ZİDEK

Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs

Ziraat Fakülteleri Eğitim Programları Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Derneği

EVALUATION MANUAL

ZİDEK
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
Web page: http://www.zidek.org.tr/en

Version 3.1-01.01.2023

ZİDEK

Evaluation Manual

Contents

ZİDEK Evaluation Manual

ARTICLE 1 Grounds, Purpose and Scope

This manual is prepared in accordance with ZİDEK Directive on Policies and Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation (PPEA) document. The purpose of this manual is to introduce the evaluation process to the evaluation team members who will carry out program evaluations on behalf of ZİDEK. The current evaluation criteria are published on ZİDEK's website (http://www.zidek.org.tr/).

ARTICLE 2 Definitions

The definitions in this document are as follows:

1) ***ZİDEK***: Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs,
2) ***ZAK***: Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs Accreditation Board,
3) ***Criteria:*** ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria to be used for the evaluation of agriculture, forestry and aquaculture education programs for accreditation,
4) ***Institution***: The academic institution (university, higher technology institute) where the program applying for accreditation is located,
5) ***Dean***: The dean of the faculty that runs the programs to be evaluated,
6) ***Evaluation team***: The evaluation team set up by ZAK to evaluate one or more agriculture, forestry or aquaculture education programs of an institution, ,
7) ***PER:*** Program Evaluator Report
8) ***PEW***, The Program Evaluator Worksheet included in the Program Evaluator Report,
9) ***PPEA***, Directive on Policies and Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation

ARTICLE 3 ZİDEK Program Evaluation Types and Evaluation Teams

3.1 ZİDEK Program Evaluation Types

The details of the application process for ZİDEK accreditation and the evaluation process to be applied for programs whose application has been accepted are given in the ZİDEK Directive on Policies and Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation (PPEA).

Depending on the accreditation history of an engineering program, one of the following three evaluation types is applicable:

General Evaluation (GE): An evaluation that includes all of the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria. The programs to be evaluated for the first time by ZİDEK and programs to be re-evaluated that had previous general evaluation 5 or more years ago are in the scope of the General Evaluation. The general evaluation process includes a 3-day visit to the institution.

Interim Evaluation (IE): The evaluation of the programs, that have been granted short term accreditation (generally 2 years) as a result of General Evaluation, within this accreditation period. It is focused on shortcomings at weakness and concern levels and observations determined in the previous General Evaluation. The Interim Evaluation is conducted either through a report provided by the institution (Interim Report Evaluation) without or through an institution visit (Interim Visit Evaluation), depending on ZAK's accreditation decision recommended in the previous General Evaluation.

Show Cause Evaluation (SCE): The evaluation focused on shortcomings at deficiency levels determined in some of the criteria during renewed General Evaluation or shortcomings at weakness levels still persisting during an Interim Evaluation. It is conducted within one year as of the previous accreditation decision. The Show Cause Evaluation is conducted either through a report provided by the institution (Show Cause Evaluation by Report) without an institution visit or also by including an institution visit (Show Cause Evaluation by Visit), depending on ZAK's accreditation decision recommended in the previous evaluation.

Details of the sections of the program evaluation process concerning the evaluation teams are included in this manual. In Section 4, details of the General Evaluation process are provided, Section 5 states the differences in attributes of Interim Evaluation and Show Cause Evaluation processes from General Evaluation process that are explained in Chapter 4.

This manual is prepared considering the processes applied during the evaluation of undergraduate programs offered at the faculties of agriculture, forestry and aquaculture engineering. However, if this manual is used for the evaluation of graduate programs, the terms "faculty" and "dean" in the manual must be interpreted respectively as "Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences" and "Director of the Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences."

3.2 ZİDEK Evaluation Teams

The teams to evaluate the faculties of agriculture, forestry and aquaculture engineering programs are appointed by ZAK in accordance with the PPEA Directive. Every evaluation team comprises of a team chair and at least one program evaluator for each program to be evaluated. In large teams, a team co-chair may be assigned to help the team chair. If a general evaluation will be conducted for a program, usually two evaluators are assigned; as one evaluator and one co-evaluator. A student evaluator is also assigned in the teams that include at least one general evaluation. If required, ZİDEK members, evaluator candidates, and representatives from local and foreign accreditation institutions may accompany evaluation teams as observers with the approval of the team chairs and related institutions, based on ZAK's decision.

ARTICLE 4 General Evaluation Process

The General Evaluation process comprises of three main stages:

(a) Pre-visit activities,

(b) Institution visit, and

(c) Post visit activities.

The success of the overall process depends on the completion of these three stages in a comprehensive, timely and professional manner and integrated approach. The improvement of the evaluation process depends on the comprehension of evaluation objectives, assessment of process outcomes, as well as feedback from all participants.

The key inputs into the process are provided by,

1) Agricultural Engineering Educational Programs Accreditation Board (ZAK) that appoints the team chair, co-chair, program evaluators, co-evaluators, and student evaluators and
2) The institution that has to demonstrate through its self-assessment reports and other relevant information presented that its programs meet the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria.

4.1 Pre-Visit Activities

Pre-visit activities are conducted prior to the institution visit and initiated with the appointment of the team members by ZAK.

4.1.1 Objectives

The pre-visit activities have three objectives:

1) to assemble a team that represents the agriculture, forestry and aquaculture disciplines in a balanced manner from various viewpoints and that is capable of accurately evaluating the quality of the programs to be visited,
2) to complete a significant portion of the evaluation prior to the visit to the institution, based on the documents provided by the institution and additional documents and information requested from the institution, and
3) to develop a plan for the inspection of the additional documents and facilities, meetings, and evaluations during the institution visit.

4.1.2 Process Participants

The key participants in the process are the team chair, team co-chair, program evaluators, co-evaluators, student evaluator and the institution. Observers, if any, may also participate in the process.

4.1.3 Process

The timing of the pre-visit activities carries great importance. These activities are given below.

A. Assembling the Evaluation Team

1) ZAK forms the evaluation team in accordance with the ZİDEK PPEA Directive
2) ZAK communicates the appointment to the team chair, team co-chair if any, program evaluators, co-evaluators, and student evaluator.
3) ZAK communicates the names and contact information of the evaluation team members to the relevant institution.
4) ZAK requests ZİDEK Office to electronically send the self-assessment reports and annexes for the programs to be evaluated by the team, to the related team members.

B. From Assembling the Evaluation Team to the Institution Visit

1. The team chair initiates contacts with evaluators and the dean of the institution whose programs are to be evaluated and determines a visiting date appropriate for all concerned parties in October-December or the following February-March. If there are

programs to be evaluated with report in the same institution, the team chair also informs the evaluators who would conduct the evaluation with report of the determined visit dates.

2. The ZİDEK Office communicates with the team chair in order to plan the necessary arrangements for the transportation and accommodation in the vicinity of the institution for the evaluators. The opinions and suggestions of the team chair regarding the selection of the accommodation should be taken into consideration. Private meeting rooms must be provided both in the accommodation and the institution for team meetings to be held during the visit.
3. The team chair electronically sends a package comprising of ZİDEK documents to be used during the evaluation to each program evaluator, co-evaluator, student evaluator, and observer, if available. This package contains a current copy of the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria, the Program Evaluator Report (PER), the Student Evaluator Report, and other documents and information to be used during the evaluation process.
4. The team chair coordinates the preparation of a draft program for the institution visit. This program must take into consideration the requests of the institution to show itself in the most effective way, so that it meets the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria and the requirements of the program evaluators, co-evaluators and student evaluator for conducting a comprehensive evaluation.
5. The program evaluator and co-evaluator examine the self-assessment report in detail, make their pre-evaluation based on the common set criteria, determine additional documents and information to be requested from the institution before and during the visit, and prepare the questions to be addressed during the institution visit.
6. The student evaluator examines all the sections of the self-assessment reports related to his/her terms of reference in detail, make his/her pre-evaluation based on the criteria, determine additional documents and information to be requested from the institution before and during the visit, and prepares the questions to be addressed during the institution visit.
7. The team chair, program evaluators, co-evaluators, and student evaluator communicate with each other in coordination of the team chair, concerning pre-evaluations, determination of the additional documents and information to be requested from the institution before the visit and the details of the visit and exchange ideas.
8. The team chair communicates with the dean and requests student transcripts and other additional documents and information of general interest to the team, to be sent to the team members prior to the visit, to be available at the beginning of the visit and to be acquired during the visit.
9. The program evaluators, with the approval of the team chair, communicate with the department chairs and request additional information specific to the program to be evaluated, to be sent to them prior to the visit, to be available at the beginning of the visit and to be acquired during the visit. The team chair is informed of the communication between the evaluators and the department chairs.
10. The program evaluators, with the approval of the team chair, communicate with the department chairs to make detailed plans for the specific departments they would

evaluate, in line with the team’s overall visit program. This information is also sent to the team chair.

11. The team chair communicates with the team members and the dean to determine the supporting units involving all the programs and prepares a program for the visit of them.
12. The student evaluator communicates the additional information needed prior to the visit and the documents needed during the visit with the team chair. The team chair communicates these requirements with the dean. The team chair and the student evaluator plan the meetings and inspections to be carried out by the student evaluator within the frame of the Directive on Student Evaluator Participation in ZİDEK Evaluations and this plan is submitted to the dean by the team chair.
13. The team chair prepares the final schedule for the visit, together with the dean, the program evaluators, and the student evaluator. At this stage, a decision is made on whether to meet for a lunch with the officials of the institution on the first day of the visit. This lunch may also be attended by the representatives of the stakeholders of the programs to be evaluated [An example of the general visit program is given in Annex-1]
14. The ZİDEK office makes reservations for the accommodation of the team members and the transportation between the institution and the accommodation is provided by the institution.
15. The program evaluators and student evaluator finalize the details of their travel plans by taking the team chair’s and ZİDEK Office’s opinions and suggestions and inform team chair and ZİDEK Office about their final decision . However, without the permission of the team chair, the team members may not arrive after the first team meeting and depart before the exit interview on the last day of the visit.
16. The ZİDEK Office makes all arrangements for the flights and car rentals for the team members. The team members themselves are responsible for transportation reservations other than flights and car rentals, and the related expenses; these expenses are reimbursed to the team members by ZİDEK Office upon submission of the ZİDEK Expense Claim Form.
17. The program evaluators finalize their pre-evaluations using the additional documents and information requested from the institution prior to the visit and also using the criteria, share the details of their evaluations with all team members, fill in the following forms that take a place in the PER based on these pre-assessments, and electronically send them to the team chair. In case there is a co-evaluator related to a program to be evaluated, these forms are to be completed by consensus of both evaluators.

1) Curriculum Analysis Form (Form 1)
2) Transcript Analysis Form (Form 2)
3) Program Evaluator Worksheet (PEW - Form 3) columns “Previous Evaluation” and “Pre-Estimate” are filled in. For the general evaluations made for the first time, the “Previous Evaluation” column is left blank.

4.2 Institution Visit Activities

Institution visit activities start with the arrival of the evaluation team members at their accommodation and this part of the evaluation procedure ends upon the completion of all meetings and the departure of the team members from the institution.

4.2.1 Objectives

The objectives of the institution visit are as follows:

a. To conduct a qualitative assessment of those factors that could not be documented in a written self-assessment report,
b. To carry out a detailed examination of the documents compiled by the institution,
c. To inform the institution of the preliminary evaluation of their strengths and shortcomings.

4.2.2 Participants in the Process

The participants in the process are as follows:

a. Team members (team chair, team co-chair if available, program evaluators, co-evaluators, student evaluator. and observers if available),
b. Institution representatives (institutional administration, faculty administrators of the programs being evaluated, department administration, academic staff of the program, members of the supporting departments, administrative personnel),
c. Students.

4.2.3 Process

The institution visit process must be conducted as a well-integrated cluster of activities. In order to clarify this process, activities are given below chronologically according to the days. The timings provided below are only a suggestion and must be adjusted based on the requirements of each visit and program. The institution visit within the scope of a General Evaluation usually lasts for 3 days, starting on Sunday (Day 0) finishes on the following Tuesday (Day 2). In order to ensure the coordination in large teams, the institution visit may also be carried out in a 4-day period, beginning with a team meeting on Saturday evening.

A. Day 0 (Usually Sunday)

a) Team members hold a team meeting in the meeting room reserved for them in the accommodation facility (A two-hour meeting is recommended.)

The discussion at this meeting, which is usually held before noon, focuses on the following:

1) The tasks to be accomplished during the evaluation visit,
2) The schedule of the evaluation visit, indicating the time and objective of each meeting,
3) ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria, consistency within the team, and potential queries by team members regarding the application of these criteria,
4) Potential questions by team members regarding the conduct of the evaluation visit and
5) The roles of observers in the visit activities.

b) The team visits the institution after the first meeting, following lunch. Upon arrival at the institution, a short introduction meeting is held at the dean's office of the faculty running the programs to be evaluated. At the end of this meeting, team members take part in the following activities:

1) The program evaluators visit the departments responsible for the programs that they evaluate in order to perform initial inspections. During these visits, the documents requested previously from the institution to be presented during the visit, primarily the assessment and evaluation and evidence documents related to the access to program outcomes, are examined. The evaluators fill in the "Day 0" column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet. (At least three hours must be allocated to these inspections). Program evaluators may also visit classrooms and laboratories within this period.
2) Student evaluator conducts the schedule organized for her/him.
3) The team chair meets with the dean and confirms all arrangements of the visit. If required, certain common areas, classrooms and laboratories may be visited. The team chair examines the initial evaluation documents prepared by the program evaluators and completes the preparations for the team meeting to be held in the evening of "Day 0."

c) The team gathers for dinner.

d) The team discusses the following issues at the meeting starting after the dinner:

1) The program evaluations prior to the visit and at the end of "Day 0", as well as consistency issues within the team regarding the program evaluations,
2) The evaluations prior to the visit and at the end of "Day 0", regarding the supporting units
3) The potential changes to the list of supporting units to be visited and the sharing of responsibilities among the program evaluators regarding these visits,

(e) The program evaluators and student evaluator fill in the "Day 0" column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet at the end of the meeting and send this electronically to the team chair. (The duration of this meeting depends on the number of team members. The team chair must conduct the discussion in a time-efficient manner to keep its duration at a reasonable length.)

B. Day 1 (Usually Monday)

a) The team meets with the dean, and the vice deans, department chairs, and the relevant individuals responsible for assessment-evaluation / quality improvement, invited by the dean. The dean presents current information on the following issues:

1) The system established by the institution to meet the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria
2) The processes implemented commonly for all agriculture, forestry and aquaculture programs of the faculty,
3) Significant results and continuous improvement efforts,
4) Other elements common to all agriculture, forestry and aquaculture programs, indicating that the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria are being met. (A period of one hour is recommended for this meeting)

b) The team chair meets with the dean and gets information about the system established at faculty level in order to meet the ZİDEK Evaluation Criteria. The team chair examines the relevant documents and the outcomes of this process at faculty level. The team chair puts forward those points about which the evaluation team is concerned in terms of the functioning of the faculty and requests additional information. The dean takes this opportunity to clarify points which s/he wishes to be taken into consideration by the evaluation team during the visit. (A period of at least one hour is recommended for this meeting).

c) The team chair meets with the president, vice presidents, and all other relevant administrators of the institution individually and discusses issues related to the functioning of the faculty running the programs being evaluated and its departments at the institutional level. (At least half an hour should be allocated for each meeting).

d) Each program evaluator meets with the department chair responsible for the program s/he evaluates and discusses the educational objectives of the program, participation of the stakeholders, processes at program level, program outcomes and continuous improvement efforts. The program evaluator explains the evaluation team's concerns regarding the functioning of the program and requests clarification. .(A one-hour meeting is recommended).

e) The program evaluators meet with task groups responsible for the various elements of the programs they evaluate and examine the details of the program processes, program outcomes and continuous improvement efforts. These groups may consist of the program's academic staff, support staff and other persons who may help to determine the state of the assessment-evaluation procedures conducted at the institution and the utilization of their results for the improvement of the program's effectiveness. (A period of one and a half hours is recommended for this meeting).

f) The student evaluator conducts the schedule planned before the visit

g) The team meets with the administrators of the institution and its guests for lunch. This activity is optional, and it is arranged during the pre-visit communications by the team chair and the dean. Alternatively, a lunch with students, graduates and representatives of the advisory committees may be arranged.

h) The team chair and the program evaluators meet individually with the representatives of the supporting units selected by the team to discuss their functions. The quality of the interaction of students, academic staff members, other staff members, and the administration of the faculty with each of the visited supporting unit is discussed. (Duration of at least half an hour is recommended for these group meetings).

i) The program evaluators meet with a group of undergraduate students registered in the program they evaluate. The program evaluators should convey their requests about the specific make-up of this group (for example: 3rd year students, 4th year students etc.) to the department chair prior to the evaluation visit. (A one-hour meeting is recommended).

j) The program evaluators meet with the academic staff responsible for different elements of the programs they evaluate (faculty members, instructors, research assistants, adjunct instructors) individually or in groups and continue to examine the program processes, program outcomes and continuous improvement efforts. (A total time of two hours is recommended for these meetings).

k) Program evaluators inspect the classrooms, laboratories of the program under evaluation and areas used for extracurricular student activities and assess the adequacy of the spaces, furnishing and equipment allocated to students, faculty members and support staff (One hour is recommended for this inspection and it may also be conducted on Day 0 if timing is convenient)

l) The team chair and the dean meet to discuss any problems identified as a result of the meetings and inspections on Day 1. (This meeting is optional; duration of half an hour is recommended).

m) All team members gather for dinner.

n) The team meets to discuss the following issues during dinner:

1) The evaluation of the programs in the light of new information,
2) Ensuring the consistency between the evaluations for similar shortcomings determined in the programs,
3) Evaluation of the supporting units,
4) Any problems that have emerged on Day 1 of the visit,
5) Any problems among team members that could not be resolved during the previous meetings. Team members fill out the “Day 1” column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet and electronically send a copy of the worksheet to the team chair. (The duration of this meeting depends on the number of team members. The team chair should conduct the meeting in a time-efficient manner in order to keep its duration reasonable).

o) The program evaluators prepare a draft “Program Exit Statement” for the program they are evaluating. The Program Exit Statement, which will be prepared as defined in PER Form 6 for each program, covers noteworthy strengths of the program evaluated and the criteria for which shortcomings have been determined. The Program Exit Statement indicates the strengths followed by the shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses and concerns) determined in order of criterion and sub-criterion and, observations, if available. The reason for each shortcoming must be explained briefly, but in sufficient detail by the program evaluator. The Program Exit Statement must include the findings of the program evaluator concerning the evaluation process in the institution and the use of the process results to improve the effectiveness of the program.

p) Program evaluators prepare the draft “Program Evaluation Form” (Form 4) and “Summary of Shortcomings” (Form 5) in accordance with the sample reports and deliver to the team chair.

C. Day 2 (Usually Tuesday)

1. Program evaluators electronically send the initial draft of the Program Exit Statement to the team chair, at the beginning of the day.

2. The team chair and the dean meet to discuss the problems that have emerged as a result of the meetings and inspections on Day 1, as well as the schedule for the Day 2. (This meeting is optional; duration of half an hour is recommended).
3. The team chair examines the drafts of the “Program Exit Statement”, “Program Evaluation Form” and “Summary of Shortcomings” presented to her/him. If there are any points in the statements that need to be clarified, the team chair carries out the necessary meetings with the related program evaluators. Furthermore, the team chair prepares a general introductory section for the Exit Interview. (Duration of two hours is recommended for this task).
4. The program evaluators finish the meetings and inspections which were planned for Day 1 of the visit but could not be completed and, carry out some additionally required meetings and inspections (Duration of one hour is recommended for these meetings and inspections).
5. The student evaluator conducts the schedule determined together with the team chair.
6. The program evaluators review the draft Program Exit Statement and make any necessary amendments/changes, fill out the “Exit Statement” column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet and the first column of the Program Evaluation Form, and if necessary, consult with the team chair. (At least half an hour must be allocated to this task).
7. The evaluation team holds a short meeting in a room allocated to them by the institution. The objective of this meeting is to share information regarding the latest status of the evaluations for each program and to ensure coordination. (Half an hour must be allocated to this meeting).
8. The program evaluators provide information to the department chair responsible for the program under evaluation. During this briefing, the program evaluator clarifies any points susceptible to misconception and verbally shares with the department chair both strong and –shortcoming aspects of the program, and also findings related to any issues that the team members still consider problematic and issues regarding the functioning of the program (A meeting of at least half an hour is recommended).
9. The team chair and the dean meet for a briefing. The team chair verbally shares the findings regarding the strengths and shortcomings of the programs being evaluated with the dean. (At least half an hour must be allocated to this meeting).
10. The team meets for lunch in the meeting room specifically allocated to them. During this meeting:
    1) The introductory section for the Exit Interview and the Exit Statement of each program are read,
    2) Each statement is revised in a manner so as to reflect the opinion shared by the team,
    3) The Program Evaluation Form (Form 4 and Form 5) is finalized for each program being evaluated,
    4) Accreditation decision recommendations are established for the agriculture, forestry and aquaculture programs under evaluation and these decision recommendations are filled in the Short Form (Form 7),

5) The fully completed Program Evaluator Report for each program under evaluation is submitted electronically to the team chair. Both the summary table (Form 5) and the form explaining the shortcomings and observations (Form 4) of the Program Evaluation Form are printed out to be submitted to the institution after the Exit Interview. (A three-hour meeting is recommended)

11. The team holds an Exit Interview with the president, the dean, and other institution officials whom they deem appropriate to include (such as vice-presidents, vice-deans, department chairs). The team chair and each program evaluator read their own Exit Statement. A short question-and-answer session may be organized, in which the team members address questions from the president and the guests, and the meeting is concluded jointly by the president and the team chair. (The duration of this meeting depends on the number of programs being evaluated. However, it is recommended not to exceed one hour).
12. The team chair presents copies of the Program Evaluation Form (Form 4 and Form 5) prepared separately for each program being evaluated to the dean. The team chair reminds the dean that the evaluations in the Program Evaluation Forms submitted are not final evaluations and the evaluations related to the findings stated in these forms may be amended by ZAK. The Program Evaluation Forms are the only documents that the institution shall receive from the team during the visit.

4.3 Post-Visit Activities

Post-visit activities are initiated after the completion of the institution visit and continue until the communication of the result of ZAK accreditation decision meeting to the institution.

4.3.1 Objectives

Post-visit activities have three objectives:

a. To ensure that the institution and program inputs related to the visit's findings are included in the statement to be presented to the institution,
b. To give each party of the visit an opportunity to indicate any additional opinions before the final accreditation decision,
c. To provide consistency between program evaluations on similar shortcomings related to a specific criterion at different institutions within the same evaluation period.

4.3.2 Process Participants

The key participants in the process conducted after the visit are:

a. The team members (team chair(s), program evaluators, and student evaluator),
b. The institution and
c. ZAK representatives.

4.3.3 Process

The post-visit process must be conducted as a well-integrated, clustered set of critical activities. In order to clarify this process, these activities are outlined below in chronological order. The time indicated is the number of days from the end of the institution visit, to the completion of the task. All correspondences and forms must be completed in electronic format throughout the process. The steps of the post-visit process are summarized below:

1) The team chair sends the electronic copy of the Short Form to the ZAK chairmanship. Furthermore, a copy of the Program Evaluator Report prepared for each program being evaluated is sent to the ZİDEK office to be archived. (+3 days)
2) If there is student evaluator in the team, the student evaluator prepares the Student Evaluator Report and sends it to the team chair to be considered in the Draft Report. (+3 days) A copy of the report is sent to the ZİDEK office to be archived.
3) The institution sends its +30-day response to the team chair. In this response, the institution may only indicate its opinion regarding factual errors related to the shortcomings listed in the Program Evaluation Forms given to the dean at the end of the visit and the improvements made within this period, in order to eliminate these shortcomings (+ 30 days).
4) A copy of the +30-day response is sent to the ZİDEK office by the team chair to be archived.
5) The team chair reviews the Program Evaluation Forms in consultation with the program evaluators and the student evaluator and edits them into a cohesive and consistent Draft Report which is in line with the template defined by ZİDEK, incorporating the information contained in the +30-day response of the institution. (+60 days)
6) The team chair sends the Draft Report and the Short Form, in which “End of Visit Recommendation” and “+60 Days Recommendation” columns are filled out to the ZAK chairmanship. (+60 days)
7) In order to guarantee consistency between the evaluations of different institutions within the same evaluation period and over the long term, the consistency of the draft reports is checked by the Consistency Control Committee in consultation with the relevant team chairs. This committee is made up of current and/or former ZAK members who preferably did not serve as team chair during that period or experienced evaluators assigned by ZAK. (+90 days)
8) Upon completion of consistency controls, the review and correction of the Draft Reports in terms of format, editorial errors and style is carried out by current and/or former ZAK members assigned by ZAK or experienced evaluators assigned by ZAK and professional editors in consultation with the relevant team chairs. (+120 days)
9) ZAK, if required organizes two separate decision meetings within a year, to make its accreditation decisions related to the programs.
10) ZAK, within the knowledge of relevant team chairs, generates the Final Reports to be sent to the institutions, having made final changes and amendments to the Draft Reports and prepares the Final Statements to be used as cover letters to these reports in notification of the institutions and certificates to be given to the institutions for each accredited program.
11) The Final Reports and the Final Statement Documents submitted to the ZİDEK Executive Board are sent to the institutions as official letters by the Chair of the ZİDEK Executive Board.

ARTICLE 5. Interim Evaluation and Show Cause Evaluation Processes

The Interim Evaluation and Show Cause Evaluation, as different from the General Evaluation focus on the shortcomings determined in the previous evaluation of the program by ZİDEK.

Therefore, the process to be followed in Interim Evaluations and Show Cause Evaluations differ from the General Evaluation process described in Article 4.

These differences are explained under the following four headings.

1) Difference in scope
2) Difference in completing the forms in PER
3) Differences in the institution visit activities
4) Process differences in the evaluations with no-visit

5.1 Difference in Scope

1) For a program subject to Interim Evaluation, the institution sends an Interim Report to ZİDEK, explaining the improvements made regarding the shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns) and observations determined in the previous ZİDEK evaluation. The Interim Evaluation is based on this interim report and focus on the shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns) and observations determined in the previous evaluation.
2) For a program subject to Show Cause Evaluation, the institution sends an Interim Report to ZİDEK, explaining the improvements made to eliminate the deficiencies and weaknesses determined in the previous ZİDEK evaluation. The Show Cause Evaluation is based on this interim report and focus on the deficiencies and weaknesses determined in the previous evaluation.

5.2 Differences in Completing the Forms in PER

The Program Evaluator Report (PER) to be prepared for programs under Interim Evaluation and Show Cause Evaluation differ from the PER to be prepared for a program under General Review as follows:

1. Completion of the Curriculum Analysis Form (Form 1) and the Transcript Analysis Form (Form 2) may not be required, depending on the shortcomings determined in the previous evaluation.
2. Shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns) and observations stated in the previous ZİDEK evaluation report are listed in the “Previous Evaluation” column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet (PEW - Form 3) for programs subject to Interim Evaluation.
3. Deficiencies and weaknesses stated in the previous ZİDEK evaluation report are listed in the “Previous Evaluation” column of the Program Evaluator Worksheet (PEW- Form 3) for programs subject to Show Cause Evaluation.
4. Differences in Exit Statement (for evaluations including a visit):
    1) The strengths of the program are not included.
    2) For programs subject to Interim Evaluation, the shortcomings and observations determined in the previous evaluation are summarized by criterion and sub-criterion and the findings of this year’s interim evaluation are listed under each of them as a summary.
    3) For programs subject to Show Cause Evaluation, the deficiencies and weaknesses determined in the previous evaluation are summarized by criterion

and sub-criterion and the findings in this year's show cause evaluation are listed under each of them as a summary.

5. The differences in the program evaluation form:
    1) For programs subject to Interim Evaluation, the shortcomings and observations determined in the previous evaluation are summarized by criterion and sub-criterion in the Statement of Shortcomings and Observations form (Form 4) and the findings of this year's Interim Evaluation are listed under each of them. The "Previous Evaluation" column of the Summary of the Shortcomings form (Form 5) is filled for the same criterion and sub-criterion.
    2) For programs subject to Show Cause Evaluation, the deficiencies and weaknesses determined in the previous evaluation are summarized by criterion and sub-criterion in Form 4 and the findings of this year's Show Cause Evaluated are listed under each of them. The "Previous Evaluation" column of Form 5 is filled for the same criterion and sub-criterion.

5.3 Differences in the Institution Visit Activities

1) The program evaluator conducting an Interim Evaluation with visit, plans and performs the meetings and examinations during the institution visit, focused on the shortcomings (deficiencies, weaknesses, concerns) and observations determined in the previous evaluation
2) The program evaluator conducting a Show Cause Evaluation with visit, plans and performs the meetings and examinations during the institution visit focused on the deficiencies and weaknesses determined in the previous evaluation
3) The following differences may occur for the institution visits consisting of programs to be evaluated only by Interim Evaluation with Visit and/or Show Cause Evaluation with Visit:

    1) The duration of the institution visit may be shorter than the three-day period determined for the General Evaluation, depending on the quantity and quality of the program shortcomings detected in the previous evaluation,

    2) Team chair's meeting with the executives of the institution (president and vice-presidents) may take place as a courtesy visit or may not be realized at all (Team chair is recommended to consult with the dean on this issue),

    3) The lunch given by the institution on "Day 1" of the visit may not be realized or may be executed at an informal level (Team chair is recommended to consult with the dean on this issue),

    4) The visit of the supporting units is performed only if the shortcoming stated in the previous evaluation necessitate,

    5) The president and vice-presidents may not participate in the Exit Interview on the final day of the visit (Team chair is recommended to consult with the dean on this issue).

5.4 Process Differences in Evaluations with No Visit

The differences stated in Articles 5.1 and 5.2 are also valid for the process to be followed during the Interim Evaluation with Report (IR) and the Show Cause with Report (SCR). However, since these evaluations do not include an institution visit, following differences exist compared to a standard evaluation process:

1) An institution visit is not conducted for programs evaluated with report; the entire evaluation is based on the interim report sent to ZİDEK by the institution and the additional documents and information that the team members may request from the institution.
2) The consistency between the evaluations regarding the shortcomings determined for the program being evaluated with report and evaluations for similar shortcomings determined for other programs being evaluated by the same team, will be ensured electronically under the coordination of the team chair.
3) An Exit Statement is not prepared at the end of the evaluation with report; an Exit Statement is not read for programs evaluated with report during the Exit Interview at the end of the institution visit made for other programs of the same institution. (Team chair is recommended to inform the dean regarding this practice, in advance).
4) The Program Evaluation Form (Form 4 and Form 5) is completed for each program evaluated with report.
5) An accreditation decision recommendation is made for each program being evaluated with report and this decision recommendation is put in the Short Form (Form 7),
6) The Program Evaluator Report prepared by the evaluator for each program evaluated with report, is sent electronically to the team chair by completing the required sections.
7) The team chair finalizes the Program Evaluation Form (Form 4 and Form 5) prepared for each program evaluated with report in consultation with the evaluators.
8) The team chair electronically sends the Program Evaluation Forms for the programs evaluated with report to the dean and requests the dean to convey her/his potential responses related to the points stated in these forms to the team chair within 30 days. (It is recommended that copies of the Program Evaluation Forms are sent to the dean in both PDF and MS Word formats).
9) If there are programs evaluated with visit by the same team, the team chair delivers the Program Evaluation Forms for the programs evaluated with report to the dean immediately after the Exit Interview of the other programs.
10) After the Program Evaluation Forms are sent to the dean by the team chair, the activities stated in Article 4.3 are performed.

ARTICLE 6 Process Evaluation and Improvement

The team chairs, program evaluators, and, student evaluator, if available, fill in the forms sent electronically by ZİDEK to provide feedback to ZİDEK by assessing each other. Furthermore, it is expected from all participating parties to make recommendations for improvement to ZİDEK, by evaluating the activities performed during all three stages of the evaluation process with or without institution visit.

ARTICLE 7 Amendments to the Evaluation Manual

Any suggestions for amendments to this manual shall be submitted by ZAK, or by a committee to be appointed by the Executive Board. Suggestions prepared shall be included in the agenda of and resolved during the first meeting of the Executive Board to follow.

ARTICLE 8 Enforcement

This Evaluation Manual comes into force as of the date of approval by the Executive Board.