agenda, currently as a means of providing training for administrative staff and with plans to develop these further, expanding them to academic staff, together with the extension of an appraisal to include administrative staff. In the longer term, the Office plans to develop an Enterprise Resource System to assist planning and address performance issues.

The Evaluation Team noted that the HR Office reported directly to the Rectorate, thus emphasising the importance to the organisation. It also noted the clear published criteria and procedures for hiring and promoting academic and administrative staff, as well as the established annual staff performance evaluation system in place. The plans which were outlined for this office are commended by the team and, if realised, will make a further strong contribution to organisational development which includes, *inter alia*, the intention and action to attract qualified academic staff from abroad. The achievement of these intentions could be strengthened by the development of an HR plan which would complement the strategic plan. Within this plan a clear career development strategy for academic or administrative staff would enhance individual performance motivation and engagement. The role of the Human Resources Office in organising professional development training for the administrative staff could usefully be expanded to coordinate academic staff education and training.

Currently the workload exceeds the staff resources available within the Human Resources Unit. To achieve the intended goals of this Unit the staff resources should be reviewed, perhaps by considering how the functions of the existing Personnel office can be developed to create a larger unit of staff focused on Human Resources issues.

7. Learning and teaching

The objective of the University is to achieve excellence and the highest standards in teaching. Several initiatives have been introduced, specifically in the last two years. These include workshops for teaching and learning which were offered to academic staff by international experts and the establishment of the Educational Technologies and Pedagogy Office (ETPO) which provides academic staff the services in use of technology in teaching. Additionally, completion rates and times are reasonable. Employability of graduates is good and stakeholders regard them well. The Evaluation Team met with universally satisfied students who are positively orientated towards their learning experience. The University has created conditions which contribute to the potential for excellence, amongst which are the positive relationships between teachers and students, the low student staff ratio and the advanced laboratories and laboratory systems.

A realistic approach with regard to professional education was also noted and exemplified by the choice of qualification within the School of Civil Aviation and the University's involvement with the Engineering Accreditation body (MUDEK). The University is encouraged to continue to seek professional accreditation for its programmes where appropriate.

The Evaluation Team viewed these as positive moves and would encourage the further development and systematic implementation of strategies to improve the standards of teaching and learning. In support of this the team has a number of suggestions which may help provide a clearer focus for actions.

Firstly, whilst noting the value of having aims to achieve excellence and the highest standards in teaching, the team found no clear indication of what was meant by this or how the University would recognise when it had achieved this goal. This means contextualising the aims within the particular type of students that the University attracts and against the available resources.

For example, student satisfaction is naturally a key measure of good teaching and this satisfaction is reflected in internal surveys and was noted in the meetings that the team had with students. However, the team were concerned that the universal satisfaction also revealed a lack of reflection and constructive critical comment which would be a feature both of undergraduate studies and contemporary European student groups. All of the indicators suggest that students can make a strong contribution to the development of the University and its teaching and learning practices and it seems that the University is yet to realise this potential. This issue is also mentioned in the Governance section.

Secondly, to pursue the vision of the University and address some of the issues raised in the SER, such as the diverse abilities of students, quite specific actions could be introduced which would focus on targeted student support, widening access and internationalising the curriculum. The nature of teaching and learning and strategies geared towards improving this should more readily reflect the needs of the student body. For example, the aim of continuously improving curricula appears to be addressed in an *ad hoc* manner, with changes driven by individuals or

individual departments. The evaluation team observed that whilst motivated staff had introduced curriculum innovation, some areas retained rigid curricula structures. Moving to a system whereby curricula review was cyclical and systematic would help to focus action purposefully and would address issues such as the rigidity in curricula structure which restricts student progression and Erasmus activity.

The team also noted the lack of clarity of indicators signalling excellence in teaching in discussions regarding the Bologna Process. This (Bologna Process) is referred to in the SER as a standardisation process, when in fact it is a harmonisation process in which each entity (University and nation state) has to develop common approaches according to its context. To this extent, within the University, the language of 'Bologna' is in place but key terms such as 'student centeredness' and moving from a teaching to a learning approach need to be further defined and the positive steps taken forward in this area continued.

In particular the intention of ETPO in promoting student centeredness and this, together with the sharing of existing good practice, such as peer mentoring, has considerable potential to influence teaching and learning positively once fully established. Currently mechanisms to share this good practice are limited and, although there is a recently established link between performance appraisal and staff development, good teaching goes unrewarded. The introduction of teaching fellowship schemes, or similar, would emphasise the importance of good teaching to the University.

The recent establishment of a Dean of Students is welcomed as a step which will introduce higher levels of advocacy for students and student issues as well as greater representation.

The Evaluation Team noted that the policy regarding the use of English in classes was not consistently adhered to and both staff and students reported a reversion to Turkish in classes which were designated to be taught in a non-native language. The language policy cuts across a number of key strategies and a lack of consistent application undermines their potential achievement. Whilst not advocating a policing of classroom activity, the Evaluation Team strongly suggests that the University first ensures the realism of its language policy by having an adequate support structure in place and, secondly, reinforces its importance with regard to the vision and mission of the University.

Finally, it must be mentioned that students frequently raised the issues of car parking and travel to the University as problematic and it was clear that demand for car parking spaces exceeded supply. Whilst the University has plans to address this, it serves as a visible and obvious reminder to ensure that, whilst implementing plans for growth, measures must be taken to ensure that there is sufficient capacity.

8. Research

The team observed that the University has a good research profile in some areas of its activity and also the enthusiasm for research amongst the academic staff group. The Centre of Excellence for Metal Forming is a very good example of engaging with niche research and reflects a success story for the University, even though initially the centre was rather the result of the personal research interests of a particular staff member than the outcome of a stated institutional research strategy. Three areas were identified by the team which may assist the University in consolidating this success and may have utility as other areas of research grow. Firstly, future plans regarding the operation of the Centre need to be developed following a careful analysis of the economic environment and perspective. Secondly, the Centre has underdeveloped financial autonomy and, in the longer term, this may limit potential and opportunity. Finally, the University does not have a policy in place regarding patents and intellectual property rights. It would be prudent for the University to identify ways to protect and benefit from its research as well as to clarify these conditions with individual researchers.

Apart from the Centre there are pockets of research activity with some impressive initiatives to promote multi and interdisciplinary research which is developing. However, this activity, like other research activities, is imbalanced across faculties. The activity is not institutionalised and lacks critical mass. Whilst a clearly articulated research strategy accompanied by appropriate funding and support would help institutionalise the research ethos sought by the University, the lack of critical mass demands a more fundamental review. There are numerous units and departments which consist of one or two members of staff and consolidating these areas into larger functional units will help build the critical mass necessary to achieve excellence. Such an action would create the possibility to develop a clearly articulated research strategy, which is currently lacking. This would also help set the financing arrangements in context as currently there is limited funding and support for research activities.

Finally, the linkages between research activity and student activity could be stronger. In particular it is a strength that students currently have the opportunity for an early introduction and support to undertake research activity, but this is not converted into research studentships and there is a low number of graduate and PhD students. It is therefore apparent that to achieve the excellence desired more effort is required to attract students to this activity.

9. Cooperation with society, industry and business

The SER highlights that the University aims to establish closer links with society, including services to industry, governmental and non-governmental organisations and disadvantaged groups. A number of initiatives in this area are described that have strengthened these links over recent years.

Businesses and enterprises which have existing links with the University, and with whom the Evaluation Team met, describe a good relationship with University staff and confidence in the abilities of its graduates. This positive stakeholder involvement and engagement was clearly evident in certain areas. For example, the Advisory Board model in Engineering is good practice which should be followed by others. This may be beneficial particularly in the social sciences which reported limited experience in developing cooperation. Some stakeholders, such as the local municipality indicated that there is potential and willingness on their part to further develop the existing good relationship.

The Evaluation Team saw potential to link more closely the teaching and learning mission of the University to its service to society through the development of lifelong learning strategies, which would use informal, formal, distance and flexible methods to enhance learning within the target organisations. Similarly, whilst placements and on-the-job training of students is in place, this was identified by businesses as an area that could be strengthened by, amongst other actions, providing longer placements.

In general terms this would emphasise the necessity of aligning the teaching and learning, research and service to society missions of the University and ensure that they were complementary to each other rather than, as it stands, three pillars of action.

10. Internationalisation

According to the SER, most of the University activity had been organised at local and national level, until the last few years, when the internationalisation process has been accelerated. It is not stated how or why this happened but it is clear that there is a growing number of projects, partnerships and bilateral agreements at EU and global levels, coordinated by both the EU and International Relations Office and International Students Office. The SER also mentions that numbers of international publications may be an indicator of international activity.

Whilst it is clear that there is growing international activity, it is not clear that this is linked with an internationalisation strategy, nor to a vision or plan of how internationalisation at Atılım University may be realised or how it would be regarded. If the University wishes to become an international university, giving its students an international experience and attracting international students, a strategy and vision needs to be developed. This needs to be supported by underpinning strategies in teaching and learning, research, Human Resources and Quality Assurance.

The growth of Erasmus staff and student mobility was noted and the Evaluation Team were advised that a target of 20% Erasmus mobility by 2020 had been set. This is noted as being more ambitious than EU targets and it is suggested that the definition of mobility could be expanded beyond Erasmus mobility.

English has been adopted as the language of instruction across many programmes and the ability to understand and communicate in different languages is emphasised within the University plans. A number of excellent initiatives were identified within the Preparatory School to support this aim and the commitment of staff was impressive. This was not as evident across all units and schools and the commitment to the University plans needs to be reinforced by emphasising the shared commitment and responsibility in achieving this goal.

11. Quality assurance

The SER describes a comprehensive quality system, which is clearly under development, and elements of an external and internal quality assurance system are present both in the planning and implementation. Currently the internal and external activities are not complementary. One outcome of this is that it is not always apparent why data is being collected or for what it will be used. Reducing the amount of data collected and ensuring that what is collected contributes to closing the quality feedback loop will reduce the workload associated with quality management, enable internal participants to see the relevance and assist in ensuring that activity is goal related. An example of this is the focus on the number of overseas partnerships, when in fact what is relevant in quality terms is the number of active partnerships and their output.

The University has taken a number of significant steps and has plans to further develop its information systems. This effort needs to be accompanied by steps which will ensure that the quality feedback loop is closed, meaning that data is collected purposefully and actioned. Finally it needs to be made clear that ownership for quality rests not only with centralised systems but with individuals and individual functional units.

The Evaluation Team appreciated the positive steps that the University was taking with regard to external accreditation and external professional bodies. It welcomed the good practice of seeking accreditation with the Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Engineering Programmes (MUDEK) and would encourage this in other areas.

12. Conclusions

Atılım University is a relatively new University which has demonstrated growth in the 15 years since its establishment. It has high ambitions for excellence as it now looks to step up its levels of performance and gain a greater degree of competitiveness. It enjoys a good location, with potential for development as well as a good reputation amongst students and businesses.

Additionally it has some excellent facilities, in particular laboratories, and there are good relationships between students and teachers. The University has established a Centre for Excellence in research in one area and has aspirations to replicate this in others. The University has also recently introduced a strong strategic planning process as well as numerous other processes to support its growth. The management team shows clear vision and ambition. These are all indications of the University's capacity and readiness for change.

This report contains a number of recommendations which are intended to support that change. In summary it may be said that these fall into three areas: articulating a clear and focused vision which promotes ownership amongst the University community; ensuring the complementarity of measures across different strategic priorities; and embedding newly established processes. Achievement in these areas, combined with the existing sound foundations, will contribute to the further and continuing success of the University.

13. Recommendations

- Continue to take advantage of and maximise privileged location by further developing a relationship with the municipality
- Consider a scholarship scheme to be able to attract good quality students
- Define the Atılım brand to build and maximise reputation
- Improve communication of a shared institutional vision, mission and values amongst the academic community
- Continue good practice of collaborative strategy plan development and monitoring of progress against plans
- Develop action plans to support strategic objectives including infrastructure development plans
- Maintain compatibility of actual and stated strategic objectives
- Prioritise objectives to optimise the use of available resources
- Improve communication between senior management, middle management and academic staff
- Develop succession planning for middle management
- Complement top down approaches with bottom up approaches to improve involvement
- Simplify the committee structure to achieve separation of duties and to maximise efficiency
- Improve, promote, stimulate constructively critical student involvement in university life and decision making
- Enhance visibility and transparency of financial procedures and results
- Diversify income streams by further exploiting existing research potential, LLL capacity and demand and IPR
- Extend HR competence for career development to academic staff
- Intensify efforts to recruit suitably qualified academic staff from abroad
- Articulate clear career development strategy
- Develop HR plans to support strategic plans so as to ensure growth and capacity are aligned
- Enhance human resources to the Human Resources Unit
- Develop Bologna Process tools and instruments which will enhance capacity to implement LLL strategies, develop comparable curricula, improve exchange opportunities
- Institutionalise and reward good teaching, learning and assessment practices following existing examples
- Consider establishing formal periodic curriculum reviews including involvement of relevant stakeholders
- Enforce the language of instruction policy
- Fully exploit existing research capacity by articulating clear research strategy to complement the strategic plan and by assigning necessary resources including an aim to increase the numbers of PhD students in targeted areas
- Consider increasing financial autonomy of research activity and encourage patent development

- Further enhance efforts to increase interdisciplinary research
- Expand the advisory board model to all faculties as a stimulus to growth, relevance and service to society
- Develop action plans to implement strategic objective of LLL and consider enhancing and extending Summer Practices
- Reconsider the student mobility target
- Incorporate internationalisation into all strategies so that it permeates the full range of university mission
- Broaden the scope of internationalisation beyond staff and student mobility to include, for example, internationalisation at home
- Integrate the existing elements of the quality assurance into a coherent whole
- Coordinate and locate the responsibility for ownership of internal quality assurance
- Expand external accreditation by professional bodies
- Make efficient use of collected data and use this to give feedback to all parties, including students

14. Envoi

Our thanks go to the Rector, Prof. Dr. Abdurrahim Özgenoğlu, for facilitating access to all staff and information as well as for his warm hospitality, the Provost, Prof. Dr. Hasan U. Akay, for his liaison role and facilitation of the schedule, and all staff, students and stakeholders who the Evaluation Team met with during the process.