



SAR ANNEX - 4

Sample Consistency Evaluation Report

**ANKARA, TURKEY
15.04.2022**

THE TURKISH HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY COUNCIL
CONSISTENCY EVALUATION REPORT

Evaluated Institution: Erciyes University

Type of Evaluation: Institutional Accreditation Program

Evaluation Report: Institutional Accreditation Report

Year of Evaluation: 2020

Team Leader: Prof.Dr. Elif epni

Secretary: Tuğba Yanpar Yelken/Ayhan Koçer

Consistency Evaluation Date: 24.06.2021

1. Evaluation of compatibility between the evaluation results of the criteria and the maturity level of the sub-criteria of the relevant criterion

This section evaluates compatibility between the explanations in the report regarding the criteria and the maturity levels of the sub-criteria of the relevant criteria. In report writing, it is expected that the evaluation judgment regarding a criterion is supported with evidence about the maturity levels of the sub-criteria, the reasons for the agreed maturity levels in the sub-criteria is evidence-based and understandable, explanations regarding criteria includes all the sub-criteria, examples for the sub-criterion is given in statements regarding areas of improvement or strengths. Unclear issues identified in this context will be recorded in the table below by the secretary. The secretary should also suggest in the table the level of maturity they recommend for the sub-criteria that do not support the criteria descriptions. In addition, the explanations section should include the reasons for the proposal of change and, whether there is additional evidence expected.

A. Quality Assurance System

Criterion	Sub Criterion	Maturity Level Decision of the Team	Maturity Level Suggestion of the Secretary	Maturity Level Consensus
A.2 Internal Quality Assurance System	A.2.1. Quality Commission	5	4	4
	A.2.2. Internal quality assurance mechanisms (PDCA cycles, calendar, the structure of units)	5	4	4
A.4. Internationalization	A.4.1. Internationalization policy	4	3	3
	A.4.2. Governance and organizational structure of internationalization processes	4	3	3
	Follow-Up and Improvement of Internationalization Performance	4	3	3

Remarks:

A.2.1 Quality Commission: PDCA cycles are operated in the quality commission. The report states that "All academic and administrative units write a Unit Self Evaluation Report (USER), these suggestions are evaluated by the Continuous Improvement Group and the Quality Commission and feedback is given to the units." These activities are suitable for PDCA, there are similar activities in other institutions and therefore, the maturity level is not 5.

A.2.2. Internal quality assurance mechanisms (PDCA cycles, calendar, structure of units): There are PDCA cycles, but the implementations are not at the 5th level. In order to decide on the maturity level "5", the cycle must be completed several times, and the practices must be systematic, sustainable and exemplary. There are not enough explanations and examples showing that 5 maturity levels are achieved.

A.4.1 Internationalization policy: Evidence showing that measures have been taken together with stakeholders should be presented. Explanations on internationalization at the end of the report stating "...it is stated that necessary improvements have been made and measures have been taken as a result of these evaluations." remain superficial. Statements of the institution should be explained with examples and/or focus group discussions.

A.4.2 Management and organizational structure of internationalization processes: Explanations on structuring in this regard are limited. There is not sufficient explanation regarding the functioning and effectiveness of the management and organizational structure.

A.4.4. Follow-up and improvement of internationalization performance: Explanations on internationalization at the end of the report stating “..necessary improvements have been made and measures have been taken as a result of these evaluations.” remain superficial. Statements of the institution should be explained with examples and/or focus group discussions.

B. Learning and Teaching

Criterion	Sub Criterion	Maturity Level Decision of the Team	Maturity Level Suggestion of the Secretary	Maturity Level Consensus
B.1. Design and approval of programs	B.1.1 Design and approval of programs	4	3	4
	B.1.2 Program objectives, outcomes and NQF-HETR compliance of the program	4	3	4
	B.1.6. Measurement and evaluation	4	3	4
B.2. Student Admission and Progression	B.2.1 Student admission and recognition and crediting of prior learning (Knowledge and skills acquired through formal, non-formal education and free learning)	4	3	3
B.3. Student-Centered Learning, Teaching and Evaluation	B.3.1 Teaching methods and techniques (Active, interdisciplinary study, interactive, research/learning focused)	4	3	3
	B.3.2 Measurement and evaluation (Including alternative measurement methods and techniques differentiated according to students'	4	3	3

	characteristics and learning levels)			
B.4. Teaching Staff	B.4.2 Teaching competence (Active learning, measurement and evaluation, innovative approaches, material development, competence acquisition and quality assurance system	4	3	4
	B.4.3 Incentives and rewards for educational activities	4	3	3
B.5. Learning Resources	B.5.5. B.5.5. Psychological counselling and career services	4	3	3
B.6. Follow-up and Updating of Programs	B.6.1 Follow-up and updating program outcomes (including language training programs in preparatory schools)	4	3	4
	A.6.2. Alumni tracking system	4	3	3

Remarks:

B.1.1. Design and Approval of Programs: The report states that "The design and approval process is defined, and improvements regarding its implementation are in progress." In addition, it has been understood that the institution has started improvement works on these issues in 2021. Therefore, there might be some challenges in completing PDCA cycles.

B.1.2 Program objectives, outcomes and compliance of the program with the NQF-HETR: The report states that "Evidence for how to plan the monitoring of the realization of the program outcomes is not sufficient." Explanation and evidence on PDCA cycles are not considered as sufficient. There are practices, but the necessary explanations should be made on follow-up and improvement.

B.1.6 Measurement and Evaluation: The report states that "The process has been secured with Measurement-Evaluation and Training Skills trainings in all units, especially in accredited units, and this situation has been monitored by Unit External Evaluation studies. The institution aims to make the necessary improvements in the units through the Unit Quality Assurance Commission by evaluating the Exit Statement and UFRs of the evaluation works at the Quality Commission." and it

has been thought that there are challenges in improvements and the institution is at maturity level 3. Necessary explanations should be made by presenting examples.

B.2.1 Student admission and recognition and crediting of prior learning (Knowledge and skills acquired through formal and, non-formal education and free learning): Practices on this subject are explained with examples in the report. However, how the PDCA cycle operates should be further explained. In addition, the recognition of free learning is not explained, examples and evidence are not specified.

B.3.1 Teaching methods and techniques (Active, interdisciplinary study, interactive, research/learning oriented): Although explanations are given about the practices on this subject, there are no explanations about how the PDCA cycle is operated and how improvements are made.

B.3.2. Measurement and evaluation (such as including alternative measurement methods and techniques differentiated according to the characteristics and learning levels of the students): Although explanations are given about the practices in this regard, the report does not include explanations on how the PDCA cycle is operated and how improvements are made.

B.4.2 Teaching competence (Active learning, assessment and evaluation, innovative approaches, material development, qualification and quality assurance system): Although it is stated that there are practices in the report, there is no explanation or evidence about monitoring and improvement.

B.4.3 Incentive and rewarding for educational activities: Although it is stated in the report that "there are awarding practices such as plates, certificates of appreciation, and acknowledgments by the unit managements regarding the education and training activities of the instructors", there are no explanations about monitoring and improvement.

B.5.5. Guidance, psychological counseling and career services: The report states that "Erciyes University Psychological Counseling and Guidance Research and Application Center (ERREM) provides psychological support and guidance services to students and that there is a Career Guidance and Information Center (KAYBIMER)." However, evidence of monitoring and how improvements are made should be indicated.

B.6.1. Follow-up and updating program outcomes (including language training programs in preparatory schools): The report stated that program update works are carried out with processes defined particularly in accredited departments and some practices in other programs are stated. Explanations on how monitoring and improvements are made can be specified.

B.6.2 Alumni tracking system: It is stated that the alumni tracking system created in the report has risks and has not reached a sufficient level to include graduates in the system. Maturity level 3 was deemed appropriate because the system did not function in accordance with its purpose and there were no explanations regarding the feedback of this system.

C. Research and Development

Criterion	Sub Criterion	Maturity Level Decision of the Team	Maturity Level Suggestion of the Secretary	Maturity Level Consensus
C.1. Research Strategy	C.1.3. Relation of research to local/regional/national development goals	5	4	5
C.2. Research Resources	C.2.3 Referring to non-university resources (Support units, methods)	5	4	5
C.4. Research Performance	C.4.3 Research budget performance	4	3	4

Remarks:

C.1.3 Relationship of researches with local/regional/national development goals: There are not enough examples and explanations about completion of the cycle more than once, and that the practices are systematic, sustainable and exemplary.

C.2.3. Referring to non-university resources (Support units, methods): The report states that "Cooperation with industry organizations and chambers of industry, which are the external stakeholders of the University in Kayseri, and the support of these institutions and organizations as external resources is remarkable." However, for a Maturity level "5", the cycle must be completed several times and it must be proven that it is taken as an example by other institutions. Explanations on the relevant sub-criterion are needed.

C.4.3 Research budget performance: Research budget performance is monitored. However, within the scope of follow-up, it has not been sufficiently explained what kind of a road map was drawn in the institution. For this reason, maturity level 3 is considered appropriate.

D. Service to Society

Criterion	Sub Criterion	Maturity Level Decision of the Team	Maturity Level Suggestion of the Secretary	Maturity Level Consensus
D.1. Service to Society Strategy	D.1.1. The policy, goal and strategy of service to society	4	3	4
	D.1.2. The management and organizational structure of service to society processes	4	3	3
D.2. The Service to Society Resources	D.2.1. Resources	5	4	5

Remarks:

D.1.1. Service to society policy, goals and strategy: The report states that, "Although there are practices carried out in line with the goals and strategy of the institution's defined service to society policy, it is considered that it will be important to develop defined mechanisms in evaluating the results of these practices." and the maturity level was determined as 4. Maturity level 3 is considered being more appropriate.

D.1.2. Management and organizational structure of service to society processes: The report states that, "Some results have been achieved by implementing the management and organizational structuring of service to society processes in the institution in the direction of institutional preferences and covering many fields. However, there is a need to develop defined processes for monitoring results." The maturity level corresponding to his expression is considered to be 3.

D.2.1. Sources: In order to give a maturity level of "5", the cycle must be completed more than once, and practices must be systematic, sustainable and exemplary. Explanations on the relevant sub-criterion are needed.

E. Governance System

Criterion	Sub Criterion	Maturity Level Decision of the Team	Maturity Level Suggestion of the Secretary	Maturity Level Consensus
A.3.. Information management system	E.3.1. The integrated information management system	3	2	3

Remarks:

E.3.1 Integrated information management system: The report states that, "It is seen that the development of KUYS software (digital governance) that will provide integrated information management institutions has started." and merging systems was aimed. For this reason, maturity level 2 is considered to be more appropriate.

2. Evaluation of Report Writing language

It is expected that the report writing language is simple, clear and contains clear expressions in terms of evaluation judgments. In the report, statements that harm institutional development, judgment and/or comparison with other institutions should be avoided, and the explanations should include the specific and authentic evaluations of the team, beyond comprising parts of THEQC documents. In addition, the recommendations in the report should be in the direction of implementing quality assurance mechanisms rather than examples of practices. In this context, the statements that need to be corrected in the report should be included in this section.

The reporting language of the Erciyes University Institutional Accreditation Report is simple, clear and specific to the institution. However, the explanations and evidence regarding the evaluations in the report remain at a limited level. The report does not contain statements that harm the development of the institution, judge the institution, or compare it with other institutions.

