

CONSISTENCY DOCUMENT

To minimize and prevent inconsistencies that may occur in practice, the consistency evaluations listed and exemplified below will be made by the Consistency Commission (CC), and relevant stakeholders will be informed and reported.

1. Consistency in Three Stages
2. Consistency Levels and Main Responsible
3. Consistency in Evaluations: Key Considerations
4. Consistency in Evaluations: Evaluation Scale
5. Consistency in Evaluations: Example Practice

1. Consistency in Three Stages

- 1.1. Consistency in the evaluation process
- 1.2. Consistency in evaluations
- 1.3. Consistency in reporting (format, style, depth/detail)

2. Consistency Levels and Main Responsible

- 2.1. Consistency between different programs evaluated by a team in an organization [Team]
- 2.2. Consistency between different organizations evaluated in the same period [Team Leaders, Consistency Commission]
- 2.3. Consistency between programs/organizations evaluated in different periods [Team Leaders, Consistency Commission, NDEAB]

Team → Team Leader → Consistency Commission → NDEAB

3. Consistency in Evaluations: Key Considerations

Evaluations; It is made according to the standards in the 8 main titles in the "AADEP standards and evaluation scale" document. For consistency in evaluations, the following considerations are taken into account:

- 3.1.** Evaluations should have the following key features;
 - a. Scope/Integrity (no main titles, titles, and standards should be omitted)
 - b. Depth/Detail (it should not be as some superficial, some overly detailed)
 - c. Balance/Consistency (evaluations must be balanced and consistent)

- 3.2.** Evaluations of the standards in the titles should be expressed in appropriate terms
(1: very unsatisfactory, 2: unsatisfactory, 3: acceptable, 4: good, 5: very good)
 - a. Evaluations should not be based on opinion,
 - b. It should be based on NDEAB standards and the evidence provided by the organization regarding these standards,
 - c. It should be based on the observations of the team members and the information obtained in the interviews,
 - d. The Self Evaluation Report should be made according to the evaluation scale criteria defined for each standard in the Evaluation Manual,

- 3.3.** When the inadequacy evaluation of the titles (1: very unsatisfactory, 2: unsatisfactory) is made; the proposed Interim Report - Interim Visit decisions should be consistent,

- 3.4.** Evaluations in the standards of a title; their contribution to the overall decision on the level of provision of that title should be well weighed,

- 3.5.** Decisions should be prudent and consistent with the extent of deficiencies observed in the organization.

- 3.6.** NDEAB terminology should be correctly understood by team leaders and evaluators,

- 3.7.** Team members should take a participatory role in all discussions and decisions made in the team,

- 3.8.** Consensus should be aimed among the team members on the evaluations of all topics,

- 3.9.** If there are differences in the terminology used by the organization, team leaders and evaluators should understand them correctly,

- 3.10.** In particular, team leaders and evaluators should have an open mind, leaving no room for doubt about the expectations of these criteria.

4. Consistency in Evaluations: Evaluation Scale

- (1) **Very unsatisfactory:** No evaluation of meeting the standard, misinterpretation and description of practices, lack of supporting documents and evidence
- (2) **Unsatisfactory:** Existence of some definitions and practices, documents, and evidence for meeting the standard; but they are not at a level to meet the standard
- (3) **Acceptable:** Adequate availability of definitions and practices and documentation and evidence for meeting the standard; however, there are issues that are suggested to be developed.
- (4) **Good:** The complete availability of definitions and practices and documentation and evidence for meeting the standard.
- (5) **Very Good:** It is an exemplary level at which definitions/practices/documents/evidence regarding meeting the standard in the relevant section of the SER are obtained with a comprehensive and systematic approach.

5. Consistency in Evaluations: Example Practice

Main Title 1. Objectives and Goals of the Education Program

- 1. If the standards under this main title have not been met in any way or have been misinterpreted, a “very unsatisfactory” evaluation should be made.*

Evidence:

- The objectives and goals of the education program are completely incompatible with the definition of NDEAB,
- Determination of the objectives and goals of the education program and periodical review processes have never been defined,
- There was no stakeholder participation in determining the objectives and goals of the education program,
- No process-based approach or systematic has been established to measure and evaluate the achievement of objectives and goals,
- No data has been developed to show how well the objectives and goals have been achieved (will not be applicable for programs to be evaluated for the first time).

- 2. If the standards under this title are not fully, but partially met, an “unsatisfactory” evaluation should be made.*

Evidence:

- The objectives and goals of the education program are not completely compatible with the NDEAB definition,
- Determination of the objectives and goals of the education program and periodical review processes are not clearly defined,

- Stakeholder participation in determining the objectives and goals of the education program is either very limited or not systematic,
- Objectives and goals are not published in a way that can be accessed by stakeholders and student candidates,
- The compatibility of the objectives and goals with the core mission of the organization has not been demonstrated,
- A process-based approach has not been used to measure and evaluate the achievement of objectives and goals, or an adequate systematic has not been defined for this,
- Insufficient data have been developed to show how well the objectives and goals have been achieved (will not be applicable for programs to be evaluated for the first time).

3. If the standards under this title are generally met, but if some problems in the future seem to endanger the provision of the standards under this title, an “acceptable” evaluation should be made.

Evidence:

- Objectives and goals are published but changed frequently,
- Objectives and goals are periodically reviewed, however, stakeholder engagement was limited or not sustained,
- The process of measuring and evaluating the achievement of objectives and goals has been defined, but it has not yet been fully implemented.