

MiAK CONSISTENCY COMMITTEE DIRECTIVE (2024)

(Approved by the MiAK Board of Directors on 15.06.2021. Correction: 30.01.2024 MiAK 2nd Term 8th Board of Directors decision no. 7.)

1. BASIS, PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This Directive has been prepared in accordance with the MiAK-MAK Accreditation Processes Document (2023). The purpose of this Directive is to define the formation and working procedures of the MiAK Consistency Committee, which will be established by MiAK to carry out the duties defined within the scope of Article 6.3 of the MiAK-MAK Accreditation Processes Document.

2. DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

In this Directive:

- a) **MiAK** defines the Association for Accreditation of Architectural Education,
- b) **MiAK Office** defines MiAK Coordinators,
- c) **Board of Directors** defines MiAK Board of Directors,
- d) **MiAK-MAK** defines the Architectural Accreditation Board, which carries out the necessary work for the evaluation and accreditation of architecture programs on behalf of MiAK,
- e) **Processes Document** defines MiAK-MAK Accreditation Processes Document,
- f) **Conditions** define MiAK-MAK Evaluation Conditions to be used in the accreditation of architectural education programs regulated by MiAK-MAK Accreditation Conditions Document,
- g) **Committee** defines MiAK Consistency Committee,
- h) **The Committee Chairman** defines the Chair of the MiAK Consistency Committee,
- i) **Institution** defines the higher education institution (university) to which the program belongs h that is applied for accreditation,
- j) **Team Chairman** defines the Chairman of the Visiting Team formed by MiAK-MAK in accordance with Article 6 of the MiAK-MAK Operating Principles,
- k) **Concluding Meeting** defines the farewell meeting held as the final activity of the institutional visit, where the evaluation findings are presented to the institutional authorities,
- l) **The Final Report** defines the final report prepared by the Visit Team in accordance with the MiAK-MAK Accreditation Processes Document,

3. STRUCTURE, COMPOSITION AND TERM OF THE CONSISTENCY COMMITTEE

The committee consists of 3 (three) people. Committee Members are appointed by the Board of Directors, in consultation with MiAK-MAK. The committee consists of one member representing MiAK-MAK, one member representing the Board of Directors and one member with experience in institution visits. The Committee Chairman is determined among the committee members at the first meeting of the Consistency Committee during the term. The Committee communicates only with MiAK-MAK and the MiAK Office. The term of office of the committee members is 2 (two) years, depending on the MiAK General Assembly.

4. WORKING PRINCIPLES OF THE CONSISTENCY COMMITTEE

4.1. Duty of the Consistency Committee

The Committee checks the Final Report submitted by MiAK-MAK to the Committee in terms of any inconsistencies it sees in terms of the MiAK-MAK Conditions Document, report - accreditation decision compatibility, balance of the proposed accreditation decision depending on years and teams, and expresses its opinions to MiAK-MAK.

As a result of the accreditation evaluation of the programs, the notifications to be made to the institutions must be consistent with each other both in terms of evaluations and form, and should be free of any spelling mistakes. After the draft reports are discussed by MiAK-MAK, it is ensured that the consistency of the evaluation is ensured at three levels:

- a) **In-Team Consistency:** In a team evaluating different programs of an institution, the evaluation of the inadequacies of these programs in the context of a particular condition should be consistent.
- b) **Inter-Team Coherence:** Program evaluations conducted at different institutions during an evaluation period should be consistent in their assessment of deficiencies in the context of a given condition. The Chairmen of the Visiting Teams of these institutions are primarily responsible for ensuring consistency at this level. In case of disagreement, the final decision is made by MiAK-MAK.
- c) **Consistency over the Years:** The evaluation of similar deficiencies in the context of a condition should also be consistent over the years. The Chairmen of the Teams formed each year are primarily responsible for ensuring this consistency. In case of disagreement, the final decision is made by MiAK-MAK.

4.2. Review of Draft Reports

The MiAK Office notifies the committee members of the list of reports submitted from MiAK-MAK for evaluation purposes, visiting team information, report and accreditation decision. Committee members evaluate the reports submitted to them in terms of conditions, teams and years at their meeting and express their opinion to MiAK-MAK.

The consistency checking process of reports consists of the following steps:

- 1.—With the planning of the MiAK Office, the reports are forwarded to all members and a meeting is called for evaluation.
2. Each report is reviewed individually by at least two Committee Members. Issues on which no agreement are discussed among all Committee Members and a common opinion is formed.
3. The Committee expresses its opinion on the items it deems problematic in terms of consistency in the controlled reports and the decisions it determines should be re-evaluated in terms of consistency, and has it written in the meeting decisions.
4. Checked draft reports are forwarded to MiAK-MAK by the MiAK Office, together with the opinions of the Committee Members.
5. Opinions conveyed to MiAK-MAK are reported to the Chairman of the Visiting Team by MiAK-MAK.

6. If any, re-evaluations based on consistency decisions and corrections of material and formal errors are reported to the Chairman of the Visiting Team.
7. The updated report is forwarded to the committee by the MiAK Office.
 - a) If the Committee Members find the corrections made in the report and/or the explanations given by the Team Chairman sufficient, the Committee Chairman informs MiAK-MAK that there is no problem in terms of consistency in the version of the report at this stage and forwards the updated version of the report to the MiAK Office for spell checkl.
 - b) If the corrections made in the report and/or the explanations given by the Team Chairman are not found sufficient by the Committee Members, the Committee Members state their additional comments on the issues they find problematic on the report and the Committee President forwards the report to the relevant Team Chairman for reconsideration..
 - c) If, after the second round of control, there are still points that cannot be agreed upon between the Team Chairman and the Committee Members, the Committee Chairman forwards the report to the MiAK Office with the necessary explanations and reports the situation to the relevant Team Chairman, so that the final decision on this issue can be made by MiAK-MAK.

4.3. Finalization of Amendment Proposals

The Committee Chairman, together with the MiAK Office, prepares a "Consistency Check Schedule" showing the status of the reports checked for consistency and the changes recommended by the Committee.

If an agreement is reached on the changes suggested by the committee and forwarded by MiAK-MAK to the Team Chairman, the report is corrected and forwarded to MiAK-MAK for the final decision, without the need for a new committee decision. MiAK-MAK makes the final decision on unreconciled issues.

5. AMENDMENT TO DIRECTIVE

Proposals for amendments to this Directive are put on the agenda and resolved at the first meeting of the Board of Directors upon the proposal of MiAK-MAK.

6. EXECUTION

The provisions of this Directive shall be executed by the Board of Directors.