ZIDEK

Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs

Ziraat Fakülteleri Eğitim Programları Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Derneği

Rules on Participation of Student Evaluators in Evaluation Teams

Version 2.1-03.05.2021

ZİDEK
Rules on Participation of Student Evaluators in Evaluation Teams

ARTICLE 1   Basis, Purpose and Scope

In 2005, the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (ESG) document, which was adopted at the Bologna process ministerial summit in Bergen, introduced European standards for quality assurance agencies, making it compulsory to include student members in quality assessment teams. ESG criteria are used in the evaluation of ZİDEK and guide its application to the "European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education" (EQAR), of which ZİDEK aims to become a member.

This document, which covers the principles of the work to be carried out in the participation of student evaluators in the ZİDEK evaluation process, aims to guide this practice.

ARTICLE 2   Selection and Training of Student Evaluators

a) Student evaluator candidates are determined by the ZİDEK Nomination Committee (NEC), preferably through contacts with the deans of Faculties of Agriculture, Forestry and Aquaculture Engineering of higher education institutions and national and international civil society platforms where undergraduate and graduate students are actively involved.

b) Selected student evaluators must be enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program in Agricultural, Forestry or Aquaculture Engineering at the time of selection.

c) Selected student evaluator candidates must not have been discipline penalties.

d) Selected student evaluator candidates must attend ZİDEK student evaluator training to prepare for the task. Candidates who have received student evaluator training in previous semesters can take part in the evaluation processes provided that their student status continues.

ARTICLE 3   Student Evaluator's Involvement in the Process

a) The student evaluator, like other evaluators, should not have any conflict of interest with the institution and a written declaration is obtained from the student evaluator on this subject. Approval is obtained from the dean of the relevant institution for the designated student to participate in the evaluation process.

b) The student evaluator in the team works together with the team chair and co-chair.

c) Prior to the visit, team chair asks the dean's office to identify the students who will be interviewed by the student evaluator on the team. Two students are selected from each program to be evaluated for accreditation, plus one student to introduce the general facilities of the campus. If possible, these students should be at the last two years of their education and should be closely involved in training and education. Preference should be given to selected faculty and department student representatives, club presidents, etc. who fit this description. If the number of programs to be evaluated at the institution is small, the number of students per program can be increased by the team leader before the visit.

d) The student evaluator may participate in all team activities other than contacts and meetings with faculty members and administrators at the visited institution; in this context, the student evaluator may be assigned dutiesby the team leader. It will be sufficient for the student evaluator to meet collectively with the group of students selected by the dean's office at a venue to be provided by the dean's office and to listen to the opinions of the students and to report the results to the team at the team meeting.

e) The student evaluator attends all team meetings.

f) At the first introductory meeting on day 0 of the visit, the student in the team meets the students selected by the evaluated institution and has a conversation about issues of general interest to the university. At the end of the meeting, a tour of the campus accompanied by the student selected by the dean's office is organized to familiarize with the campus and its facilities. Other representative students may also participate. The student evaluator reports to the team leader at the end of the day.

At the evening team meeting, he/she presents this report to the team, answers questions and notes the issues that the program evaluators want him/her to examine.

g) On the 1st day of the visit, after the dean's presentation, the student evaluator meets separately with the student representative group of each program that has applied to ZİDEK for evaluation, according to the schedule, at a venue to be provided by the dean's office and prepares a note based on the criteria, for the relevant program evaluator. In the evening team meeting, he/she presents these notes to the team, answers the questions and notes the issues that the program evaluators want him/her to examine.

h) For the second day, a program is made according to the request from the team leader.

i) At the end of the evaluation visit, the student evaluator prepares a "Student Evaluator Report" and submits it to the team leader.

ARTICLE 4 Criteria of Interest to Student Assessors

Some of these criteria may concern the institution as a whole, the program only, or both. Institution-wide issues will be addressed in the first day's meeting, while others will be addressed in the program evaluation meetings.

Criterion	General Faculty	Program
(Criterion 1.3) Measures should be taken by the institution and/or program to encourage and ensure student mobility through agreements and partnerships with other institutions.		X
(Criterion 1.4) Counseling services that guide students on course and career planning should be provided.		X
(Criterion 1.5) Students' achievements in all courses and other activities within the program should be measured and evaluated by transparent, fair and consistent methods.		X
(Criterion 7.1) Classrooms, laboratories and other equipment should help to provide an atmosphere conducive to learning and sufficient to achieve the educational objectives and program outcomes.	X	X
(Criterion 7.2) There must be an appropriate infrastructure that allows students to engage in extracurricular activities, meets their social and cultural needs, supports their professional development by creating an environment for professional activities, and stimulates student-faculty relations.	X	X
(Criterion 7.3) Programs should provide opportunities for students to learn how to use modern engineering tools. Computer and informatics infrastructures should be adequate for the scientific and educational activities of students and faculty members in line with the educational objectives of the program.	X	X
(Criterion 7.4) The library facilities offered to students meet the educational objectives and must be at a sufficient level to achieve the program outcomes.	X	X
(Criterion 7.5) Necessary security measures must be taken in the teaching environment and student laboratories. Infrastructure arrangements must be made for the disabled.	X	X
(Criterion 9) The organization of the higher education institution and all decision-making processes within and among the rectorate, faculties, departments and other sub-units, if any, should be organized in a way that supports the realization of program outcomes and the achievement of educational objectives.	X	X

ARTICLE 5 Failure to Visit the Institution

If the institutional visit cannot be made due to any force majeure (e.g., pandemic, natural disasters, security, etc.), the method specified in Article 8.d of ZİDEK PPEA Directive is applied for program evaluation.