

Architecture Education Accreditation Association - MiAK
Thematic Analysis Report – 2025
March 2026

Foreword.

THE ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION ACCREDITATION ASSOCIATION, known in short as MiAK, was established on 10.09.2019. Having carried out its activities between 2006 and 2019 under the name “Architecture Accreditation Board” in cooperation with the TMMOB Chamber of Architects, as of 2019, the Association established its independent structure under the umbrella of an Association.

MiAK’s primary objective is to contribute to the improvement of the quality of architecture education by conducting accreditation, external quality assessment, and information activities for architecture education programs. In this way, it aims to improve the quality of social welfare and the natural and built environment by raising the quality of architectural services.

MiAK aims to ensure the development of the architecture profession through education and to evaluate and develop architecture education through cooperation with official bodies related to education and the recommendations it will develop, and through competency studies.

MiAK aims to ensure inclusiveness and participation by allowing broad representation of stakeholders such as educators, academics, students, graduates, employers, and professional organizations in the formation and/or activities of its members, management staff, all boards, and teams.

MiAK aims to improve the quality of education by contributing, where there is demand, to the accreditation of architecture postgraduate programs and other design-related education programs (interior architecture, industrial product design, urban and regional planning, etc.) in addition to architecture undergraduate programs under its institutional structure.

MiAK’s activities:

- Preparing, updating, and publishing documents related to processes, conditions, institutional quality policy, visit team guides, etc., for the accreditation of architecture education programs,
- Evaluating and accrediting programs upon application from institutions providing architecture education,
- Conducting the selection and training of evaluators who will serve in accreditation activities,
- Providing information and training to program administrators and faculty members on program evaluation,
- Continuously monitoring the current and future needs of the stakeholders of architecture programs, determining program evaluation criteria, and ensuring that evaluation criteria and processes are reviewed and renewed when necessary.

This report aims to examine, through tables and charts, the evaluations in thematic areas of programs that applied to MiAK-MAK for accreditation in 2025, whose decisions were concluded, and which were announced on the MiAK website, and to identify strengths and areas for development through the analyses conducted.

Table of Contents

1. General Analyses.....	3
1.1. Number of Programs Applying for Accreditation.....	3
1.2. Visiting Team Composition of Programs in the Accreditation Process.....	4
1.3. Number of Programs with Completed Accreditation Process.....	4
1.4. Workshops Held in 2025.....	4
1.5. 2025 Preliminary Report Results of Programs with Completed Accreditation Process.....	5
1.6. 2025 Distribution of Accreditation Decisions of Programs Accredited.....	5
2. Strengths and Areas for Development According to Visiting Team Final Reports (VTFR) of Programs in the Accreditation Process According to MiAK Conditions:.....	6
2.1. Institution to Which the Program Belongs.....	6
2.2. General Characteristics of the Program.....	6
2.3. Program-Institution Relationship.....	6
2.4. Program Self-Evaluation Activities.....	6
2.5. Progress Report.....	7
2.6. Program Approach.....	7
2.7. Human Resources.....	7
2.8. Resources for the Learning Environment / Financial Resources.....	7
2.9. Teaching and Learning Characteristics of the Program.....	8
2.10. Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies to be Acquired by Graduates.....	8
3. Conclusions.....	10
4. References.....	11

Abbreviations

MiAK: Architecture Education Accreditation Association

MAK: Architecture Accreditation Board

SER: Self-Evaluation Report

VT: Visiting Team

VTFR: Visiting Team Final Report

1. General Analyses

Within the scope of the general analyses, the number of architecture programs that applied to the Architecture Education Accreditation Association Architecture Accreditation Board for accreditation and completed the process in 2025, the types of universities, the number of programs that submitted letters of intent but did not continue in the process, and the reasons for non-continuation have been analyzed. Analyses were conducted on the characteristics of the visiting teams formed for programs that applied for accreditation, the number of programs and evaluator information workshops held, the number of participating programs/persons, the assessment results of the self-evaluation preliminary assessment reports by the VT, and the distribution of accreditation decisions for programs.

Of the total 16 programs that applied for the 2025 accreditation process, 11 were initial applications, and 5 were accreditation renewal applications. Of the applying programs, 3 are at state universities, and 13 are at foundation universities (Table 1).

Of the total 7 programs with completed accreditation processes in 2025, 5 were initial applications, and 2 were accreditation renewal applications. Of the applying programs, 3 are at state universities, and 4 are at foundation universities (Table 4). 2025 Of the programs accredited in that year, 1 was accredited with "Six-Year Accreditation," 2 with "Conditional Six-Year Accreditation," 2 with "Three-Year Accreditation," and 2 with "Two-Year Supervised Accreditation" (Table 7).

1.1. Number of Programs Applying for Accreditation

Programs that applied in September 2024 according to the 2025 accreditation calendar, are indicated in Table 1. Of the applying programs, 11' (69%) are initial applications, 5' (%31) are renewals, and 3' (19%) are at state universities, and 13' (81%) are at foundation universities.

Table 1. Programs applying to the 2025 accreditation calendar

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Application Type		Type of Applying Institution		Total
	Initial application	Renewal	State	Foundation	
2025	11	5	3	13	16

Table 2. Number of programs that submitted a letter of intent but did not continue in the accreditation process, and their reasons

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Number of Programs That Submitted a Letter of Intent but Did Not Continue in the Accreditation Process	Reasons for Not Continuing in the Process
2025	2	Withdrew application
	1	Application rejected
	1	SER not submitted
	1	SER rejected. Revision requested. Not submitted.
TOTAL	5	

1.2. Visiting Team Composition of Programs in the Accreditation Process

A total of 11 visiting teams were formed for programs applying to the MiAK 2025 calendar. A total of 66 persons served on the visiting teams. Numerical data is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Number of members serving on visiting teams

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Number of Accepted Programs	Number of Programs Submitting SER	Number of Programs with Completed Visits	Visiting Team Members					
				Chair	Member	MiAK Obs.	Institution Obs.	Student Obs.	Total
2025	16	11	8	11	22	11	11	11	66

1.3. Number of Programs with Completed Accreditation Process

Numerical data on the architecture programs for which accreditation decisions were issued by MiAK-MAK following the completion of the accreditation process in 2025 are shown in Table 4. Of the 7 accredited programs, 71% (5) applied for the first time, and 29% (2) are programs that applied for accreditation renewal. 43% (3) of these programs are at state universities, and 57% (4) are at foundation universities.

Table 4. Number of programs with completed accreditation process in 2025

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Application status of programs with concluded accreditation		Types of programs with concluded accreditation		Total
	Initial application	Renewal	State	Foundation	
2023	1	-	-	1	1
2024	2	1	2	1	3
2025	2	1	1	2	3
TOTAL	5	2	3	4	7

1.4. Workshops Held in 2025

In this section, workshops held in 2025 are analyzed in Table 5. A Visiting Team Workshop was organized for VT members who will serve in the programs applying to the 2025 calendar. A Self-Evaluation Report Preparation Workshop was also organized for programs planning to apply for accreditation in the 2026 calendar or later calendars.

Table 5. Workshops

YEAR	Workshop Name	Number of workshops	Number of participants
2025	MiAK-MAK Visiting Team Workshop 2025	1	40
	Self-Evaluation Report Preparation Workshop	1	90 (36 programs)

90 participants from 36 programs attended the Self-Evaluation Preparation Workshop. The high attendance at this workshop indicates that awareness of accreditation processes among architecture programs is increasing.

1.5. 2025 Preliminary Report Results of Programs with Completed Accreditation Process

Preliminary report results of the self-evaluation reports of architecture programs with completed accreditation processes in 2025 are analyzed in this section as seen in Table 6. In 2025, 15 SERs were submitted. Of these, 5 (33%) were accepted, and their visits were completed. 6 (40%) were accepted with a request for additional information, and their visits were completed. The SERs of 4 programs (27%) were found incomplete, and additional information was requested with a revision request. Of these programs, 3 resubmitted their SER; however, 1 program did not resubmit the report, and its process was terminated.

The assessment of the 3 programs that were resubmitted will be conducted in 2026.

Table 6. Results of Self-Evaluation Report, Preliminary Reports

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Number of programs submitting Self-Evaluation Reports	Visiting Teams' Decision Regarding the Visit			
		Institution visit accepted ACCEPTED	Institution visit accepted, additional information requested ACCEPTED	Additional information requested because the Self-Evaluation Report was found incomplete REVISION	Self-Evaluation Report found insufficient REJECTED
2023	1 (accepted in 2024)		1 (in 2025) visit year 2025	1 (in 2024) – accepted upon resubmission.	
2024	2 (accepted in 2024) 1 (accepted in 2025)	2 (in 2024) visit year 2025	1		
2025	11	3	4	4	
TOTAL	15	5	6	4	

1.6. 2025 Distribution of Accreditation Decisions of Programs Accredited

This section presents the distribution of accreditation decisions issued by MiAK-MAK for architecture programs that completed accreditation processes in 2025. Distribution of decisions is shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Distribution of Accreditation Decisions

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Number of accredited programs	Accreditation Decision			
		2-year supervised accreditation	3-year accreditation	6-year conditional accreditation	6-year accreditation
2023	1	1			
2024	3	1	1		1
2025	3			2	1
TOTAL	7	2	2	2	1

2025 Of the programs accredited in that year, 1'i (14.2%) "Six-Year Accreditation", 2' (29.6%) "Conditional Six-Year Accreditation", 2 (29.6%) "Three-Year Accreditation", 2 (29.6%) were accredited with "Two-Year Supervised Accreditation" periods.

2. Strengths and Areas for Development According to Visiting Team Final Reports (VTFR) of Programs in the Accreditation Process According to MiAK Conditions:

2.1. Institution to Which the Program Belongs

This section outlines the founding philosophy, history, mission, and vision of the program and the institution in which it is housed. Information is provided about the disciplinary distinctiveness and autonomy of the program within the institution. The support provided and expected to be provided by the institution toward the development of the program is evaluated.

Table 8. University and Faculty in Which the Program Is Housed

Accreditation Calendar Year Applied	Number of accredited programs	Faculty types					
		Architecture		Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture		Faculty of Fine Arts and Design	
		State	Foundation	State	Foundation	State	Foundation
2023	1						1
2024	3	2	1				
2025	3	1	1		1		
TOTAL	7	3	2		1		1

Architecture programs are housed within different faculties. While the department to which the programs belong is always "Architecture," the faculty name may vary. Of the 7 programs, 71.4% are housed within a "Faculty of Architecture," 14.3% within a "Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture," and 14.3% within a "Faculty of Fine Arts and Design."

2.2. General Characteristics of the Program

Within the scope of the general characteristics of the program, the history and the mission and vision of the program are explained. Programs make successful and distinctive statements with their diversified program characteristics and their missions and visions that emphasize different aspects. It is observed that the assessments in the Visiting Team Final Reports also cover the alignment of the educational framework with the programs' missions and visions, and these assessments are positive.

2.3. Program-Institution Relationship

Under this heading, the administrative organizational structure of the academic unit and institution in which the program is housed, the officials and their responsibilities in program management, the processes for participation of academic staff and students in management, and the compatibility of the program with other academic units and programs are addressed. The self-evaluation reports of programs contain successful and distinctive explanations on this topic. The assessments made by the Visiting Team Final Reports under this heading are positive.

2.4. Program Self-Evaluation Activities

This section briefly describes the program's self-evaluation processes, strengths and weaknesses, and progress. A plan relating to the development vision is presented. Evaluations by the program's

stakeholders (internal stakeholders such as faculty members and students, and external stakeholders such as graduates, the professional chamber, etc.) cover feedback obtained through survey studies, focus group meetings, and similar methods relating to course content, scope, delivery methods, learning outcomes, and graduate achievements, as well as program evaluations prepared for other external assessment bodies (national or international, if any). If the self-evaluation activities of programs are found insufficient upon initial submission, they are returned to the program to be corrected and resubmitted. If they are still found insufficient upon resubmission, the program's application is not continued in the accreditation process on the grounds that the self-evaluation report is insufficient. Programs whose self-evaluation reports are accepted are noted as having addressed their self-evaluation activities adequately.

2.5. Progress Report

This section is not taken into consideration by programs applying for the first time. The continuity of the program's accreditation is possible through demonstrating that sufficient work has been done to address the deficiencies noted in the Visiting Team Report. Of the seven applying programs, five were initial applications, and two were accreditation renewal applications. These programs are successfully addressing the areas for improvement identified during the previous visit. Recommendations for more comprehensive progress on these topics were noted in the Visiting Team Final Reports.

2.6. Program Approach

In this section, the program's relationships with the components of the architectural environment — the academic environment, academic staff, students, the architectural profession, other professional fields, and society — are addressed. The manner in which these components are addressed within the program's mission, and the visions, objectives, and approaches for each, are defined. The self-evaluation and statistical values on which long-term plans and strategies for future improvements are based are stated. The program successfully demonstrates the extent to which it can respond to the expectations of the stakeholders and environments — including the institution to which it is affiliated, other educational institutions, the professional chamber, and other relevant bodies. In the programs accredited in 2025, the programs were found successful in this section of the Visiting Team Final Reports.

2.7. Human Resources

Under the heading of human resources, the human resource capabilities of programs are evaluated under the headings: a) academic staff; b) students; c) administrative staff. The outcome assessments of the Visiting Teams containing positive and/or areas-for-development findings regarding programs accredited in 2025 are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9. Human Resources

YEAR	Number of accredited programs	Academic Staff		Students		Administrative Staff		Description
		Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	
2025	7	7	0	7	0	7	0	

2.8. Resources for the Learning Environment / Financial Resources

In this section, "Physical Resources" and "Information Resources" are analyzed under the heading Resources for the Learning Environment. In addition, "Financial Resources" are assessed by Visiting Teams through the documents submitted with the self-evaluation report and its appendices. Assessments as reflected in the Visiting Team Final Reports are compiled in Table 10.

Table 10. Resources for the Learning Environment / Financial Resources

YEAR	Number of accredited programs	Physical facilities		Information Resources		Financial Resources		Description
		Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	
2025	7	7	0	7	0	7	0	

2.9. Teaching and Learning Characteristics of the Program

“Degrees and Curriculum,” “Learning Environment and Achievement Level,” and “Learning Culture” are evaluated in the VTFR by Visiting Teams within the framework of self-evaluation reports, relevant documents, and what was expressed by program stakeholders during interviews conducted during the visit. The analysis of the results of these evaluations, as reflected in the Visiting Team Final Reports, is shown in Table 11.

Table 11. Program Teaching and Learning Characteristics

YEAR	Number of accredited programs	Degrees and Curriculum		Learning Environment and Achievement Level		Learning Culture		Description
		Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	Demonstrated	Not Demonstrated	
2025	7	7	0	7	0	7	0	

2.10. Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies to be Acquired by Graduates

When Table 12, prepared below regarding the assessment of graduate outcomes according to the VT Final Reports of programs accredited in 2025, is examined, it is seen that the defined knowledge, skills, and competency areas of the Bachelor of Architecture program are largely met. When the average of the seven programs is taken into account, it was determined that 72.91% of outcomes were met, 18.29% were partially met, and 8.80% were not met. These findings reveal that programs present a structure aligned with their general objectives, but that there are areas open to development in some domains.

Under the heading I. Architecture - Design / Creative Thinking, it is observed that all of the outcomes of “Critical Thinking,” “Communication,” “Research,” and “Design” are met at a high rate (85.71%). This indicates that programs present a strong pedagogical framework in developing design-oriented thinking skills.

Under area II. Architecture - History / Theory / Culture / Art, outcomes relating to the competencies of “World Architecture” and “Local Architecture/Cultural Diversity” also have similarly high fulfillment rates (85.71%). This finding shows that students are acquiring the competency to address architecture together with its historical, theoretical, and cultural contexts.

In contrast, it is noteworthy that some outcomes under heading III. Architecture - Environment / City / Society has lower fulfillment rates. In particular, it is observed that “partially met” and “not met” assessments are increasing in areas such as “Sustainability” (57.14%), “Nature and Human” (71.43%), and “Geographic Conditions” (71.43%). This suggests that environmental and social dimensions need to be addressed in a more holistic and practice-oriented manner in studio and theoretical courses.

Table 12. Rate of Fulfillment of Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies to be Acquired by Graduates According to the Visiting Team Final Report of Programs Accredited in 2025 Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies to be Acquired by Graduates

Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies to be Acquired by Graduates	Knowledge / skills / competencies	2025			
		Met	Partially	Not met	Full Fulfillment Rate (Met/Total)
I. Architecture - Design / Creative Thinking	Critical Thinking	6	1		85.71%
	Communication	6	1		85.71%
	Research	6	1		85.71%
	Design	6	1		85.71%
II. Architecture - History / Theory, Culture / Art	World Architecture	6	1		85.71%
	Local Architecture / Cultural Diversity	6	1		85.71%
	Cultural Heritage and Conservation	6	1		85.71%
III. Architecture - Environment / City / Society	Sustainability	4	2	1	57.14%
	Social Responsibility	6	1		85.71%
	Nature and Human	5	1	1	71.43%
	Geographic Conditions	5	1	1	71.43%
IV. Architecture - Technology	Life Safety	3	2	2	42.86%
	Structural Systems	6	1		85.71%
	Building Physics and Environmental Systems	4	2	1	57.14%
	Building Envelope Systems	6	1		85.71%
	Building Service Systems	3	2	2	42.86%
	Building Materials and Applications	5	2		71.43%
	Integration of Building Systems	6	1		85.71%
V. Architecture - Professional Environment	Program Preparation and Evaluation	6	1		85.71%
	Comprehensive Project Development	6	1		85.71%
	Building Cost Consideration	5	2		71.43%
	Architect-Client Relationship	4	1	2	57.14%
	Teamwork and Collaboration	6	1		85.71%
	Project Management	5	2		71.43%
	Practice Management	5	2		71.43%
	Leadership	3	1	3	42.86%

	Legal Rights and Responsibilities	5	1	1	71.43%
	Professional Practice	5	1	1	71.43%
	Professional Ethics	3	1	3	42.86%
AVERAGE (across 7 programs)		5.10	1.28	0.62	72.91%

Area IV. Architecture - Technology constitutes one of the most critical headings in the table. While high fulfillment rates are observed in topics such as “Structural Systems,” “Building Envelope Systems,” and “Integration of Building Systems” (85.71%), relatively low rates draw attention in areas such as “Life Safety” (42.86%), “Building Service Systems” (42.86%), and “Building Physics and Environmental Systems” (57.14%). These findings point to the need to strengthen the integration between technical knowledge and the design process.

Under the heading V. Architecture - Professional Environment, it is observed that outcomes such as program preparation, comprehensive project development, teamwork, and project management are largely met. However, it is observed that fulfillment rates drop in outcomes directly related to professional practice, such as “Leadership” (42.86%), “Professional Ethics” (42.86%), and “Architect–Client Relationship” (57.14%). This situation reveals the need to strengthen content focused on practice, internship, and professional practice that will support students’ transition to professional life.

Overall, it is understood that programs are strong in design, theoretical foundations, and project development; however, some outcomes related to environmental sustainability, building technologies, and professional practice need to be developed. In this direction, increasing interdisciplinary approaches, addressing technical courses in a more integrated manner with studio processes, and integrating professional environment experiences into the program at early stages will contribute to raising outcome levels.

3. Conclusions

The 2025 Thematic Analysis Report thematically reports the general analyses pertaining to institutions, programs, and visiting teams that affect the assessments in the visiting team reports and the preparation of self-evaluation reports for programs whose accreditation decisions were issued during the year. Under the heading “General Analysis,” a general analysis of the characteristics of programs that completed the accreditation process in 2025 and other analyses relating to accreditation processes in 2025 were carried out. These data will be compared with subsequent years in other reports to be prepared, and recommendations for improving the system will be developed.

The fact that only 33% (5) of the applying programs (15) were accepted on first submission, and that a significant portion of those accepted on first submission were programs undergoing renewal, shows that the self-evaluation culture is better established in institutions that are continuously in the accreditation process. This situation contributes to one of MiAK’s primary objectives: ensuring that quality in education is sustainable through continuous improvement.

Some of the programs that did not complete the process encountered problems with the preparation and timely submission of the self-evaluation report. This points to the conclusion that the self-evaluation culture in the accreditation processes has not yet been sufficiently established in all programs. The fact that the Self-Evaluation Report Preparation Workshop held in 2025 was attended by far more programs than the number that applied (36 programs) shows that trainings that will

support the self-evaluation culture in institutions (such as Self-Evaluation Report Preparation Workshops and Accreditation 101 Workshops) have a positive contribution.

Under the heading Knowledge, Skills, and Competencies to be Acquired by Graduates, there are 29 knowledge, skills, and competencies under five main headings. The assessments made based on the required courses in the curricula of programs regarding their graduates' acquisition of the defined knowledge, skills, and competencies are expressed in three ways in the visiting team reports: a) met, b) partially met, c) not met. The strongest areas of programs accredited in 2025 were identified as the knowledge, skills, and competencies of "Critical Thinking," "Communication," "Research," "Design," "World Architecture," "Local Architecture/Cultural Diversity," "Cultural Heritage and Conservation," "Structural Systems," "Building Envelope Systems," "Integration of Building Systems," "Program Preparation and Evaluation," "Comprehensive Project Development," and "Teamwork and Collaboration," with a fulfillment rate of 85.71%.

The criteria of "Nature and Human," "Geographic Conditions," "Building Materials and Applications," "Building Cost Consideration," "Project Management," "Practice Management," "Legal Rights and Responsibilities," and "Professional Practice" are met by 71.43% of the assessed programs; whereas the criteria of "Sustainability," "Building Physics and Environmental Systems," and "Architect-Client Relationship" are met by 57.14% of the programs. Among the knowledge, skills, and competencies, the lowest fulfillment rate is seen in the criteria of "Life Safety," "Leadership," and "Professional Ethics," with a fulfillment rate of 42.86% of programs. The results reveal the need to prioritize the development of outcomes relating to these three criteria, which are seen to be unmet in most (57.14%) of the assessed programs, and also to support outcomes in the criteria of "Sustainability," "Building Physics and Environmental Systems," and "Architect-Client Relationship," which also have limited fulfillment rates.

4. References

AKDENİZ UNIVERSITY - Faculty of Architecture - Bachelor of Architecture Program (Turkish) Visiting Team Final Report

ERCİYES UNIVERSITY - Faculty of Architecture - Bachelor of Architecture Program (Turkish) Visiting Team Final Report

İZMİR UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS - Faculty of Fine Arts and Design - Bachelor of Architecture Program (English) Visiting Team Final Report

MEF UNIVERSITY - Faculty of Art, Design and Architecture, Bachelor of Architecture Program (English) Visiting Team Final Report

YAŞAR UNIVERSITY - Faculty of Architecture, Bachelor of Architecture Program (English) Visiting Team Final Report

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY - Faculty of Architecture - Bachelor of Architecture Program (English) Visiting Team Final Report

YILDIZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY - Faculty of Architecture - Bachelor of Architecture Program (English) Visiting Team Final Report