

## **HEPDAK CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION (CIC) 2024 ANNUAL REPORT**

In 2024, the Commission for Continuous Improvement (CIC) held three (3) meetings. In these meetings, it was decided to appoint a faculty member to the CIC, conduct focus group discussions on the institutional, instructor, and student evaluator trainings organized by HEPDAK and related commissions, and share the results with the HEPDAK. Fifteen academics were invited to solicit opinions on evaluator training and seven (7) academics attended the related meeting. For institutional training, interviews were scheduled with 22 institutional representatives and eight (8) participating institutions were surveyed. To obtain opinions on student evaluator training, 13 student participants were selected and five (5) students were interviewed. The findings obtained from the focus group discussions are summarized below and were forwarded to the HEPDAK Board of Directors to ensure planning for the appropriate committees.

***Student reviewer suggested that;*** repeated training supports the learning process, the establishment of a Whatsup group should be mandatory in all assessment groups to ensure effective communication, it is important that students receiving refresher training and students being trained for the first time are in different groups, it makes more sense to move training for student evaluators to February due to student responsibility, sample formats for writing should be given to ensure new participants better understand the processes for writing reports / samples with case studies should be provided. Students also suggested that the resources provided before the training should be made clearer for the newly trained students, that more detailed information should be provided about the mentoring system used in the training process, that other arrangements should be made for the online training process as students had issues with the sustainability of the training as they preferred to attend the training over the phone, and that attention should be paid to the length of the training.

***Academic evaluators suggested that;*** extending the training period, conducting training with smaller groups instead of groups of 10 people, obtaining the opinions of trainers through a questionnaire to determine the most appropriate time to schedule the training, separating the group receiving refresher training from the group being trained for the first time, carrying out a

different planning due to the limited level of exploratory learning in groups with s trainers with more experience as evaluators, the new evaluators experience anxiety due to extreme decisions/evaluations among trainers with more experience in evaluation in trainings conducted through examples, therefore, a consensus should be reached between experienced trainers in advance, working with senior academicians (Prof.) can be a pressure factor, face-to-face trainings should be conducted compared to online trainings and if possible, these trainings should be planned at regional level, new evaluators have too many expectations from the team leaders in the trainings, but it should be frequently reminded/emphasized that the process is a learning process for the team leader as well, although it was found that the preliminary materials provided for the training were sufficient, it was suggested that it could be more effective, work on a SID without deficiencies rather than the modified/incomplete Self Assessment Report (SAR) used, or if the incomplete SAR is to be used, it is important to share the completed version of the SAR after the training and paint/mark the areas to be included in the evidence, and if there are links that cannot be opened in the example SAR, a note should be made next to it or explanations should be provided regarding which interface (Chrome, Edge, etc.) can be used to open it.

***Representatives of the institutions suggested that;*** some topics could be omitted/shortened (e.g. goals and visits could be omitted; The preparation of the PDR could be shortened due to its lengthy nature, allowing more time for group work/examples, the time for case presentations could be increased or the number of working groups formed could be reduced, the final version of the cases could be given to the evaluators, to form the truth in the minds of the evaluators/shared on the website/sent out to participants, clearer/quantifiable evaluable standards such as number of students per faculty member should be established/more space should be given to examples of institutions that have applied but had their applications rejected, It was noted that the duration of the training could be organized as two (2) full days or three (3) half days, that the case group facilitators could be more useful in understanding the process if they are selected from experienced educators who are evaluators, but that HEPDAK should set some rules for the role of the facilitator as it is feared, that some people may remain more passive under the influence of the facilitator in the group work during the training process, that it is useful for the accredited institutions to introduce themselves but this should be moved to a separate training session, and that the issues to be considered in each standard could be covered in more detail.

### **Continuous Improvement Commission (CIC)**

- Prof. Dr. Ayla Keçeci (Chair), Düzce University
- Prof. Dr. Gülsüm Nihal Çürük (Secretary), Izmir University of Economics
- Prof. Dr. Şeyda Seren Intepeler, Dokuz Eylül University
- Prof. Dr. Zeynep Özer, Akdeniz University
- Prof. Dr. Lecturer. Prof. Dr. Hatice Şen, Cyprus International University
- Res. Asst. İbrahim Kavaslar, Düzce University