

### **Survey response for Turkey**

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Turkey to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, <a href="https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en">https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en</a>. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at <a href="https://stip.oecd.org/resgov">https://stip.oecd.org/resgov</a>.

Contact:

Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: <u>Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org</u>; Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: <u>Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org</u>.

# Abbreviations and acronyms

BTP-UP	Bilim ve Teknoloji Politikaları Uygulama Planı
	Science and Technology Policy Implementation Plan
EU	European Union
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
MoD	Kalkınma Bakanlığı
	Ministry of Development
MoSIT	Bilim, Sanayi ve Teknoloji Bakanlığı
	Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
R&D	Research and Development
RIS-3	Research Innovation Strategies for Smart Specialisation
SCST	Supreme Council for Science and Technology
STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
TÜBİTAK	Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu
	Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey
UBTYS	Ulusal Bilim, Teknoloji ve Yenilik Stratejisi
	National Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy
ULAKBİM	Ulusal Akademik Ağ ve Bilgi Merkezi
	Turkish Academic Network and Information Centre
YÖK	Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı
	Council of Higher Education
	Turkish Academic Network and Information Centre Yükseköğretim Kurulu Başkanlığı

## Survey of public research policy

#### Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

#### Question Response Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the scientific, sectoral a and b) The Supreme Council for Science and Technology and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for a) (SCST) decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic HEIs and b) PRIs? priorities of budgets for HEIs and PRIs. SCST formulates guidelines for STI policy, defines priority areas for public investment in research and innovation, and designs c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on programmes accordingly. It assigns tasks to agencies and scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national other public bodies according to these priorities; it also importance, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please determines in which research fields and in what proportions describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities R&D investments are made. (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, c) Missing answer. etc.). (This question does not refer to who sets overall science, d) No major reforms made. technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.) d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)? References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B4.

TÜBITAK (n.d.), SCST, www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-scst (accessed on 3 March 2017).

## **Q.1.2.** Who allocates **institutional block funding** to a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)

c) Who allocates **project-based funding** of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs?

(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)

- d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?
- e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?
- f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?

a and b) The Ministry of Development (MoD) allocates institutional funding to HEIs and PRIs. Additionally, the Ministry of Finance provides institutional funding to public HEIs under the Scientific Research Program (BAP).

c) The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK) is the leading agency for project-based funding of HEIs and PRIs.

TÜBITAK was established in 1963 and is an autonomous institution governed by a Scientific Board whose members are selected from universities, industry and research institutions. TÜBITAK also conducts research and operates the main network of PRIs in Turkey.

- d) Turkey is associated with the European Commission (EC) Framework Programme since 2003 and the Horizon 2020 programme since 2014. Turkish HEIs and PRIs can apply for European funding for research and innovation.
- e) Missing answer.
- f) No major reforms made.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B4.

EC (2014), Turkey joins Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, <a href="http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\_IP-14-631">http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\_IP-14-631</a> en.htm (accessed on 5 March 2017).

Estermann, T., T. Nokkala, and M. Steinel (2011), University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, European University Association, p.30.

TÜBITAK (2013), Science, Technology, and Innovation in Turkey in 2012,

www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/sites/default/files/sti in turkey 2012.pdf (accessed on 5 March 2017).

TÜBITAK (n.d.), "Who we are", www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-who-we-are (accessed on 6 March 2017).

## **Q.1.3.** Do **performance contracts** determine funding of a) HEIs?

Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)

- b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?
- c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?
- d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?
- e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?
- f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?
- g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?
- h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?

(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)

References

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey, Response C5.

TÜBITAK (2013), Science, Technology, and Innovation in Turkey in 2012,

www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/sites/default/files/sti in turkey 2012.pdf (accessed on 5 March 2017).

a to f) Institutional funding to HEIs is not determined by performance contracts.

g) Performance-based elements for funding of research at HEIs and PRIs were introduced in 2014 which affect for project-based funding; the part of project-based funding of TÜBITAK that is used to cover overhead costs of institutions (personnel, infrastructure, etc.) depends on universities' performance. Performance will be assessed annually based on performance criteria. A higher level of performance will lead to a higher project overhead for universities, resulting in increased R&D budgets for those good performers. Under this scheme, deducible overheads can be increased from 10% to up to 50% of the project budget whereas the previous practice was to have a fixed overhead rate of 10% (since 2004).

Additionally, a performance-based funding system which provides state funds to university-affiliated research centres was established in 2014.

h) There were no major reforms except performance-based funding made.

**Q.1.4.** Who decides on the following key **evaluation** criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

a to f) The newly created Higher Education Quality Council sets criteria for evaluating performance of HEIs. It is also responsible for evaluating and monitoring HEIs' performance.

h) The Higher Education Quality Council was established by the Directive on Quality Assurance in Higher Education in 2015. It follows the pilot evaluation project "Institutional Performance Evaluation System" which has been implemented in a small sample of universities by the Higher Education Council.

An evaluation methodology for university-affiliated research centres, the "Efficiency Evaluation of the University Affiliated Research Centers", was developed jointly by the MoD and TÜBITAK in 2014 to promote the efficient use of public research infrastructures. This change was introduced along with an increase in autonomy of the research centres affiliated with universities.

In 2012, TÜBITAK introduced the "Entrepreneurial and Innovative University Index" to monitor entrepreneurial performance of universities. The index ranks universities based on five dimensions including scientific and technological research competence, intellectual property pool, cooperation and interaction, entrepreneurship and innovation culture, as well as economic contribution and commercialisation. These five areas are measured by 23 indicators. It is scheduled to be published annually and aims to foster entrepreneurship and innovation activities in universities. However, index performance does not determine university funding.

In 2014, the Department of Impact Assessment was created at the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT). The department will be in charge of monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment of all public STI policies, covering programmes of the Ministry and TÜBİTAK.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey, Responses B12d, H4, C5.

**Q.1.5.** Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

The Higher Education Quality Council was established in 2015 in order to set up a system of independent evaluation of HEIs.

The scheme for "Efficiency Evaluation of the University Affiliated Research Centers" introduced performance-based funding and increased autonomy for university-affiliated research centres.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Hungary. Response B4.

#### **Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms**

#### Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

#### Question Response

#### Q.2.1. a) Is there a Research and Innovation Council. i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?

- provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports);
- and/or oversee policy evaluation;
- and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies);
- and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines);
- and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint crossministry preparation of budgetary allocations)?
- b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?
- c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B4.

TÜBITAK (n.d.), SCST, www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-scst (accessed on 3 March 2017).

Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's mandate explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?

a to e) The Council's mandate includes policy coordination. preparation of strategic priority setting, and decision-making for budgetary allocations. SCST is responsible for coordination within government regarding STI policy and the development and implementation of programmes supporting STI; it includes non-state stakeholders from industry and academia in the policy-making process. It also assigns tasks to public bodies such as agencies according to its plans and programmes. It further assists the government in setting long-term STI policies, identifying R&D targets for science and technology, identifying priority areas in R&D, and preparing bills and legislations for related STI plans and programs with the aim to increase the effectiveness of the S&T system in Turkey. The Council decides about the allocation of R&D funds to research fields.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Hungary. Response B4.

TÜBITAK (n.d.), SCST, www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-scst (accessed on 3 March 2017).

a and b) The Supreme Council for Science and Technology (SCST) is the main research and innovation council in Turkey with decision-making power for national STI policy. The SCST was created in 1983; it held its first meeting in 1989. Since 2005, it meets twice a year.

c) Inter-Governmental Coordination Council for R&D (established 2012)

Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, who formally participates in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts

a to j) The SCST has 21 permanent members. It is chaired by the Prime Minister. Other permanent council members include: Ministers of State, National Defence, Finance, National Education, Health, Forestry and Rural Affairs, Industry and Trade, Energy and Natural ReReferences, as well as Environment and Forest; the Chairman of the Council of Higher Education; the Undersecretary of the State Planning Organisation; the Undersecretaries of Treasury and Foreign Trade; the Chairman of the Turkish Atomic Energy Authority; the President and Vice President of TÜBİTAK; the General Director of Turkish Radio and Television; the Chairman of the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey; a representative of the Council of Higher Education and one representatives from HEIs.

Other relevant stakeholders are invited to the meetings. In total, over one hundred different actors from the governmental bodies, higher education and business sectors are represented in SCST meetings.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B4. TÜBITAK (n.d.), SCST, <a href="www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-scst">www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-scst</a> (accessed on 3 March 2017).

**Q.2.4.** With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) **staff** and/or its own b) **budget**? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.

a and b) SCST does not have its own secretariat or budget. TÜBİTAK works as the secretariat of SCST; TÜBİTAK evaluates and monitors policy implementation.

c) From 2005-16, were any **reforms** made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?

c) No major reforms made.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B4.

#### Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question Response

Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or

b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or

References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B1.

Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?

- a) Specific themes and/or societal challenges (e.g. Industry 4.0; "green innovation"; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?
  - Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations,
  - Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0)
  - Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change)
  - Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science)
  - Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility)
  - Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development)
- b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?
  - Agriculture and agricultural technologies
  - Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies)
  - Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies)
  - ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy)
  - Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems)
- c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)
- d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)
- e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)
- f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?

a and b) The National Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy (UBTYS) 2011-16 is the main national STI strategy in Turkey. The STI strategy for 2017-2023 is currently in development.

a and b) The UBTYS 2011-16 identifies nine priority sectors: Automotive, machinery and manufacturing technologies, energy, information and communications technology (ICT), water, food, defence, space and health.

Following the addition of "health" as a priority sector in 2013, technology roadmaps have been drafter for pharmaceuticals, vaccines, biomaterials, biomedical engineering, as well as equipment and diagnostics.

- c) The main national STI strategy does not address specific regions. Turkey has three regional Strategies for Smart Specialisation (RIS-3), one for East Marmara; one for Konya, Karaman and Manisa; and one for Afyonkarahisar, Kütahya, and Usak. They were introduced in 2014.
- d) The UBTYS does not address transnational objectives.
- e) It sets quantitative targets for 2023, including the raise of gross expenditures on R&D as a percentage of GDP to 3%, the increase of business expenditure on R&D as a percentage of GDP to 2%, and a rise in the number of researchers to a total of 300 000, and 180 000 in the private sector.
- f) Additional sectoral STI strategies are in place: the National Energy R&D and Innovation Strategy, the National Water R&D and Innovation Strategy, and the National Food R&D and Innovation Strategy.

Between 2005 and 2016 a number of STI strategies were introduced: The Science and Technology Policy Implementation Plan (BTP-UP 2005-2010) (2005), UBTYS 2011-2016 (2011, with addition of a health sector strategy in 2013), the National Energy R&D and Innovation Strategy (2011), the National Water R&D and Innovation Strategy (2011), the National Food R&D and Innovation Strategy (2011), the RIS-3 of the East Marmara (2014), RIS-3 of Konya-Karaman (2014), and RIS-3 of Afyonkarahisar, Kütahya, Usak, (2014)

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response A2, B1.

TÜBITAK (2013), National Science, Technology and Innovation Strategy 2011-2016, www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/aboutus/policies/content-national-sti-strategy-2011-2016 (accessed on 2 March 2017).

European Commission (2017), "Registered countries and regions in the S3 Platform", http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/s3platform-registered-regions (accessed on 2 March 2017).

Q.2.7. What reforms to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?

No major reforms made.

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question

Response

**Q.2.8.** Does inter-agency joint programming contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy?

Interagency join-programming is not in place in Turkey.

(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)

References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B6.

**Q.2.9.** a) Is co-ordination within the **mandate of agencies**?

b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?

a and b) The Inter-Governmental Coordination Council for R&D was created in 2012; it coordinates between different public institutions in order to overcome fragmentation of STI policy governance in particular with regard to programme design and implementation. It is chaired by the president of TÜBİTAK, with the participation of high level representatives of relevant Ministries (Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology, Development, and Economy) and agencies such as e.g. the Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises Development Organisation.

The Inter-Governmental Coordination Council has met 20 times since its establishment in 2012. The Council works currently on the evaluation of R&D support schemes and ways to strengthen coordination between the funding agencies. To this aim, sub-working groups have been established with the participation of all agencies and ministries with view to establish evaluation criteria, and harmonise review and evaluation processes.

The Supreme Council for Science and Technology (SCST) is another body that plays a co-ordination role in programming and implementation of STI support policies between different ministries and agencies (see response to question 2.2.)

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B7.

**Q.2.10.** What **reforms** of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?

The Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology (MoSIT) has been established in 2011 as part of a restructuring of the former Ministry of Industry and Trade. TÜBITAK which used to be affiliated to the Prime Minister's Office has become an affiliated institution to the MoSIT.

In 2014, the Department of Impact Assessment was created at the MoSIT. The department will be in charge of monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment of all public STI policies, covering programmes of ministries and TÜBİTAK.

The Inter-Governmental Coordination Council for R&D was created in 2012 with view to supporting policy co-ordination within the government.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Responses and B4 and B7.

#### **Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy**

#### Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

#### Question Response

Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in Research and Innovation Councils? (i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)

- Private Sector
- Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations)
- HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations
- b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in **council/governing boards of HEIs?**

(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)

- Private Sector
- Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations)

- a) The SCST includes the chairman of the Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey as a representative of the private sector, the chairman of the Council of Higher Education and a representative of HEIs.
- b) In Turkey, the University Senate is the governing body of HEIs. There are no national provisions for external representation in University Senates. In general, University Senates are composed of the rector, vice-rectors, deans, directors of the graduate schools and the post-secondary vocational schools, as well as a teaching staff member from each faculty elected for a three-year term.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Response B4.

TÜBITAK (n.d.), SCST, www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/en/about-us/content-scst (accessed on 3 March 2017).

YÖK (2014), Higher Education System in Turkey, p.13,

 $\underline{www.yok.gov.tr/documents/10348274/10733291/TR'de+Y\%C3\%BCksek\%C3\%B6\%C4\%9Fretim+Sistemi2.pdf} \ (accessed \ on \ 6 \ March 2017).$ 

- **Q.3.2.** a) Are there **online consultation** platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)?
- c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?
- a) Missing answer.
- c) Committees for coordination of STI programme design were introduced by TÜBITAK in 2010. They aim to facilitate a bottom-up process of identification of sectoral priorities and include the private sector and academia. These committees focus on priority areas and involve permanent members of the SCST and various stakeholders. The committees contribute to identifying challenges and formulating recommendations to harmonise policy approaches. These meetings support the sectoral orientation of the UBTYS 2011-16 and play an important role in strategy development and in elaborating open calls funding programmes, notably the High-Level Prioritization Meetings and Focus Groups.

Following the addition of health as a sectoral priority in the UBTYS 2011-2016, TÜBITAK has conducted a comprehensive study to identify priority technology areas in the field of medical biotechnology. The study involved open ended surveys gathering more than 1 200 ideas from 300 distinguished researchers and experts; the collected ideas were consolidated and a Delphi study was conducted in order to draft technology roadmaps for five areas of medical biotechnology jointly with universities, private sector representatives, and NGOs. Based on the strategic objectives of the roadmaps, TÜBITAK has opened 48 dedicated calls and funded approximately 200 projects.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey. Responses A2 and B4.

**Q.3.3.** Which **reforms** to consultation processes have proven particularly important?

No major reforms made.

#### Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

#### Question

# **Q.3.4.**Who decides about **allocations of institutional block funding** for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.

<u>Institutions themselves</u>: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)

#### Response

- a) Institutional funding for HEIs takes the shape of transfers of line-item budgets rather than a block grant. HEIs receive funding for different activities, i.e. teaching, research, research infrastructure and equipment while they are not free to move funds between those line-items.
- b) PRIs receive institutional funding from the Ministry of Development (MoD) earmarked for infrastructure. Additionally, PRIs receive institutional funding from the Ministry of Finance under the BAP. PRIs decide themselves on how to allocate these funds internally.

#### References:

Data on institutional autonomy is based on a survey conducted by the European University Association between 2010 and 2011 across 26 European countries. The answers were provided by Secretaries General of national rectors' conferences and can be found in the report by the European University Association (Estermann et al., 2015).

Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from <a href="http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University">http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University</a> Autonomy in Europe II - \_The \_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016, p.30.

TÜBITAK (2013), Science, Technology, and Innovation in Turkey in 2012, <a href="https://www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/sites/default/files/sti">www.TÜBITAK.gov.tr/sites/default/files/sti</a> in turkey 2012.pdf (accessed on 5 March 2017).

## **Q.3.5.** Who decides about **recruitment** of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(<u>National/regional level</u>: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.

Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)

## Who decides about **salaries** of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?

(<u>National/regional level</u>: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.

<u>Institutions themselves</u>: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)

## Who decides about **reassignments** and **promotions** of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.

<u>Institutions themselves</u>: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)

- a) The recruitment of academic staff at HEIs is decided at the national level (Council for Higher Education). The Council for Higher Education allocates a specific number of vacancies to universities, which then handle the recruitment process on their own. When a post holder resigns or retires, the post again comes under consideration by the Higher Education Council.
- c) Salaries of academic staff at HEIs are prescribed at the national level.
- e) Promotion of academic staff at HEIs is only possible if a post is available at a higher level.
- b, d and f) Missing answer for PRIs.

#### References:

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Turkey, Response H4.

Estermann, T., T. Nokkala, and M. Steinel (2011), University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, European University Association, pp. 39 - 42.

Q.3.6. Who decides about the creation of academic departments (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. technology transfer offices) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?

(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, otc.

<u>Institutions themselves</u>: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)

Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. spinoffs) and industry partnerships at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? (National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.

<u>Institutions themselves</u>: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)

a to d) The creation of academic departments in HEIs is subject to approval by the Council for Higher Education. HEIs can only create not-for-profit entities. Information for PRIs is missing.

#### References

Estermann, T., T. Nokkala, and M. Steinel (2011), University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard, European University Association, p.24.

- Q.3.7. Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?
  - HEI
  - Research unit / laboratory within HEI
  - Researchers
- c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?
- a) The new Industrial Property Law (Law No. 6769 of 10th January 2017) designates ownership of IP from publicly funded research to universities. Researchers are entitled to receive at least one third of the revenue derived from commercialisation of IP. Previously, researchers were not obliged to disclose inventions to the HEIs.
- b) Missing answer.
- c) Since 2014, university-affiliated research centres are partially independent from their universities of affiliation and have their own management model (see response to question 1.5)

#### References:

DESTEK PATENT (2017), "Welcome New Industrial Property Law", <a href="https://www.destekpatent.com.tr/news-detail/welcome-new-industrial-property-law-9414">www.destekpatent.com.tr/news-detail/welcome-new-industrial-property-law-9414</a> (accessed on 6 March 2017).

Uzunalli, S. (2016), "Patent right on inventions of academics at universities", Journal of Commercial and Intellectual Property Law, No 1, p.179.

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Hungary. Responses C5.

**Q.3.8.** Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?

No major reforms made.