DEDAK

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING THE SELF-STUDY REPORT

Dil Eğitimi Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Kurulu

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION

The DEDAK Accreditation Self-Study Report (DSR) is prepared by the institution to be reviewed and is used by the Language Education Evaluation and Accreditation Board (DAK) and DEDAK reviewer teams to conduct DEDAK accreditation evaluations. The rules to follow when preparing the DSR, explanations, suggestions and the DSR sections can be found within this document.

CONTENT OF THE DEDAK SELF-STUDY REPORT

The purpose of the self-study report is for the language program to provide the required information to allow DEDAK to make a quantitative and qualitative evaluation. It is imperative that a participatory approach that involves all stakeholders during the preparation for accreditation and the writing of the report is employed.

The report should be written in adherence to the DSR template, contain all required information and all information should reflect actual implementations.

The report should be written in "Calibri 11 font (excluding headings) and utilize a spacing of 1.15 ". A separate DSR should be written for each individual program. During the writing of the DSR, the headings, content and questions contained in the draft report template should not be deleted, the answers and verification should be provided in the designated areas of the report. The institution should adhere to the template sent to them when writing the report and use clear and understandable language.

The Self-Study Report is made up of 4 sections:

1. **COVER PAGE**
2. **A. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROGRAM**
3. **B. DEDAK STANDARDS AND REQUIRED RESPONSES AND VERIFICATION TO BE PROVIDED FOR EACH STANDARD**
4. **C. APPENDICES**

A description for each section of the DEDAK Self-Study Report can be found below:

1. **COVER PAGE:**

This section is the cover page of the report and information about the program will be written in the indicated areas. The text provided in parentheses should be changed with wording appropriate to the program. For example, the (Program Name) area on the cover page should be deleted and the program's name should be written in full.

2. **A. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROGRAM**

In this section there are questions about the profile of the program and the report preparation process grouped under 8 headings. Programs are expected to answer these questions by taking information and their experiences about the program into consideration.

3. **B. DEDAK STANDARDS AND QUESTIONS AND VERIFICATION TO BE PROVIDED FOR EACH STANDARD**

In this section institutions present how they meet each standard with verification. This section is made up of 3 different sub sections.

- Required responses from the institution for each standard
- Verification
- Planned self-recommendations

An explanation for each sub-section can be found below:

Required responses from the institution for each standard

In this section, programs are expected to answer the questions located under each standard by using evidence-based implementations.

- The standards mean something due to the content; thus, content should be given importance when responding to the standards.
- Information may need to be repeated when responding to different standards.
- When writing the report, it is important to answer each question carefully by considering what the question is asking. Explanations should be provided when an "Explanation" is required and a "list" should be provided when a list is requested.

Verification

The reviewer team will only take evidence-based statements into consideration. Any statement made without evidence will not considered. The DEDAK Evaluation Standards Verification Handbook is an instructive source on what type of documentation can be provided for each standard and this document can be accessed on the DEDAK web site under the documents heading. The documentation list that can be found here is meant to serve as an example. The documents can be diversified and increased based on program data.

There are two areas under the Documentation heading as shown below under every standard in the DSR for the documents to be listed. Documentation to be submitted with the DSR should be listed under the "Documentation in the report" heading and each document should be hyperlinked to the evidence file or the web site that makes up the evidence. All links must be functional and allow access to the respective file or web site when the DSR is submitted.

Under the "Verification on site" heading, evidence that cannot be attached to the DSR and can only be shared during the site visit should be listed. Examples for this type of evidence are items that must be physically observed, all exams, and files that cannot be shared due to employee rights.

Evidentiary documents and web pages in the report should be hyperlinked and when clicked these links should directly access the evidence.

Documentation

Documentation in the report

Verification on site

Planned self-recommendations

In this section, programs can mention improvements that have been planned but have not yet been implemented. As these plans cannot be considered as an example of implementation, they will have no bearing on the meeting of a standard. However, generally speaking, they can give an idea about continuous improvement plans.

DEDAK
Dil Eğitimi Değerlendirme ve Akreditasyon Kurulu

EXAMPLE STANDARD CONTENT

In order to provide a better understanding about how to answer the standards, an example of a response to a standard and the verification list has been provided below. This example has been provided not as a model of implementation but as how to write a response to a standard.

Example:

Curriculum Standard 1

Consistency with the Mission and Needs

Standard 1: The Language Program has learning outcomes that are consistent with the mission and are needs based.

1. State how the Language Program's mission aligns with the curriculum and describe how it guides and is in accordance with the curriculum.

The mission of the English Preparatory Program is to equip students with the necessary language skills to complete an academic course of study and to function well in a professional and social context, and the aim is to improve students' language skills and to provide them with reading and communication skills – both written and spoken – which will consequently contribute to their overall academic success as they begin their studies at our university. Therefore, students, with limited knowledge of English, admitted to the undergraduate, associate, and graduate programs of the university are required to attend the Preparatory Program of the School of Foreign Languages in order to improve their English skills.

As the mission of the university is to equip students with the English skills required like, reading, writing, listening and speaking in their further studies or in their business life, education in the English Preparatory Program is conducted through a modular system. In an academic year, there are four modules, which last for eight weeks. In accordance with the mission of the program, the modular system provides students with the necessary language skills to achieve the module objectives and move on to a higher level. The system not only accommodates students who need more time to consolidate their learning but also gives quick learners the opportunity to progress at a faster pace (see Student Booklet 2020-2021, Modular Calendar 2020-2021).

2. List the methods/sources/data/tools that are used to determine the curricular needs of the program.

   __X data collected from program students (student surveys, student focus group meetings, etc.)
   ___ analysis of data collected from students that have successfully completed the program
   ___ analysis of data collected from institutional graduates
   ___ analysis of data collected from departmental faculty members
   __X analysis of data collected from language program faculty members
   ___ other (specify)

3. State how the methods/resources/data/tools utilized in the needs analysis were used in the design of the curriculum. Explain how these are used to determine the needs and how the results are used.

In order to determine the curricular needs of the program, qualitative data through focus group meetings and open-ended questions, and quantitative data through surveys are collected. At the end of each module, qualitative and quantitative data are collected through surveys from instructors via the language management system, and quantitative data is collected from students via an online survey.

Instructors and students give feedback on the learning objectives, the course material, the use of technology, teaching/ learning strategies and methods and assessment (see Instructor End of Module Survey 2020-2021, Student End of Module Survey 2020-2021). The data is analyzed by the Head of the Curriculum and Materials Unit (CMDU), and the results are shared with administration. Results are also shared with instructors at the end of each academic term via the learning management system. Apart from end of module surveys, feedback is received from instructors and students through focus group meetings at the end of each academic year (see Focus group questions for instructors 2020-2021, Focus group questions for students 2020-2021). Instructor focus group participants are determined on a voluntary basis and/or by the Head of Preparatory Program and the Head of CMDU. Student participants are selected from different levels. Classroom instructors' assistance is taken when determining students for the focus group meetings to ensure transparency and objectivity. The Head of Preparatory Program, the Head of CMDU and the Head of Testing hold the focus group meetings. Both instructors and students are asked some leading/ guiding questions pre-prepared by the above-mentioned units. The notes taken during the focus group meetings are organized based on the themes discussed in the meetings and are put into report by the Head of CMDU. The report is shared with the administration and the outcomes are discussed and considered in the end of year meeting held with the administration, the CMDU, the Testing Unit and the Teacher Development Unit. Based on the feedback received from instructors and students, necessary steps are taken in adapting or revamping the curriculum. To illustrate, based on last year's feedback from instructors and students, the coursebooks have changed, the number of assessments has been increased and their content has been developed, and amendments have been made to the homework tasks and digital assessment (see Instructor End of Module Survey Results 2020-2021, Student End of Module Survey Results 2020-2021, Instructor Focus group minutes 2020-2021, Student Focus group minutes 2020-2021).

Verification

Documentation in the report

Student Booklet 2020-2021 Modular Calendar 2020-2021 Instructor End of Module Survey 2020-2021 Instructor End of Module Survey Results 2020-2021 Student End of Module Survey 2020-2021 Student End of Module Survey Results 2020-2021 Focus group questions for instructors 2020-2021 Focus group questions for students 2020-2021 Instructor Focus group minutes 2020-2021 Student Focus group minutes 2020-2021	

Verification on site

Instructor End of Module Survey Results for all years Instructor End of Module Survey Results on Learning Management System Student End of Module Survey Results for all years Instructor Focus group minutes for all years Student Focus group minutes for all years	

Program self-recommendations

Describe the planned changes within the Language Program under this standard, if any.