



## **ZIDEK**

*Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs  
Ziraat Fakülteleri Eğitim Programları Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Derneği*

# **PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT**

*Prepared for use with ZIDEK Evaluation Criteria for Undergraduate Programs (Version 2.3)*

2011

**ZIDEK**

**Ziraat Fakülteleri Eğitim Programları Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Derneği**

**Gazi Mahallesi Özata Sokak No:21/5**

**Yenimahalle-ANKARA / TÜRKİYE**

**Phone: +90 (312) 419 04 99 Fax: +90 (312) 419 04 98**

**E-mail: [info@zidek.org.tr](mailto:info@zidek.org.tr)**

**Web page: <http://www.zidek.org.tr/en>**

# ZİDEK

## Program Evaluator Report

### REMARKS

*For each evaluated program, it is mandatory to prepare a Program Evaluator Report (PDR). The program evaluator must fill in an electronic copy of the entire form and send it to the team chair within the week following the institution of the evaluated program visited.*

*For general review visits, all forms present in this report template must be filled out.*

*For interim visits and show cause visits, it is sufficient to complete only the parts relevant to the shortcomings identified in the previous evaluation report.*

*Curriculum Analysis (Form 1) and Transcript Analysis (Form 2) forms as well as the “Previous Evaluation” and “Preliminary Estimation” columns of the Program Evaluator Worksheet (Form 3) must be completed by the program evaluator based on the Self-Assessment Report of the program and, if available, on previous ZİDEK reports on the institution before the institution visit and an electronic copy of each must be sent to the team chair.*

*The program evaluator, after making the necessary changes during the institution visit, must fill in the columns entitled “Day 0,” “Day 1,” and “Exit Statement” on the Program Evaluator Worksheet and submit a copy to the team chair at the end of the team meeting held in the evening of Day 0, at the end of the team meeting held in the evening of Day 1, and at the beginning of the team meeting held after the briefing with the department chair on Day 2, respectively.*

*Each program evaluator report is an essential part of the draft visit report prepared by the team chair and sent to the Accreditation Board for Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs (ZAK).*

- *Form 3, is a confidential document intended for use of the evaluator(s), his/her team members and ZİDEK. It shall not be shared with program officials.*
- *Form 4 and Form 5 are prepared for the institution and copies of these forms are left at the institution after the exit meeting.*
- *Form 6 is intended for reading during the exit meeting and is prepared in a speech format.*
- *Form 5 and Form 6 must be used as the basis of the “program draft report” to be prepared within the +30-60 day period using the format of the ZİDEK Report template (ask your team chair for a copy!) and submitted to the team chair.*
- *Form 7 will be filled in by the Team Chair.*
- *In case of presence of a co-evaluator, the evaluator and the co-evaluator must jointly complete copies of all the forms in the Program Evaluator Report in all stages of the review, and must submit single copy of each version of these forms to the team chair.*

# ZİDEK

## PROGRAM EVALUATOR REPORT

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of the Institution that has the Program being evaluated)

Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of the Program Being Evaluated)

Visit Dates: \_\_\_\_\_

Team Chair: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name and Surname)

Team Co-Chair: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name and Surname)

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name and Surname)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Address)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Work Phone) (Home Phone) (Fax)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Mobile Phone) (e-mail)

Institution of the Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of the Institution)

Co-Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name and Surname)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Address)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Work Phone) (Home Phone) (Fax)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Mobile Phone) (e-mail)

Institution of the Co-Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of the Institution)

Evaluation has been carried out according to the ZİDEK General Criteria and Discipline Specific Criteria Version Below:

\_\_\_\_\_  
ZİDEK Criteria

\_\_\_\_\_  
Discipline-Specific Criteria





# ZİDEK

## FORM 1 CURRICULUM ANALYSIS

Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

*PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM BEFORE THE INSTITUTION VISIT AND SUBMIT A COPY TO THE TEAM CHAIR AT THE FIRST TEAM MEETING. FINALIZE THE FORM DURING THE VISIT BY MAKING ANY NECESSARY CHANGES THAT REFLECT YOUR COMMENTS ON AND ANALYSIS OF THE CURRICULUM.*

| ZİDEK Curricular Categories  | Credits or ECTS Credits |                                  |                             |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|  | Evaluation Criteria     | Self-Assessment Report Table 5.1 | Assessment of the Evaluator |
| Mathematics and Basic Sciences   |                         |                                  |                             |
| Basic Engineering Sciences and Engineering Topics Suitable to the Discipline |                         |                                  |                             |
| General Education  |                         |                                  |                             |

| Please list below the requirements of the applied Discipline-Specific Criteria: | Self-Assessment Report | Assessment of the Evaluator |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------------|
|   |                        |                             |
|   |                        |                             |
|   |                        |                             |
|   |                        |                             |

| Are the curriculum requirements met in each of the following areas?   | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| The curriculum is completed with a comprehensive major design experience.   |     |    |
| The major design experience is based on knowledge and skills acquired in earlier courses.   |     |    |
| The major design experience considers engineering standards and realistic constraints that include the majority of economic, environmental, sustainability, manufacturability, ethical, health and safety, social and political considerations. |     |    |
| Design experience requirements (if any) in the applied "Discipline-Specific Criteria" are satisfied.  |     |    |

*If any of the above categories is marked as "no," please explain this shortcoming on the form entitled "Explanation of Shortcomings and Observations."*

# ZİDEK

## FORM 2 TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS

Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

*PLEASE COMPLETE THIS FORM BEFORE THE INSTITUTION VISIT AND SUBMIT A COPY TO THE TEAM CHAIR AT THE FIRST TEAM MEETING*

| ZİDEK Curricular Categories  | Credit or ECTS Credit <sup>(1)</sup> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
|  | ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria            | Credits earned by sampled students <sup>(2)</sup> |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
|  |                                      | 1   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Mathematics and Basic Sciences   |                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
| Basic Engineering Sciences and Engineering Topics Suitable to the Discipline |                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |
| General Education  |                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |

| Please list below the requirements of the applied Discipline-Specific Criteria: | For each student, in the relevant row indicate whether the requirement has been satisfied (✓) or not (x) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |  |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|--|
|   | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |  |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |  |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |  |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |  |
|   |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |  |

<sup>1</sup> Use only the number of credits or ECTS credits, whichever is being used for calculating the student performance

<sup>2</sup> Credits earned by the sampled students should be based on the student/graduate transcripts requested from the institution. These transcripts should not be curriculum-based documents provided in the Diploma Supplement but Student Transcripts which show the courses that the student enrolled in each semester, their credits and grades in a chronological order.

# ZIDEK

## FORM 3. PROGRAM EVALUATOR WORKSHEET

|                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Institution:</b>       | <b>Program:</b>              |
| <b>Team Chair:</b>        | <b>Visit Date:</b>           |
| <b>Program Evaluator:</b> | <b>Program Co-Evaluator:</b> |

| In each line, please use “D” for Deficiency, “W” for Weakness, “C” for Concern, “O” for Observation; if there are no shortcomings or observation please use (√). | Previous Evaluation  | Pre-Estimate | Day 0 | Day 1 | Exit Statement |
|--|--|--------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| <b>1. STUDENTS</b>   |  |              |       |       |                |
| 1.1 Procedures for student admission, monitoring, and evaluation procedures exist and are applied  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 1.2 Procedures for horizontal and vertical transfers, double major, minor, and course equivalencies exist and are applied  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 1.3 Student exchange procedures exist and are applied  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 1.4 Procedures for advising and monitoring exist and are applied   |  |              |       |       |                |
| 1.5 Procedures for the assessment and evaluation of student performance exist and are applied  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 1.6 Procedures for determining graduation requirements exist and are applied   |  |              |       |       |                |
| <b>2. PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES (PEO)</b>   |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.1 PEO have been defined  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.2(a) PEO are consistent with ZIDEK definition  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.2(b) PEO are consistent with the missions of the institution, faculty, and department  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.2(c) PEO have been determined with the involvement of internal and external constituencies   |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.2(d)   |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.2(e) PEO are frequently updated, based on the needs of internal and external constituencies  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 2.3  | There is an ongoing assessment and evaluation process for periodically determining and documenting achievement of PEO  |              |       |       |                |
|  | This process (if already defined) is being applied and achievement of PEO is demonstrated  |              |       |       |                |
| <b>3. PROGRAM OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT</b>  |  |              |       |       |                |
| 3.1  | Outcomes defined by the program include all ZIDEK outcomes   |              |       |       |                |
|  | Outcomes defined by the program are consistent with the PEO  |              |       |       |                |
| 3.2  | Process to periodically determine and document achievement of program outcomes is established and operating  |              |       |       |                |
| 3.3  | Achievement by the students of the following ZIDEK outcomes and additional outcomes, if any, defined by the program is demonstrated  |              |       |       |                |
|  | i. Adequate knowledge in mathematics, science and engineering subjects pertaining to the relevant discipline (such as Agricultural Engineering); ability to use theoretical and applied knowledge in these areas in complex engineering problems.            |              |       |       |                |
|  | ii. Ability to identify, formulate, and solve complex engineering problems in the relevant discipline; ability to select and apply proper analysis and modeling methods for this purpose.  |              |       |       |                |
|  | iii. Ability to design a complex system, process, device or product under realistic constraints and conditions, in such a way as to meet the desired result; ability to apply modern design methods for this purpose.  |              |       |       |                |
|  | iv. Ability to devise, select, and use modern techniques and tools needed for analyzing and solving complex problems encountered in relevant engineering practice; ability to employ information technologies effectively.                                   |              |       |       |                |
|  | v. Ability to design and conduct experiments, gather data, analyze and interpret results for investigating complex engineering problems or discipline specific research questions  |              |       |       |                |
|  | vi. Ability to work efficiently in intra-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary teams; ability to work individually.  |              |       |       |                |
|  | vii. Ability to write effective reports and comprehend written reports, prepare design and production reports, make effective presentations, give and receive clear, intelligible instructions.  |              |       |       |                |
|  | viii. Recognition of the need for lifelong learning; ability to access information, to follow developments in science and technology, and to continue to educate him/herself   |              |       |       |                |
|  | ix. Consciousness to behave according to ethical principles and professional and ethical responsibility; knowledge on standards used in engineering practice.  |              |       |       |                |
|  | x. Knowledge about business life practices such as project management, risk management, and change management in engineering practice; awareness in entrepreneurship, innovation; knowledge about sustainable development.                                   |              |       |       |                |
|  | xi. Knowledge about the global and social effects of engineering practices on health, environment, and safety, and contemporary issues of the century reflected into the field of engineering; awareness of the legal consequences of engineering solutions. |              |       |       |                |
|  | Additional outcomes defined by the program   |              |       |       |                |

# ZIDEK

## FORM 3. PROGRAM EVALUATOR WORKSHEET

|                           |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| <b>Institution:</b>       | <b>Program:</b>              |
| <b>Team Chair</b>         | <b>Visit Dates:</b>          |
| <b>Program Evaluator:</b> | <b>Program Co-Evaluator:</b> |

| In each line, please use “D” for Deficiency, “W” for Weakness, “C” for Concern, “O” for Observation; if there are no shortcomings or observation please use (√).  | Previous Evaluation | Pre-Estimate | Day 0 | Day 1 | Exit Statement |
|---|---------------------|--------------|-------|-------|----------------|
| <b>4. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT</b>  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 4.1 Evidence that the results obtained from the established assessment and evaluation system are used for continuous improvement is provided.   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 4.2 These improvement efforts are based on solid data gathered systematically in all areas of the program that are open to development, primarily those that are related to Criterion 2 and Criterion 3   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| <b>5. CURRICULUM</b>  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.1 A curriculum that supports its program educational objectives and program outcomes exists and contains components common to all programs, as described below under this criterion, as well as the discipline-specific components given under Criterion 10                         |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.2 Educational methods used in the implementation of the curriculum guarantee that the students acquire the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes.  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.3 An education management system that guarantees the implementation of the curriculum as stipulated and that ensures its continuous improvement is in place.  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.4.(a) The curriculum contains a minimum of one year or 32 credits or 60 ECTS credits of mathematics and basic sciences. (Basic sciences education is relevant to the specific discipline and is supported by experimental studies.)   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.4.(b) The curriculum contains a minimum of one-and-a-half years or 48 credits or 90 ECTS credits of agriculture education   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.4.(c) There is a general education component that is consistent with the program objectives, complementing the technical content of the curriculum  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 5.5 The students are being prepared for engineering practice, through a major design experience, based on the knowledge and skills acquired in earlier course work and incorporating engineering standards and realistic constraints.   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| <b>6. FACULTY MEMBERS</b>   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 6.1.(a) Number of faculty members is adequate to ensure an adequate level of student-faculty interaction, student advising and counseling, service to the university, professional development, and interaction with industrial and professional organizations, as well as employers. |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 6.1.(b) Number of faculty members is sufficient to cover all areas of the program.  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 6.2 Faculty members have adequate qualifications.   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 6.3 Criteria for appointing and promoting faculty members exists and is being used.   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| <b>7. FACILITIES</b>  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 7.1 Facilities used for education (classrooms, laboratories) and associated equipment are adequate  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 7.2 Facilities for students’ participation in extra-curricular activities, for their social and cultural needs, and for encouraging their professional development are adequate.  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 7.3 Modern engineering tools and computer and information technology facilities are adequate  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 7.4 Library services are adequate to accomplish program educational objectives and program outcomes   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 7.5 Safety measures and arrangements for disabled persons exist   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| <b>8. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES</b>   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 8.1 The level of institutional support and leadership, financial resources and their allocation strategy is adequate to assure the quality and continuity of the program  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 8.2 Resources are adequate for attracting and retaining qualified faculty members and for continuing their professional development   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 8.3 Resources are adequate to acquire, maintain, and operate facilities and equipment   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| 8.4 Support personnel and institutional services are being provided; number and quality of technical and administrative staff are adequate  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| <b>9. ORGANIZATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES</b>  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| Decision-making processes at the levels of president’s office, faculty, department and other sub-units are organized to support achievement of the program outcomes the realization of the program educational objectives   |                     |              |       |       |                |
| <b>10. DISCIPLIN-SPECIFIC CRITERIA</b>  |                     |              |       |       |                |
| Discipline-specific criteria are being met  |                     |              |       |       |                |



# ZİDEK

## Explanatory notes on FORM 4 and FORM 5

The Program Evaluation Forms (PEF- Form 4 and 5) provided in the following page summarizes the initial evaluation of the evaluation team visiting the institution, on each of the programs evaluated by ZİDEK.

The PEF has two sections.

In the first section (Form 4), detailed descriptions are provided, following the order of criteria and sub-criteria numbering and giving reference to the relevant sub-criterion number.

In the second section (Form 5), shortcomings and observations related to the ten evaluation criteria, as identified by the evaluation team, are summarized. These shortcomings are rated as Deficiency (D), Weakness (W), and Concern (C) and Observation (O). If more than one shortcoming and/or observation exist for a given criterion then relevant letters are used side by side, with one type being used only once. For example, for a criterion that has one weakness and three observations WO should be used.

# ZİDEK

## FORM 4

### PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

#### EXPLANATION OF SHORTCOMINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

(PROVIDE THE INSTITUTION WITH A COPY OF THIS FORM AT THE EXIT INTERVIEW)

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_ Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Co-Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Team Chair/Team Co-Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

The following explanations are provided in order to give more detailed information about the shortcomings and observations related to the program.<sup>(1)</sup>  
(If there is no shortcoming or observation regarding a criterion, indicate as such.)

#### 1. STUDENTS

#### 2. PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

#### 3. PROGRAM OUTCOMES

#### 4. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

#### 5. CURRICULUM

#### 6. FACULTY MEMBERS

#### 7. FACILITIES

#### 8. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

#### 9. ORGANIZATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

#### 10. DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC CRITERIA

#### Important Notes for the Institution:

1. The use of the text provided in these forms is expected not to be used outside your institution and its use inside the institution is expected to be limited to the department running the program (and the upper management of the university).

<sup>1</sup> In Interim and Show Cause evaluations, if any new shortcomings or observations that were not reported in the previous ZİDEK evaluation report are identified, these should be indicated at the end of this form under the heading "Additional Shortcomings and Observations Not Indicated in the Previous Evaluation".

2. The shortcomings indicated in Form 4 and Form 5 are reviewed by ZAK and the accreditation decision resulting from this evaluation is taken by ZAK. ZAK, if needed, can re-consider the shortcomings indicated in these forms and revise the decisions taken based on them.
3. If the text in this form contains any factual errors, and/or presentation of additional information to be considered during drafting of the evaluation report is being requested, and/or improvements related to indicated shortcoming have been recently made and urgently implemented, then, the faculty dean may respond in electronic format to the team chair within 30 days following the visit (30-day response) to correct these errors, provide additional information or to provide information on the implemented improvements.
4. In the cases when the institution provides a 30-day response;
  - Accreditation decisions will generally be based on state of the evaluated program during the institution visit.
  - Nevertheless, any improvements regarding shortcomings identified during the institutional visit which have been acted upon and implemented within 30 days after the visit may be taken into consideration, provided that they are backed up with evidence in the form of official documentation signed by the management.
  - Primary reason for the 30-day response to be given by the institution is to correct any existing “factual errors” in the information, findings and impressions that have been reported in the exit statement.
  - Nevertheless, the institution may provide in its 30-day response, additional information that they would like the evaluation team to consider when preparing their report.
  - Shortcomings identified during the institutional visit may be considered to be corrected, only if they have been acted upon and started to be implemented within 30 days after the visit and evidence in the form of official documentation signed by the management is provided.
  - For any shortcoming, if certain corrective actions have been initiated but their results have not yet been fully realized or if these are limited only to indications of good will, such corrective actions (e.g. starting of procedures for recruiting a new staff member, adding a new course, planning for additional financial resources or equipment) will be taken into consideration by ZAK during the next planned interim evaluation visit or with report.
  - The following should be taken into consideration when preparing the “30-day response”:
    - A separate 30-day response file should be prepared for each evaluated program.
    - For each response given for the evaluated program, the relevant criterion and the evaluation statement given in this form regarding this criterion should be used as the heading of the response.
    - Reasons for factual error correction requests and/or evidence on implemented improvements should be included in or attached to the 30-day response text or its appendix.
    - 30-day responses should not include unnecessary detail and should be kept as short as possible.
    - Any previously provided information or material should not be repeated in the 30-day response.
    - The 30-day response should include only those evaluation statements given in this form where request for factual error corrections and/or implemented improvements are involved. Hence, it is not expected that each one of the evaluation statements given in this form to be addressed one by one.

# ZİDEK

## FORM 5

### PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM SUMMARY OF SHORTCOMINGS

(PROVIDE THE INSTITUTION WITH A COPY AT THE EXIT INTERVIEW)

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_ Program: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Co-Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_ Team Chair/Team Co-Chair: \_\_\_\_\_

| PROGRAM CRITERIA                                 | Use “D” for Deficiency, “W” for Weakness, “C” for Concern, “O” for Observation in the relevant row <sup>(1),(2)</sup> If there is no shortcoming, enter (√) |                |                     |                             |              |
|--|---|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
|  | Columns to be filled by the evaluator   |                |                     | Columns to be filled by ZAK |              |
|  | Previous Evaluation   | Exit Interview | +30-60 Day response | Consistency Results         | ZAK Decision |
| 1. STUDENTS                                      |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 2. PROGRAM EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES                |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 3. PROGRAM OUTCOMES                              |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 4. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT                        |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 5. CURRICULUM                                    |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 6. FACULTY MEMBERS                               |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 7. FACILITIES                                    |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 8. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 9. ORGANIZATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES    |   |                |                     |                             |              |
| 10. DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC CRITERIA                 |   |                |                     |                             |              |

<sup>1</sup> Definition of Terms:

**Deficiency:** A deficiency shows that the criterion is not satisfied. Thus, the program does not comply with the criterion. The institution should take immediate measures in order to satisfy this criterion.

**Weakness:** A weakness shows that the criterion is partially satisfied, but only with difficulty, and that there is no guarantee that the quality of the program will not deteriorate until the next general review. Thus, the institution should take corrective measures so that the criterion can be satisfied completely.

**Concern:** A concern shows that a criterion is currently satisfied, but there is potential for a negative change in this situation in the near future, and the criterion may not be satisfied then. Thus, it is beneficial for the institution to attempt to guarantee the maintenance of the criterion.

**Observation:** An observation is an impression, comment or proposal that may or may not be related to the criteria used for evaluation and is intended to assist the institution in their ongoing activities to further develop their programs.

<sup>2</sup> In Interim Reviews and Show Cause Reviews, any new shortcomings or observations that have not been included in the previous ZİDEK evaluation report but have been identified in this visit are not shown on this form. Nevertheless, shortcomings that have developed after the previous evaluation and identified during this evaluation should be taken into consideration in this form.



# ZİDEK

## FORM 6

### EXIT STATEMENT FOR THE PROGRAM

(MUST BE READ AT THE EXIT INTERVIEW – NOT TO BE GIVEN TO THE INSTITUTION)

*The Program Exit Interview Statement, to be prepared for oral presentation, should first emphasize the strengths determined for each program<sup>(1)</sup>. Afterwards, the deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns and observations for each criterion should be read out loud from a document written in easily understandable language, in the order of criterion and sub-criterion numbers, providing a short justification for each evaluation.*

*In explaining deficiencies, weaknesses, and concerns, ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria should be referenced and be the language used in the criteria should be used wherever possible.*

---

### PROGRAM EXIT STATEMENT

<sup>1</sup> In Interim Evaluations and Show Cause evaluations, the exit interview should be implemented as follows:

- If there are no other program subject to a general review, institutional strengths, shortcomings or observations should not take place in the first section which is presented by the team chair.
- Very short references should be made to each shortcoming or observation given place in the previous ZİDEK evaluation report and short information should be given on the removal/change/persistence of each of these, together with reasons.

# ZİDEK

## RECOMMENDED ACCREDITATION DECISION

Institution \_\_\_\_\_ Program \_\_\_\_\_

- \_\_\_\_ NGR (Next General Review) – This decision means that the program fully meets the relevant criteria. This decision may only be made after a general review and is usually valid for five (5) years.
- \_\_\_\_ IR (Interim Report) – This decision shows that the criteria for which "weaknesses" have been reported need to be improved so that the quality of the program shall not deteriorate until the next general review. The nature of the weaknesses does not necessitate an institution visit for a further review of the corrective measures to be taken. However, the institution has to deliver a report focused on these corrective measures. This decision may only be made during a general review and is usually valid for two (2) years.
- \_\_\_\_ IV (Interim Visit) – This decision shows that the criteria for which "weaknesses" have been reported need to be improved so that the quality of the program shall not deteriorate until the next general review. The nature of the weaknesses necessitates an institution visit for a further review of the corrective measures to be taken. The institution has to deliver a report focused on these corrective measures before the visit. This decision may only be made during a general review and is usually valid for two (2) years.
- \_\_\_\_ RE (Report Extended) – This decision shows that the institution has taken adequate measures to remove any weaknesses specified in the previous IR decision. This decision may only be made during an IR evaluation. This decision extends accreditation until the next general review and is usually valid for three (3) years.
- \_\_\_\_ VE (Visit Extended) – This decision shows that the institution has taken adequate measures to remove any weaknesses specified in the previous IV decision. This decision may only be made during an IV evaluation. This decision extends accreditation until the next general review and is usually valid for three (3) years.
- \_\_\_\_ SCR (Show Cause with Report) – This decision shows that deficiencies have been found in an accredited program, or that the weaknesses found during the previous evaluation are still persisting. The nature of these deficiencies or persisting weaknesses do not necessitate a visit to the institution in order to assess the measures taken by the institution to remedy them. On the other hand, the institution is expected to submit an interim report focused on the corrective actions taken. This decision may only be made during a general review or IR or IV evaluation and is usually valid for one (1) year.
- \_\_\_\_ SCV (Show Cause with Visit) – This decision shows that deficiencies have been found in an accredited program, or that the weaknesses found during the previous evaluation are still persisting. The nature of these deficiencies or persisting weaknesses necessitate a visit to the institution in order to assess the measures taken by the institution to remedy them. Prior to this visit, the institution is expected to submit an interim report focused on the corrective actions taken. This decision may only be made during a general review or IR or IV evaluation and is usually valid for one (1) year.
- \_\_\_\_ SE (Show Cause Extended) – This decision shows that the institution has taken sufficient measures to remedy any shortcomings specified in the previous SCR or SCV decision. This decision may only be made after an SCR or SCV evaluation. This decision extends accreditation until the next general review and, thus, is usually valid for two (2) to four (4) years.
- \_\_\_\_ NoA (Not to Accredite) – This decision may be made after the evaluation of an unaccredited new program or after an SC evaluation of a program. This decision shows that a program evaluated for the first time has exhibited deficiencies in its general review and fails to meet the criteria. If made after an SC evaluation, this decision shows that the deficiencies of an accredited program found during the general review or the ongoing weaknesses found during its interim evaluation continue even after the SC period.

# ZİDEK

## FORM 7

### PROGRAM ACCREDITATION DECISIONS SHORT FORM

*(To be filled by the Team Chair)*

Institution: \_\_\_\_\_

| Program Name | End of Visit Recommendation | +60 Days Recommendation | ZAK Decision |
|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |
|              |                             |                         |              |

#### **Explanations:**

*The team chair enters the accreditation recommendations of the evaluators related to the program that they evaluate in the "End of Visit Recommendation" column.*

*Team chairs fill out the "End of Visit Recommendation" and "+60 Days Recommendation" columns for all programs evaluated on a single form and, together with "Draft Report," submit this form to the ZAK Chairmanship.*

*The "ZAK Decision" column is for use by the ZAK Chairmanship when preparing the ZAK decisions.*

# ZİDEK

## ***EXPLANATIONS AND NOTES OF CAUTION ON FOR POST-VISIT***

The due process begins immediately after the institution visit of the evaluation team. Due process is an important part of the evaluation procedure and is made up of the following stages:

- +30-Day Response of the Programs: If there are any factual errors in the exit statement provided to the institution or if certain improvements related to the program have been initiated within the 30 day period following the institution visit, the institution may respond to the team chair for the purpose of correcting these errors or for providing information on the implemented improvements within 30 days following the visit. This response must be in electronic format. If there is no need for a 30-day response, the institution must inform the team chair in electronic format, about their intention not to respond.
- Draft Statement (Report): After each institution visit, the visiting team prepares a draft evaluation statement containing the preliminary findings and accreditation recommendations and presents it to the ZAK Chairmanship, in writing, within 60 days following the visit. This draft should consist of a separate section for each program evaluated, containing the evaluations of the respective evaluator. In case of a 30-day response to the exit statement, the team chair, in consultation with the program evaluators, will make the necessary corrections on the draft statements so as to eliminate any errors in the information collected during the institution visit and the information initially provided by the institution at the beginning of the evaluation process.
- Draft Statement (Report): Following consistency controls and editing, the draft statements, delivered to the ZAK Chairmanship in writing, are presented to the members of ZAK for their approval. Approved statements are the final statements to be sent to the institutions.
- Please keep the notes that you have taken and all forms that you have filled during the visit for a reasonable time period. You may need these for refreshing your memory in the event that the Team Chair or ZAK decides to refer to your opinion once more within one year.