EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER EVALUATİON OF PROGRAM OBJECTİVES – RESULTS

1 – Strongly Disagree

2 – Disagree

3 – Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 – Agree

5 – Strongly Agree

A total of 29 participants employed at various hospitals and universities completed the External Stakeholder Evaluation Form on Program Objectives prepared by the Department of Nursing, Faculty of Health Sciences, KTO Karatay University.

1. When the distribution of participants according to their affiliated institutions was examined (n=29), Meram State Hospital and Necmettin Erbakan University (including Meram Faculty of Medicine and its hospital) had the highest representation, each accounting for 10.3% (n=3) of the participants. This was followed by Pamukkale University, Konya City Hospital, and Konya Numune Hospital, each representing 6.9% (n=2) of the participants. The remaining institutions—Şehit Prof. Dr. İlhan Varank Training and Research Hospital, Ankara University Cebeci Faculty of Medicine, Dr. Serhat Yarar Clinic, Başkent Hospital, Dr. Ali Kemal Belviranlı Hospital, İstanbul Okan University, Başakşehir Çam and Sakura City Hospital, Manisa Mental Health and Diseases Hospital, Selçuk University Kulu Faculty of Health Sciences, Hacettepe University Hospital, Burdur Bucak State Hospital, Ankara Etlik City Hospital, Koç University, and Karatay Selim Sultan No. 15 Family Health Center—were each represented by 3.4% (n=1) of the participants.

2. When the distribution of participants according to their roles within their institutions was examined (n = 29), the majority were found to be employed in nursing positions. Specifically, 72.4% (n=21) of the participants were working in nursing-based roles. Within this group, 48.3% (n=14) held the title of staff nurse. The remaining participants consisted of 6.9% (n=2) operating room nurses; 3.4% (n=1) nurse educators; 3.4% (n=1) charge nurses; 3.4% (n=1) specialist nurses; 3.4% (n=1) family health center nurses; and 3.4% (n = 1) nurses working in a lactation unit. Participants serving in academic positions accounted for 17.2% (n = 5) of the sample. Of these, 6.9% (n=2) were Assistant Professors (Dr. Faculty Members), 6.9% (n=2) were Faculty Members, and 3.4% (n=1) were Lecturers.

Additionally, 6.9% (n = 2) of the participants were health officers, and 3.4% (n = 1) were employed in a managerial position.

3. When the evaluations regarding the statement “Graduates provide holistic care in their institutions in accordance with national and international standards” were examined (n = 29), the majority of participants expressed positive views. Accordingly, 44.8% (n = 13) selected “Strongly Agree,” and 27.6% (n = 8) selected “Agree.” The proportion of participants who indicated a neutral position (“Neither Agree nor Disagree”) was 10.3% (n = 3), while 10.3% (n = 3) selected “Disagree,” and 6.9% (n = 2) selected “Strongly Disagree.” These findings indicate that perceptions regarding graduates’ competence in providing holistic care are generally at a high level.

4. “Graduates play an active role in the improvement of patient care in their institutions”. When the evaluations regarding the statement “Graduates play an active role in the improvement of patient care in their institutions” were examined (n = 29), the majority of participants expressed positive views. Specifically, 55.2% (n=16) selected “Strongly Agree,” and 34.5% (n=10) selected “Agree.” While 3.4% (n=1) indicated a neutral position (“Neither Agree nor Disagree”), 6.9% (n=2) selected “Disagree.” No participants selected “Strongly Disagree” (0%). These findings indicate that perceptions regarding graduates’ active involvement in improving patient care are at a very high level.

5. “Graduates engage in academic activities.” When the evaluations regarding the statement “Graduates engage in academic activities” were examined (n=29), participant responses were concentrated at a moderate to high level. Specifically, 37.9% (n=11) selected “Strongly Agree,” and 17.2% (n=5) selected “Agree.” In contrast, 34.5% (n=10) indicated a neutral position (“Neither Agree nor Disagree”). The proportion of negative responses was relatively low; 6.9% (n=2) selected “Disagree,” and 3.4% (n=1) selected “Strongly Disagree.” These findings indicate that perceptions regarding graduates’ engagement in academic activities are generally positive, although a notable level of neutrality is also present.

6. When participant views were analyzed thematically, the suggestions were found to cluster under several main themes. A total of 23.5% (n=4) of the participants emphasized the need to increase the number of faculty members, ensure the presence of subject-matter experts in all areas, and improve the faculty-to-student ratio. Similarly, 23.5% (n=4) proposed strengthening alignment between education and clinical practice, extending internship duration, increasing practical training opportunities, and enhancing collaboration between academia and the field.

With regard to academic development, 17.6% (n=3) indicated that graduates should be encouraged to engage in academic work and that adequate competence and time should be allocated for such activities. Suggestions related to clarifying roles and responsibilities, strengthening professional accountability, improving communication skills, and reinforcing professional values were expressed by 23.5% (n=4) of the participants. Additionally, 11.8% (n=2) stated that specific aspects of the curriculum—such as continuity of care and discharge education—should be further developed.