EUA-Institutional Evaluation Programme

ANADOLU UNIVERSITY

EVALUATION REPORT

November 2015

Team:
Tove Bull, Chair
Krista Varantola
Hans Beunderman
Simona Dimovska
James Gosling, Team Coordinator

Contents

1. Introduction

This report is the result of the evaluation of Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Turkey. The evaluation took place in 2015 with two visits by the evaluation team, the first in March and the second in October.

1.1 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 IEP is a full member of the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) and is listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR).

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 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 the institution know it works?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

1.2 Anadolu University and its contexts

A preliminary consideration of some elements of the context of Anadolu University and of the situation of the University itself may help readers, inside and outside the University, to understand better that planning courageously and flexibly, and achieving more effective outputs from managers and staff at all levels may be crucial preconditions for Anadolu

University "to become a life-long learning oriented world university" (Vision statement, Anadolu University Self evaluation Report – 2015 (hereafter SER, p. 9).

The Current Global Situation

In recent centuries the world and human civilisation have been changing fast, but change has accelerated greatly in recent decades and years, especially in Turkey's neighbourhood. There are wars with intra-Islamic strife and complex tensions in adjacent countries to the east. These have generated an enormous continuing refugee crisis in which Turkey has accepted millions fleeing violence, with significant, if unknown numbers in Eskişehir City and Province. There is unresolved conflict in the Ukraine to the north, and, to the south, the Palestinian situation is proving more and more difficult to resolve. Add in ongoing uncertainty in the Eurozone to the west, but hopefully with Greece on a new road. Also, as the whole world economy is now hugely inter-dependent, there are risks associated with the huge Chinese economy that is now at a hazardous stage of development. Appropriate caution with respect to many of these situations, coupled with judicious risk management, may be very important to Anadolu University.

The Current Higher Education Situation in Turkey

There has been enormous expansion in the Turkish higher education sector in the last ten years; more public institutions were founded and budgets more than doubled, but physical planning for these rapid developments appears to have been inadequate (http://www.oecd.org/edu/innovation-education/centreforeffectivelearningenvironmentscele/48358175.pdf) The sudden creation of many new universities, private and public, has prompted questions about the maintenance of quality. However, a comprehensive National Qualifications Framework (NQF) was put into law in 2014 and this recognises the urgent need for fully functional quality assessment systems in support of the NQF as well as educational quality in general. Particularly relevant to Anadolu University, the Lifelong Learning Strategy and Action Plan (2014-2018) presents many opportunities as well as challenges. Political uncertainty is a threat to progress in many sectors resulting in broad legislative reform of higher education being very slow. Therefore, in the short term, significantly greater autonomy, even for high-performing established universities, seems unlikely.

The University

Although, like many universities around the world, Anadolu University (AU) is less than sixty years old, it has many of the attributes of a more venerable institution; widespread national recognition, traditions, impressive infrastructure, a very well developed main campus near the city centre, another large, modern one to the north, and a third is again near the city centre. It is fortunate in its location in an attractive, quite large – but readily navigable – modern, go-ahead city. Eskişehir has a population of nearly 700,000; it is located at 790 m above sea level on the Porsuk River and overlooks the rich Phrygian Valley. Unemployment is lower than the national average, 3.4% versus 4.8% in 2014 (SER, p. 4). In turn, Eskişehir is fortunate in its two

large universities (the other being Eskişehir Osmangazi University, located towards the southern suburbs). They were once one institution but separated in 1993.

Presently, Anadolu University is a distinctively socially conscious university with over 30,000 on-campus students, and a university that sees education and research in the context of whole lives. Physical resources, including many new or refurbished buildings, are impressive and not as limiting as they often are in other universities across the world. Planning and continuous improvement are consistent high priorities. The University's huge distance and open education enterprise, which has well over a million active students in many countries, is widely recognised and admired nationally. Although fees are fixed and low, and many supplementary aids and services are included, this is a highly profitable enterprise for the University. However, legal restrictions and government regulations on expenditure, hiring, staff development, student admission and internationalisation, as well as the necessity to obtain permissions from central government for a wide range of standard activities, hamper necessary development. Anadolu University is clearly ambitious with respect to research, it has significant and growing research infrastructure and has begun to prioritise selected research areas; a large proportion of academic staff are research active, but outputs are still very uneven.

1.3 The Evaluation Process

The self-evaluation process was undertaken by a widely representative, 28 member group including five students, chaired by the Professor Doctor Adnan Özcan, Vice Rector for Education and International Relations. The same group prepared the University's Strategic Plan (2014–2018) and a few of the team members had participated in the self-evaluation processes for previous IEP evaluations (2008 and the 2010 follow up evaluation). Although, according to the present SER, there was cooperation with all sectors of the university, and a late draft was shared "with the whole academic and administrative personnel and students", the general academic staff and students met by the IEP team (see below) did not express significant familiarity with the report.

The self-evaluation report of Anadolu University, together with the appendices, was sent to the evaluation team in late February 2015. The visits of the team to the University took place from 23 to 25 March and from 11 to 14 October 2015, respectively. In between the visits the liaison person, efficiently and well ahead of a general deadline, provided the evaluation team with additional data and documentation.

The evaluation team (hereafter always named 'the team') consisted of:

- Tove Bull, Chair, former Rector, University of Tromsø - The Arctic University of Norway
- Krista Varantola, former Rector, University of Tampere, Finland
- Hans Beunderman, former Vice Rector, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
- Simona Dimovska, student, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University, Macedonia

- James Gosling, Team Coordinator, former Director of Quality, National University of Ireland - Galway, Ireland

The team thanks the Rector Professor Doctor Naci Gündoğan, the Vice Rector Professor Doctor Adnan Özcan, the academic, support and restaurant staff, the impressive students, our most helpful guide, our skillful driver and the interpreters. They are due our sincere appreciation of the welcome they gave us, their cooperation and openness, and their friendliness. Not least, we thank also the liaison person, Professor Doctor Ibrahim Halil Diken for his ultra-quick responses, steady contact and support.

1.4 Previous IEP evaluations of Anadolu University

Follow up evaluations within two to three years and/or a series of IEP evaluations over a longer period are potentially very valuable provided the resulting recommendations are taken seriously and implemented, after carefully assessment with respect to feasibility, cost and compatibility with developing contexts. Anadolu University commissioned a full evaluation in 2008. In 2010 Anadolu University asked for a follow up evaluation. In the resulting report, Anadolu University was complemented on progress with implementing the earlier recommendations and some further (mostly related) recommendations were made. In the 2008 SER (p. 1) it is stated that the University sees IEP evaluations as an "integral part of its quality improvement efforts".

It may also be appropriate for the present team to comment, concisely and in general terms, on general progress since 2008 to date (2015), with reference to the implementation of both the 2008 and 2010 recommendations.

- *Mission and Planning*: The current statements of Vision, Mission & Strategic objectives are more distinctive, concise and relevant. The new Strategic Plan is much more action-orientated.

- *Governance and management – human and financial*: Anadolu University continues to try to maximise its limited autonomy. However, the team is of the opinion that its organisational structure is still too complex. The continuing lack of an advisory board of external stakeholders is explained as due to legal restrictions (SER p. 24).

- *Teaching, learning and students*: Reforms are continuing, but it is not clear if these are as wide-spread as desirable, particularly with respect to student-centred learning. The library now opens for 24 hours per day, seven days per week.

- *Internationalisation*: Anadolu University is one of the more internationalised public universities in Turkey, and continues to expand its international profile and activities.

- *Research and society*: The University has invested greatly in research infrastructure and prioritises the relevance of research to society. There is now a vice rector for research (and university staff). Awareness of the importance of agreed priority research areas is somewhat greater.

- *Quality culture*: The Board of Academic Assessment and Quality Improvement (ANADEK) systematically monitors implementation of the University Strategic Plan. A student feedback system operates widely if not always effectively. Some teachers seek feedback directly.

- *Open and Distance education*: The impressive new building is an important asset that will enable developments and improvements that may not have been feasible before. There is evidence of greater coherence between the core participating faculties (Open Education, Business Administration, and Economics) and with the other faculties, and a clear commitment to initiatives, reform and related research.

2. Governance and institutional decision-making

Governance at Anadolu University is dependent on frequent meetings between the Rector and senior officers, and of governing bodies, perhaps even more so than at the time of the first IEP evaluation. Both the Senate (58 members, including just one student) and Executive Board (21 members with others – but no students – informally invited, speaking but non-voting) meet frequently. The Senate meets almost every month (only two per year are legally required) and the Executive Board meets every week throughout the year (SER p. 8). Therefore, institutional decision-making appears to be highly centralised, dependent on multiple meetings, and highly consensual. There appear to be significantly fewer executive decisions at lower levels (i.e. delegations of authority, often informal) than is the case in high performing universities in other parts of the world; universities that are considered to be more than adequately consultative and democratic.

Legally, the Rector has a very wide range of responsibilities; on the diagram representing reporting lines (SER, Appendix 3) almost all lines from institutes (nine), faculties (17), schools (seven), independent departments (six), research centres (30) and academic support units (21) – 90 units in all – lead directly to the Rector. The single exception is represented by 11 administrative units that report to the General Secretary, who reports to the Rector. On the diagram, no units report directly to any of the five vice rectors. However, according to a clarification by the University, the diagram does not reflect present administrative reality as the Rector delegates much of his official authority and responsibilities to the five vice rectors, who have the following responsibilities:

- Education and international affairs
- Administrative and financial affairs
- Research and development
- Open and distance education system
- Human resources

When the Rector's and some other officer's workloads arose during discussions, it appeared that many time-consuming issues are personal or inter-personal and have little directly to do with the formal duties of the people concerned. This was described as an aspect of internal culture. These institutional styles and patterns of governance, and related issues may well be repeated in at least some of the faculties and other larger units.

Overall, governance at Anadolu University, while generally planning-orientated, consultative and effective, is extremely demanding of officers and representatives with respect to the time spent in meetings – the team even felt concern at the effects of these long working days and long evening meetings on family life and individual wellbeing. This style of governance may also be far from optimum with respect to individual effectiveness and motivation at all levels. Senior officers and deans with more time could travel more to spread the word of all the good things happening at Anadolu University in accord with the sentiments expressed in the SER (p. 26). Not least, given more autonomy, perhaps many more staff of all categories would 'just get on with their jobs'.

The team recommends:

- That student representation be expanded by adding student members (non-voting, if not otherwise possible) to governing boards at all levels.
- That AU simplifies its administrative and academic structures to the extent allowed by legal constraints.
- That the capacity of the five vice rectors to contribute to the management of AU be fully realised.
- That all legally allowed decision-making be delegated to the vice rectors, faculties, and other units with sufficient competence, while preserving only necessary oversight by the Rector, Senate, Executive Board and senior management.

3. Teaching and learning

As well as visiting four faculties and meeting deans, staff and students during the first visit, in the second visit in October the team met with the directors of the specialised schools and with the directors of the vocational schools of the University. Clearly these schools enhance the broad mission of the University and themselves benefit from the association. Issues raised included needs for more support for staff to improve English language capabilities, more facilities for practical education and even closer cooperation with industry. In October also, the team met with deans, staff and students from faculties not visited earlier.

Students all expressed general satisfaction with their University, and with the teaching they experience; some were highly enthusiastic about being students at Anadolu University. Facilities are mostly good and teaching staff are generally very friendly and accessible. Of course there were exceptions, for example, some students felt that facilities for practical work and experience were limiting. Teachers in general were praised, but some students report that teachers 'were not up-to-date', 'do not listen' or are uninspiring and expect only rote-learning. Over-crowded classes is also an important issue for students in some areas and students in faculties on the Iki Eylül campus wished for better transport connections with the larger Yunus Emre campus. For most students, the institutional system established about ten years ago whereby they must complete feedback forms at the end of each semester is missing a vital stage; that is: regular reports back to students as to actions taken in response to their inputs. Some of the above issues indicate that not all aspects of the Bologna reforms are fully integrated across the university, and that full compliance with the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area has not yet been accomplished. (See further under Chapter 6 Quality Culture.)

However, students do recognise that, for example, the much extended opening hours of the main library were in response to student requests made via the Board of Student Representatives. This is comprised of elected delegates from all individual study programmes and meets at least once a month.

Speaking to academic staff, the team learned that some have sought out opportunities for specific training on pedagogy and/or routinely seek direct feedback from their students early in their courses. However, a recurring theme in talking to teaching staff was the need for more and regular opportunities to update their pedagogic skills; including skills related to new technologies, large classes, improving competence in teaching via foreign languages, or just retaining the attention young people who are quite different from how they (the teachers) themselves were as students. The SER notes that teaching competence is not a contributing factor in new academic staff appointments (p. 14).

Among bachelor students at Anadolu University drop-out rates vary from 10% to about 40% depending on faculty. Long times to graduation are common with up to about 50% taking 5 or more years to graduate from a four year programmes; for a small number of faculties this is

better with less than 20% being slow to graduate. However, the team was not aware that in all faculties these issues are being analysed in detail or given the attention they deserve.

In any case, the team recognises that unsuitable national regulations and restrictions are responsible for many of these and other problems. For example, deficient acceptance criteria that allowed entry to insufficiently prepared students, the lack of time limits that result in inactive students being able to continue registration indefinitely, and deficient curricula defined nationally without the opinions of the staff who deliver them being taken into account.

One area not given adequate attention during either of the team's two visits is education and training in research i.e. PhD and related programmes. The team notes the existence of five graduate schools among the list of institutes. The University should ensure that these have modern structured PhD programmes with defined procedures governing supervision and monitoring of student progress, and support given for generic skills training (research methodology, communication, statistics etc.). Although this is not explicit in the Strategic Plan (2014–2018), the team trusts that AU is compliant with the Salzburg I (2005) and II (2010) reports and recommendations, or has compliance as an objective. If not, these issues should be taken into consideration by the University.

Finally, with respect to teaching and learning, as well as other aspects related to internationally recognised good practices, some faculties are much more advanced than others. This is a clear source of pride for their staff and students, and also for the University leadership. However, it is also a responsibility of the leadership to act to encourage and facilitate, and at times require, the raising of general standards to equivalent levels throughout all faculties and schools.

The team recommends:

- That AU carry out a needs analysis with respect to wide-spread, systematic, in-career training for all teaching staff in higher education pedagogy.
- That all faculties continue with Bologna reforms until all teaching is student centered.
- That compliance with the Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area (2015) be prioritised.
- That all faculties assess why students drop out or take a long time to complete and attempt to improve these rates.

4. Distance and Open Education

A core function of Anadolu University, and central to its mission and ethos, is the making available of a wide range of educational programmes (seven bachelor, 30 associate and 30 certificate) to adults throughout the extensive territory of the Republic of Turkey, parts of which are extremely isolated, and to the Turkish-speaking people of its diaspora in many countries, particularly in western Europe. At any one time well over one million people – most in full-time employment, some at home, some disabled and some in prison – are actively taking advantage of these low-cost services. This requires a huge, international organisational network as well as a substantial infrastructure on the main campus to provide classes, generate teaching content and materials, and assess learning. Turkish speakers everywhere, know of and appreciate Anadolu University because of these services. Their continued success is a prime concern of the Rector and all senior officers, who maintain relations with relevant international associations in Europe (EADTU, EDEN) and Asia (AAOU). The importance of international accreditation is recognised and it is to be expanded; 28 associate programmes are now accredited by Pearson Assured, UK. Although the fees are low, the scale of the operation is huge, enabling the generation of income that supports many activities and developments in the University as a whole.

The future development of this enterprise – improving and diversifying to meet the changing needs of students and employers, and growing competition from other universities – is a major task that is recognised in a specific strategic plan for 2014 to 2018. This plan, which was supplied to the team with a thorough SWOT analysis, is also included as 'Goal 4' in the University Plan. It has four subsections:

4.1. Ensuring the sustainability of the learner-centered, flexible, accessible and technology-based quality of the Open Education system

4.2. Increasing the effectiveness of communication and learning technologies in the open education system

4.3. Ensuring the training and development of human resources for the open education system

4.4. Taking steps to improve reputation of the open education system

Together, these have 19 actions, each with a number of performance indicators, each of these with annual targets and indicated responsible officers or bodies. The plan and its action-orientated nature are highly commendable. There are emphases on infrastructure and training, updating course materials and achieving accreditation of all study programmes, and increasing greatly research on distance education. The intention to establish an 'Open and Distance Education National Excellence Centre' is particularly praiseworthy but the goal of a 30% 'Status of realization' by 2018 is disappointing, even if, given constraints of which the team are unaware, it is realistic. It would be good if it could be created informally and be recognised externally (including by competitors, who would benefit from it) well in advance of achieving any legal status. Action 4.2/S.4 'Organizing national/international scientific events' is also commendable; at best it would include a home-grown annual event with topical themes capable of attracting substantial international participation. Although more may be intended

than is evident in the Plan, the targets associated with two actions appear to be conservative. Under 4.1/S.2 'Increasing program diversity' and, especially, 4.1/S.7 'Using alternative methods and tools in the evaluation and assessment of student achievement' no great intended changes are evident. However, by other means, the team learned that new study programmes in English are planned as well as master's and doctoral level distance education courses via international cooperation (4.3/S.3).

In the first site visit, the team participated in a packed, enthusiastic, round-table discussion on 'the future' in the new, impressive dedicated building for the distance education faculties on the Yunus Emre Campus. During the second site visit, in a video/live conference the team discussed their impressions of their study programmes with nearly thirty students in six centres – Baku, Eskişehir, Istanbul, Köln, Kosovo and Lefkoşa (Nicosia). In general, they expressed high levels of satisfaction with the courses and programmes they were taking, stressing the advantages of being able to take programmes while working and appreciation of the course materials. However, when pressed, some mentioned a few general issues including: a desire for e-texts that are more interactive, more diverse examination methods, too short gaps between mid-term and final examinations, a necessity to repeat whole years if an examination is failed, a desire for courses in English and master level programmes and (from a significant number of students) more opportunities to interact academically and socially with classmates – for example, week-end study sessions in Eskişehir / main centres, occasional festivals!

The team specifically recommends:

- That AU continue to be ambitious in the further development of its Distance and Open Education enterprise and:
    - Invest more in reacting effectively to feedback from students
    - Prioritise social aspects of learning in major centres
    - Introduce analytically orientated assessment methods.

5. Research

It is a prime ambition at Anadolu University to achieve high standard research outputs in an increasing number of discipline areas throughout its 17 faculties and multiple research centres. Research funds are obtained from a range of national, international (EU) and business sources, a wide range of diverse support and resource structures have been established at AU (some of which also have regional roles) and now nearly half (45%) of "total academic members" are reported to be research active. Anadolu University has been rising steadily through the Turkish National Entrepreneurship and Innovativeness Index from 37th to 16th to 13th place in 2012, 2013 and 2014, respectively (SER, pp. 5–7). This year Anadalou University was listed by Times Higher Education World Rankings among the top 800 universities in the World; within the 601 – 800 group and the seventh highest ranked university in Turkey. The ambition of Anadolu University is to be ranked among the top 500. However, although real progress is being made; achieving the necessary international prominence as a significant centre for research will not be easy. Reputation among international peers is a major ranking determinant and, in practice, high impact research outputs, while contributing directly, also improve reputation. The very large number of research centres (30 on the supplied organisational chart) can actually make a poor impression on persons from successful research-intensive institutions. Most of such universities have thrived through setting a limited number of research priorities. Such a strategy is almost indispensable when setting out to create high quality collaborations while competing for external funding.

Among the information requested by the IEP team between the first and second visit were lists of full papers (with full titles, author lists) published in international refereed journals for 2013, 2014 and to date in 2015. Obviously these lists, which were obtained from Thomson Reuters Web of Science, represent just snapshots of recent research outputs and cannot be fully representative of outputs over a longer period, but they are indicative of a significant level of articles available to other researchers throughout the world. The three searches for papers with address 'Anadolu University' found 389, 346 and 138 articles for 2013, 2014 and to date in 2015. Almost all were in English (one noticed in 2013 is in Italian but none are in Turkish). Overall, these research outputs appear to be substantial. A very rough classification of the topics of the nearly 400 articles for 2013 indicates considerable strength in some very broad areas such as:

- Chemistry / biological chemistry (pharmacology, materials, medicine) / environmental sciences;
- Mathematics / computer science / the internet / finance;
- Education / disability, psychology / sociology.
- Civil engineering / aeronautics; and
- Classical zoology / botany are also evident.

The two years since the end of 2013 is not a long time for citations to accumulate (ten years is a more common standard) but the most highly cited articles (i.e. more than five citations, with

some, such as on waste treatment, materials, synthetic chemistry, and mathematical modelling, having up to 20 or more) are mainly in the first broad area above.

Anadolu University has not yet designated clear and well publicised priority themes for research and scholarship (a significant recommendation in the 2008 IEP report). In discussions on research policy at various times during the evaluation, the following areas were mentioned: Distance and open education, Special education, Energy and nanotechnology, Food Technology and Rail systems. However, there is not a great deal of overlap between these priorities and the above existing strong research areas. Also, these priority areas are not widely promulgated (they are absent from the SER, none were included in a presentation by the Vice Rector for Research or are listed under 'Research' on the website). Selecting a small number of research priorities is never easy, even very broad themes leave some researchers dissatisfied (although with time many of these may find opportunities to contribute substantially), and management may fear being out of step with potentially changing national and local development priorities. However, it is impossible to achieve the necessary levels of resources in all discipline areas. Most importantly, prioritisation does not mean actively discouraging any productive researcher; priorities can and should change.

Externally, the 2014–2018, 10th Development Plan of the Ministry of Development has four priorities: Qualified people / strong society, Innovative production, Livable places and sustainable development, and International Cooperation for development. The 2014–2023 Local Development National Strategy prioritises employment and entrepreneurship in the region and city, the prominent sectors of which are aeronautics, rail systems, ceramics, 'white goods' and food (SER, p. 5).

Perhaps the solution (and a solution is important if significant international prominence is to be achieved, which can be only done in areas that have potential and/or are already strong and are given or achieve extra resources) is to designate both broad institutional priorities *and* priority areas for which the clear and focused objective is to achieve wide international recognition for excellence in research. For example, research at Anadolu University is already strong in a number of areas (see bullet point one above) that could be collectively described as 'Molecules, materials, health and the World'. Another broader theme covering areas that are already strong could be 'Education for all', and so on. All priority areas would be favoured ensuring the regular updating of what can, at times be, highly expensive instrumentation. Such capital-intensive instrumentation (like NMR, mass spectrometry, x-ray crystallography) that needs expensive maintenance and regular renewal and could be used in many associated areas, biochemistry, chemistry, environmental, fuels, materials, pharmacology etc. Other prioritised areas would be favoured in ways appropriate to them.

The 2008 recommendation was: "That the University designate priority themes for research and scholarship that draw on all sectors of its academic spectrum […]." The team, more succinctly, now recommends:

- That AU carefully consider, clarify and highlight its research priorities

- That AU act to improve the national and international visibility of its research outputs
- That AU significantly reduce the large number of research centres by mergers and/or discontinuing all insufficiently active centres.

6. Service to society

Service to society is evident in most aspects of what Anadolu University does. The University is highly aware of its national and regional roles, and contributes substantially, culturally as well as economically, to the region and city of Eskişehir. Throughout the year, together with the city Governor's office, its sister Eskişehir Osmangazi University and others, Anadolu University offers a wide range of art and cultural events. These include a large annual festival held in late autumn. Its symphony orchestra is one of two in the city and it has choirs, musical, dance and theatrical ensembles with folk and international repertoires. It has a wide range of impressive venues including concert and chamber music halls and a cinema, with capacities up to more than 400.

Economically, apart from its general diverse and substantial contributions, some of the bodies that support research and development in the University also have wider remits. The Innovation coordination unit (ARINKOM) with national authorisation (ARINKOM-TTO) provides services to a wide range of industries (transport, materials pharmacology etc.) and universities in the region (SER, p. 6).

Anadolu University's strong focus on human and social values, and particularly on special education also contributes significantly to society in general, the region and the city. The team had the privilege of witnessing for a few moments a one-on-one class for a special needs child in an excellent facility that allows parents to understand a process and to learn how to continue with a similar approach at home.

In accord with all this, out of a total of just five broad goals, Goal 3 of the University's Strategic Plan is focused on its services to society. It is entitled 'Increasing the effectiveness and ensuring the sustainability of community service practices' and has three objectives with ten diverse associated targets including promoting increased community service and cooperation with non-governmental organisations that serve the community. Anadolu University is also highly aware of the Syrian refugee crisis and is seeking ways to help, both socially and educationally.

The team has no specific recommendations to make in this area beyond to continue the excellent work and wishes the University the best in its diverse services to society.

7. Quality culture

Anadolu University is on the road to an effective quality culture. ANADEK, the University planning and quality committee was founded in 2005. The importance of the external accreditation of study programmes is recognised and promoted for all programmes, and many have achieved accreditation from a range of national and some foreign agencies. External accreditation of all units, as well as programmes, is a stated policy (SER, p. 13). Eight four-year cycle engineering programmes are accredited nationally by MÜDEK, which became a signatory of the Washington Accord in 2011 (http://www.mudek.org.tr/en/akredit/ akredite2015.shtm) giving them very wide international recognition (not prominent on the Faculty (English) website). The Engineering Faculty also achieved the Turkey Excellence and 5* EFQM awards in 2014 (SER, p. 25), and this is a goal for at least one other faculty. There are general procedures for the initiation and approval of study programmes before they are submitted for national approval. Revision of existing programmes also occurs with the views of external stakeholders taken into account but it is not clear if these are in accord with the new Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area (ESG 2015) (www.enqa.eu/wp-content/ uploads/2013/06/ESG_ 3edition-2.pdf.)

Information systems at Anadolu University appear to be comprehensive and fit for purpose. Extensive data requested by the team was supplied quickly, and was largely well presented and easy to interpret. Risk management is the responsibility of the 'Risk Supreme Board. There is a Scientific Ethics Committee, although it is not clear that all potentially relevant research projects must have its approval.

The team was supplied with the translation of a short statement of Gender Equality Policy that states that "Anadolu University is totally committed to a policy of gender equality". In this respect Anadolu University sets a good example in Turkish society as 52% of its academic staff are female, and female deans and directors were prominent in discussions with the team. However the Rector and vice rectors are all male.

ANADEK is highly active and oversees the implementation of the University Strategic Plan as well as a range of quality procedures and activities. Among others, the SER mentions mechanisms for quality assessment, including study programme evaluation, obtaining feedback on teaching from students on teaching (beginning in 2000), surveying the opinions of students and graduates, and assessing research and development activities under a number of headings (SER pp. 11–17).

However, it was not easy for the team to understand fully the routine operation and timing of these activities or of their efficacy. Many may need revision, be more frequent and more effectively linked to decision-making processes. Continuous development and improvement of diverse mechanisms for student feedback, and visible reaction to the feedback obtained are prerequisites for a true quality culture in a university.

Recommendations made under other sections above and below have relevance to quality; in addition and more specifically, the team recommends:

- That AU ensure that student feedback on teaching is fully evaluated and used to identify and effect improvements, and that students be kept fully informed of how their feedback is used.

8. Internationalisation

Anadolu University has an international ambiance. A range of programmes are taught in English and there are joint study programmes with universities in the US and England. There are significant numbers of on-campus foreign students (more than 1,000) and numbers of outgoing and incoming exchange students (Erasmus and Mevlana programmes) are high (c.1000) with respect to Turkish norms. The Distance and Open study programmes, although all delivered in Turkish to date, are inherently international. A range of other initiatives to do with teaching and research with international dimensions are established or have been recently initiated. There are 'dual-degree' study programmes with universities in the UK and USA (SER, p. 27) and the university is a member of Global Partner Network of the State University of New York (http://coil.suny.edu/page/global-partner-network). Also, the University was accredited in February of this year as a 'sender', 'host' and 'coordinating organization' by the European Volunteer Service (http://ec.europa.eu/ youth/evs). The administration to support internationalisation has been effective and is ambitious (Strategic Plan 2014–2018, O5.4). Many staff have high levels of competence in English and other foreign languages; often sufficient for the present offering of relevant study programmes. Many students met by the team were highly articulate when speaking English.

However, foreign language capabilities could be much greater in many academic, relevant administrative staff and, not least, in University management. English is no longer just a means of communication with linguistically lazy English or Americans, it has become the lingua franca for communication between people who do not speak it as their first language. In countries like Turkey and in Anadolu University, it is essential to playing significant roles on the international stage whatever the continent.

Therefore, the team recommends:

- That AU make high levels of competence in English and other foreign languages a high priority for all categories of staff, and:
    - Provide diverse opportunities for social interactions and cultural awareness through these languages
    - Enhance and publicise library collections with suitable and graded printed and video resources.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

In concluding this report the team sees it to be relevant to reconsider the four key IEP questions listed in the Introduction.

What is the institution trying to do?

Anadolu's general statements of vision, mission and list of core values are worthy and appear to be entirely appropriate. Its Strategic Plan 2014–2018 is comprehensive and action-orientated, and its five major sections include one on Distance and Open Education, and one on Service to Society. The associated SWOT analysis is very usefully self-critical and could be repeated profitably every year and discussed in the Executive Board or Senate. However, given that enabling excellence in all areas is impossible, greater prioritisation of research areas is highly desirable.

How is the institution trying to do it?

Governance at Anadolu University appears to be fully effective with respect to routine management and significant project development. It is highly consultative by means of frequent meetings of senior managers and of governing bodies. However, the general style of governance and reporting relationships may not allow for the degree of managerial and individual freedom to act and initiate appropriately that may be needed for the University to achieve widespread recognition as a 'world university'.

How does the institution know it works?

Information systems at Anadolu University appear to be comprehensive and fit for purpose. Extensive data requested by the team was supplied quickly and was largely well presented and easy to interpret. There is a wide range of mechanisms for quality assessment, but some of these may need revision, be more frequent and more effectively linked to decision making processes.

How does the institution change in order to improve?

Limited autonomy with respect to governance structures, decision-making and finance is a major constraint on the strategic development of Anadolu University, especially given its inherent advantages, financial resources and worthy ambitions. Although it does manage to develop and change within these limits, there may still be unexplored opportunities within the constraints of the law.

Summary of the recommendations

Governance, Structure & Management

- That student representation be expanded by adding student members (non-voting, if not otherwise possible) to governing boards at all levels.
- That AU simplify its administrative and academic structures to the limits allowed by legal constraints.

- That the capacity of the five vice rectors to contribute to the management of AU be fully realised.
- That all legally allowed decision making be delegated to the vice rectors, faculties, and other units with sufficient competence, while preserving only necessary oversight by the Rector, Senate, Executive Board and senior management.

Teaching and Learning

- That AU carry out a needs analysis with respect to wide-spread, systematic, in-career training for all teaching staff in higher education pedagogy.
- That all faculties continue with Bologna reforms until all teaching is student centered.
- That compliance with the new European Quality Standards and Guidelines be prioritised.
- That all faculties assess why students drop out or take a long time to complete and attempt to improve these rates.

Distance and Open Education

- That AU continue to be ambitious in the further development of its Distance and Open Education enterprise and:
    - Invest more in reacting effectively to feedback from students
    - Prioritise social aspects of learning in major centres
    - Introduce analytically orientated assessment methods.

Research

- That AU carefully consider, clarify and highlight its research priorities
- That AU act to improve the national and international visibility of its research outputs
- That AU significantly reduce the large number of research centres by mergers and/or discontinuing all insufficiently active centres.

Quality culture

- That AU ensure that student feedback on teaching is fully evaluated and used to identify and effect improvements, and that students be kept fully informed of how their feedback is used.

Internationalisation

- That AU make high levels of competence in English and other foreign languages a high priority for all categories of staff, and:
    - Provide diverse opportunities for social interactions and cultural awareness through these languages
    - Enhance and publicise library collections with suitable and graded printed and video resources.

10. Envoi

As Anadolu University moves towards reaching its ambitious vision, we in the IEP team of 2015 will take pride in a possible contribution.