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**DEDAK - DIRECTIVE ON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION AND ACCREDITATION**

## Ground, Purpose and Scope

**Article 1**. (1) This directive has been issued in accordance with article 12, section 1, provision (ğ) of the charter of the “Association for Language Education, Evaluation and Accreditation

(DEDAK)” which mandates “the preparation of directives and circulars compatible with the charter”.

(2) The purpose of this directive is to regulate the basic principles of DEDAK’s program evaluation and accreditation practices.

## Definitions

**Article 2** - In this directive, the following terms shall have the meanings as defined below:

1. DEDAK shall stand for the Association for Evaluation and Accreditation of Language Education Programs;
2. Executive Board shall stand for DEDAK’s Executive Board;
3. DAK shall signify Language Education Accreditation Board;

(ç) Criteria shall signify DEDAK’s Evaluation Criteria to be used for the evaluation of language education programs for accreditation;

1. Institution shall stand for the institution that is applying for the accreditation of a relevant program.

## Objectives of DEDAK Accreditation

**Article 3 -** The accreditation of the language education programs by DEDAK is a voluntary process; DEDAK solely evaluates the programs whose accreditation is sought after. DEDAK accreditation aims to achieve the following objectives in order to contribute to enhancing the quality of language education in Turkey:

1. Determining among the applying language education programs those that meet the evaluation criteria.
2. Informing society, future students, student advisors, students’ parents, educational institutions and possible employers and state institutions about the programs that meet the evaluation criteria by publishing the list of accredited programs.
3. Assuming a guiding role in the constant improvement of the existing language education programs and the development of new programs.

## Programs Eligible to Apply for Accreditation and their Institutions

**Article 4 –** (1) Institutions and programs eligible for application are designated below:

1. All programs offering language education in any country can apply for evaluation leading to accreditation, primarily those in Turkey and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus
2. Any program that will apply for the first time must have operated and provided language education for at least 1 year before the application date.
3. In the case of an institution offering different language programs, a separate accreditation application for each program must be made.
4. A multi-campus institution, which seeks to have its programs accredited by DEDAK, must apply separately for each of these programs in case they differ physically and administratively from each other.

## The Accreditation Application Process

**Article 5 -** (1) The application process for programs whose accreditation is requested for the first time is described below

1. An institution requesting evaluation for the first time for accrediting one or more of its programs should convey such a request to DEDAK by submitting a separate DEDAK Conformity Application Form for each program no later than the end of October every year.
2. The accreditation request of the institution is examined by DAK from the perspective of its conformity to the evaluation criteria. DAK may ask the institution to provide additional information if needed.
3. DEDAK will inform the institution whether the programs for which accreditation has been requested are eligible for evaluation or not, as well as the total accreditation fee and terms of payment ascertained for the programs to be evaluated, by the end of December following the month of application.

(ç) For the programs whose accreditation conformity is approved as a result of the DAK examination, the institutions finalize their accreditation requests by sending the confirmation letters to DEDAK within 1 month expressing that they accept the notification and conditions of DEDAK. Any institution that fails to send the letter of acknowledgment by this date shall be considered as having withdrawn its application

1. The institution shall participate in the "accreditation workshop" to be organized by DAK for the programs whose accreditation request is finalized. After the workshop, the DAK starts working on setting up an evaluation team.
2. The institution shall inform DEDAK in writing the time it has chosen for the self-assessment report preparation process at the end of the workshop. These periods can be 12 or 18 months.
3. The institution shall start to prepare a self-assessment report conforming to the content and the required format established by DEDAK after the notification of time for each of its programs whose accreditation requests are finalized. The time statement signifies the starting date for the preparation of the self-assessment report as well. At the end of the designated period, the self-assessment report is sent to DEDAK with pertinent attachments.
4. The institution may request an additional 6 or 12-month period in writing from DEDAK 3 months before the submission date of the self-assessment report. Additional time requests are made only once. The self-assessment report delivery period cannot be longer than 24 months in total, including extensions. Applications of institutions that do not submit a self-assessment report within this period are deemed withdrawn.

(ğ) DAK shall conduct a preliminary examination of the self-evaluation reports sent to DEDAK by the institutions in terms of format and content. If, as a result of the preliminary examination, insufficient format and/or content is identified in the self-assessment reports, the institutions will be notified within 45 days following the deadline. Institutions are required to make the necessary corrections within 15 days following this notification. Within this period, the accreditation applications of the programs that do not rectify the notified deficiencies are deemed withdrawn by their institutions.

1. In the preliminary examination of the self-assessment reports by the DAK, if deficiencies that may inhibit the program from obtaining accreditation in terms of content, especially in reporting the criteria, the accreditation assessment of the relevant program is stopped. This situation is communicated to the institution by DEDAK with its justifications. After the elimination of these deficiencies by the institution, it is informed that it can re-apply to DEDAK at the earliest in the next evaluation period. Failure to notify deficiencies in the reporting of the criteria as a result of the preliminary examination does not indicate that an assessment of inadequacy to meet the criteria as a result of the detailed examination by the evaluation team will not be made.

ı) The evaluation process of the programs that do not have any format and/or content insufficiency to inhibit the accreditation evaluation of the program in the self-evaluation reports or the programs that eliminate them within 15 days is initiated by DAK.

1. In case of a high number of applications high, DEDAK reserves the right to establish a second evaluation period within the same evaluation year.

(2) The application process for the Programs with Expired Accreditation is as follows:

1. DEDAK shall send a reminder to the institutions 24 months before the report submission deadline, which is prior to the expiration date of the accreditation period, for the programs whose accreditation periods will expire.
2. In the application procedures for these programs, the process defined in article 5.1 for the first accreditation applications is implemented with the following differences.
3. The institution wishing to request an evaluation for the programs whose accreditation period will expire and which will be evaluated by DEDAK for a general evaluation or an interim evaluation shall send this request to DEDAK in writing 18 months before the report submission date, which is prior to the expiration date of the accreditation period. The institution shall inform in this letter for which programs it chooses to apply. For programs that are not submitted to DEDAK on time, institutions are deemed to have not applied for an accreditation evaluation.
4. Instead of a comprehensive self-assessment report for programs to be evaluated by interim reports or interim visits, the institution prepares an indicator-focused interim report that indicates whether the criteria and related fields that were found to be lacking in the previous general assessment are met. The institution sends this report and its annexes electronically to DEDAK on the date specified by DEDAK in the evaluation report. Institutions that do not submit interim reports until this date are deemed not to apply.

## Program Evaluation Teams

**Article 6** - (1) Program Evaluation Teams are formed according to the following principles:

1. The teams that will evaluate the language education programs shall consist of a team leader selected by the DAK, and the program evaluators selected by DAK from the existing pool of program evaluators and a student evaluator.
2. The head of the team is selected from among the members who have been or have previously worked in the DAK or, when necessary, among the DEDAK evaluators experienced in the field of program evaluation.
3. The student evaluator must be continuing a similar program or should have completed the programs at most two years ago.

ç) Evaluation teams consist of at least four people.

1. The number of members in the team may be reduced in cases where the evaluation focus is very limited and significant overlap between programs to be evaluated exists, such as interim evaluations or evidence-finding evaluations.
2. While appointing evaluation team members, issues such as the possibility of a conflict of interest with the relevant institution, institutional distribution within the team, and transportation requirements of program evaluators are taken into consideration.
3. The formation of program evaluation teams is finalized within 2 months after the submission of the self-evaluation report and the institution is notified by the DAK for approval. DEDAK office transmits electronic copies of the reports to the relevant team members electronically.
4. From this stage on, all communication and arrangements of the team with the institution are carried out under the joint responsibility and cooperation of the team leader and the most authorized manager conducting the programs or the person responsible for the accreditation process to be assigned by this manager.

ğ) The transportation and accommodation requirements of the team are provided by the institution to be visited under the coordination of the team president.

## Stages of the Program Evaluation Process

**Article 7 -** (1) The program evaluation process, which entails the evaluation of qualitative and quantitative factors, and an accreditation decision to be reached at the end, consists of the following three stages:

1. Examination of the self-evaluation report prepared by the institution: The self-evaluation report is an introductory document that describes the programs whose accreditation are sought after by the institution, the processes applied in the implementation of these programs, all relevant academic and administrative units on a specific format, and subsumes information about the institution evaluated. During the review of the self-evaluation report, any additional information and documents deemed necessary by the members of the evaluation team for pre-visit evaluation are requested from the institution without waiting for the visit to the institution.
2. Institutional visit: The evaluation team conducts an institutional visit and an on-site inspection following the examination of the self-assessment report and the examination of any additional information and documents requested from the institution. The institutional visit has three purposes for the evaluation team:
3. Evaluating the issues that cannot be sufficiently clarified in the self-evaluation report. These cover the academic environment, motivation of students and lecturers, consistency and stability of lecturers and students, the quality of staff and students, student endeavors whose educational outcomes are measured, and issues that are not easy to document in a selfassessment report similar to these.
4. Helping to identify the strengths and aspects of the program that are open to improvement.
5. Examining the documents and information prepared by the institution as proof that the DEDAK evaluation criteria are met, and observing the physical facilities on site.

c) Preparation of a report by the evaluation team: The evaluation team submits its preliminary report to the institution within 20 days following the institutional visit. The institution responds to the report within 30 days. The evaluation team prepares a draft report, taking into account the 30-day response of the institution and submits it to DAK.

## Details of the Evaluation Process

**Article 8** - (1) A detailed examination is required in order to settle the first accreditation of a program or to evaluate the general or interim accreditation of an accredited program. Such an examination is performed by the evaluation teams in accordance with the principles given in the DEDAK Evaluation Guide prepared by DAK. Some prominent details of the evaluation process are given below:

1. The programs for which applications were made should be evaluated scrupulously at 5-year intervals. These types of assessments are detailed assessments called "General Assessment" (GD - general assessment).
2. If a program is not awarded an accreditation, or if the accreditation is annulled as a result of an evaluation, or if the status of “candidacy” is granted instead of an accreditation, the institution can object to this decision as detailed in Article 13.
3. The detection of some criteria that are partially met or not met at all during the general evaluation requires an evaluation that cannot wait for the periodic general evaluation. These types of evaluations are called “Interim Evaluations” (AD - interim evaluations). Interim evaluations focus only on the partially met and not met criteria specified in the previous general evaluation and on the measures taken and improvements made by the institution in order to eliminate these observations and deficiencies. An interim evaluation may also

include a focused visit to the institution, depending on the type of shortcomings noted in the previous evaluation. If in the information provided by the institution during the interim evaluation, in the documents and / or the information obtained during the visit, in the documents, in the interviews and during the visit, new deficiencies and observations regarding the evaluation criteria that were not disclosed in the previous evaluation are identified, these new deficiencies and observations are delineated in a separate section of the evaluation report.

ç) Interim reports sent by the institution as evaluations based only on interim reports, which do not require interim visits, are evaluated by the evaluation teams established under Article 6. These types of assessments are called "Interim Report Based Assessment" (ARD – interim report based assessment). The electronic copy of the prepared draft report is sent electronically to the DAK President by the team leader. Reports, whose consistency checks and editorial controls have been completed, are submitted to the approval of the DAK members. Approved reports are the final reports to be released to institutions. The DAK submits a report to the institution with an Interim Report-Based Assessment and a 2-Year Accreditation decision, including explanations on the areas that partially meet and do not meet the DEDAK criteria of the institution. Institutions submit a report to the DAK within 18 months following the decision, which includes improvements in areas that partially meet and do not meet the DEDAK criteria.

1. The date of visit of the evaluation team to the institution is determined jointly by the team leader and the authorized director of the institution, acceptable to the team members and the institution.
2. The examination, interview and evaluation activities of the evaluation team during the visit, additional information, document requests and the details of the visit plan are examined before the visit jointly with the team leader and the authorized manager of the institution visited and a relevant plan is drawn.
3. Observers may participate in the evaluation teams only with the permission of the team leader and the institution.
4. Support of academic units such as administration, student services, library, computer and informatics infrastructure, other departments and faculties, etc., and issues related to general institutional functions are only considered in terms of their relations to evaluated programs.

ğ) The evaluation team presents an "Exit Notice" to the people it deems appropriate as the last event of the institutional visit, the meeting where this exit notification is made is called the "Exit Meeting". In the Exit Notification, the participants of the meeting are informed about the findings based on the indicators of the program after the site visit. Information regarding the accreditation decision is not disclosed in the exit notification.

1. DAK shares the preliminary assessment report, which includes the findings based on the criteria, with the relevant institution manager within 20 days at the latest after the site visit. The institution may respond to the insufficiency statements in the pre-evaluation report prepared by the evaluation team within 30 days following the visit. If no response is received from the institution to DEDAK within this period, it indicates that all evaluations in the preliminary assessment report are accepted by the institution and the right to appeal is waived.

ı) The primary purpose of the 30-day response for the institution is to rectify the "factual errors" in the information and impressions on which the team evaluation presented in the pre-evaluation report is based. Inadequacies detected during the visit are considered remedied if the necessary corrections or changes are agreed upon within 30 days after the visit and if they are started to be implemented and proven by official documents signed by authorized administrators. However, any shortcomings found during the visit shall be considered as remedied, if the necessary corrections or changes have been decided on, if the implementation of these changes has begun within 30 days following the visit, and if they have been attested by means of official documentation signed by authorized persons. In cases of attempts made and measures taken to solve a problem, if the outcome of these measures are not fully observable yet, or if there are only signs of good faith, then DAK, during the next planned interim visit or interim report, shall take into consideration the effects of such corrective measures.

1. The evaluation team shall prepare a draft evaluation report that encompasses its main findings and accreditation recommendations after each visit to the institution, taking into account the findings of the site visit and the 30-day response, if any, The draft report should incorporate the 30-day responses of the institution to the pre-evaluation report and team evaluations regarding these responses. The electronic copy of the prepared draft report is sent electronically to the DAK President by the team leader. Reports, after consistency checks and editorial controls, are submitted to the approval of DAK members according to the DAK evaluation schedule. Approved reports are the final versions to be submitted to institutions.
2. The DAK President sends the report sent by the team chair to the Head of the Consistency Committee for consistency reviews. The Chairman of the Consistency Committee assigns two of the committee members and ensures that the necessary investigations and, if necessary, corrections are made. The revised report is sent to the DEDAK office to check the spelling. After the relevant adjustments, the report is sent to the DAK.
3. Reports, which are checked for consistency and spelling, are submitted to the approval of DAK members according to their evaluation schedule. Approved reports are the final reports to be given to institutions.

## Accreditation Decisions

**Article 9** - (1) Accreditation Decisions are taken according to the following rules:

1. Pronouncing the final verdict lies with DAK in all accreditation decisions. This decision is based on the recommendations made to DAK by the evaluation team and the Consistency Committee.
2. The DAK can take the following decisions:
3. AV (Accreditation) - This decision indicates that the program fully or almost fully complies with the DEDAK criteria. This decision can only be taken with one GD and its duration is 5 years until the next GD.
4. ARD (Interim Report Based Assessment) - This decision implies that the criteria with areas not met or partially met must be satisfied more thoroughly to ensure that the program fully complies with the criteria until the next general assessment. The nature of the criteria that are not met or partially met neither necessitates any precautionary steps to be taken by the institution nor requires any institutional visits for corroborating the corrective measures taken and subsequently their re-evaluation. However, the institution must prepare and submit an interim report focused on the corrective measures taken. This decision can only be made with a GD and its duration is 2 years.
5. AD (Interim Evaluation) - This decision denotes that the criteria with areas not met or partially met must be met more strongly to ensure that the program fully fulfills the criteria until the next general evaluation. The nature of the criteria not met or partially met requires the institution to take corrective measures and then a visit to the institution for re-evaluation. Prior to the visit, the institution should prepare and deliver an interim report detailing the corrective measures taken before the visit. This decision can only be made with a GD and is usually valid for 2 years.
6. ARDU (Evaluation and Extension Based on Interim Report) - This decision demonstrates that adequate measures have been taken by the institution to improve the criteria not met or partially met in the previous ARD decision. This decision can only be made with an ARD. This decision extends the accreditation until the next general assessment and therefore its duration is 3 years.
7. ADU (Extension with Interim Evaluation) - This decision reveals that adequate measures have been taken by the institution to improve the criteria that were not met or partially met in the previous AD decision. This decision can only be taken with AD. This decision extends the accreditation until the next general assessment and therefore its duration is 3 years.
8. ADV (Candidacy) - This decision can be made after GD, AD, or ARD. Giving after GD indicates that fulfilling the criteria that are not met or partially met is not considered possible with AD or ARD processes. If it is given at the end of AD and ARD, it signifies that the expected improvements were not made regarding the criteria that were not met at the end of the GD or only partially met. In this case, the program is given candidate status. The candidate status of an institution can continue for a maximum of 24 months. The institution submits a report to DAK within 18 months following the granting of the candidate status, that subsumes improvements in areas that partially or fully do not meet the DEDAK criteria. The evaluation made at the end of this process will be in GD status.
9. AVM (No Accreditation) - In case of a re-application for a program for which an ADV decision has already been taken, if there are conditions that require a new ADV decision in terms of meeting the criteria in the GD, the ADV decision is not taken for the second time. In this case, the AVM decision is taken and the candidate status of the program is terminated.
10. S (Termination) - This decision is usually taken depending on the closure of an institution and/or its related program.
11. DEDAK accredits the programs deemed appropriate by DAK, communicates the accreditation decisions and reports finalized by the DAK to the relevant institution and the head of the relevant team, prepares and archives the list of accredited programs annually.

ç) DEDAK cannot rank the programs according to their qualifications.

1. Accreditation decisions only specify the type, duration and date of the next evaluation. Relevant certificates are issued to the accredited programs, which will remain valid during the accreditation period.
2. In the general evaluation of a program, if it is concluded that the program complies with the minimum requirements specified in the DEDAK criteria, a 5-year accreditation is awarded. Despite the existence of partially met or not met criteria, an accreditation of 2 years is awarded if the infrastructure and dedication required to meet these criteria are observed although criteria that are partially met or not met in the overall evaluation of a program do exist. AD (Interim Evaluation) or ARD (Ara Rapora Dayalı Değerlendirme – ARD - Interim Report Based Assessment) is initiated for programs with 2year accreditation made in the last year (second year) of the accreditation validity period. In case of an AD or an ARD, the duration of the accreditation to be awarded may be up to 5 years starting from the previous general evaluation date.
3. AD (Interim Evaluation) or ARD (Interim Report Based Assessment) focuses on criteria that are partially met or not met during the general assessment. If, as a result of the evaluation, it is determined that there are still areas that partially or fully do not conform to the relevant criteria, the accreditation of the program may not be extended. In programs where necessary improvements are observed in AD or ARD, accreditation periods are extended according to the decisions of DAK.
4. In the evaluation process for accreditation decisions, the decisions DAK takes are not based on meeting the criteria and areas quantitatively, but on evaluating the significance of the criteria areas that have not been met and by appraising the depth of the necessary improvements via a general and holistic approach.

ğ) If DEDAK acquires some knowledge that a program can no longer fulfill the criteria within the given accreditation period, this information is immediately reported to the institution and a response is requested to DEDAK within 30 days. If there is no response from the institution or the response is not found sufficient by DAK, DEDAK can initiate a reasoned cancellation process. These processes start with the notification of the reasons for the reasoned cancellation to the institution. An institutional visit may be arranged to determine the actual data. A report detailing the reasons for the cancellation is prepared and sent to the institution for review and reply within 30 days. If there is no response from the institution or the response is not found sufficient by DAK, the accreditation is revoked. The institution is immediately notified about the cancellation, together with an explanation of the reasons.

1. Evaluation reports prepared for programs evaluated by DEDAK are not shared with anyone other than the relevant institution, except for legal obligations.

## Declaration of Accreditation Decisions to the Public

**Article 10** - (1) DEDAK publishes the updated list of programs whose accreditations are valid or that are in the status of accreditation candidates on the DEDAK website.

## Objections and Appeals

**Article 11** - (1) Objections, re-evaluation requests and re-visit requests can only be made against the decisions of ADV (Candidacy) and AVM (No Accreditation). In addition, such objections or requests can only be based on the opinion that the decision of ADV or AVM is not appropriate on account of some misinformation on behalf of DEDAK or evaluations contrary to DEDAK's published criteria, regulations and directives. In the appeal or reevaluation requests, only the conditions revealed to DEDAK at the time of DEDAK's decision will be taken into consideration. In the event of a re-visit request, significant improvements and corrections made prior to the request and documented by the institution will also be considered.

1. Institutions may request a re-evaluation or re-visit by DAK, instead of an immediate appeal.

If such a request is rejected by the DAK, the institution may appeal the original ADV or AVM decision. Requests for re-evaluation or re-visit must be made in writing to DEDAK within 30 days following the notification of the ADV or AVM decision to the institutions.

1. Objections must be made in writing to DEDAK within 30 days following the notification to the institutions of the rejection of the ADV or AVM decision or the re-evaluation or re-visit request.
2. Revisit
3. If significant and documented improvements are made in a program for which an ADV (Candidacy) or an AVM (No Accreditation) decision were made before the subsequent evaluation period begins, this program may be a candidate for re-visiting. In such cases, the institution must make a written request to DEDAK for a re-visit within 30 days following the notification of the ADV or AVM decision. Along with this request, a report explaining the measures taken to remedy the deficiencies specified in the notification made by DEDAK to the institution should also be submitted. This report should include documentation of significant developments and corrective actions and support the request for re-visits. However, institutions are warned that inadequate effectiveness of corrective measures may result in an inefficient visit.
4. DAK takes a decision within 30 days following the receipt of the re-visit request of the institution to DEDAK. This decision is made solely on the basis of the report and supporting documents issued by the institution regarding the deficiencies leading to the ADV or AVM decision.
5. If DAK concludes that there is no need for a re-visit, the relevant institution shall be notified of the reasons for the DAK's disapproval of the request and the institution's right to appeal the ADV or AVM decision.

ç) If DAK decides to revisit, the institution is deemed to have waived the right to appeal against the previous ADV or AVM decision or the new ADV or AVM decision that may be made as a result of the re-visit.

(5) Re-evaluation

1. If the organization that offers a program for which an ADV (Candidacy) or an AVM (No Accreditation) decision has been made reveals that the DAK has reached an erroneous ADV or AVM decision using some important and documented incorrect information, it may become a candidate for re-evaluation. In such cases, the institution must make a written reevaluation request to DEDAK within thirty 30 days following the notification of the ADV or

AVM decision. Along with this request, a report explaining important and documented information errors and their effects on erroneous ADV or AVM decisions and supporting documents should be submitted.

1. DAK re-evaluates the ADV or AVM decision within 30 days following the receipt of the request of the institution to DEDAK. This assessment is made solely on the basis of the said report and supporting documents issued by the institution regarding the deficiencies that led to the ADV or AVM decision.
2. If it is accepted that the institution is right about the flaws that caused DAK to make an erroneous decision, DAK may change the ADV or AVM decision and award the most appropriate one among suitable accreditation decisions.

ç) If the DAK concludes that there is no need for re-evaluation, it rejects the request for reevaluation with a letter explaining the reasons for the rejection and the institution's right to appeal against the ADV or AVM decision. The refusal of re-evaluation cannot be appealed.

(6) Objection

1. Only the ADV (Adaylık Verme – ADV - Candidacy) or AVM (Akreditasyon Vermeme – AVM - No Accreditation) decision can be appealed. Objections should be made in writing to DEDAK by the highest authority of the institution within thirty 30 days following the notification of the ADV or AVM decision to the institution. In the appeal application, the reasons for not conforming to the ADV or AVM decision taken by the DAK should be explained with the reasons (information errors or not complying with the published criteria of DEDAK, non-compliance with which policies or methods, etc.).
2. After the decision of objection reaches DEDAK, the DEDAK Board of Directors elects an objection committee of at least three among its members and/or former members of the Board of Directors. Those who may be members of the appealing institution are not eligible for such a position. At least one member of this committee must have experience as a program evaluator and/or former member of DAK. DEDAK Board of Directors appoints one of the committee members as the committee chairman.
3. Copies of all documents submitted to the institution at different stages of the evaluation process, the institution's responses during the evaluation process, and other documents submitted by the institution and DAK are given to the objection committee.

ç) The institution is expected to respond to the DEDAK evaluations on which the ADV or AVM decision previously sent by DEDAK is based. The institution can also provide other necessary materials to support the appeal. However, the institution must have given such materials to DEDAK during the evaluation process of the program, on which an ADV or an AVM decision was based.

1. Program arrangements made after the meeting of DAK during which the ADV or AVM decision is made are not taken into consideration by the objection committee.
2. In addition to the response to the institution to express its views and the evaluations on which the ADV or AVM decisions are based, DAK may also present other written documents. Such documents must be submitted to the institution and the appeal committee at least 60 days before the meeting of the committee. Any objections and counter statements of the institution regarding these documents should be submitted to the committee at least 30 days before the committee meeting.
3. Only written documents issued by the institution and DAK will be taken into consideration in the recommendation to make at the meeting of the objection committee. Institutional representatives or DAK members cannot attend this meeting. The decision to be taken by the appeals committee is limited to the decision options available to DAK. The objection committee submits its decision to the members of the DEDAK Board of Directors in a written report by the Committee Chairman within 30 days of the commencement of the appointment. The decision taken by the DEDAK Board of Directors is final.
4. The decision and its justifications are notified to the institution and DAK in writing by DEDAK within 15 days following the decision.

## Changes Within the Evaluation Period

**Article 12 -** (1) Programs accredited by DEDAK submit a change-notification report to DEDAK every year signifying any change in their programs that may affect the accreditation status.

(2) It is the responsibility of the institution to notify DEDAK in the change-notification reports of the changes in the criteria and related fields that occur in a program accredited by DEDAK and that may affect the accreditation status of the program. Significant changes may include the following:

1. Program Name
2. Teaching Staff
3. Learning Outcomes

ç) Educational program content

1. Students
2. Administration
3. Program Infrastructure
4. Financial Status of the Institution / Program
5. An evaluation process is initiated upon notification by the institution or a third party to DEDAK of significant changes in an accredited program that may affect the accreditation status of the program. The first step to be taken in this evaluation process is to inform DEDAK in a manner that will allow it to respond to the allegations or decisions.
6. The information provided by the institution should be sufficient to gauge the impact of the changes on the accredited program.
7. DAK evaluates the information provided by the institution and decides whether any change in the currently valid accreditation decision is required. This decision depends on an assessment of whether the program affected by the change may continue to meet relevant evaluation criteria.
8. After the notification of a significant change in an accredited program reaches DEDAK, the head of the DAK sends copies of the information provided by the institution to two DAK members.
9. These two members of DAK are asked to evaluate the information provided to them and report their proposals to DAK within 30 days. These members can request additional information from the institution. The proposal may be to extend the accreditation of the affected program until the end of the current evaluation period or may be for the institution to request a re-visit to determine the accreditation status of the changed program.
10. DAK evaluates the proposal made and takes a final decision.
11. This final decision is immediately notified to the institution by DEDAK.
12. The refusal of re-visit by the institution constitutes grounds for the cancellation of the said program's accreditation.

## Ensuring Consistency in Evaluation Processes

Article **13 -** (1) The Chairman of the Board of Directors ensures that all necessary studies are carried out to ensure consistency in the evaluation processes. The Consistency Committee, formed with the recommendation of the DAK and the approval of the Board of Directors, examines the evaluation reports prepared within the evaluation team, between teams, between years and to ensures spelling consistency. The Chairman of the Consistency Committee attends the consistency meeting held by the DAK in the first month of each year, and presents his views on ensuring consistency and, if any, suggestions for changes to be made in practices and training. The DAK evaluates the relevant suggestions and makes a proposal to the Board of Directors to makes changes it deems appropriate.

## Amendment to the Directive

**Article 14 -** (1) Amendments to this directive may be submitted to the Executive Board by DAK or a committee to be appointed by the DEDAK Executive Board. The proposals prepared are put on the agenda of the first meeting of the Board of Directors and are resolved.

## Enforcement

**Article 15 -** (1) This directive takes effect on the date it is approved by the Board of Directors.