



DIRECTIVE ON ASSESSMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION PRINCIPLES (DAIP)

Purpose and Scope

Article 1 - (1) The purpose of this directive is to regulate the procedures and principles of program evaluation and accreditation implemented by the Communication Education Assessment and Accreditation Board (ILED AK).

Legal Basis

Article 2 - (1) This directive has been prepared in accordance with the Charter and Working Regulations of the ILAD Communication Research Association (ILAD).

Definitions

Article 3 - (1) The terms used in this directive are defined as follows:

- a) ILAD: Refers to the Communication Research Association.
- b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS: Refers to the ILAD Board of Directors
ILAD
- c) ILED AK: Refers to the Communication Education Assessment and Accreditation Board.
- d) CRITERIA: Refers to the ILAD/ILED AK Evaluation Criteria to be used in the accreditation evaluation of communication education programs.
- e) INSTITUTION: Refers to the higher education institution (university) to which the program applying for accreditation is affiliated.
- f) SAR: Refers to the Self-Assessment Report.
- g) PER: Refers to the Program Evaluator Report.

OBJECTIVES OF ILEDAKILEDAK ACCREDITATION

Article 4 – (1) The accreditation of communication programs by ILAD is a voluntary process, and ILAD evaluates programs that apply for accreditation with the objective of granting accreditation.

(2) ILAD accreditation aims to contribute to enhancing the quality of communication education in Turkey by pursuing the following objectives:

- a) To identify communication programs that meet the ILAD evaluation criteria among the applicant programs.
- b) To publicly announce accredited programs, thereby informing society, prospective students, academic advisors, parents, educational institutions, professional organizations, potential employers, government agencies, and other stakeholders about programs compliant with ILAD criteria..
- c) To guide the continuous improvement of existing communication education programs and the development of new programs.

ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS AND INSTITUTIONS FOR ACCREDITATION APPLICATION

Article 5 - (1) Higher education institutions offering associate, undergraduate, or graduate programs in Turkey, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC), and foreign countries recognized by the Council of Higher Education (YÖK) may apply to ILAD for accreditation.

(2) The applying program must be in the field of "communication" and must have produced graduates prior to the application date.

(3) For programs with both primary and evening/second shift offerings, the evaluation shall adhere to the following principles:

- a) Separate applications must be submitted for the primary and evening/second shift programs.
- b) Institutions must demonstrate compliance with ILAD criteria separately for both primary and evening/second shift programs.
- c) Evening/second shift programs that have not yet graduated students or were not evaluated previously due to inactivity shall undergo evaluation only after producing graduates, even if their primary counterparts were previously accredited.

(4) Multi-campus institutions seeking accreditation must treat each physically and administratively distinct campus as a separate entity during the evaluation process.

(5) Programs offered under the same name but in different languages at a single institution shall be evaluated as separate programs.

APPLICATION FOR ACCREDITATION AND PRELIMINARY-EVALUATION PROCESS

Article 6 – (1) Application Process for First-Time applicants:

a) Institutions seeking accreditation for one or more programs for the first time must submit a written request to ILAD by the end of February of the evaluation year, specifying the programs applied for.

b) ILEDAK shall review the eligibility of the application under the conditions stipulated in Article 5. ILEDAK may request additional documentation if deemed necessary. ILEDAK ILEDAK

c) ILAD shall notify the institution by the end of March regarding the acceptance of the application, the total accreditation fee, and payment terms.

d) The application is finalized upon the institution's submission of a confirmation letter accepting ILAD's terms by the end of April.

e) The institution shall prepare a Self-Assessment Report (SAR) in the format prescribed by ILEDAK for each program, submitting one printed copy and one electronic copy to ILAD. Failure to submit the SAR by the specified deadline results in automatic withdrawal of the application. ILEDAK

f) ILEDAK conducts a preliminary review of the SAR for compliance with format and content requirements. ILEDAK

g) ILEDAK sends the Preliminary Evaluation Report to the institution. SARs deemed sufficient are forwarded to evaluation teams upon their formation. SARs with partial deficiencies may proceed only after rectification. ILEDAK ILEDAK

h) If the SAR reveals deficiencies that preclude accreditation, the process is suspended. The institution is notified and may reapply in the next evaluation cycle after addressing the deficiencies. ILEDAK ILEDAK ILEDAK

i) Programs with compliant SARs or remedied deficiencies proceed to full evaluation by ILEDAK. ILEDAK

(2) Application Process for Programs with Expiring Accreditation Periods

a) ILAD notifies programs of impending accreditation expiration via written communication by the end of January.

b) Institutions seeking re-evaluation must submit an application form to ILAD by the end of February, one year prior to the accreditation expiration date.

c) Programs affected by force majeure (e.g., pandemics, natural disasters) may receive a one-year accreditation extension via Board of Directors resolution.

Application and Evaluation Process Schedule

ARTICLE 7- (1) The schedule for the application and evaluation process shall be announced and communicated to relevant institutions by ILAD annually.

(2) The timelines specified in this directive pertaining to the accreditation application, evaluation process, and procedural workflow may be modified by ILAD based on prevailing conditions. Any amendments shall be publicly notified.

Program Evaluation Teams

ARTICLE 8- (1) Teams evaluating communication programs shall be selected by the ILEDAK Team Formation Committee from a pool of program evaluators, comprising experts in the relevant field. Their availability shall be confirmed in writing.

(2) When appointing evaluation team members, the following factors shall be considered:

a) Potential conflicts of interest with the institution under review.

b) Institutional diversity academic-industry representation balance, and gender parity within the team,

c) The need for a team leader and co-leader,
d) Logistical requirements, including evaluators' travel arrangements.

(3) The team chair shall be selected from experienced program evaluators with at least two prior terms of service as ILEDAK evaluators. If deemed necessary, a co-chair may also be appointed.

(4) Evaluation teams shall consist of at least three members. For interim evaluations or evidence-based assessments with narrow scopes, the number of team members may be reduced.

(5) Program evaluation teams shall be finalized and communicated to institutions by ILAD no later than the end of October. Institutions shall be consulted regarding potential conflicts of interest and must approve the team composition.

(6) Following team finalization, all communications and arrangements between the team and the institution shall be jointly managed by the team chair and the dean of the relevant faculty or director of the vocational school.

(7) Institutions shall provide electronic copies of the Self-Assessment Report (SAR) and appendices to each team member, chair, and co-chair.

(8) The ILAD Office shall furnish team members with electronic templates for the Program Evaluator Report (PER), exit briefing form, and post-visit chair report. Previous evaluation (interim and/or full-scale) reports, if applicable, shall also be shared.

(9) Upon assignment, the team chair shall convene an introductory meeting to establish a work schedule and team protocols.

(10) Team members shall individually review the SAR and share their findings with the team per the agreed timeline. They shall jointly prepare the PER, documenting strengths, areas for improvement, and site visit inquiries for each criterion.

Evaluation of Programs

ARTICLE 9- (1) Evaluations of programs applying for accreditation shall assess compliance with the assessment criteria. During the evaluation process, the following points has to be taken into consideration:

a) Although institutions may use their own terminology, the following definitions made by ILAD apply:

Program Educational Objectives: Broad statements describing graduates' expected career achievements.

Program Learning Outcomes: Specific knowledge, skills, and competencies students must acquire by graduation.

Assessment: The process of defining, collecting, and organizing data and evidence using various methods to assess attainment of objectives and outcomes.

Evaluation: The process of interpretation of data and evidence obtained through assessments. The evaluation process should indicate the level of achievement of the program's educational objectives and outcomes and should address the improvement areas of the program.

(2) Institutions retain autonomy in curriculum design, provided qualitative factors outweigh quantitative metrics (e.g., credit hours). Compliance with general principles in the criteria shall be rigorously verified.

(3) Teaching methods and assessment tools must employ contemporary, reliable techniques to ensure learning outcomes are met, regardless of traditional or innovative approaches.

(4) A program to be evaluated by ILEDAK must fundamentally qualify as communication education programs, irrespective of specialized titles. . Therefore, evaluations shall prioritize::

a) Compliance with communication education standards, regardless of the wording or emphasis in the program name.

b) Alignment of program names with the program content.

c) If a program's name relates to one or more programs with specific criteria, the program must fulfill all relevant program-specific criteria.

(5) Programs lacking specific criteria shall be assessed per ILAD's *Criteria Determination Procedures Directive*. A decision shall be made in accordance with the standards established by ILAD.

Stages of the Program Evaluation Process

ARTICLE 10- (1) Review of the Self-Assessment Report Prepared by the Institution:

The Self-Assessment Report is a self-descriptive document detailing the program's processes. Evaluators may request additional documentation, including graduate transcripts from the past three years.

(2) Institution Visit: After reviewing the Self-Assessment Report and supplementary materials , the ILEDAK team conducts an on-site inspection.

a) Objectives of the on-site inspection include: :

- 1) Assessing factors not fully captured in the SAR (e.g., academic environment, student-faculty motivation).
- 2) Identifying institutional strengths and areas for improvement.
- 3) Verifying compliance through physical inspections and document reviews.

(3) Briefing the Findings of the On-Site Inspection:

a) As a final stage of the on-site visit, findings are orally presented to the rector or designated representatives by the ILEDAK team. This presentation is called the "Exit Briefing" and the meeting where the exit report is delivered is referred to as the "Exit Meeting." The exit meeting may be set online under exceptional circumstances.

b) The Exit Briefing should reflect the findings of the on-site inspection process. The evaluation team prepares a written report covering the findings of on-site inspection to be shared with the institution.

(4) Preparation of the Report by the Evaluation Team:

a) A draft report prepared by the evaluation team , taking into account the content of the Self-Assessment Report, the documents and information submitted by the institution, the discussions held during the on-site visit, the facilities seen, and the information gathered shall be submitted to ILEDAK within 30 days post-visit.

b) Responding within the Fifteen-Day: The institution may submit corrections to factual errors within 15 days. Remedial actions require official documentation. The institution may also submit additional information for consideration in preparing the evaluation team's final report. If deficiencies identified during the visit are corrected within the 15-day period and official documents signed by the responsible administrators are provided as evidence, they will be considered corrected. In cases where remedial actions have been initiated but their effects are not yet fully realized or only limited signs of good faith are observed, the effectiveness of corrective measures will be considered during the next scheduled follow-up visit or report evaluation.

c) Failure to respond within 15 days constitutes acceptance of findings.

(5) Following each institution visit, the draft report prepared by the ILEDAK team shall include a separate section addressing the faculty or vocational school responsible for the evaluated programs in general; a dedicated section for each individual program under review. In cases where the visited institution submits a response to the exit report, the draft report shall incorporate the institution's 15-day response to the findings and the evaluation team's assessments of the institution's responses. The finalized draft reports, accompanied by comparative tables prepared by the ILAD Office, shall be submitted to the **Consistency Commission** for review.

(6) The Consistency Commission reviews reports for internal, inter-team, and inter-temporal consistency submitting findings to ILEDAK.

(7) The evaluation team reports and the Consistency Commission's report are discussed during ILEDAK meetings according to the evaluation schedule, and decisions are made. These decisions are submitted to the ILAD Board of Directors for approval. Approved reports are finalized upon ILAD Board of Directors' endorsement and to be delivered to the institutions.

Details of the Evaluation Process

ARTICLE 11- (1) The accreditation of a program for the first time or the general/interim accreditation evaluation of an accredited program shall be initiated through an examination conducted by ILEDAK teams. Team activities shall be executed by evaluation teams in accordance with the principles set forth in the *ILEDAK Evaluation Manual*.

(2) For the renewal of accreditation, a detailed evaluation of the program shall be conducted at five (5)-year intervals. Such detailed evaluations, referred to as "**General Evaluation**," shall be carried out by ILAD as concurrently as possible for all accredited programs of an institution. This synchronization shall be organized to ensure that no program remains unevaluated for more than six (6) years. The accreditation period may be shortened to less than five (5) years to align with the General Evaluation timelines of other programs within the same institution, provided such adjustments are made with the explicit consent of the relevant institution.

(3) Should accreditation be denied to a program or revoked following an evaluation, the institution may appeal such decisions. Appeals may also be lodged against two (2)-year accreditation decisions. In such cases, procedures shall be conducted per the Appeals Directive, based on the review and recommendation of the Appeals Commission and the subsequent resolution by the ILAD Board of Directors.

(4) The identification of deficiencies during a general evaluation necessitates an interim evaluation. Interim evaluations shall focus exclusively on observations, concerns, and weaknesses noted in the preceding general evaluation, as well as the measures and improvements implemented by the institution to address such deficiencies. An interim evaluation may include a targeted site visit, contingent on the nature of the previously identified deficiencies. Should new deficiencies or observations related to evaluation criteria emerge during the Interim Evaluation—through documentation, site visits, interviews, or facility inspections—these shall be documented in a separate section of the evaluation report.

(5) Significant deficiencies identified subsequent to the prior evaluation shall be taken into account when rendering accreditation decisions or revoking existing accreditation. Persistent deficiencies undetected in the preceding General Evaluation shall not influence the accreditation decision; however, they shall be explicitly highlighted in the final report, with a directive for rectification.

(6) For Interim Evaluations not requiring a site visit (i.e., those based solely on interim reports), and provided no other programs of the institution necessitate a visit during the same period, the interim report shall typically be assessed by a member of ILEDAK. The evaluating ILEDAK member may, if necessary, request assistance from relevant program evaluators..

(7) The date for the evaluation team's site visit shall be mutually agreed upon by the team chair and the institution's authorized administrator (typically the dean, relevant deputy dean, or vocational school director), taking into account the availability of both the team members and the institution. The scope and logistics of the visit—including requests for additional information, documentation, interviews, and inspections—shall be jointly planned in detail by the team chair and the institution's authorized administrator prior to the visit. Specific requests from program evaluators regarding the visit schedule shall be coordinated with the relevant program administrator (typically the department chair or deputy chair), with the dean and team chair duly notified.

(8) Evaluations of general institutional functions—including administration, student services, library, IT infrastructure, and support from other academic units (departments/faculties)—shall be conducted solely in relation to the services provided to the evaluated programs.

(9) Under extraordinary circumstances impeding site visits (e.g., pandemics, natural disasters), teams shall conduct evaluations through online consultations with the institution's/program's administrators, students, and stakeholders. The team chair may, if necessary, delegate one or two evaluators to conduct limited on-site infrastructure inspections. In cases where travel is entirely prohibited, all site visit activities—including inspections of libraries, IT infrastructure, and facilities—shall be completed online via video recordings, live streams, or other technological means.

(10) Terms to be Used in the Exit Report:

a) **Deficiency Notice:** Indicates failure to meet a criterion. The program is non-compliant with the relevant criterion. The institution must immediately implement corrective measures.

b) **Weakness Notice:** Indicates partial fulfillment of a criterion, with no guarantee that the program's quality will remain uncompromised until the next General Evaluation. The institution must adopt corrective measures to strengthen compliance.

c) **Concern Notice:** Indicates insufficient fulfillment of a criterion, with potential for future non-compliance. The institution is advised to initiate proactive measures to ensure sustained compliance.

d) **Observation Notice:** A non-binding commentary or recommendation, either related or unrelated to the evaluation criteria, intended to assist the institution in its ongoing efforts to enhance the program.

Consistency and Editorial Checks

ARTICLE 12- (1) Notifications issued to institutions following the accreditation evaluation of programs shall be consistent in both substance and form, and free of typographical errors. Prior to the deliberation of draft reports by ILEDAK, attention shall be paid to ensuring intra-team, inter-team, and inter-temporal consistency in evaluations.

(2) Draft reports prepared by evaluation teams shall undergo reviews and corrections for consistency, formatting, typographical errors, and stylistic coherence.. In cases In cases requiring extensive revisions, the participation of program evaluators shall be requested through the relevant team chairs. These checks shall be conducted by the Consistency Control

Commission established by ILEDAK, in accordance with the principles outlined in the *Consistency Control Directive*.

Evaluation and Accreditation Decisions

ARTICLE 13- (1) Reports subjected to consistency and editorial checks shall be deliberated and resolved per ILEDAK's evaluation calendar. Decisions rendered by ILEDAK shall be finalized upon approval by the ILAD Board of Directors.

(2) Accredited programs shall be issued a certificate valid for the duration of the accreditation period.

Full Accreditation

ARTICLE 14- (1) If a program is determined to meet all minimum conditions specified in the ILEDAK criteria, it shall be granted accreditation for five (5) years for associate degree programs, five (5) years for undergraduate programs, and five (5) years for graduate programs. Full Accreditation signifies that no deficiencies or weaknesses were identified in any criterion, though concerns or observations may be noted. Such programs shall be subject to a **Subsequent General Evaluation (SGE)**. Full Accreditation decisions shall only be rendered following a General Evaluation and confirm full compliance with applied criteria.

(2) Institutions granted full accreditation shall submit a Monitoring Report covering all criteria to ILEDAK by the end of the third year. The template for this report shall be prepared and communicated to the institution by ILEDAK.

Conditional Accreditation (Interim Evaluation)

ARTICLE 15- (1) If a program's General Evaluation identifies weaknesses in one or more criteria—without deficiencies—it shall be granted accreditation for two (2) years.

(2) Programs awarded two-year accreditation shall undergo an interim evaluation during the final year (second year) of the accreditation period. This evaluation shall focus on criteria flagged for weaknesses or concerns in the prior general evaluation.

(3) If none of the weaknesses identified in the prior general evaluation persist during the interim evaluation, the program's accreditation period may be extended by up to three (3) years, pending the next general evaluation.

(4) If weaknesses from the prior general evaluation persist during the interim evaluation, the accreditation period shall be extended by one (1) year, during which the institution must submit evidence of corrective measures.

Decisions Following General Evaluation

ARTICLE 16- (1) Interim Visit (IV): This decision signifies that the criteria flagged with a weakness notice during the general evaluation must be strengthened to ensure the program's quality remains uncompromised until the next general evaluation. The nature of the weakness necessitates a site visit to assess the institution's corrective measures.

(2) **Interim Report (IR):** This decision signifies that the criteria flagged with a weakness notice during the general evaluation must be strengthened to ensure the program's quality remains uncompromised until the next general evaluation. The nature of the weakness does not necessitate a site visit; however, the institution must submit an interim report focused on corrective measures. This decision may only be rendered following a general evaluation and is typically valid for two (2) years.

Decisions Following Interim Evaluation

ARTICLE 17- (1) Extension by Visit (EV): This decision confirms that the institution has implemented sufficient corrective measures. It may only be rendered following an Interim Visit evaluation and extends accreditation until the next general evaluation, typically for three (3) years.

(2) **Extension by Report (ER):** This decision confirms that the institution has implemented sufficient corrective measures to address weaknesses identified in a prior Interim Report. It may only be rendered following an Interim Evaluation and extends accreditation until the next general evaluation, typically for three (3) years.

(3) If weaknesses persist during the Interim Evaluation:

a) Provide Evidence via Visit (PEV): Indicates that weaknesses identified in the prior evaluation persist. A site visit is required to assess corrective measures, preceded by the institution's submission of a report focused on such measures. This decision may be rendered during an Interim Evaluation and is valid for one (1) year.

b) Provide Evidence via Report (PER): Indicates that weaknesses identified in the prior evaluation persist. A site visit is not required; however, the institution must submit a report focused on corrective

measures. This decision may be rendered during an Interim Evaluation and is typically valid for one (1) year.

(4) Decision following the Provide Evidence period: Extension by Evidence (EE): This decision confirms that the institution has implemented sufficient corrective measures following an Evidence via Visit or Evidence via Report evaluation. It extends accreditation until the next general evaluation, typically for two (2) years.

Decisions to Deny Accreditation

ARTICLE 18- (1) **Denial of Accreditation (DA):** This decision may be rendered following the evaluation of a new program or a program subject to Evidence via Visit/Report. It signifies that the program exhibits deficiencies in meeting criteria during its initial general evaluation.

(2) If rendered post-Evidence via Visit/Report, this decision confirms that weaknesses identified in a prior general or Interim Evaluation persist.

(3) A Denial of Accreditation (DA) decision is issued if the weaknesses in the relevant criteria are determined to persist, and the program's accreditation is not extended. A Denial of Accreditation decision shall be subject to appeal.

(4) Accreditation remains valid until a final decision to deny extension is rendered following an Evidence-based Interim Evaluation.

Termination

ARTICLE 19- (1) This decision is typically rendered in response to an institution's request to extend the accreditation of a program slated for closure, to accommodate currently enrolled students.

(2) ILEDAK and the institution shall collaborate to ensure the program's accreditation remains valid until its closure date, subject to the following conditions:

a) Accreditation of a program to be closed during its active accreditation period shall remain valid from the closure notice date until the closure date, contingent on ILEDAK's acceptance of a report submitted by the institution.

b) Accreditation of a program to be closed within three (3) years of its accreditation expiration may be extended by one (1), two (2), or up to three (3) years via a Termination decision by ILEDAK,

based on an institutional report. A one-day site visit by a team chair may be requested.

c) ILEDAK shall annotate the closure date for programs subject to Termination in the accredited programs registry.

Revocation of Accreditation

ARTICLE 20- (1) If credible evidence indicates a program no longer meets criteria, the institution shall be notified and required to submit a response within thirty (30) days. Failure to respond or an inadequate response determined by ILEDAK authorizes ILAD to initiate justified revocation procedures.

(2) Revocation procedures commence with formal notification of grounds. A site visit may be conducted to verify findings. A revocation document detailing grounds shall be issued, and the institution must respond within thirty (30) days. Failure to respond or an inadequate response results in revocation. The decision, including rationale, shall be promptly communicated to the institution and is subject to appeal.

Appeals

ARTICLE 21- (1) Appeals may be lodged against decisions to "deny accreditation" or grant two (2)-year accreditation. Appeals or petitions may be grounded on claims that the accreditation decision contains factual inaccuracies in ILEDAK's assessment, or deviates from published criteria, regulations, or directives of ILAD. Appeal petitions shall be adjudicated based on conditions known to ILEDAK at the time of the original decision. (2) Procedures and principles governing appeals by institutions are stipulated in the "Appeals Directive".

Changes During the Evaluation Period

ARTICLE 22- (1) The institution's governing authority is obligated to notify ILAD of material changes to an accredited program that may affect its accreditation status.

(2) Following changes that may impact the accreditation status of a program must be reported to ILAD:

- a) Program Name
- b) Academic Staff (Faculty composition)
- c) Educational Objectives
- d) Institutional Infrastructure, or similar material alterations..

(3) Upon notification of such changes—whether by the institution or a third party—an evaluation process shall be initiated. The institution shall first provide ILEDAK with information addressing the reported changes. While detailed documentation is not mandatory, submissions must contain sufficient particulars to assess the change’s impact on accreditation.

(4) ILEDAK shall evaluate the submitted information to determine whether amendments to the current accreditation decision are warranted. This determination hinges on the degree of certainty that the program continues to meet relevant evaluation criteria.

(5) Upon receipt of a material change notification by ILAD/ILEDAK, the ILEDAK Chair shall forward copies of the institution’s submission to two ILEDAK members. These members shall evaluate the materials and submit recommendations to ILEDAK within thirty (30) days. They may request additional information via the ILAD Secretariat. Recommendations may propose extending accreditation until the current evaluation period concludes, or requiring a revisit to reassess the program’s accreditation status.

(6) ILEDAK’s recommendations shall be deliberated by the ILAD Board of Directors, whose decision shall be communicated to the institution.

(7) The institution’s refusal to permit a revisit constitutes grounds for revocation of accreditation.

(8) ILEDAK must be continuously informed of material changes to accredited programs, including closures, faculty or infrastructure modifications, organizational restructuring, student enrollment status, or related unit changes. Unauthorized closure of a program results in automatic termination of its ILAD/ILEDAK accreditation.

Amendments to the Directive

ARTICLE 23- (1) Proposed amendments to this Directive may be submitted by the “Legislation Development and Update Committee”, as commissioned by ILAD.

(2) Proposed amendments shall be placed on the agenda of the Board of Directors’ first meeting for deliberation and resolution.

Effectiveness

ARTICLE 24- This directive enters into force upon approval by the ILAD Board of Directors.