Turkish Higher Education Quality Council

SAR ANNEX - 2
Sample ISER Feedback Report

INSTITUTIONAL SELF EVALUATION FEEDBACK REPORT

ATILIM UNIVERSITY

2020

1. Self Evaluation Works

A. Stakeholder Involvement

In Atılım University's 2019 Institutional Self-Evaluation Report, the defined processes for ensuring the involvement of internal and external stakeholders in the areas of quality assurance system, learning and teaching, research and development, service to society and governance system processes are not adequately explained. Although the content works on the determination of the satisfaction levels of the stakeholders are included in the report, the evaluation of these satisfaction levels and improvement works were made available in the report. In particular, it is expected that student involvement is disclosed more clearly.

It is observed in the report that the stakeholders are included in some boards and commissions; however, explanations regarding the impact of these stakeholders on the decision-making processes are not included in the report. The effects of stakeholder involvement should also be included in the report, along with how stakeholder involvement was achieved. For example, how the stakeholder involvement is ensured in the strategic plan works and the preparation of policy documents, as well as how they impact the content of this plan should be included.

B. The Quality Commission

Within the scope of the Quality Commission Directive, the working areas and commission members of the commission at the University were determined. Also, the quality commission took part in the 2020-2024 strategic plan works. It was stated in the report that improvement reports were prepared by the quality commission. However, these improvement reports were not found in the report. The improvement works carried out at the university based on the mentioned improvement reports should be disclosed more clearly. Unit-level quality structures have been created and self-evaluation works are carried out for academic units. However, other activities carried out by the commission during the year were not included in the report. The impact of the activities of the quality commission on the decision-making processes should also be included in the report.

2. Institutional Self-Evaluation Reports

A. Institutional Self-Evaluation Reports

The main issue expected from higher education institutions within the framework of "Quality Management" is to establish systems that will ensure a successful institutional governance and continuous improvement. Institutional Self Evaluation Reports are an important tool that will ensure the continuous review, evaluation and improvement of this system. In this context, universities are expected to provide answers to the questions of how the system related to the criteria in their ISERs is provided and how it is developed. The issue that should particularly be taken into account in the evaluation of the implementation of maturity levels of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report are that maturity levels are one step in the rubric and it is only possible to move on to the next level after completing the previous level. For example; it is not realistic to mention a maturity level 4 if the practice has not been planned yet.

The explanations regarding the criteria in Atılım University's 2019 ISER include the processes defined in general, the practices related to these defined processes and the follow-up processes. It is expected that the university includes more in the report on the 'acting'

processes. It has been determined that the level of maturity given to the sub-criteria by the university within the scope of the rubric in the annex of the Institutional External Evaluation and Accreditation Guide is not objective and evidence-based. In particular, although the report did not show any evidence regarding any actions taken, there were sub-criteria for which maturity level 4 were given. For example, it was stated in the report that feedback on research support programs was received. However, evaluation and improvement works regarding this feedback is not included in the report. The internal quality assurance components and practices cannot be understood in the report.

The issue that should particularly be taken into account in the evaluation of the implementation of maturity levels of the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report are that maturity levels are one step in the rubric and it is only possible to move on to the next level after completing the previous level. For example, it is not possible to be at maturity level 4 in a practice that had no planning stage. In this respect, when the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report of Atılım University is evaluated in general, the explanations and evidence that must absolutely be stated in the ISER for each maturity level can be summarized as follows;

- For maturity level 2, plans and defined processes should be mentioned, future plans within the scope of the criterion should be expressed.
- For maturity level 3, it should be proven that the practices spread to the entire institution and are part of the quality assurance system.
- For maturity level 4, evidence (analysis reports, survey questions used, results, etc.) should be presented. To be at this level, practices within the criteria must have been improved. For this reason, only the improvements that have been realized should be explained in the report.
- For maturity level 5, how the sustainability of the practice is ensured must be demonstrated. In order to be an example of good practice, it should be presented where and with which universities the practice was shared.

In this case, improvement in the ISER can be made by evaluating the extent to which the above conditions are met in the practices, the level of which has been determined by Atılım University. In this respect, criteria that should be particularly evaluated in the Atılım University 2019 ISER
are as following; A2 Internal Quality Assurance, A3 Stakeholder Involvement, B4 Teaching Staff, B5 Learning Resources, C4 Research Performance, E1 Structure of Governance and Administrative Units. The connection of the evidence presented in the report with the relevant sub-criterion should be properly evaluated. The evidence section should focus on evidence demonstrating the existence of an internal quality assurance system rather than examples of official correspondence and meeting signature lists. In this context, the Institutional Self-Evaluation Report Writing Guide should be carefully examined. Evidence should not only include plans, practices and defined processes, evidence of follow-up and practices related to the taken measures should also be included in order to demonstrate the internal quality assurance system.

3. Improvement Works

A. Improvement Works

In the conclusion and evaluation part of the report, the university stated its strengths and areas for improvement under the main headings. However, action plans regarding areas for improvement were not included. Also, which works were carried out in the institution

regarding the areas for improvement in the ISER, which emerged as a result of the external evaluation of the university in 2016 were not stated.