ZİDEK

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

Issues to be Considered During the Preparation of Self-Assessment Report

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 2.1-01.01.2023

ZİDEK

Issues to be Considered During the Preparation of Self-Assessment Report

Educational engineering programs at agriculture, forestry and aquaculture faculties to be evaluated by ZİDEK should prepare their self-evaluation reports (SAR) in accordance with the Self-Evaluation Report document determined by ZİDEK and should explain with evidence how ZİDEK evaluation criteria are met.

The current versions of ZIDEK documents regarding the self-assessment report format to be used and ZİDEK evaluation criteria can be accessed from ZİDEK website (http://zidek.org.tr/en).

It is very important that the self-assessment report is prepared meticulously, since most of the evaluation will be done first on this report. Care should be taken not to have inconsistencies in the content of the report. The report should be prepared in a language that is easy to read and understand, and all information should be documented.

Considering the following issues during the preparation of the self-assessment reports to be submitted to ZİDEK will contribute to a more accurate functioning of the evaluation process:

1) Physical format of self-assessment report: Self-evaluation reports should be prepared in pdf format that can be printed on A4 paper when necessary and sent to ZİDEK only in electronic form. All appendices (Annex I) except Annex II (Institution Profile) must be in the main report file. Annex II (Institution Profile), which gives information about the university, the relevant faculty and all the programs carried out in this faculty, should be prepared in the same format as the main report, but as a separate file. All boxes (except shaded) in the tables used in the SAR must be filled with valid data. No data should be entered into shaded boxes. If the data in the boxes where data entry is required is not defined (for example, if there is no graduate in that year), it should be indicated using a "-" sign.

2) Evaluation of secondary education programs: According to Article 4(d) of the ZİDEK Directive on Policies and Procedures for Evaluation and Accreditation, even if the names and contents of the secondary education programs in an institution are the same or similar to the primary education programs, they will be considered as separate programs. Therefore, institutions need to prepare separate and specific self-evaluation reports for their secondary education programs. Data and evidence (especially including the assessment-evaluation-feedback results of the program) on how all ZİDEK criteria (especially for Criterion 3 regarding program outcomes) are met should be documented separately, disaggregated for both primary education programs and secondary education programs but should include the analysis of the effects of the programs on each other. The fact that the application is made for both programs together or separately does not eliminate the need to examine the interaction between the programs.

3) Explanations on the assessment-evaluation-improvement processes used: It is expected that an engineering program applying for ZİDEK evaluation should have established and is currently utilizing a documented quality assurance and improvement system in order to regularly measure, evaluate and continuously improve the requirements of all ZİDEK criteria, especially the program's educational objectives and the program outcomes. Explaining the assessment-evaluation-improvement processes used by the institution within the scope of this system in detail in the self-evaluation report will help ZİDEK evaluate the program in a more accurate way.

4) Explanations on Criterion 2 and Criterion 3: It must be noted that the program educational objectives defined in Criterion 2 should define the career goals and professional expectations that students are expected to achieve in the near future after graduation. It should also be noted that the program outcomes in Criterion 3 should define the knowledge, skills and behaviors that students need to acquire until graduation in order to achieve these goals. The relationships between the outcomes and the objectives and the links between the outcomes of the courses in the curriculum and the program outcomes should be demonstrated with a realistic evaluation. The expression of the educational objectives of the program as ZİDEK outputs is considered as a shortcoming.

5) Evidence of program outcomes: An engineering program applying for the ZİDEK evaluation is expected to be able to demonstrate that it meets ZİDEK evaluation criteria, and in this context, it is expected to prove that the program outputs defined under Criterion 3 are fully met. The use of questionnaires alone is not sufficient to measure program outcomes and to prove that these outcomes are achieved, and this is considered as a shortcoming by ZİDEK. Therefore, it is of great importance that institutions preparing their programs for ZİDEK evaluation pay special attention to this issue, and that they concretely explain and document the use of direct measurement methods based on student studies, other than questionnaires, in their self-assessment reports, in order to make a healthy program evaluation. The contribution of the outcomes of the courses in the curriculum to the program outcomes should be determined and proven with concrete and measurable methods. It is recommended that the level of achievement of each output be proven using at least two measurement methods.

6) Evidence for continuous improvement: Criterion 4, one of the ZİDEK evaluation criteria, requires the submission of evidence showing that the results obtained from the established measurement and evaluation systems are used for the continuous improvement of the program. This improvement should be based on concrete data collected in a systematic way about all areas of the program that are open to improvement, especially the areas related to Criterion 2 and Criterion 3.

In particular, it is expected that the measurement-evaluation-improvement cycle for Criterion 3 is completed at least once, and that improvement in education through feedback based on the measurement-evaluation results will be documented in full detail in the self-assessment report.