

BILKENT UNIVERSITY

EVALUATION REPORT

July 2010

Team:
Sokratis Katsikas, chair
Bente Kristensen
Ivan Ostrovsky
Bruno Carapinha
Sybille Reichert, coordinator

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 The Institutional Evaluation Programme	3
1.2 The Self Evaluation Process.....	3
1.3 The Evaluation Team	4
2. KEY FINDINGS.....	6
2.1 The National and International Context.....	6
2.2 Mission and Vision.....	7
2.3 Strategic Development.....	7
2.4 Governance	8
2.5 Financial Management.....	9
2.6 Human Resources Management	10
2.7 Teaching and Learning.....	11
2.8 Research	11
2.9 Contribution to Innovation in and Cooperation with Society and Industry.....	12
2.10 Internationalisation.....	13
2.11 Quality Assurance.....	14
3. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	15

1. INTRODUCTION

This report is the result of the institutional evaluation of Bilkent University, Turkey, which was undertaken in 2010, comprising a self-evaluation process which resulted in the publication of a self-evaluation report in February 2010, followed by two evaluation visits in March and May 2010. This report was written and edited in May and June 2010.

1.1 The 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 management
- Relevance of internal quality processes and the degree to which their outcomes are used in decision making and strategic management as well as perceived gaps in these internal mechanisms.

The evaluation is guided by four key questions, which are based on a ‘fitness for (and of) purpose’ approach:

- What is the institution trying to do?
- How is the institution trying to do it?
- How does it know it works?
- How does the institution change in order to improve?

1.2 The Self Evaluation Process

The self-evaluation process was coordinated by a steering committee comprising the Vice Rector for Administration and Finance, Prof. Aydogan, the Deans of the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Business Administration, a former Vice Rector who is also the Director of the Executive MBA Programme, the Director of the Vocational School, two faculty members, the Director of the Bilkent Computer Center, the quality and accreditation coordinator and a student representative. This committee decided on the content, coverage and information requirements of the self-evaluation and proposed an outline for the report. The self-evaluation committee organised its work with the help of three sub-committees on research, teaching and services.

The self-evaluation report of Bilkent University, along with the appendices, was sent to the evaluation team in March 2010. The team's visits to Bilkent took place on 23-24 March 2010 and 12-14 May 2010. In between the visits the self-evaluation team provided the evaluation team with some additional documentation on the institutional strategy and on questions relating to quality assurance rules.

The University community was informed about the evaluation through the Bilkent newspaper and the University's website. The student council was also invited to a meeting with the Committee in January 2010. The review team found that there had not been a very active discussion process of the contents in most faculties, thus most faculty members and students were even unaware of the evaluation until invited to the interviews. This is probably because existing quality assurance-related reporting is already well-established so that the need to mobilise the community was not felt as strongly.

The team found the self-evaluation report to be very informative, detailed, and supported by good and readable data. However, it offered relatively little depth with respect to exploring challenges and weaknesses, although the latter were briefly mentioned. Nevertheless, the team would like to stress that its visits convinced it that Bilkent is characterised by a deep-rooted quality awareness and lively quality culture in a search of continuous self-improvement which permeates the whole institution and at all levels.

1.3 The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of:

- Prof. Sokratis Katsikas (Chair), Professor of the University of Piraeus, former Rector of the University of the Aegean, Greece
- Prof. Bente Kristensen, Quality Adviser, former Vice-Rector of Copenhagen Business School
- Prof. Ivan Ostrovsky, former Vice-Rector of Comenius University, Bratislava
- Dr. cand. Bruno Carapinha, Portugal
- Dr. Sybille Reichert, team coordinator, Director of Reichert Consulting for European Higher Education, Zurich, Switzerland

The Team would like to thank the university for its warm welcome, its great hospitality and, most of all, its openness and readiness to engage in a genuine dialogue which made the evaluation a very stimulating experience for the evaluators and hopefully also useful for the university, as part of the institutional culture of continuous self-improvement which is the true watermark of a top quality university.

2. KEY FINDINGS

2.1 The National and International Context

Since its beginnings in the early 1980s, Bilkent University has defined its core mission and portfolio in relation to its national and international context, wanting to help instil the highest international standards in Turkish higher education and offer teaching and research areas which were not yet offered in the country. Bilkent has thus made a pioneering contribution to Turkish Higher Education, and many of the internationally oriented practices which are now established in Turkey go back to this pioneering role. Today, Bilkent's investment and portfolio choices still reflect the concern to lead the way and tread along untrodden paths, although this role is becoming increasingly challenging with many state universities themselves having become more innovative and international. In the future, Bilkent will thus have to be even more on its toes and all the more astute in its identification of strategic opportunities and innovative potential.

Turkish higher education has witnessed a very dynamic development in the last decades, including increasing involvement in European HE and greater attention to and investment in research. The increased national and international research funds and wider gamut of funding instruments are providing a range of new opportunities for Bilkent of which it makes very active use, e.g. acquiring major research infrastructures and postdoctoral positions.

A more problematic feature of the national context concerns the comparatively strong constraints imposed by the national HE Council (YÖK) which even includes staff promotion and programme definition (e.g. the Turkish culture requirement for undergraduate studies), although these constraints are clearly less intrusive for private universities than for public ones. Nevertheless, these are often of real concern to those institutions, like Bilkent, that want to be internationally competitive.

Another major development involves the increase in student numbers, with rising participation rates. However, attracting the best students has not become easier for Bilkent since many qualified students, following a cultural bias or recent trend, choose to study medicine, which Bilkent does not offer. In contrast, humanities are not as popular and often have more trouble attracting the better students. Since the national exam system ranks candidates according to their results, with the best performers getting to choose their preferred universities while the lower performers go where places are available, the most popular subjects (which include engineering) attract the best students. This can present a problem in some subjects, e.g. in the Humanities where professors noted that student interest and motivation was not always up to standard. In general however, Bilkent is able to attract extremely able and motivated students and the university also invests a lot of time and organisational effort in marketing its strengths to prospective students and parents, showing acute awareness of the importance of qualifications for the overall high standards of its education.

2.2 Mission and Vision

Bilkent is a university with a clear mission, namely to contribute to Turkey's knowledge and innovation society and potential by applying, developing and spreading the highest international standards and state of the art in research and teaching. In many respects Bilkent occupies an important and very visible role as a change agent in the country. With respect to the students it teaches, Bilkent evidently goes beyond a utilitarian view of career-oriented education or training, pursuing a broader sense of education which aims to develop critical, independent-minded and responsible individuals and future leaders. These aims may sound overly ambitious but the Team has seen a wide range of evidence that Bilkent is living up to these ambitions. While a private university, it is clearly still driven by a spirit of public interest and active citizenship.

This mission also seems to affect the institutional culture, as the Team found when talking to students and staff, many of whom appear highly driven and enthusiastic about their work and projects. The institution seems to be acutely aware that hiring is its most important quality assurance instrument and takes great care in attracting internationally oriented staff (many from abroad) with excellent qualifications and remarkable levels of engagement. In its responsiveness to personal initiative and its reward structure, the institution appears to be highly supportive of individual creativity.

2.3 Strategic Development

In contrast to the active sense of mission and spirit of individual initiative, the official strategic development process lacks energy and seems far from mobilising the innovative potential which the Bilkent community otherwise displays. While many individuals report that they find initiatives of strategic importance may be brought forward non-bureaucratically and, if well supported and argued for, are listened and responded to by the institutional leadership, the fate of this process depends wholly on the judgement of two or few individuals, primarily the rector and the provost - sometimes even the president is approached - and to a lesser degree the deans, without any process supporting the bottom-up flow and deliberation of ideas. Officially, there is a five-year cycle for strategic planning which appears to be closely connected to the evaluation process. Nevertheless, it remains unclear where any deliberation of larger strategic perspectives takes place. Only for new programmes is there a group that has a strategic task, namely the curriculum committee of the Provost's office which reviews proposals in detail. Likewise larger initiatives that involve new hiring decisions are discussed and negotiated at the Provost's office. Apart from the Provost's office, there is only one non-official forum, a sub-group of the senate comprising the deans and directors, where strategies are discussed informally and on a rather ad hoc basis. The senate decides major academic issues but is not used as a deliberation forum for strategic development. In the faculties, academic staff are not aware of any communication groups or lines apart from the one to the Provost, rector

or president, which provide opportunities to discuss larger strategic directions. In two faculties, academic staff reported they were not even informed of the strategic decisions made at the level of the institution. There also seems to be a lack of feed-back to academic bodies on achievements of strategic management. All in all, the connection between the top level strategic planning and the decentral generation of ideas for future direction remains too strongly concentrated on few individuals and seems somewhat ad hoc. Of course, the purely individualistic approach and enabling culture does often lead to excellent results, of which the team has witnessed many. However, the reliance on a handful of top institutional leaders for the development of future directions puts a brake on the innovative potential of the institution since visions for the future may emerge anywhere and more widespread systematic expert discussions may produce exciting new directions for departments.

The top-down nature of strategic deliberation and decision-making may also alienate those young academics who have been hired for their potential and international research performance but who do not yet have the influence or connections to the higher echelons of the academic hierarchy to make their ideas heard.

2.4 Governance

The governance of Bilkent is clearly centred on its institutional leadership. This is not only due to the fact that it is based on a foundation whose president must be also the president of the university and whose board of trustees constitutes the highest body of the institution, but even more decisively on the visionary qualities of the founder, Prof. Ihsan Dogramacı, and of his son. The attention to international orientation and visionary leadership is also displayed in the appointments of the rector, provost, vice-rectors and the deans, all of whom were selected with great care and then given a large degree of power to develop their domain.

It should be added that the competencies of managerial and decision-making bodies at institutional, faculty and departmental level are all clearly defined, but clearly concentrated at the centre where large competencies are given to president, rector and provost, and to a lesser degree the deans, while only very limited competencies can be exercised at the lower level, e.g. by heads of departments.

While the responsibilities are transparently described, the information flow among the levels is insufficient, so that decisions often remain opaque to the wider community. At several faculties there seems to be a lack of active communication initiatives within the faculty, not only with respect to passing on information about central decisions but also with respect to developing perspectives across the departmental boundaries.

In comparison to many European universities, participation of students in governing and decision-making bodies is comparatively weak, although their representatives are consulted regularly on an informal basis by the rector. In contrast, students are very actively engaged in organising extra-curricular activities.

With respect to governance, it should be noted that there is a strong perception of unequal treatment among the faculties. While the Faculties of Engineering, Science, Business Administration and the Graduate School and Faculty of Education find that they work and develop future perspectives in a generally supportive environment, this experience is not shared by the Faculty of Humanities and Letters, the Faculty of Fine Arts or the School of Applied Technology. Here many academics and even some department heads find that their concerns are not listened to receptively or that these units are not receiving the same attention, good will and priority in strategic investments. Many department heads and staff feel that these areas are strongly disadvantaged both culturally and in terms of resources and that there is inadequate or no development or negotiation of strategic perspectives about the future of these units between the central leadership and the faculties. Some strategic decisions are even just passed down to them without prior consultation. Whatever the reasons for these decisions, the Team urges the central leadership to establish a more in-depth strategic deliberation process with these faculties so as to provide the same sense of a supportive and improvement-oriented environment as is felt to be the case in other parts of the institution.

2.5 Financial Management

Even in times of global and national financial crisis, Bilkent still benefits from excellent financial standing, given the level and diversification of income from the foundation and other sources. In particular, there seems to be a high level of research funding, both for projects as well as for infrastructure, both through the investment of the university itself as through the increasing range and scope of national funding sources.

There is also a high level of scholarship support, which is especially important to keep up high quality standards at a private university with tuition. The Team noted, however, that the levels of scholarships are not uniformly set across the institution, but vary according to faculty budgets or choices, which means that some scholarship students receive full support while students from other faculties but with same level of qualifications receive only partial scholarships and have work part-time to maintain themselves.

The budget definition is centralised with the operational budget management (not including the salaries) is partly decentralised. While the process is clear, the criteria for budget allocation lack transparency, especially with respect to the distribution of resources among units, both at faculty as at departmental level. While interviews revealed that resource and investment decisions were strongly guided by quality and strategic concerns, it seems that there is a lack of feedback on criteria for decisions on resource allocation, especially with respect to proposals for investment.

2.6 Human Resources Management

Bilkent's quality culture resides especially in its excellent recruitment policies and practices, which follow highest international standards, as reflected in a very international faculty recruited from excellent universities. The recruitment efforts include active international head hunting, competitive offers and international scholars support services, including relocation service, on-campus housing and availability of international schools (IB World schools). All these measures allow Bilkent to attract scientists from abroad, even if they have no familiarity or connection with Turkey.

Clearly, the institutional leadership shows great strategic awareness in its approach to hiring, while there is no visible connection between the hiring policy and the official strategic planning. In this context it should be observed that, as the senior academic managers play a key role in human resource policies and decisions as well as other aspects of institutional development, the ageing of the first generation of senior academic managers could pose a risk to Bilkent unless it proactively develops the next generation in their leadership skills.

Bilkent's academic promotion policy is rigorous and largely based on research performance and quality. Academics who do not perform highly in research, as evidenced in the annual faculty evaluations, are given some chances to improve. If no improvement in research output and quality is noted, but they show satisfactory teaching performance they may change their task description and become lecturers instead. This status implies a greater teaching load with accordingly less expectation to excel in research. If they are not good teachers either, their contracts are not renewed, but they have more than half a year to look for alternative employment. This rigorous and differentiated evaluation process is the key to Bilkent's success as one of the top national universities and as one that is also internationally recognised.

The process of academic promotion, which is accompanied by promotion committees under the provost's office, comprises an external (international) review followed by an internal committee deliberation. Whereas the rigorous orientation towards quality and international research standards is clearly good practice, the interviews revealed that neither process nor criteria of promotion are entirely clear to the community concerned. Moreover, the time span between appointment to assistant professors and promotion to associate professor is often very long in international comparison, which threatens Bilkent's attractiveness to internationally oriented staff. Also, the practice of semi-open voting in order to preserve anonymity, introduces a random element that may undermine the credibility of the decision. The Team recommends reviewing the promotion process and reducing the time span between initial appointment and promotion.

In general, the human resource management is highly centralised, implying relatively little flexibility for the faculties to develop their own priorities. Recently, some faculties have suffered from the freezing of academic staff appointments, leading to severe staff shortages and even programmes not being supported after the departure or retirement of academics. In addition, the freezing of administrative staff recruitment in recent years has created staff shortages in some areas, making adaptation to new demands and competence requirements very difficult. At the same time, however, the policy for administrative staff career development is widely appreciated.

2.7 Teaching and Learning

Bilkent can be congratulated on its holistic approach to education which takes the students' personal development as individuals seriously, with attention to competence development beyond the mere transmission of knowledge and with the clear ambition to educate experts and future leaders who are able to put their specialised expertise into broader contexts. Accordingly, students are widely enthusiastic about their student experience, the quality of their teaching, the excellent facilities, student support services, including career preparation and orientation. The Team was very impressed by the quality of the students they met, their open attitudes, international interest and skills, their excellent English, acuteness and self-confident articulate self-presentation. Moreover, the students are not only talented and qualified but also extremely satisfied with their Bilkent experience and thus identify strongly with the institution.

With respect to teaching approaches, the Team has noted that the move to student-centred learning is well on track and is widely appreciated by all students and supported by most teachers. Likewise the application of Moodle as a support instrument for student-teacher or student-student communication practice is widely appreciated by students and staff and has spread with considerable speed. All this is facilitated by a very favourable staff-student ratio, which is one of the major assets and selling points of a Bilkent education.

There are still some inconsistencies, however, which deserve institutional attention. First, given the overall aim to educate individuals who take initiatives, appreciate broader horizons than those of their domain of studies, and show great responsibility with respect to the wider community, the high workload for students should be reviewed as it undermines the realisation of this educational goal, making extracurricular engagement difficult and reducing the motivation to explore and excel in subjects that are not at the heart of the specialisation. Secondly, there are still quite a few programmes in which students have clearly too many contact hours. Thirdly, the use of two credit systems, the Bilkent one which corresponds more to US credit systems and is taken as the basic credit system as well as the European credit system ECTS, is somewhat inconsistent since the latter is based on work load while the former is contact-hour based. Considering the move to student-centred education at Bilkent and the increasing importance of European exchange for the university, the Team would recommend taking ECTS as the basic system.

One last point that deserves attention is the fact that not all students have equal access to learning resources: the SATM students are at a disadvantage here, given their separate geographic location. Also, the fact that stipends differ in level from faculty to faculty implies, even though qualification levels may be the same, an unequal treatment of students that should not be allowed.

2.8 Research

As mentioned before, Bilkent is a highly research-oriented institution and derives its national and international acclaim from this orientation. It is highly successful in attracting external research funding and personnel and can boast an excellent research infrastructure. Thus it is now in an excellent position to attract substantial external research funds, the availability of which has increased significantly in recent years.

With respect to its attention to research performance and quality it should be noted, however, that the research performance criteria used in annual evaluations apply better to some disciplines than to others (article publication). While the leadership seems to pay attention to the quality and impact of the journals in which articles are published and is aware that success is measured differently in different disciplines, there could be more reflection of diverse research performance indicators in different disciplines, such as the value and impact of books in the humanities or other research products e.g. in the fast moving fields of computer science.

Given the research intensity of Bilkent, the graduate student numbers should increase further, as is the institution's explicit goal. The Team believes that the potential to attract well-qualified graduate students from abroad is particularly high at doctoral level, since the quality and international acclaim of the research groups should act as an attractor. The Team also applauds the Bilkent's efforts to lobby for a formal recognition of postdoc positions in the national law.

Bilkent already has many interdisciplinary research groups but should consider encouraging interdisciplinary research more systemically and to remove all managerial and organisational obstacles to interdisciplinary cooperation across faculty lines.

Bilkent should also be applauded for having invested in the internationally acclaimed Research Centres, which provide excellent research conditions and enjoy full managerial and financial autonomy.

2.9 Contribution to Innovation in and Cooperation with Society and Industry

As Bilkent University defines itself as an institution that wants to contribute to innovation in society, it entertains a lively exchange with external partners, including excellent ties with industry, particularly in the engineering and science sectors, and continuous influence on governmental policies. In addition to providing library access to the public, Bilkent also provides a major cultural service to the metropolitan region of Ankara by having established an internationally known symphony orchestra and concert hall, which is also a major asset for the university's acclaimed music academy.

The most impressive example of Bilkent's engagement with its stakeholders and society at large which the Team has witnessed is its major investment in reforming the national school system through its teacher training programmes, its continuing professional development programmes and even the establishment of its own high schools as models of good and innovative practice. The teacher training programmes seem to take great care in exposing their students to the latest

educational research and teaching practices, as well as ample teaching practice with close coaching provided by practitioners and Bilkent university professors. Graduates of these programmes, who have no trouble obtaining the best jobs in their field, are clearly motivated and confident in being able to help innovate high school teaching in Turkey. Even within undergraduate studies, students already have the opportunity to tutor less privileged high school students as part of their extracurricular activities in so-called social responsibility programmes.

The only area in which the university falls surprisingly short of its potential, is the low degree of institutional engagement or strategic attention to continuing education and continuing professional development. While there is excellent good practice in the Graduate School of Education, with its Master programmes for practicing teachers, a much more widespread offer could be imagined, given the portfolio of the institution, its social mission and lively ties with the professional world as well as its experience with innovative teaching practices. In view of the possible demographic decline and the opportunities which continuing professional development would offer with respect to alumni and employer relations, the institutional leadership and faculty deans should develop a more strategic approach to this dimension of institutional engagement and knowledge transfer. Moreover, synergies between existing innovation activities and external relations and an expanded continuing professional development offer would create mutually reinforcing effects and help build strategic alliances with external organisations.

2.10 Internationalisation

As mentioned above, Bilkent University is clearly very international in its orientation, very aware of international good practice and of international standards with respect to research, teaching and services. Most strikingly, it has one of the highest degrees of internationalisation with respect to its faculty of any university in Europe, with about one third of the academic staff coming from abroad. Its international outlook is also conveyed through the remarkable policy of using English as the exclusive language of instruction and to invest major efforts into developing the English language capacity of its students (with the exception of the Turkish literature and culture programmes and language courses).

The international spirit is not reflected as strongly in student exchange, which still presents more of a challenge to the university. Although Bilkent has a high number of international cooperation agreements with good quality institutions in Europe, the US, and Asia, and provides excellent support services both for incoming and outgoing students, the cooperation opportunities are insufficiently exploited, especially with respect to incoming students. While Bilkent is already very actively pursuing exchange with American institutions (whose students are notoriously reluctant to go abroad), it may be better off targeting the European and Asian student population at institutions of comparable quality standards and research orientation. Rather than basing its efforts mostly on cooperation agreements, it may want to invest more effort into developing common programmes, i.e. joint masters or joint doctoral schools with compatible institutions so as to embed student exchange in common curricula or research orientations whereby the flow of incoming students may be mobilised more easily. Also Bilkent may want to develop summer schools so as to increase

international name recognition and attract graduate students to short term visits which may lead to longer student visits afterwards.

2.11 Quality Assurance

Bilkent University displays a well-developed quality culture and is strongly driven by the quest for high international quality standards in its key strategic decisions, as reflected in its approaches to staff recruitment, major investments into research infrastructures and in its policies concerning teaching approaches and student selection. To support this quality orientation Bilkent has developed a comprehensive system of quality assessment, which comprises extensive annual academic staff evaluations and regular teacher and course evaluations, all of which have consequences for staff development, promotion and task descriptions or for course design and improvement of teaching practices. The deans seem to play an important function in this regard, as they review and discuss the collected evaluation data with the staff. The Team observes, however, that with respect to faculty evaluation the quality assessment system appears overly quantitative in its approach and does not provide the kind of qualitative information it takes to develop quality rather than simply assess it. With respect to student evaluations of courses and teaching, the Team was impressed to hear many accounts of significant consequences on teaching improvement, although in many cases these consequences had not been sufficiently communicated to the students so as to assure them that their evaluations are an important contribution to quality improvement.

3. CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Bilkent University is an internationally oriented research-intensive university with a strong societal mission and a keen ambition to contribute to the innovative capacity of Turkey. Even though the institution is little over twenty years old, it has already firmly established its position as a national leader in many domains and as an institution that is acutely aware of international best practice and standards and capable of adopting, developing and spreading these in and beyond the institution. This is made possible by the combination of generous private investment coupled with public interest and social engagement, and two decades of excellent hiring practices. Bilkent does face some major challenges however. These are summarised in the following key recommendations:

1. After two decades of pioneer activities, the Turkish higher education landscape has become more international and the pioneering role has accordingly become much more difficult to sustain but should be continued with all force and vision, for which visions are needed from all parts of the institution.
2. Bilkent faces the challenge of having been strongly driven by its visionary founder and his son, as well as an excellent first generation of academic leaders who have been selected with great care. The transition to the next generation of academic leadership will have to be prepared with equal care so as to allow such visionary leadership to continue.
3. In its strategic decision-making and management, Bilkent's approach is highly centralised and rather top-down. The flow of innovative ideas from below works well in many cases but not across the whole institution. Bilkent may thus want to consider establishing a more institutionalised flow of ideas to contribute to strategic development so as to allow for a more lively discussion and development of overarching strategic perspectives which is less individualistic and ad hoc, without undermining the spirit of individual initiative which it has nurtured so well.
4. Bilkent is very aware of the importance of excellent recruitment and rigorous criteria for promotion and has done a remarkable job of recruiting internationally successful academics from all over the world. Also, its differentiated approach to staff profiles contributes greatly to the quality of its staff. However, it should reduce the time to promotion in order to sustain the international attractiveness of its assistant professorships and it should ensure that the criteria are transparent, differentiated enough according to disciplinary norms, and clearly communicated right across the institution.
5. The university can be congratulated on the quality of its students and the quality of the teaching and student experience it provides. Improvement could be made with respect to the overly high work-load which undermines the possibility of broader engagement in courses outside the dominant subject specialisation and in extracurricular activities. The university should also ensure that all students are treated equally in respect of the level of stipends (for same levels of merit) and access to infrastructure.

6. Bilkent's quality culture resides especially in its excellent recruitment policies and practices, which follow highest international standards. Its promotion procedures require more transparency in their decision-making.
7. While Bilkent's attention to research quality and international research standards is exemplary, it could adapt its research performance assessment to reflect the diversity of research success measures in different disciplines more adequately.
8. Given its high level of engagement with external stakeholders and its mission to increase the innovative capacity of society at large, as well as its experience with innovative teaching practices, Bilkent should exploit the strategic opportunities of expanding its continuing education offer more systematically.
9. To increase the number of international students, in line with its high degree of internationalisation in staff and institutional practices, Bilkent may want to invest more effort into developing joint programmes, i.e. joint masters or joint doctoral studies with compatible institutions, so as to embed student exchange in joint curricula or research orientations.
10. While displaying a well-developed quality culture and great quality awareness across all institutional dimensions, Bilkent's quality assessment system appears overly quantitative in its approach and does not provide the kind of qualitative information it takes to develop rather than simply assess quality.