

**European System of Evaluation of Veterinary Training**

**REPORT ON THE STAGE 1 REVISIT TO THE FACULTY OF VETERINARY  
MEDICINE, SELCUK UNIVERSITY, KONYA, TURKEY**

**3-4. March 2011**

**EXPERT GROUP**

**Prof. Dr. Michael Boevé**  
Utrecht, The Netherlands  
(Chairman)

**Dr. John Williams**  
Leeds, United Kingdom

FINAL REVISIT REPORT

## **Background**

A full introduction to the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine of Selçuk University in Konya, Turkey (FVMSK), can be found on pages 6 and 7 of the SER Stage 1 (2009).

Two EAEVE/FVE Expert Teams visited the FVMSK from 16 to 30 October 2009 and carried out a full evaluation of:

- *for Stage 1*, the facilities, educational courses, student aspects and the staff
- *for Stage 2*, the quality assurance procedures in place. As has become the normal situation since January 2009, a student member was present within the Visiting Teams, an ENQA requirement.

The Stage 1 Visitation Team's report was considered by ECOVE at its meeting in February 2010. At that meeting, ECOVE determined that three Category I deficiencies were present:

**1. Insufficient case load in the clinical Department, especially concerning companion animals and “minor species”;**

**2. Inadequate isolation facilities;**

**3. Problems concerning animal welfare.**

This report deals with the Stage 1 revisit (2011). The “Re-visit report (preliminary) to the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine” written by the Faculty is attached separately.

**Findings:**

**Insufficient case load in the clinical Department, especially regarding companion animals and “minor species”**

For the revisit, FVMSK provided updated figures, which show that the patient case-load per student graduating has actually fallen from 46.8 patients per student in 2008 to 16.7 patients per student in 2010. So the Team concluded that the situation had deteriorated rather than improved – largely because the number of students graduating has increased by a factor of more than 2.5, while the case-load over the same period did not change to such a significant degree.

**Table 1.**

	Total number of patients	Number of graduates	Number of patients per student
2008	2857	61	46,8
2009	3176	100	31,8
2010	2661	159	16,7

The Team were also concerned by the quality and availability to students of the clinical case records for patients which they saw. These were little more than a brief description of diagnosis and treatment, and showed no evidence of the direct involvement of students. Their primary purpose appeared to be for accounting purposes, rather than for teaching, recording the progress of clinical cases, or as a basis for subsequent research.

Based on what they saw during this (short) visit, the Team was unsure of the depth of involvement of students in the clinical work of the Faculty. The visitors gained an impression that students were too often spectators of work being carried out by members of the Faculty, rather than carrying out (and recording) clinical work themselves, under the guidance and supervision of clinical teachers

**Suggestions:**

- **Urgent steps should be taken to increase the exposure of undergraduates to clinical cases;**
- **Efforts should be made to persuade the University and funding bodies that student intake should be reduced to a number which can be sustained, given the availability to the Faculty of clinical material from the surrounding area.**

**Inadequate isolation facilities**

The isolation facilities are now adequate. They can be used for companion animals, cattle and horses.

However, the visiting Team was concerned that neither staff nor students demonstrated a full appreciation of the basic principles of biosecurity. An example of this may be illustrated by the fact that the revisiting experts were led through the isolation facility (without protective measures) while these were occupied by a calf suspected of bovine virus diarrhoea (BVD).

**Suggestions:**

- **Teaching on the basic principles of biosecurity should be incorporated at an early stage in the undergraduate course and put into practice throughout the Faculty premises.**

**Problems concerning animal welfare.**

No deficiencies regarding animal welfare were seen by the Team during a visit to the Faculty farm. The animals seemed in good condition and housing, husbandry and feeding were adequate. Since animal welfare problems had also been seen at the slaughterhouse visited on the last occasion, the slaughterhouse Yilet was visited, but only carcasses were present during the visit, as no slaughtering was taking place.

However, the Team encountered some welfare issues (for both animal and man) during this evaluation:

- The above-mentioned calf with diarrhoea, suspected of BVD, did not have drinking water available.
- The condition of a cow being examined by staff and students as part of a research project was very poor. The animal was the property of the Faculty and resident at the Faculty.
- A radiograph of a canine patient showed the (gloveless, unprotected) hands of a person holding the animal.

**Suggestions:**

- **The Faculty should continue to ensure that the teaching of Animal Welfare reflects current European standards and that appropriate steps are taken by staff and students to promote and safeguard the welfare of all animals seen at the Faculty.**
- **A comprehensive health and safety audit of the Faculty should be undertaken and its findings implemented without delay. It may be helpful for this to be carried out by suitably qualified University staff.**

**Additional suggestions**

### **English language proficiency**

- The low level of English language proficiency (as stated by the Faculty in its SER-1, SWOT analysis, page 7) in both students and scientific staff should be regarded as a critical weakness, inhibiting the further development of the Faculty.

### **Contact with other veterinary faculties**

- The Faculty should actively encourage students and staff to visit other veterinary faculties, both in Turkey and elsewhere in Europe, to gain experience of best practice in undergraduate teaching and in research. Similarly, the Faculty should seek ways to encourage graduates of other veterinary faculties to bring the benefit of their experience and expertise to FVMSK

### **Acknowledgements**

The revisit Team was treated with great courtesy and hospitality during its visit and its members were provided freely with all the facilities and information which they requested. They would like to thank the Dean and the Faculty for the welcome and assistance they received and record their particular thanks to Dr Mustafa Arican for acting as Liaison Officer for this short visit.

**Prof. Dr. Michael Boevé**  
Utrecht, The Netherlands  
(Chairman)

**Dr. John Williams**  
Leeds, United Kingdom

**ECOVE decision: NON APPROVED**

### **Confirmed Cat. 1 def:**

- **Insufficient case load in the clinical department, especially concerning companion animals**
- **Problems concerning animal welfare**

FINAL REVISIT REPORT