artesnet Europe

Faculty of Fine Arts Review

AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY
Antalya
Turkey

October/November 2008

Content

Introduction

1.1   **Objectives and principles of the review process**

The objectives include:

- To support all arts institutions in Europe (including students, management, teaching, technical and administrative staff) to gain expertise on self-evaluation, linking internal quality issues with external requirements with a special focus on institutions in the new member states and candidate countries.

- To address subject-based as well as institutional review, looking at self-evaluation as an institutional responsibility to enhance the quality in art schools, rather than focusing on the bureaucratic and controlling aspects of quality assurance.

- The quality of an external evaluation is directly dependent on the preparation and implementation of a continuous rigorous internal evaluation process and the institution's willingness for open, honest critical self-evaluation.

- To consolidate and further develop a shared body of knowledge within the European higher arts education community on quality issues, that could lead to an independent European quality assurance network as a voluntary partnership for higher arts education.

- To value and preserve cultural, artistic, and pedagogic diversity.

The principles include:

- Move to student centred, outcomes-based learning;

- Involves student participation;

- Need for comparability – *European Qualifications Framework*;

- Emphasis on enhancement (not compliancy);

- Increased emphasis on key stakeholders (Students and employers) in programme planning;

- The development of a common understanding of terminology

The Evaluation Teams' (ET) main outcome with the visit to Akdeniz University is to arrive at a well-substantiated view of the strategic management and operation of quality assurance and enhancement in the Faculty at both faculty/institutional and subject discipline level.

The review takes place over two visits; a preliminary and a main visit. The focus of the preliminary visit is on understanding the specifics of the faculty/institution, in a regional and national context. The main visit focuses on how and with what results the faculty/institution's strategic and internal quality policies and procedures are implemented throughout all levels of the faculty.

1.2   **Brief description of the University and Faculty**

The University

Akdeniz University (AU) is a campus university established on approximately 925 acres of land to the west of Antalya city centre between Dumlupinar Boulevard and the Uncalı district. It was founded in 1982, and incorporated the higher education institutions already established in Antalya, Isparta and Burdur. There are at present 11 faculties and a conservatoire active in the university. There are also 4 vocational schools within the university providing bachelor degree courses, 8 vocational schools established in Antalya and its surrounding districts which offer 2-year courses and 4 graduate schools providing education at master and doctorate levels. There are 27 research and application centres within the University and 148 laboratories, supporting both research and academic teaching purposes.

In the academic year 2006-07 there were 10,249 on Batchelor degree, 8,494 on 2-year and 1,403 on post-graduate programmes; making a total of 20,146 students studying at the university. This number has more than doubled over the past eight years. In the same year there were 44 associate, 53 Batchelor and 97 post-graduate degrees offered, which reflects more than doubling of the undergraduate courses and quadrupling of the post-graduate courses.

Delivering these courses and carrying out the research were 240 Professors, 97 Associate Professors, 251 Assistant Professors, 286 Lecturers, 793 Research Assistants, 106 Instructors and 84 Specialists, making a total of 1857 academic staff. These were supported by 1,308 administrative staff.

Faculty of Fine Arts

The Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA), which is the sole higher education State University Faculty of Fine Arts in Antalya, comprises of twelve departments. It was founded with the Departments of Painting, Sculpture, Graphic Arts and Ceramic in 1999. In 2000-2001 the Department of Architecture and Environmental Design and in 2002-2003 Cinema-TV and Musical Sciences were

added. The Department of Basic Education co-ordinates and delivers the service courses such as History of Art, Philosophy, Interpretation of Contemporary Art and basic art courses. In the near future Departments of Traditional Turkish Handcrafts, Architecture, Fashion, Textile Design and Stage Design will be planning to start their courses, when Instructor quotas and physical conditions are available.

The mission of the Faculty of Fine Arts is *"to educate modern, creative, multi-dimensional and culturally developed individuals who will successfully represent our country on the international stage and contribute to Turkey's and the World's culture with universal thoughts and values. We aim at searching for futuristic programmes through which students will be educated in a way that they know all the norms to reach success"* The vision aims at *"educating individuals who have an artistic point of view and who question the era, society and himself and can artistically demonstrate what he finds from the questioning process into his life."*

Currently the Faculty of Fine Arts has fifty eight academic personnel including lecturers, assistants, research assistants and instructors; and seventeen administrative personnel, including the Secretariat of the Department, Editor's Office, Student Affairs, Personnel Affairs, Financial Affairs and Technical Affairs. This has grown from the 14 academic and 4 administrative staff employed in 1999-2000.

For this 2008-2009 academic year there are 611 registered students: Photography - 51; Graphic Arts – 73; Sculpture – 37; Interior Architecture and Environmental Design – 111; Musical Sciences – 100; Painting – 64; Ceramics – 81; Cinema and Television – 94.

In 2007, the foundation of Akdeniz University Institute of Fine Arts was a big step in terms of higher arts education. Their first objective of this graduate school is to offer graduate, doctorate and efficiency in art programmes and train artists and scientist specialized in art to contribute to the development of science and art in Turkey.

1.3   **National and regional institutional context**
Akdeniz University is located on the outskirts of the city of Antalya, which is situated in the South of Turkey and has a central position in Mediterranean Region. Antalya has a population of 1,700,000 and is well known for its historical, cultural and natural assets, which makes it the tourist capital of Turkey.

The Faculty of Fine Arts makes a major contribution to the artistic and cultural developments within the city and the region, organising arts festivals, exhibitions and events and providing professional expertise to cultural organisations.

1.4   **Evaluation Team (ET)**
           Through the Self Evaluation Reports (SER) and the outcomes of the main site visit, the ET will evaluate the faculty/institution's
           capacity for quality management and enhancement, identify good practice and make observations and recommendations on how to
           make any necessary improvements.

1.4.1   **Members**
           The members are selected to ensure a balance of expertise and experience appropriate to the chosen institution and will cover
           expertise at senior management level and in the selected discipline.

           Bob Baker, Head of Department of Fine Art, School of Art & Design, Limerick Institute of Technology, Ireland
           Professor John Butler (Chair), Chair of Art, Birmingham Institute of Art & Design, UCE Birmingham, UK
           Paula Crabtree, Dean, Department of Fine Art, Bergen National Academy of the Arts, Norway
           Eva Engstrand, College Director, Faculty of Fine, Applied & Performing Arts, Gothenburg University, Gothenburg, Sweden
           Richard Fajnor, Vice Dean, Faculty of Fine Arts, Brno University of Technology, Brno, Czech Republic
           Radu Pulbere, Dean. Faculty of Applied Arts & Design, University of Art and Design Cluj-Napoca, Cluj Napoca, Romania
           Lars Ebert[1], Project Manager *artesnet Europe,* European League of Institutes of the Arts [ELIA], Netherlands

           Responsibilities include:
           - extensive critical analysis and written observations on SERs prior to visits
           - participation in the two (preliminary and main) visits, chairing delegated meetings and note taking
           - working closely as a team and contributing to the writing of the final report

1.4.2   **Terms of reference**
           Role of the Evaluation Team (ET)
           - to analyse the faculty/institution's existing and intended quality management and enhancement capacity and procedures
           - to make recommendations to the institution on how to improve quality management and enhancement (QME) capacity
             and procedures
           - to identify good practice

---

[1] LE was unable to join the preliminary visit but joined the main visit to ensure continuity and comparability to previous Institutional Review visits

To carry out these tasks the ET will act as:
- representatives - to reflect current good practices in quality management and enhancement
- evaluators – to analyse the institutions existing quality management and enhancement practices
- advisors – to make recommendations to develop these practices

All team members share equal responsibility for and contribute fully to the process.

1.4.3 **Process of review**
The ET analyse and evaluate the strategic management, operational procedures and capacity to communicate issues of quality at all staff levels. Triangulation is one of the key terms used to estimate the efficiency of QA mechanisms. It describes the shared perspective on an issue that is substantiated by evidence from normally three separate sources and then tests the institutions QA mechanisms to see how it is being dealt with. In that sense QA is about mechanisms that are operational in identifying problems and finding solutions by addressing issues at the appropriate level of decision-making.

The University had experienced an Institutional Review by the European Universities Association (EUA) in 2007 and the resulting report is generally positive of the institution's QA policies and how they are implemented within the majority of the faculties. Although a relatively new Faculty, it is noticeable however how little the Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA) is mentioned in this report, which is reflected in the ET's difficulty in finding the quality management procedures to be found and practiced within the faculty. The Faculty's Self Evaluation (FSET) Team had to find a way to tune the existing University policies, procedures and reports into new documents that were transparent to the ET. The FSET sees the process as a mechanism that would make such QA information readily available to appropriate internal and/or external people. In reality FFA over the review period realised that the changes brought about were not to be equated to just more work (bureaucracy) but to a better arrangement of processes and procedures and some innovative approaches to internal mechanisms of reflection on QA.

The team effort of preparing for the two review visits and writing both SERs united the academic staff . This provoked a better understanding of QA as a rigorous internal process requiring strong transparent institutional communication channels.

The implementation of quality assurance mechanisms enhances debate and the development of a bottom-up QA strategy. FFA is beginning to see this as a chance to bring together new platforms for development and be more proactive in the implementation of the whole Bologna process.

Representing the Institution
The following are identified as key members/roles in the review process:
The Faculty Liaison Person is the principle conduit for communication between the ET and the Faculty.
Asst. Prof. Oğuz HAŞLAKOĞLU – Head of the Painting Department.

Faculty Self-evaluation Commission
The group of staff responsible for planning and preparing the institution for the review process and producing the SERs.

Asst. Prof. Öznur Aydın(Chairman)	The Faculty of Fine Arts, Deputy Dean
Asst. Prof. .Oğuz Haşlakoğlu (Coordinator)	Head of the Painting Department
Assoc.Prof. Eser Gültekin	The Department of Architecture, Lecturer
Asst. Prof. Erol Kılıç (added as a member later by faculty management and not present during the preparation of self-evaluation report)	The Department of Painting, Lecturer
Asst. Prof Gökmen Özmenteş	The Department of Musical Sciences, Lecturer
Ins. Pınar Engincan Bol	The Department of Interior Architecture and Environmental Design, Lecturer
Ins.Defne Alkandemir	The Department of Graphic Arts, Lecturer

Research Assistant F. Simge Şafak from the Painting Department gave intensive support to taking notes and coordinating the Commission members.

The members of this commission are leading group members who will support accreditation to the other departments in the faculty according to the Painting Department model, as a part of the studies for Institutional Quality Assurance and Enhancement Management System. The Commission comprised of former Deputy Deans who helped to analyze the academic and administrative processes. Moreover the Deputy Dean and the Chairman of the Commission contributed to the process by accelerating the flow of information and documents between the Dean's Office and the Rectorate.

1.4.3.1   Preliminary visit 5^{thn}– 8th October 2008

Principle objectives are:
- To gain a clearer understanding of the specific national, regional and local contexts impacting on the institution (autonomy)
- To gain a clearer understanding of the existing management operations of the institution
- To discuss the self evaluation process and the institution's Self-Evaluation Report (SER)
- To gain greater understanding of the institution's Quality Management & Enhancement (QME) processes
- To identify and request any missing information from the SER
- To draft a programme for the main visit, agreeing dates, discipline(s) to be reviewed, which groups to meet etc.

Programme   (Ch : Chair   Rap : Rapporteur for each session)

Sunday 5th

14.00 – 18.00 ET briefing meeting to discuss SER, identify issues, division of tasks

Monday 6th   ET arrive at institution before 09.30

09.30 – 10.30 ET meet with Liaison Person to discuss protocols and procedures of the review process
10.45 – 11.30 ET meet with Head of Institution to discuss objectives of the review and the institution's expectations of the process (Ch JB   Rap BB)
11.30 – 12.30 ET meet Institution Liaison Person and Self-evaluation Steering Group to discuss the review process, levels of involvement, preliminary institution findings   (Ch BB Rap PC)
12.30 – 14.00 lunch with the institution
14.00 – 16.00 ET meet with Faculty Management Team to discuss Faculty and Institutional policies, management and operational structures, Quality Management Enhancement (QME) policy and processes, national HE and Faculty research policies and strategies, the impact on the Faculty in implementing *Bologna* and student issues   (Ch PC Rap JB)
16.30 – 18.30 ET meet to discuss outcomes
20.00   dinner with the institution

Tuesday 7th

09.00 – 11.00   ET tour Faculty
11.00 – 12.00   ET meet selected discipline management and staff to discuss the discipline SER, their relationship to central
                management, QME activities and identify information and documents required for the main visit   (Ch PC Rap BB)
12.00 – 13.00   ET meet students from a range of Faculty courses to discuss their learning experiences and input into QA&E
                process (Ch RF Rap JB)
13.00 – 14.30   ET working lunch to discuss outcomes
14.30 – 15.30   ET meet external partners, professional representatives and past students to discuss their knowledge and
                experience of the quality of the programmes and input into reviewing and developing them   (Ch EE Rap RF)
15.40 – 16.30* ET meet Senate to discuss QME and internal decision making processes and responsibilities (Ch BB Rap PC)
15.40 – 16.30* ET meet senior Administrative/Technical staff to discuss QME processes and their role   (Ch RP Rap EE)
16.30 – 18.30   ET meet to discuss outcomes, identify further information required and prepare for Day 3
20.00   ET working dinner

Wednesday 8th

09.00 – 10.30   ET final meeting to identify key issues and   additional requirements to the SER
10.30 – 11.15   ET and Liaison Person to plan main visit schedule
11.30 – 12.30   meet with Head of Institution and key staff to give interim feed-back and agree main visit programme and
                additional information and documents required (Ch JB)
13.00   lunch with Institution

•   simultaneous meetings

1.4.3.2   Main visit 24th– 27th November 2008

Principle objectives are:
- The ET's main objective is to arrive at a well substantiated view of the strategic management of quality assurance and enhancement in the institution at both institutional and subject discipline level.

- Where the preliminary visit focus was on understanding what is specific about that institution, the main visit is about finding out if, how and with what results the institution's strategic and internal quality policies and procedures are implemented throughout all levels of the institution.

Programme   (Ch = Chair   Rap = Rapporteur)

Sunday 23rd

11.00 – 18.00   ET briefing meeting to discuss SERs, identify issues, division of tasks

Monday 24th   ET arrive at institution before 09.30

09.30 – 10.30   ET meet with Liaison Person to discuss protocols and procedures of the main visit
10.45 – 11.30   ET meet with the Dean of the Fine Arts Faculty to   discuss the review and the institution's expectations and experiences of the process (Ch JB   Rap BB)
11.30 – 12.30   ET meet Institution Liaison Person and Self-evaluation Steering Group to discuss the review process, levels of involvement, institutional findings   (Ch BB Rap PC)
12.30 – 14.00   lunch with the institution
14.00 – 16.00   ET meet with Faculty Management Team to discuss: Faculty and Institutional policies the Quality Management Enhancement (QME) policy and processes, the Faculty strategy in implementing *Bologna* and student issues (Ch PC Rap JB)
16.30 – 18.30   ET meet to discuss outcomes
20.00   dinner with the institution

Tuesday 25th

09.00 – 11.00   ET meet Discipline management and staff to discuss the discipline SER, discipline QA&E activities and outcomes of the review process   (Ch RP Rap BB)

11.30 – 13.00   ET meet subject discipline students to discuss their learning experience and input into QA&E process (Ch RF Rap EE)

13.00 – 14.30   ET working lunch to discuss outcomes

14.30 – 15.30   ET meet Faculty Head of Research, research staff and PhD students to discuss research activities in the Faculty and QA&E processes (Ch EE Rap RF)

15.30 – 16.30   ET debrief meeting

16.30 – 18.30   ET meet Rector and Vice Rectors to discuss outcomes and engagement in the QA&E process (Ch JB Rap PC)

20.00   ET working dinner

Wednesday 26th

09.30 – 11.00   ET final meeting to identify key issues, recommendations and good practice for oral feedback report

11.15 – 12.00   ET presentation of the oral report to Dean of Faculty, Senior Managers, Self-evaluation Steering Group, Liaison Person, Subject Discipline staff   (Ch JB)

13.00   lunch with Institution

1.4.4 **Documents provided** (all translated into English)

- Faculty SER
- Painting Department (Discipline) SER
- European Universities Association (EUA) Institutional Review Report 2007
- AU report of the survey of *"The Problems of the students of Akdeniz University"*
- Guidelines for Undergraduate/Associate Degree Students Consultancy
- FFA student guidance *"Instructions for Practices within and out of the Department"*
- AU student clubs
- FFA 2008-09 student analysis
- FFA list of *"Staff Specialist Project Groups"*
- AU student guidelines for *"Instructions for the Second Major Programme"*
- AU undergraduate and associate student guidelines for *"Horizontal Transfers Among Higher Education Institutions"*
- AU regulations on *"Physical Education/Fine Arts Co-ordination Chairmanships Operation and Education Directive"*
- AU directive on *"Administrative Organisation of the Faculties"*
- AU bylaw concerning *"The Education of Undergraduate Studies and Testing"*
- FFA 2008-09 *"Special Abilities Examination Guidebook"* for new student entries
- AU student guidelines *"Instructions for Minor Programmes"*
- FFA principles for student entry *"Special Ability Exam Directive*
- AU principles for *"Directive of Preparation Programme for Vertical Transfer Students to Batchelor Education"*
- FFA operational diagramme of faculty management structure
- FFA *"Graduate Education Rules and Regulations"*
- AU *"Guidelines for the Scientific Research Projects"*
- FFA list of *"Scientific Research Projects"* 2004 – 08 (Annexe 2)
- AU guidelines *"Criteria for starting Post-graduate Studies"*
- FFA *"Socrates Erasmus Unit Co-ordination"*
- AU *"Code of the Cultural-Art Research and Implementation Centre (KUSAM) of the University of Akdeniz"*
- FFA Painting Department Semester Undergraduate Course Programme (Annexe 5)
- FFA Painting Department Semester Graduate Course Programme (Annexe 6)

2   Higher Education in Turkey

The Turkish national education system is based on the Basic Law of National Education, which covers formal education, pre-primary, secondary and higher education. The National Ministry of Education is responsible for all educational activities in the country except for higher education.

Higher Education embraces all institutions with a curriculum of at least two years following secondary education. Entrance to the Higher Education sector is through a one-level exam called the *Student Selection Examination*. For the Faculty of Fine Arts the students sit the *Special Abilities Examination*

In the constitution of the Republic in 1982, two Articles 130 and 131 referred to Higher Education. According to the Higher education Law all higher education institutions came under the authority of the *Higher Education Council* (HEC) and independent institutions existing before the HEC were affiliated to universities, including Education, Conservatoires and vocational schools. In that year 8 universities were founded and between then and 2005 the total number of HE institutions grew to 99, including 68 state and 25 private universities, 5 military and 1 police academies.

The two governing bodies overseeing higher education – the *Higher Education Council* (HEC) and the *Inter-Universities Council* (IUC) are supported by the *Rectors Conference*, which acts as an advisory committee. The Minister of Education, who Chairs the HEC represents higher education in the National Assembly of Turkey.

2.1   University mission and objectives
Akdeniz University Strategic Plan 2007–12 states four basic mission objectives:
- To produce education integrated with the academic World based on high quality programmes that also support student mobility;
- To produce scientific knowledge at the universal level;
- To realise the conversion of scientific output into technology;
- To respond to society's requirements in terms of knowledge, technology, and social needs by means of continuing education, health care and other activities.

It also states that it wishes *"to become a World-class university characterised by entrepreneurship and sensitivity to environmental issues, which can continuously improve its quality in the fields of research, education, fine arts and technology."*

The University is clearly strategic in achieving these aims and has developed its faculties to address them, establishing national and international recognition in the fields of Medicine, Agriculture, Tourism and Hotel Management, Archaeology and Chemistry. All these aspects relate to very specific local needs and resources and these Faculties are recognised as being among the best in Turkey.

2.2   **The *Bologna* process**
The University through its aims and the strategies employed is very dynamic in developing its international profile and standards. A number of faculties have established international elements in their programmes (e.g. Economics & Administrative Sciences – international diploma programme). The University is nationally recognised as having the best practices in the EC Erasmus/Socrates Student Exchange Programme and the Faculty of Fine Arts is very active in this programme.

It is clear from the *European Universities Association* review report 2007 and after our discussions with University and Faculty management that the Akdeniz University is committed to embracing and embedding the principle objectives and actions of the *Bologna* proces*s.* They have introduced the three-cycle system across the Faculty programmes and the majority (8) of the FFA's 12 departments have undergraduate level courses and one (Painting) has just introduced post-graduate level courses – with the Graphics and Music Departments following this year.

The aims of the FFA include *"to have a student centred education which aims at creating modern, artistic and futuristic individuals……and who know different language. ….. at being a positive effect on society, improve good relationships and communications with foreign institutions .. to reach international success and create world-wide activities."*

The Faculty has introduced a credit system but it is not clear how this fits into the ECTS and the teaching staff struggle to fully understand *Learning Outcomes*, which are fundimental building blocks to the *Bologna* process.

3 Quality Assurance Management and Enhancement (QME)

3.1 Background

The University has a QME policy/strategy document, but the FFA has yet to write one and is using this review exercise to prepare for it.

When the European Universities Association made an institutional review visit and produced its report in 2007 it found the University had moved a long way in developing its Quality Assurance Management strategies at an institutional level and some of the more mature faculties like Medicine had adopted them and embedded them at programme level. Between now and then the University has undergone many changes with a new Rector, Vice Rectors, many members of Senate and new Deans, and as a consequence a number of the proposals stated in the EUA report have been placed on hold or been slowly implemented. As a consequence we found that there has been little monitoring or development of the QME strategies into the FFA and found little evidence of clear guidelines for their implementation and review process.

3.2 Institutional level

The University has produced *Total Management Practice Guidelines*, which the FFA used to help prepare for the review.

A QAE policy and strategy is mentioned in the University strategic plan. There are 8 performance areas, with some objectives/performance criteria - one of which is the development of education. There is no systematic reporting within the evaluation process. The more mature University units like the Hospital and Faculties (e.g. Medicine and Agriculture) have well established Quality Management systems, which should be acting as models of best practice, but the University has yet to implement procedures to formalise this.

The faculties try to develop good quality teachers and twice a year there is a big academic meeting where all teachers and lecturers get together about teaching to talk about what they can do to develop it. There are very little top-down/bottom-up formalised processes or guidelines to help faculties introduce and operate their QME processes. All new programmes are approved by Senate and existing programmes present Senate with a review report twice a year.

3.3 Faculty level

For this review the Faculty used the evaluation (University) as a model, as the guidelines were considered to be useful, but they were anxious to internalise the process as they believed in these circumstances it was important that everyone in the Steering

Group was engaged. FFA thought it really important that they made the SER into a questionnaire and gave it to the departments who passed it on the student representatives and all the staff for discussions, questions and seeking their opinions of the process. Past students were also invited to engage in the process through *Facebook* and the faculty received 68 positive responses.

The Faculty SER Commission will be responsible for disseminating and rolling out the outcomes of this review. Some Departments have openly welcomed this process (e.g. Graphics, Architecture, Music) but others are more reticent to engage.

There is no FFA QME policy and very few formal monitoring/review procedures in place, but it is made more difficult for them as there are no clear guidelines produced by the University. This should be of the highest priority for both the University and the Faculty.

Overall the Faculty Management and the Departments support the change and are committed to ensuring they are at the forefront of higher arts education development in Turkey.

3.4   **Staff development**
All staff are reviewed by Senate through an on-line student evaluation questionnaire (mandatory for the students to complete). Senate congratulates staff with good evaluations but gives warnings to those who receive negative responses. The ET are not sure that relying totally on student feedback is totally reliable as the sole source for teacher evaluation as they are not the best informed in new developments in learning and teaching and what is needed and how it is best delivered. We suggest the student input into the process is complemented with some form of internal teacher observation (piloted by the Interior Decoration & Environmental Design Department) and appraisal. There appears to be no formal University staff development programmes to help them overcome their (teachers) weaknesses once identified.

At the AEU review in 2007 the University announced the establishment of the *Centre for Excellence in Teaching* for developing and training its staff, but because of the major changes to senior management this has been put on hold. The University hopes this will be opened in the next twelve months. The ET believes this is a very important tool in sustaining the quality of the student learning experience.

3.5   **Student participation**
Students knew about the SER process through teachers providing information and student representatives in the SER Steering Group, Department Board, Faculty Board informing other students about the process, but the students feel this could be

improved. It may be necessary for the University to provide to some training for student representatives to help them carry out their responsibilities.

The students as well as teachers and professors are involved in the process of developing programmes and students says that they are confident that this new student centred outlook will make things better - for example improve the credit system, which is now mixed and confusing.

After preparing for the review the FFA stated that they (students) are the centre of the entire process:
- This exercise creates awareness. We have documented everything - make awareness.
- Giving more importance to the quality of education. Now we have course outlines and now the urge to develop in terms of content as well.
- Self awareness - institutional as well as individual.
- The reason to produce evidence is clear.
- I give time (vice Dean) to work in the group. This group makes the process become faster. Lots of studies consisting of student clubs and student graduates.
- Students quality is the most important
- Student oriented workshops and exhibitions.
- Producing a catalogue of graduate student work.
- Course evaluation system and preparing it. - Students works, projects are important in course evaluation system. The evaluation, exhibitions, project evaluation are all put into the catalogue.

Student representatives and Student Union officers are non-voting members on the University's Boards and Committees; the ET Panel believe the regulations should change and students should be given voting rights on these Boards and Senate.

3.6   Faculty of Fine Arts & Painting Discipline

3.6.1   General
The Faculty was establishes in 1999-2000 with the departments of Painting, Drawing, Sculpture, Graphic, Ceramic and glass Departments; expanding in 2000-01 Interior Decoration & Environmental Design and Photography and 2002-03 Cinema-TV and Music were added.

The Rector, Vice Rector and Senate are very supportive of FFA and perceive it as the new fastest growing faculty.

3.6.2 Curriculum development

The teaching staff were aware of learning outcomes but they were not used in course planning and most students didn't know what they were.

A number of students believed it was important that the Faculty increased the international aspect in their courses, through more international teachers/visitors, support to visit international exhibitions outside Antalya and more international students - most students have very limited experience outside Antalya, but most were very positive of the Wednesday afternoon lecture programme

3.6.3 Learning, Teaching & Assessment

From discussions with the students and looking at the course programme (see Appendices 5 & 6) there is little time for independent learning and students have little opportunity to take responsibility for their learning experience. The teaching programme varies very little through the semesters/levels at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. It is important the University gives clear guidelines to the Faculties on Qualification Frameworks and Level Learning Outcomes and staff receive training on developing learning and teaching strategies to deliver courses at the appropriate level. The students say they don't think they share experiences with teachers and studio classes often starts with teacher's introduction of his/her experience.

Professors and lecturers use e.learning as a tool to support their teaching, but this could be extended to provide support for the student learning.

There are no formal assessment feedback procedures and this is generally done through oral feedback but only if asked for, which could be difficult for some students.

3.6.4 Research

There is a faculty Research Institute but it reports to Senate and is autonomous to the Faculty, although the Dean monitors it through Senate. The ET Panel believes the Faculty could miss-out on the full benefits of having a research centre if it is not fully integrated into it – research should help develop the teaching staffs knowledge, skills and job satisfaction and enhance their teaching and the research outputs should feedback into it. The Faculty should prioritise their research strategy and be engaged in the staff's involvement in it, or it will lead to conflicts of interest!

The University has produced considerable documents, codes of practice and guidelines on developing research.

Six Faculty research projects and nine graduate student projects have been supported by research institute between 2004–2008 (see Annexe 2) and these artistic and scientific projects have been conducted according to the regulations of administrative unit of scientific researches project of the University.

The University transfers 5% of its total revenue to a special fund for the support of academic staff's research projects.

3.6.5   **Student progression/achievement and employability**
The ET was not presented with statistical data to compare student progression and achievement on their courses over the past five years, so it is impossible to make observations on the maintenance of standards or compare them nationally or internationally.

The University is engaged in student tracking, but the ET has not been provided with any statistical data.

3.6.6   **Student recruitment**
The Faculty has clear guidelines and procedures for recruiting students and all students have to take a *Special Abilities Examination*, for which they receive a comprehensive guidebook – presenting the principles, terms, objectives and procedures of the examination.

The ET was not presented with statistical data to see the trend in student recruitment, which would indicate the health and future of the Departments.

3.6.7   **Student support and guidance**
The University and the FFA is committed to supporting students both academically and pastorally and has established a considerable number of processes to help this. There is also a large amount of printed and on-line material to make students aware of this support. The student services include: health (physical and mental); accommodation; catering; sports, cultural and recreational clubs; transport and finance.

Approximately 35% of fee income has been allocated to students who need financial support over the last ten years through a special student support budget.

The on-campus Health Centre provides students with free diagnostic and treatment services and a clinic within the Centre provides psychological support and guidance. In 2006 a new unit was added to provide special support for disabled students.

The students would benefit from departments writing Student Handbooks (either paper copies or on-line) to help know what they can expect and what is expected of them, on their course. This should provide key information about their course including: course aims, learning outcomes, assessment criteria and methods, learning and teaching strategy, course programme module/unit descriptors, student support services, appeals procedures, etc.

3.6.8   **Accommodation and resources**

The FFA has moved into a large new building in the centre of the University campus offering a wide range of high quality spaces including specialist studios and workshops for the Departments and Schools and a good exhibition space. At the moment the students are fairly cramped in their studio and workshop spaces, but this should be resolved when the other Faculty (Engineering) sharing the building moves out in the next 12 months.

The Faculty of Fine Arts library and reading halls stock 599 books and 155 periodicals. The University Library occupies 4.305 m2 area and stocks 40.000 books and 16.000 volumes of journals. This central library has 1,251 art books, 479 electronic journals, 25 printed periodicals that belong to the Faculty of Fine Arts. In the Reading hall, which occupies 30 m2, there are 155 specialised books. The Faculty Library will soon be transferred to new space, which will occupy 70m2.

The students claim the library has too few specialist art and design texts, which cannot be loaned out and it closes too early (5pm); therefore it is difficult to access outside their taught time. Their studios are also difficult to access outside taught time, with the students having to go through a complicated process to access them – again diminishing the opportunity to develop independent learning.

The building has wireless access to the internet, but has no open-access computers, although student can access through the library computers.

3.**6.9**   **Faculty Strengths, Issues & Threats**

<u>Strengths</u>

- Young teachers
- Young faculty and departments nothing fixed in stone
- Attractive area - historically and culturally
- Tourist area
- Support from University management for Fine Arts
- Growing profile of faculty
- Advantage of good will - openness
- Potential of flexibility to make changes
- Good location - good feeling as people apply here from all over Turkey
- Campus presents a good learning environment
- Good contact with cultural traditions to be used as a base for development
- Part of a big university - potential for bigger and better partners
- Expanding - growing
- Adequate financing (financial stability)
- High number of administrators for a relatively small faculty
- Good communication (but rather primitive)
- Good exchange programme but low numbers
- University performance related support as a good incentive (could also be a threat if not used)
- Students thought there is good teaching - but students also thought there are too few teachers
- Good resources in some Departments
- Student representation – although some students thought it worked others didn't
- Majority of students know what is expected of them at assessment but only receive verbal feedback
- Processes in place but most are informal not recorded or documented - need to make them more visible - "word of mouth"
- Good financial and welfare support for students
- Engaged staff
- Ambitious students

- Wednesday lectures with guest teacher programme

<u>Issues & Threats</u>

- Little communication between departments - there is good practice but no forum for transferability.
- Lack of staff development programme – who is responsible for it?
- Lack of staff induction programme
- No follow up with alumni
- External stakeholders not engaged in review and development process
- Low research profile - no PhD students and no written guidelines
- Lack of rollout of *Bologna* - lacking infrastructure to deliver *Bologna* process
- Lack of adoption of learning outcomes initiative
- Lack of crossover/collaboration between departments
- No mechanism for sharing best practice
- Poor dissemination of information - i.e. student representatives not informing colleagues
- Lack of awareness of this view
- Lack of space and workshops
- Not all departments have appropriate qualified staff
- Rigidity of departments and the possibility for students to cross over departments - narrowly focused programmes
- Very little contact outside University - very closed
- Most initiatives come from students
- Library resources - lacking relevant texts
- Over timetabling of classes - mostly theory - little time for research projects - self directed study, practical work, social time.
- Lack of guidance for students with learning difficulties

4 The capacity for change

4.1 Strategic planning

The University's first strategic plan 2007 – 2012 was approved by Senate and put into effect on the 1st January 2007. It was based on SWOT analyses by all the faculties and the findings of 9 study groups who were formed to conduct specific planning and analysis in separate performance areas carried out between 2005 – 07. The University lays great importance on developing activities expected by the external stakeholders, and which addresses the specific needs of the region. This is carried out through carefully monitoring its environs, the most significant of which was the *Institutional Identity Assay* conducted in 2006, and this was a major contributor to the University Strategic Planning Process. This covered major aspects such as medicine, agriculture and tourism – all key economic and social factors to the region.

4.2 Planning for change

Akdeniz University identified the following actions in its first Strategic Plan 2007 – 2012, which were to be implemented by the 1st January 2007:

1. Institutional re-organisation to achieve the most effective and productive academic and administrative services;
2. Implementation of ISO 9001:2000 Quality Management System to ensure the continuity of the institutional structure;
3. Development of an Institutional Performance Evaluation System;
4. Excellence in research infrastructure in selected areas;
5. Implementation of a culture of innovation at AU to enable the conversion of research output into technology;
6. Development of technology incubators, and the establishment of an advisory unit under the Rector's office to orientate academics towards the development of technology;
7. Establishment of an office to guide academics on the issue of *Intellectual Property Rights* (IPR);
8. Establishment of a *Centre of Excellence for Teaching*;
9. Obtaining *European Credit Transfer System* (ECTS) and *Diploma Supplement* labels;
10. Establishment of the *Foreign Language School* to conduct language education on a powerful infrastructure;
11. Planning and applying the *Quality Assurance* system in teaching and education in accordance with the *Bologna* process;
12. Establishment of a *Human Resources Performance Evaluation* system;
13. Preparation of improvement plans for the physical environment for the 2007 – 2012 period;
14. Development of an integrated information system to support all academic and administrative processes;
15. Improvement of the student and staff support services including new infrastructure and facilities;

16. Establishment of the *zero emission campus* project;
17. Establishment of a well-developed database for alumni and improvement of their links.

The ET believe the full implementation of these comprehensive actions would make the Quality Assurance management and operational processes at Akdeniz University robust to achieve the *Bologna* processes and bring it in line with the Universities across the greater Europe. The Panel found that many of these actions were in the process of being implemented, but a number were being held-up due to major changes in the senior management of the University.

The University will have to ensure guidelines and processes are introduced to support and monitor faculties in implementing these actions and sustaining the quality of its programmes. The University will also need to review these policies to make sure they are inclusive for the FFA.

The FFA will need to review these actions to ensure they have the policies and operational structures in place to achieve the objectives of the strategic plan.

5   **Identified areas of good practice**

Learning Teaching Assessment
- Introduction of student oriented education
- Introduction of learning outcomes
- Commencing collection of alumni detail and student tracking: Preparation of a table for past students on *Facebook*: 68 student replies.
- Intending to use Jury/panel assessment.
- Developing regular student exhibitions
- Competency in Art Programme as recognised equivalent to PhD
- Wednesday open invitation to visiting artists
- Manufacturers to share developments in new products - marketing products sharing them with students and staff.
- Interior architecture department bringing professionals into the programme to provide current and future developments.

Department and Faculty Management
- Inviting students to participate in meetings
- Commencing open door policy for students to approach staff
- Peer review in some teaching classes (shared teaching)
- Increased cohesion in staff endeavours.
- Commencing, internalising and engagement with the Quality Assurance and Enhancement process
- Expressing an enthusiasm for the opportunity to make fresh initiatives in Quality Assurance and Enhancement processes.
- Shift from criticising each other to self-criticism and greater self awareness
- Willingness to embrace the main *Bologna* requirements.
- Willingness and openness to external critique - expression of trust.
- Ambition to be at the forefront of Fine Art higher education developments in Turkey.
- Recognition of the importance of engagement with the city and the exploration of engagement with other members of society and professional bodies in regional, national, cultural arenas.
- Interest in sharing knowledge and cooperation at an international level.
- Good formal and informal Quality Assurance and Enhancement strategies in some departments.
- Started routines for collecting information about students and staff - importance of statistics and have established a good archive.
- Engagement with regional projects.
- Good year and programme structure of student representation on commissions.

University Management
- Staff development opportunities - travel to other institutions
- 16 Fine Art staff undertaken pedagogy training in medical faculty.
- positive support from the Rectorate
- Good and possibly increasing financial support /financial stability
- Enhanced QA budget for 2009
- R&D money available to applicants on a competitive basis
- new QAE handbook at University level
- Established Centre for Excellence in Teaching.

- Initiated the Institute to commence MA and PhD programmes.
- Annual evaluation of teaching staff by students
- KUSAM 1st research and implementation centre for contemporary arts in Turkey.

Physical resources

- Improving the student facilities
- Increase the size of the Student Affairs Office - move to another room.
- Sole occupancy of the building for the Fine art Faculty
- Extremely good campus and learning environment soon to be completed

6   Recommendations for enhancement

1. The University develops a more coherent Quality Assurance and Enhancement policy, addressing key aspects such as learning and teaching, assessment, student recruitment, staff appointment and development, student support and guidance, student complaints, equal opportunities, course approval and monitoring, health and safety;
2. Establish a University wide Quality Management system, with clear terms of reference, outlining devolved responsibility for monitoring and developing the policy and implementing the strategy Annual report must be a valuable tool rather than a formal exercise – including more structured engagement across all courses with past students and professional bodies.
3. The University and the Faculty should produce a staff QA&E handbook with policies, guidelines for procedures and processes and templates for documents as soon as possible.
4. The QA&E methodology, whether *formal* or *informal*, if seen as good practice can be maintained, but for ensuring standards across the University and feeding into the QA&E monitoring process it must be regularised across all programmes.
5. The University open the *Centre of Excellence in Teaching* as soon as possible and with the Faculties develop a stronger pedagogic staff development programme.(e.g. for developing learning outcomes).
6. Each award programme should produce its own handbook defining philosophy and aims of programme from a holistic point of view. Course documents.
7. Faculty policy on assessment and a transparent documentation of the process
8. Faculty policy on learning and teaching
9. Establish better communication channels with students
10. Establish better communication among staff across the faculty to facilitate structured ways to share best practice across departments, such as a forum consisting of heads of departments to identify and discuss formal issues.

11. Faculty should define own research policy and strategies.
12. The Faculty and University work together to ensure a synergy/cohesive approach between research strategies within the Faculty to support the MA students and staff. Make explicit aims of the MA programmes.
13. The Faculty and University find ways to facilitate greater student mobility (Erasmus exchange) and ways of supporting student travel to exhibitions etc - study trips.
14. Move from teacher led to student centred learning
15. Greater cohesion between the years - more time and space for individual practice and for the student to develop their own ideas and have greater access to individual work spaces.
16. The panel believes that for students to develop independent learning skills to better prepare them for the professional world the programmes should require them to take more responsibility for their learning earlier in their course. Leaving it until the 4th year to start taking responsibility for their learning is too late.
17. Student representatives and Student Union officers are non-voting members on the University's Boards and Committees; the ET Panel believe the regulations should change and students should be given voting rights on these Boards and Senate.