

Annex 4: Example of Training Program and Training Material

THEQC MID-TERM EVALUATION PROGRAM 2024 SITE VISIT PREPARATION TRAINING

06 June 2024 Thursday			
	Time	Program Content	Location
20 min	14:00-14:20	Opening <i>Prof. Ümit KOCABIÇAK</i> (THEQC President) <ul style="list-style-type: none">Welcome and introduction, followed by general information about the Mid-Term Evaluation Program.	Zoom
20 min	14:20-14:40	Information on the 2024 Mid-Term Evaluation Program and Training <i>Dr. Resul TELLİ</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Detailed information about the purpose, scope, and areas of focus of the Mid-Term Evaluation Program.	Zoom
30 min	14:40-15:10	Report Writing Process and Consistency <i>Res. Asst. Sena ÇATAL</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Comprehensive details on the Mid-Term Evaluation Program, including its content, formal structure, and writing process.Insights into the Consistency Work at THEQC.	Zoom

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Assessment of maturity levels through case studies.	
10 min	15:10-15:20	Break	
75 min	15:20-16:35	Sample Criteria Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Practicing teamwork in small groups formed on Zoom, allowing evaluators to rehearse collaborative skills.Evaluating the Mid-Term Evaluation report by reading the SAR, conducting a mock assessment, and writing the relevant explanations.	Zoom
20 min	16:35-16:55	Q&A Session, Satisfaction Survey Application and Closing <ul style="list-style-type: none">Receiving questions and answersConducting satisfaction surveys and sharing the results	Zoom

Activity: Simulating Difficult Conversations

Dear Participant,

This activity involves a problematic scenario that can be encountered within the evaluation team and between the evaluation team and the evaluated higher education institution during the field visit in the evaluation process. The aim is to raise awareness both individually on different evaluator perspectives and as a team on negative situations that may be encountered during the field visit.

1. Identify a Rapporteur:

- Choose a team member to act as the rapporteur. This person will share their screen and present on behalf of the group.

2. Review the Scenario (10 minutes):

- Carefully read and analyze the provided field visit scenario.

3. Identify and Discuss Problems (25 minutes):

- Identify the sources of the problems within the scenario.
- Recognize problematic behaviors and discuss how these behaviors can be managed.
- Evaluate the current approach being used in the scenario.
- Develop new behavioral suggestions and plans to ensure more effective and constructive communication and cooperation.

4. Presentation and Discussion (25 minutes):

- The rapporteur will present your evaluations and suggestions in the main hall.
- Discuss your findings and proposed solutions with the larger group.

Thank you for your contributions!

Total Activity Duration: 60 minutes

Excerpts from the ADA University Site Visit

Scenario 1

The evaluation team consists of six evaluators: a team leader, three academic evaluators, one administrative evaluator, and one student. The team goes on a site visit to conduct an external evaluation of a university. They hold their first meeting at their accommodation, going over the site visit plan and the questions to be asked in the field. One of the academic evaluators did not attend the preparatory meetings and did not prepare for the site visit (did not read the institution's previous reports).

Questions:

1. What should be the attitude of the team leader towards this situation of the unprepared evaluator?
2. Discuss how the unprepared evaluator will affect the evaluation process.

Scenario 2

The next day, the evaluation team arrived at the institution at the appointed time in accordance with the site visit plan and held its first meeting with the rector. In line with the expectations of the institution, it was felt by the team that the rector focused on the outcome rather than the process, was in a tense mood, and tried to influence the team by saying that the outcome of the evaluation process would undoubtedly be positive in favor of the institution. Although the team leader talked about the importance of focusing on the nature of the external evaluation and the impact of the process on the development of the organization rather than the outcome, the team observed that the rector was concerned about the meaning of what was being said about the outcome of the evaluation and that his tension about the negative or unexpected decision discourse increased.

Questions:

1. Let's imagine that after this meeting, the Team Leader has a conversation with his/her teammates. How would you fictionalize this conversation?
2. Discuss how the team should communicate with the rector and the stakeholders of the organization who are thought to be under the influence of the rector.

Scenario 3

The team decides to split into two focus working groups to conduct the faculty visit interviews as part of the site visit plan. The team chair, administrative evaluator, and student evaluator form one group, and the remaining three academic evaluators form another group. Although there had been prior discussions about splitting into groups

and conducting extensive faculty visits, one of the academic evaluators in the second group indicated that she would like to conduct visits and individual interviews outside the field plan in her field. This attitude of the team member, who stated that it would contribute more to the evaluation process and speed up the process, caused tension first within her own group and then within the team. Despite the tension, she realized her wish and left the group during the faculty visit. The team came together and delayed the start of the meeting that the team was to enter together, causing the plan to be disrupted. The delayed meeting started half an hour late, and the daily plan slipped. At the end of the meeting, the team leader asked for a short team meeting. The team leader also noticed that in his group, the administrative evaluator was comparing his organization with the evaluated organization during the interviews. He observed that another evaluator also agreed with these statements of the evaluator making comparisons. The team leader emphasized at the meeting that comparisons should not be made, and the academic evaluator who acted individually was warned. However, this academic evaluator who was warned argued that what she did was appropriate and the tension increased even more. The evaluator, who stated that she would continue to act individually and that she contributed more to the evaluation process, left her duty and left the field in the face of the reactions.

Questions:

1. Discuss the drawbacks of making comparisons in line with institutional characteristics.
2. Discuss the attitude of the evaluator acting individually in the field. How should the team leader act in the face of this situation? Evaluate the situation in terms of team psychology and the evaluation process.

Scenario 4

Within the evaluation process, the writing of the SAR caused discussions within the team. While one of the evaluators argued that the report should be divided into certain parts and everyone should be responsible for different sections, another evaluator stated that the whole report should be written by the Team Leader due to the busy schedule, arguing that individual contributions would not be feasible. The Team

Leader suggested appointing a rapporteur. The Team Leader stated that one of the evaluators had left the field and the team was down by one person, so he transferred the relevant part of the report allocated to the evaluator who left the field to the student evaluator and made a new plan.

Question:

- Discuss whether this planning constitutes a healthy report writing process within the scope of THEQC expectations.