EUA
European University Association

European University Association
Institutional Evaluation Programme

PAMUKKALE UNIVERSITY
TURKEY
EVALUATION REPORT

August 2009

TEAM
Virgílio Meira Soares, Chair
Sokratis K. Katsikas
Hans Peter Jensen
Viorel Proteasa
Teresa Lee, Coordinator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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 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 planning
- Relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision making and strategic planning 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?

2. Pamukkale University

Pamukkale University (PAU), Turkey, became a legal entity in 1992. However, its roots go back further as many of the academic units, such as for example the Faculty of Education or the Faculty of Engineering, existed in various capacities prior to the university's establishment.

In the academic year 2008-2009 PAU had 27,996 students and 2,467 personnel, of which 1,430 were academic and 1,037 were administrative staff. The institution reported in its Self Evaluation Report (SER) that 29,000 students have graduated since 1992. PAU has 3 institutes, 7 faculties, 5 higher education schools offering 4 year programmes, 8 vocational higher education schools and

15 Research and Development Centres. A proposal for the establishment of a Faculty of Architecture and Design and a Higher Education School of Tourism and Hotel Management was accepted by the Council of Ministers in 2007.

The university is located in one of the important cities of the Aegean region, Denizli, which is a centre of agriculture, industry, trade and tourism. Located at the southwest of the Anatolian Peninsula and at the southeast of the Aegean Region, Denizli is an industrial city with intensive production in sectors such as machinery, textile, marble, glass and food.

PAU has a total of 6 campuses two of which are located in the city centre with the remainder located in the surrounding districts. The vocational higher education schools are in the districts of Bekilli, Çivril, Honaz, Buldan, Denizli Çamlık Campus and in Denizli Kınıklı Campus which is the university's main campus. The faculties, higher education schools, institutes and social facilities are located in the Denizli Kınıklı Campus.

A student council, which is elected democratically by the student body and which operates according to national legislation, is in place at PAU. Council members can be invited to attend university board and committee meetings but legislatively have no formal role in decision making processes. Basic facilities are provided by the PAU administration to assist the Council in its operations.

3. The Evaluation Process

In accordance with the Institutional Evaluation Programme methodology and guidelines and in advance of the preliminary visit Pamukkale University sent a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) to the Team. This SER was accompanied by detailed annexes. The Team appreciated the work completed for the SER and considered it to be an honest and open assessment of PAU's situation.

The Evaluation Team came to PAU for the preliminary visit from 26- 27 March 2009 and for the main visit from 2-5 June 2009. During its two visits, the Team held detailed discussions with a wide variety of persons, both from inside and outside the university community.

For its main visit, the Team requested additional documentation relating to: student success rates; student financial support mechanisms; the use of credits and ECTS; research activities and outputs; details of PAU income and budgets; management

structures and processes and promotions criteria; and additional information relating to the new strategic plan. This additional information was provided in advance of the main visit.

On the final day of the main visit the Team presented the oral report indicating the principal findings and recommendations to an audience that included PAU leaders and other members of the academic community. This written report is a full exposition of these conclusions and recommendations.

The Team would like to acknowledge warmly the co-operation and hospitality received throughout the two visits. The Team appreciated the open manner in which it was received and welcomed the wide range of opinions expressed. It must be emphasised that conversations had with staff, students, and with the assistive staff were always frank, friendly and helpful. The Team wishes to thank the Rector, Prof Dr Fazıl Necdet Ardıç, the heads of school, and all staff and students, as well as stakeholders from outside the university, who welcomed and supported the Team during both visits.

Special thanks is extended to the liaison person, Assoc. Prof Aşkıner Güngör, and the local co-ordinator, Prof Dr Diler Aslan, and the members of the Self-Evaluation Group for their great efficiency in organising the documentation, for liaising with the Team, for maintaining the schedule and, last but not least, for the warm hospitality extended to the Team members. The Team considered that the SER was a good and well written report and it was honest and sufficiently self critical for the Team to understand the university's problems. A word of thanks also to the support staff and in particular the interpreters, Jade Tutku Kançıkmaz and Meltem Balaban, who provided an excellent service to the Team.

The evaluation team consisted of:
- Professor Virgílio Meira Soares (Portugal), Former Rector University of Lisbon, Departamento de Química e Bioquímica, Faculdade de Ciências (Chair);
- Professor Sokratis K. Katsikas (Greece), University of Piraeus. Former Rector, University of the Aegean.
- Professor Hans Peter Jensen (Denmark), Former Rector, Technical University of Denmark.
- Mr. Viorel Proteasa (Romania), Former Member of the Executive Committee, European Student's Union.
- Dr. Teresa Lee (Ireland) Quality Enhancement Manager, Irish Universities Quality Board, (Secretary).

4. Constraints and institutional norms

PAU is a newly created university and challenges arise when one creates a new institution. For instance, new buildings and new programmes must be established and services must be set up. The Team were impressed to see that PAU, having been created in 1992, has reached the point of seeking to become a leading university in the country. That brings, of course, new challenges that have to be dealt with using common sense, wisdom and necessary care. Turkey created, almost at the same time, quite a number of new universities. This means that the amount of funding available is restricted and this may act as a constraint for the difficult tasks that lie ahead for Pamukkale University.

PAU is a university with ambitious leadership, a young and committed staff and an engaged student body. The university is trying to survive with all the inherent difficulties associated with the growing process.

The Team recognise that PAU is an important asset to the region and deserves to be considered one of the most important partners to the Denizli area. This is, regrettably, not always fully recognised by the local authorities. PAU programmes are recognised by the Council of Higher Education of the Republic of Turkey (YÖK) and as far as some Team members were concerned they recognised within their own scientific disciplines that the programmes have the necessary scientific and technological content to be of value to the region and the country. PAU may not as yet be one of the leading universities in the country but that does not mean that the added value it gives to students, from entry to graduation, is not on a par with the skills and attributes of graduates coming from other more traditional and well known Turkish universities.

It is commendable that PAU has had a strategic plan in place since 2005. It is a positive sign that, after 17 years, the university has diversified its offering of new programmes with sufficient quality to be considered as an equal to other Turkish universities. However, to reach this point of development the university has had to compromise some of the important aspects that should be present in every development plan. Some examples of this include:
- A prioritisation of programmes given the limited number of teachers
- Less of an emphasis on the research function of the university due to the large teaching load of the academic staff
- Rapid academic expansion without the fulfilment of the necessary quality conditions, e.g. number of places for students in the library or the availability

of the necessary laboratories spaces and equipment and the adequate provision of computers.

In the process of development of the university the Team found evidence of ambitious strategic aims and objectives. To be successful in reaching those goals, the university needs to be managed in such a way that all its members contribute to their achievement. Therefore it is important that any leadership of the university is able to mobilise the academic community (students included). Taking this into account the Team strongly support the will of the present Rector to instil greater democratic governance processes.

Of course, the position of the current leadership has the risk of developing strong resistance to change but the university is faced with new challenges, the most important in its view being to become a modern and research focused university. It was obvious to the Team that the choices of the institution and its leadership need to be supported by some measures that are not yet ready to be utilised due to certain constraints:

- The legislation of the country is too strict and by that is meant that it leaves little room for autonomy and democratic processes inside the university.
- The joining of Turkey to the Bologna Process is a recent development and as far as the Team understand is not fully applied across the country.
- Turkey is in the process of joining the European Union and in relationship to that has embarked on a number of EU programmes, and joined EU committees and organisations. Despite this, Turkish universities should not overlook the possibilities for internationalisation in cooperation with partners in other regions of the world.
- The budgetary situation of the university system both in terms of flexibility and level of funding does not allow for many activities that are not connected to the teaching and learning processes.
- The necessary conditions for developing research of international quality are not yet in place such as an appropriate teaching load, the necessary state of the art equipment, adequate human resources and a tradition of research.
- Relationships between universities and employers, at least in some parts of the country, are not yet based on trust and partnership, a fact that inhibits a closer and desirable cooperation between the two parts.
- Democratic processes inside universities are not sufficiently embedded in order to be of value in contributing to building consensus and for the promotion of ownership of decisions made.

The Team were pleased to observe that PAU is very much aware of these constraints and has a positive attitude towards overcoming them. The Team commends the university for its attitude regarding these difficulties.

5. Capacity for change

In terms of governance and management

During meetings with the academic and administrative staff, the Team found a lot of evidence to suggest that the staff are enthusiastic and supportive of the Rector's plans and are appreciative of the efforts being made to develop a more democratic decision making process. However, it was also clear that there is still a certain lack of clarity in the criteria used for making decisions and a perception still exists that ultimately the Rector can override any decision made. This is not a reflection on the current Rector who is seen to be fair minded and to be open and willing to take advice. It is a reflection of the culture that exists within Turkish universities where rectors are seen to be all powerful and who can make decisions without regard to advice given.

To ensure that the current Rector of PAU can continue to mobilise the academic community, to develop a greater sense of trust in decisions and to promote the continued development of a democratic environment, several measures can be undertaken. This includes the application of clear and consistent criteria for decision making processes, and the delegation of the duty of chair, on all committees that advise the Rector, to a committee member other than the Rector. The capacity of the Senate to make decisions, working within the limits of the law, should be developed and the Senate should be strongly encouraged to utilise more fully the powers accorded to them by law in order to support and assist the Rector in quality and educational processes.

The use of data to support and inform policy development and decision making processes, or Institutional Research as it is more commonly called, is now the norm in countries such as Australia or the United States. Other countries, especially in the EU, are in the process of developing their institutional research capacity in order that they can use their information and data systems to inform the development of university policies. PAU is currently in the process of developing its data management systems and the work being undertaken by PAU staff is commendable. However, it is recommended that PAU seek external expertise in the use of data systems as an institutional research tool. In this way the new data systems will not only be of use for

the day to day management and operation of university processes but the systems can also be used as an extremely effective management tool.

External stakeholders indicated that they would welcome opportunities to liaise more closely with PAU management with a view to advising on increasing collaborations with industry. In that regard, the university should explore its options for including external stakeholders in relevant consultation processes. For instance, PAU could make use of industrial stakeholders on advisory committees so that they can inform the development of a university strategy for increasing linkages with industry and business in the Denizli region. Such consultation platforms could also be used to determine means of overcoming obstacles to collaboration that may arise. For instance, the Team were made aware that student placements in industry were inhibited due to an issue with insurance. Such matters could be resolved more quickly if a platform for dialogue existed between PAU and the external stakeholders. Any such measures could be put in place whilst still operating within the boundaries of the law.

Despite the attitude of the leadership regarding democratic governance, increased student representation and participation is something that must still be addressed. PAU must make much greater efforts to promote student participation on university and faculty decision making bodies and to actively work to promote student engagement within these bodies. Furthermore, the university should ensure that students have an opportunity to engage on all topics for discussion, not just discussions related to student issues.

Students can be involved in the decision making process but staff acknowledge that students don't always avail of this opportunity. Whilst students are aware that they can contribute to boards and committees they do not feel they are sufficiently supported or that their contributions are always taken into account. The Student Council mainly concentrates its efforts on informing the administration of student difficulties and in organising social and cultural activities. Many enrolled students stated that they would like to see much greater development of campus life so the role of the Student Council in contributing to achieving this objective is important. The Student Council must be encouraged by PAU to take a stronger role in decision making processes and all staff members who sit on boards and committees should make every effort to include students in discussions and to encourage and listen to their contributions. PAU should ensure that each incoming Student Council and the

student population in general are aware of the rules and regulations pertaining to student participation at Senate and meetings of other decision making bodies.

Efforts must also be made to ensure that the student body is well informed as to the role played by student representatives as many students reported that they were unclear as to their exact function. By keeping the students well informed PAU can ensure that students avail of the opportunity available to them to report issues back through Student Council and thereby to staff and to the PAU administration.

In terms of teaching

It was noted that the diversity and number of programmes on offer at PAU is considerable given the extent of its resources (financial and human). Having too large a number of programmes on offer will inhibit PAU's ability to move forward in a strategic and targeted manner. PAU must begin to identify its areas of expertise in programme provision and should decide to discontinue programmes that are no longer required and seek to control more carefully the introduction of new programmes. In this way PAU can, over time, develop a suite of programmes that are targeted to specific areas of expertise and that meet the needs of employers.

Staff indicated that many programmes, especially those in the vocational schools, are developed on the basis that a particular need is identified as being required by businesses in the Denizli region. The desire of the university to meet emerging skills needs is understandable as one of the functions of a regional university is to seek to meet the needs of that region. However, PAU must ensure that the quality of provision is maintained for all existing programmes and is upheld in all new ones. A system for the discontinuation of existing programmes should be established to ensure programmes that are no longer viable or that have fulfilled the skills need of the business sector can be closed.

Regarding the Bologna Process it is noteworthy that work has already progressed in PAU on the implementation of certain aspects. A Bologna Process Commission has been established which is responsible for the co-ordination and implementation of Bologna.

It is expected that PAU will shortly be in a position to generate its Diploma Supplements electronically. ECTS credits are being reformulated to reflect learning outcomes. Progammes are being catalogued in a database which can be updated readily by staff with course content and credit allocations recorded. Learning outcomes will also be recorded in this database once they are developed. A brochure

of each programme is being produced which indicates the associated ECTS credits. Training programmes for staff are under development and a manual for informing staff on the Bologna Process will be provided. The Team were also informed that 2-3 members of PAU staff actively participate at national Bologna meetings. This ensures that PAU is kept up to date on Bologna developments.

Despite all the work already undertaken at PAU the Team found that awareness of the Bologna Process amongst staff and students was quite low. The Team are aware that the introduction of change can be difficult and may often be resisted by staff. The Team recognises that manuals and information leaflets can act as a very good resource for supporting staff members as they work on implementing the required changes. However, to ensure 'buy-in' and the continued support of staff for the Bologna Process it is imperative that efforts are made to have as much peer to peer contact as possible with staff. In that regard, it is recommended that training and information sessions are held within faculties and schools to ensure that they can be accessed by the maximum number of staff members.

After meeting with numerous teaching staff members the Team are of the opinion that there may be resistance from some members to the introduction of new learning and teaching methods. Therefore, PAU must not delay in developing a training programme for staff on teaching and learning. By this means staff may become quickly aware of the value of and the need for the latest pedagogical methods. PAU already has a model that can be built on for developing a university-wide training programme. The Faculty of Education provides training to the Faculty of Medicine in the use of problem based learning (PBL) techniques and the Team were informed that the Faculty is in the process of setting up a centre for the training of staff in pedagogical methods. It is expected that this centre will be in a position to offer training across the university.

University-wide pedagogical training will improve the quality of education provided to students thereby improving success rates. The Team were of the opinion that currently insufficient efforts are being made to improve student success rates. It appears that summer schools are relied on to ensure student progression as opposed to having support mechanisms in place during the course of the academic year, such as providing tutorials. Less reliance on summer schools would also be advantageous for students in terms of their financial outlays as no additional fees would be incurred and students would not have to finance their living costs during the summer periods.

PAU's focus on internationalisation would appear to be directed to the Erasmus programme alone. The Team considered this to be short-sighted and not at all strategic. Decisions about strategic partners should follow a straightforward plan and it was confirmed that there was no such plan. The numbers of students participating in Erasmus programmes is small and there was not much enthusiasm or indeed awareness amongst staff on how links could be established with international universities in order to set up additional Erasmus programmes. PAU should include internationalisation as a priority for change over the coming years.

The Evaluation Team also noted that there was a general lack of foreign language skills at the university. External stakeholders whose businesses had an international dimension indicated that they would like to see PAU graduates with increased language skills. A small number of programmes have introduced English language training as part of the first year curriculum and it was reported that PAU is planning to include language training (with English and French as the main options available) as part of the first year of every academic programme. In addition, English language training for teaching staff is in train, which will facilitate the teaching of programmes through English. This is to be commended. However, care must be taken to ensure that students receive an adequate level of training in their language of choice as some students reported that training for one year was insufficient. Students also indicated that language training concentrates more on reading and writing as opposed to listening and speaking skills. Efforts to address this imbalance should be made.

To move the internationalisation agenda forward in PAU a clear strategy and implementation plan will be necessary. The resources and supports to develop such a plan should be established. This could be achieved by means of an advisory committee on internationalisation. Once a plan is in place additional resources will be required, such as for the internationalisation office, to ensure that the plan can be effectively implemented.

When asked the most common areas of complaint for students were: the lack of adequate resources in the library; the need for greater access to computers and the internet; and the lack of laboratory equipment in certain instances. Students also indicated that they would like to receive career counselling especially in the last year of their programme. A recurring theme for students was a desire to see the environment of the campus improved in order that they could study on site and that they could feel that they are part of a community. Many students stated that they

study at home as facilities on campus are not sufficient. All these factors can have an impact on student success and efforts should be made by PAU to improve them.

In terms of research

PAU wishes to develop its research capacity further and is seeking to raise its profile. The university has already made some progress in reaching this objective. For instance, 15 Research and Development centres are currently in place; support is provided to staff to attend conferences and to submit scientific papers; and PAU has been successful in its application for research funding in Turkey and in several instances has received funding through EU funding initiatives.

PAU has a young academic staff (currently approximately 73% are 40 years or younger) and the Team were informed that many staff members undertook their doctoral training outside Turkey. PAU management recognise that the academic staff are enthusiastic and are eager to contribute to the development of PAU's research (and indeed teaching and learning) capacity. PAU clearly appreciates the value of building and encouraging this enthusiasm. However, any university, and particularly a young university, is not able to develop good research in all areas, and therefore it has to define its key aims. The university has not, as yet, established its list of research priorities. In order to increase its research capacity successfully, PAU will have to decide on the balance it wishes to achieve between research and teaching and learning activities, establish its research priorities, and will have to encourage staff to undertake research which is in keeping with its research priorities. One possible way of encouraging this would be to give increased recognition, as part of the staff promotional system, for the development of research which is in line with the university's stated research objectives.

Awareness amongst PAU academic staff of the possibilities available to them to develop research linkages or for undertaking research in other institutions as part of a sabbatical arrangement varied. For instance, in one faculty it was evident that whilst some staff members were unaware that they could apply for sabbatical leave to undertake research elsewhere, other staff were well informed and had already availed of the opportunity. Staff members who had taken sabbatical leave were very appreciative of the support and encouragement given by PAU and acknowledged that the sabbatical leave allowed them to develop their research further and ensured that they continued to develop research linkages.

It would be well worthwhile, in terms of developing research capacity, for PAU to increase efforts to inform staff of the arrangements in place and the support provided by the university to staff for developing their research capacity. This could include information or support provided for the development of linkages locally, nationally and internationally, information on the arrangements in place for taking sabbatical leave, and the funding opportunities available to support attendance at conferences or to submit scientific papers. Information on the opportunities and the means of applying for available research funding could also be made more readily available.

As many academic staff members undertook their PhD studies outside of Turkey, PAU staff can potentially nurture and develop international and national linkages with their former PhD supervisors and former student colleagues. In several instances, where a staff member was actively involved in research, it was found that contact with former colleagues was maintained. Research relationships can also be forged by means of engagement in national and international conferences and seminars.

In recent years Turkish universities have had to increase student numbers in response to government directives. The Team were informed that the increase in student numbers was not matched by a corresponding increase in resources. This has undoubtedly put additional pressures on existing resources and staff reported that time available to undertake research was now more limited than ever. The Team heard from many staff members that they are increasingly utilising evenings, weekends and summer periods to undertake their research work. It was also evident that quite a number of staff are committed to teaching at summer schools and receive additional remuneration for this work. The summer schools provide an opportunity for students to retake a course if they are unsuccessful at the first attempt. Students can also take courses/modules of a programme during the summer period thereby accelerating their progress through the academic programme. However, the summer schools place an additional demand on the valuable time of the academic staff and most especially on the time that they can devote to their research.

To address these problems PAU should consider setting standards for staff on the amount of time that is allocated for research activities. In addition, in order to increase the amount of time that can be devoted to research, PAU should consider using more remedial measures during the normal academic period to increase student success rates. Furthermore, designating the summer period as time during which staff can concentrate on their research work would contribute greatly to the development of PAU's research capacity.

PAU is the only university in the industrial area of Denizli. It seemed to the Team, and this was confirmed by external stakeholders, that links with the industrial sector were few in number and where they did exist they were relatively weak in nature.

The general position of external stakeholders met by the Team was positive and they expressed a willingness to engage with PAU. However, this must be encouraged further with a proactive attitude by the university. It is in the interest of the university to develop partnerships with the industrial/business sector in order to get better traineeships for its students and to develop more research and development projects with industry, such as is planned with the *Technopark* project. It is also in PAU's interest to consult with employers and other stakeholders when designing new programme contents or curricula in order to meet the demands of the market.

Some external stakeholders indicated that they experienced difficulties in making the initial approach to PAU in order to develop collaborations. In some instances this was attributed to the fact that the external stakeholders had no knowledge of any designated office or staff member in PAU with responsibility for the development of industrial or business contacts. External stakeholders stated that they welcomed opportunities to attend as guest lecturers on programmes and several, who now work in collaboration with PAU, indicated that this was the means by which initial contacts were made with relevant academic staff. In order to overcome any difficulties, PAU should highlight and promote the means by which external stakeholders can liaise with PAU and should actively nurture relationships in order to increase the possibility of reaching successful conclusions.

It was determined that PAU does not have an alumni association in place. The SER indicated that, since 1992, the number of graduates from PAU programmes is in the region of 29,000. These alumni could be a very useful resource to PAU: in the development of linkages with industry; for the development of research linkages; in providing 'success stories' on graduates whose success can be used to assist in raising the profile of PAU; and in providing a means for highlighting PAU's success in learning and teaching. In addition, alumni can be a potential source of revenue for the university. It is therefore strongly recommended that PAU establishes an alumni association as soon as possible.

In terms of quality assurance

PAU has already created an expectation amongst the academic community for an increased quality approach to education and has begun the task of developing and

introducing a more systematic approach to quality assurance processes. The seeds of this development lie in the creation of PAU's first strategic plan in 2005 and the next strategic plan, which is near completion, will undoubtedly provide a clearer picture of the path that PAU intends to take. Preparations for the SER and both visits of the Evaluation Team will have already focused the attention of staff, and students, on areas that require improvement. Together with the findings and recommendations included in this report, PAU has a wealth of information at its disposal which it can now use, if it so wishes, to inform its processes over the coming years.

Several areas for consideration have already been discussed as part of the preceding chapters and all findings and recommendations can essentially be considered to be quality assurance issues. The following paragraphs highlight additional areas that PAU should take into consideration as it seeks to improve the quality of its teaching, research and support mechanisms and the service it provides to the wider community.

The problem based learning (PBL) approach to teaching used in the Faculty of Medicine includes a systematic evaluation of courses/modules by students. This provides a means for students to inform staff of issues arising from the academic programme and provides an opportunity for PAU to really increase the quality of the educational programmes. Several faculties, besides Medicine, also indicated that they make use of feedback mechanisms to solicit student views.

Many students met by the Team stated that they had opportunities to inform their teachers of issues that arise or that are causing difficulties. In many instances the students reported that issues, raised though structured evaluation or through informal mechanisms, were addressed to their satisfaction.

In several other instances however, students said that they were not happy with the quality and the standard of education they received. In order to ensure that they can be made aware of such issues PAU, building on practices which are already in use in several of its academic units, must introduce systematic procedures for the evaluation of programmes and teaching and have systems in place for the systematic evaluation of the feedback collected. Evaluations should not be confined to students as feedback from external stakeholders must also be sought in order to ensure that academic programmes are meeting the needs of employers.

The evaluation of teaching programmes and teaching staff is not universal in PAU and the reliance of students on individual teaching staff to resolve problems is not ideal. Such a system is unstructured and by its very nature is dependent on the good will of

the staff member involved. In some cases students reported that issues, sometimes of a serious nature, were not acted upon and the students in question did not feel they had the means to go any further to resolve matters. Procedures for dealing with issues that arise should be in place and students should not have to depend on the teacher of the programme. For example, if a student wishes to dispute the grades awarded by a teacher or if there are specific issues associated with a particular teacher or programme the student(s) should have some structured resolution or appeals mechanism available to them by which they can seek to address their concerns.

Just as it is important to evaluate the situation of the current cohort of students it is also important to determine the success of graduates of university programmes. The Team determined that, whilst some academic units are aware of where their graduates go and have maintained contact in some instances, there is no systematic collection of graduate destination statistics. It was found during discussions with external stakeholders that many were not adequately informed as to the quality of PAU graduates. The collection of data on the success of PAU graduates would provide valuable information that could be used to address this. Such data could also be used to inform the development of programmes (new and existing) and could be a source of information to be used for informing potential students of the career paths that they might expect to follow having completed a PAU programme.

It was clear to the Team that the Quality Coordination Commission (KKK) and the Self-Evaluation Group has undertaken a lot of work in preparing the SER and in preparation for the visits of the Evaluation Team. This work will have contributed greatly to the formation of a quality culture in PAU. The self evaluation process was far reaching and inclusive of the academic community. However, it is the opinion of the Team that PAU should now consolidate its quality management structures and establish a new quality committee to move the quality agenda forward and to oversee the introduction of its new quality initiatives and processes across the university.

The Team also strongly recommends that PAU reconsiders its plans to use ISO 9000 as its quality assurance model. This process works well for management processes, for which it was specifically developed. PAU should investigate and use other quality systems that have been developed to meet the needs of teaching and learning and research activities and which are more in keeping with the standards outlined in the *Standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area* (ENQA, 2005).

6. Conclusions

It is evident that PAU intends, and has already made great efforts, to introduce changes in its operations. It is doing this for several reasons amongst which is a desire to increase its research capacity and a wish to enhance its academic reputation. In pursuing these objectives PAU must make strategic choices so that the university can make maximum usage of the available resources. In achieving its strategic goals it is vital that PAU management is supported by the academic community and indeed the current Rector would appear to have this support.

Areas where PAU is already performing well or has the capacity to change have already been highlighted, together with a focus on constraints that exist. The recommendations to follow should be considered as constructive peer criticisms. They point out major difficulties and highlight potential pitfalls that were identified by the Evaluation Team that PAU should avoid so that it can correct its path if it so wishes.

7. Recommendations

In terms of strategic planning and decision making

- Commendation: PAU is to be commended for having started the establishment of a democratic governance system.
- However, to ensure the continued development of its internal democratic environment PAU must increase the trust in the decisions of the leadership by establishing and consistently applying criteria for its decision making processes.
- In order to develop more democratic decision making processes it is recommended for all advisory committees that the Rector delegate the duty of chair to another member of staff. Clear terms of reference should be provided to guide this process.
- The leadership of PAU is encouraged to expand the decision making capacities of the Senate in the spirit of democratic governance and within the limits of national legislation.
- The Senate should provide more support to the Rector with respect to the development of quality and educational processes. They can do so by using the powers invested in them by law which relate to these matters.
- PAU must encourage greater student representation and participation on university and faculty advisory and decision making bodies.
- The development of university policies should be evidence based. The data management systems currently under development should be designed with

this in mind. It is recommended that external expertise be sought in order to advise PAU on the most effective means of developing their data sets and systems in order that they can be used to inform policy development and decision making processes.

- It is recommended that the academic promotion system include an incentive, such as the awarding of additional marks, for initiatives linked to the achievement of PAU's key strategic aims.

In terms of student representation and participation

- It is recommended that the leadership of PAU further enhance the participation of students in the senate and faculty councils, under all points of the university agenda. Students are part of the academic community, so they can contribute to all matters for decision, including elections and budget.
- PAU should continue to secure the running facilities for the Student Council and should assign a yearly budget for their activities and projects including elections. Further on, the rules regarding the Council and the Senate should be clearly stated as should the procedure for revising them.
- The rights and duties of PAU student should be clear and made publically available.

In terms of internationalisation

- It is recommended that PAU establish an advisory group on internationalisation which provides advice to the Rector on ways of enhancing international processes at the university. This group, operating under established terms of reference, works independently of the Rector. The group could also advise on the development of a strategy for internationalisation in PAU.
- A foreign language policy in relation to university activities should be formulated and enforced and the capacity to provide the necessary foreign language training should be developed.
- In order for this internationalisation strategy to be implemented effectively the international office should be strengthened.

In terms of the Bologna Process

- The university is reconsidering the formulation of ECTS based on student workload (not only contact hours), learning outcomes and on the opinions of the students. However, to overcome the above mentioned lack of awareness

and knowledge of the Bologna Process it is recommended that the service in charge of the implementation of the changes work directly with each of the faculties and schools.

- In order to overcome resistance to the implementation of new learning and teaching methods it is recommended that the university put in place a process to train staff members as soon as possible.
- The data management system is not yet capable of following the professional careers of PAU graduates and therefore there is a lack of information about their employability. It is recommended that the university address this issue in order to fulfil one of the aims of the Bologna Declaration.

In terms of learning and teaching

- The quality of instruction must be improved and the possibility of introducing tutorials should be considered.
- Some faculties provide pedagogical training already. However, the level of pedagogical training must be increased and training must be extended across the university to all teachers (new and established).
- Data should be collected on completion and throughput rates in an effort to determine student success rates.
- PAU must focus on the creation of a student centred educational approach and must seek to create a suitable study and identity-forming environment on the campus.
- It is recommended that PAU take stock of the diversity of programmes which are currently being provided and take this into account when planning for the attainment of future strategic aims.
- It is necessary for PAU to improve the resources provided to students in support of their education. For example, library resources require improvement; the availability of computers and computer access must be increased; and laboratory equipment, whilst sufficient in many instances, must be improved in other areas.
- It is recommended that PAU introduce some form of counselling for its students, including career counselling, especially in the later part of their studies.

In terms of research

- PAU should consider the balance it wishes to achieve between research and teaching activities.

- The university should consider setting standards for the portion of time individual faculty members should allocate for undertaking research.
- PAU should seriously consider how to reconcile a continuing need for summer schools, which are necessary for students to achieve success in some disciplines, with a need to ensure that academic staff have opportunities to concentrate their efforts on research activities. In order to focus on their research, staff must have regular periods of significant length when they are free from any teaching obligations. Under the present circumstances, unless a change in the organisation of the annual teaching workload of academic staff (including summer schools) is introduced, the research potential of PAU is threatened.
- In its strategic plan the university should define a list of prioritised research areas taking into account:
  - their strengths
  - what they want to do, and
  - possible partnerships with industry for joint research and development projects.
- The university should clarify what are the real roles of the research centres as opposed to the faculties.
- International contacts in research should be investigated and set up in order for research activities to be at the cutting edge.
- While the capacity of the university to increase the number of doctoral degrees awarded is limited, it is recommended that PAU seek partners to develop joint projects or even joint doctoral programmes, nationally or internationally.

In terms of external stakeholders

- PAU must find solutions to circumvent the obstacles (including legal ones) that inhibit the placement of students on internships with industrial and business partners. (e.g. insurance)
- PAU must endeavour to make external stakeholders aware that PAU graduates are able to compete on an equal footing with graduates of other universities which have already established their reputations.
- It is recommended that PAU establish an Alumni Association to capitalise on success with its graduates, to build up its prestige, and to inform current and potential students on future opportunities. Moreover, an alumni association can be used as a means of generating income for the university.

- An advisory council for industry, which has several members from the industrial sector, must be established in order to advise the Rector on defining PAU's policy with respect to strengthening its links with industry.
- Commendation: It is praiseworthy that PAU has included the creation of links with industry as an activity worthy of additional marks in the academic promotion system.

In terms of quality assurance

- It is highly recommended that PAU undertake additional research into, and consider the use of quality processes specifically designed for educational, teaching and research activities.
- It should establish standard procedures and set goals for improving the quality of education along the lines of the European standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the European higher education area.
- To enhance the quality of the academic programmes provided to students, PAU must establish systematic evaluation processes which include input from students and from external stakeholders.
- It is recommended, now that the KKK and the associated SGGs (Continuous Improvement Groups) have successfully fulfilled their role in developing the SER for this review, that PAU establish a new committee for moving forward with the development of the university's quality initiatives.

Final recommendation

- It is understandable why government is increasing student numbers. On the other hand, for the level of quality in Turkish universities not to decrease, the necessary resources to cope with the additional number of students must be provided. Since this recommendation is not addressed to the university, the Team ask PAU to forward this recommendation to YÖK and to government.

8. Envoi

The Team wish to thank Pamukkale University once again for its generous hospitality and for the excellent arrangements provided. It was a pleasure to be in the university and to meet with students and staff. The university community is to be congratulated for its frankness and openness in the drafting of the Self Evaluation Report and in all of its discussions with the Team. It is hoped that the university finds the comments and suggestions helpful, and the Team wish the university well for the next stage of its development.