

Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Association

**Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Association Evaluation and
Accreditation Unit of Psychological Counseling and Guidance Education Programs**

OBJECTION AND COMPLAINT DIRECTIVE

Korkutreis Mh. Necatibey Cd. No: 20/12, 06590 Çankaya/ANKARA

Tel: 0 (312) 430 36 74

E-posta: akreditasyonpdr@gmail.com

Web page: <http://www.https://pdr.org.tr/akreditasyon>

PART ONE

Purpose, Scope, Basis, Definitions and Abbreviations

Purpose and scope

ARTICLE 1- (1) The purpose of this Directive is to regulate the principles and principles related to the objection to accreditation decisions taken by PDR-EPDAB AUK about a program that has been externally evaluated and the complaint processes for the services carried out by PDR-EPDAB AUK.

Fulcrum

ARTICLE 2- (1) This directive is part 7 of the PDR-EPDAB Working Regulation. article 9 of the PDR-EPDAB Evaluation and Accreditation Application Principles Directive. prepared in accordance with the article.

Definitions and abbreviations

ARTICLE 3- (1) The provisions of this directive:

AUK : PDR-EPDAB Accreditation Supreme Council

PDR-EPDAB : Psychological Counseling and Guidance Training Programs Evaluation and Accreditation Unit,

Establishment : PDR-EPDAB

Board : AUK

Institution : Institutions that carry out the psychological counselor training program,

Commission: Appeals and Complaints Commission,

Program : Refers to psychological counselor training programs.

PART TWO

Establishment, Duties and Responsibilities of the Objection and Complaint Commission

Formation of the Commission

ARTICLE 4 - (1) The Commission consists of a total of four members, one of whom is a substitute. (2) The members of the Commission are determined by the Board taking into account the following issues: a) One of the Commission members must be a previous AUK member, b) One of the Commission members must have evaluation experience c) One of the Commission members must have executive experience in accreditation organizations ç) Current AUK members cannot be a Commission member. (3) The term of office of the members of the Commission is three years. No member of the commission may be held for more than two terms. (4) The PDR-EPDAB Office shall carry out the secretariat of the Commission.

Duties and responsibilities of the Commission

ARTICLE 5 - Duties and responsibilities of the Commission;

- a) To evaluate the objections to the decisions made within the scope of the program accreditation carried out by AUK and to submit the evaluation results to AUK,
- b) To evaluate the objections to the report published within the scope of the external program evaluation carried out by AUK and to submit the evaluation results to AUK,
- c) To evaluate the objections to the Monitoring Report published within the scope of the Monitoring Program carried out by the AUK and to submit the evaluation results to the AUK,
- ç) To evaluate the complaints related to the services carried out by the AUK and to submit the evaluation results to the AUK.

THE THIRD PART

Objection and Complaint Process

Decisions that Can be Appealed

ARTICLE 5- (1) Instead of immediately objecting, institutions may first request a re-evaluation or a re-visit by the AUK. If such a request is rejected by the AUK, the institution may appeal against the accreditation decisions specified in article 5(2).

(2) Institutions may appeal against the following decisions:

Dec (Dec Report)- This decision indicates that the national standards / criteria for which the “weakness” notification was made should be provided more strongly to guarantee that the quality of the program will not deteriorate until the next general assessment. The nature of the weakness does not require an institution visit for the next evaluation of the corrective measures to be taken by the institution. However, the institution is required to provide a report focused on the corrective measures it has taken. This decision can only be made in a general assessment and its duration is usually two (2) years.

AZ (Dec Visit)- This decision indicates that the national standards / criteria for which the “weakness” notification was made should be provided more strongly to guarantee that the quality of the program will not deteriorate until the next general assessment. The nature of the weakness requires a visit to the institution for the next assessment of the corrective measures to be taken by the institution. Before the visit, the institution is also required to provide a report focused on the corrective measures it has taken. This decision can only be made in a general assessment and its duration is usually two (2) years.

RU (Extension with Report)- This decision indicates that adequate measures have been taken by the institution to address the weaknesses identified in the previous Dec. This Decision can only be taken in the AR evaluation. This decision extends the accreditation until the next general assessment, and therefore its duration is usually three (3) years.

ZU (Extension with Visit)- This decision indicates that adequate measures have been taken by the institution to address the weaknesses mentioned in the previous AZ decision. This decision can only be taken in A MINIMAL evaluation. This decision extends the accreditation until the next general assessment, and therefore its duration is usually three (3) years.

KG (Show Evidence)- This decision indicates that deficiencies have been detected in the overall evaluation of an accredited program, or that weaknesses identified in the previous evaluation are still ongoing in the interim evaluation of a program Dec. An institution visit is required to evaluate the measures taken by the institution to address deficiencies or ongoing weaknesses. This decision can be taken in a general assessment or in an AR or A Dec assessment, and the duration is usually one (1) year.

KU (Extension with Show Evidence)- This decision indicates that adequate measures have been taken by the institution to address the deficiencies specified in the previous KG decision. This decision can be made only after the KG assessment. This decision extends the accreditation until the next general assessment and therefore its duration is between two (2) years and four (4) years. Dec.

AV (Not Granting Accreditation)- This decision can be made after the evaluation of a new program that does not have accreditation, or after the KG evaluation of a program. This decision indicates that there are shortcomings of national standards / criteria in the overall evaluation of a program evaluated for the first time. If it is made after the CG assessment, this decision indicates that the deficiencies identified in the general assessment of a program with accreditation or the weaknesses identified as ongoing in the Dec evaluation still persist after the CG period.

Objections, re-evaluation requests and re-visit requests received as a result of some information errors of the AUK or evaluations contrary to the published national standards / criteria, regulations and guidelines of the AUK (article 1 of this article. (mentioned in the paragraph), it can be based on the opinion that a decision is not appropriate.

In requests for objection or reconsideration, only the conditions known by the AUK at the time the board made the decision are taken into account.

In case of a re-visit request, important improvements and corrections made before the request and documented by the institution are also taken into account.

Institutions can always consult with the AUK Presidency to determine the course of action that may be most appropriate for them.

Objection Period

ARTICLE 5- (1) Requests for re-evaluation or re-visit must be made in writing to the AUK within thirty (30) days following the notification of the accreditation decision to the institutions.

Objections must be made in writing to the AUK within thirty (30) days of notification to the institutions of any accreditation decision that has been made or the rejection of a re-evaluation or re-visit request that has been made.

Re-Visit Prompt

ARTICLE 7- (1) If significant and documented improvements are made in a program for which a decision has been made Not to Grant Accreditation before the start of the next evaluation period, this program may be a candidate for re-visit. In such cases, the institution must submit a request for a re-visit to the AUK in writing within thirty (30) days following the notification of the “non-accreditation” decision to it. Along with this request, a report explaining the measures taken to eliminate the deficiencies mentioned in the AUK’s notification to the institution should also be provided. This report should contain documentation of significant developments and corrective measures and support the request for a re-visit. However, institutions are warned that a lack of sufficient effectiveness of corrective measures may also lead to a non-productive visit. The AUK decides on this request within thirty (30) days after the institution's re-visit request reaches the AUK. This decision is made only on the basis of the report and supporting documents issued by the institution regarding the deficiencies that led to the decision not to “grant accreditation”.

If the AUK concludes that there is no need for a re-visit, the relevant institution is notified of the reasons why the AUK does not consider the grounds of the request appropriate and that the institution has the right to object to the decision “not to grant accreditation”.

(4) If the AUK makes a decision to re-visit, it is considered that the institution has waived one of the rights to object to the “non-accreditation” decision or the “non-accreditation” decision that may be made at the end of the re-visit.

Re-Evaluation

ARTICLE 8- (1) If the institution that owns a program for which a decision has been made not to grant accreditation reveals that the AUK has reached an erroneous decision not to grant accreditation by using some important and documented incorrect information, it may be a candidate for re-evaluation. In such cases, the institution should submit a request for re-evaluation to the AUK in writing within thirty (30) days following the notification of the “non-accreditation” decision to it. Along with this request, a report explaining important and documented information errors and their effects on the erroneous “not granting accreditation” decision and documents supporting this claim should also be provided.

The AUK re-evaluates the decision not to “grant accreditation” within thirty (30) days after the request of the institutions reaches the AUK. This assessment is made only on the basis of the

report and supporting documents provided by the institution related to the deficiencies that led to the decision not to “grant accreditation”.

If it is accepted that the institution is right about the mistakes that led to the AUK's erroneous decision, it may change the AUK's decision “not to grant accreditation” and make the most appropriate one among the accreditation decisions that can be taken.

If the AUK concludes that there is no need for a re-evaluation, it rejects the re-evaluation request with a letter explaining the reasons for the rejection and that the institution has the right to appeal the “non-accreditation” decision. The rejection of the re-evaluation cannot be appealed.

Evaluation of Objections

ARTICLE 10- (1) Copies of all documents submitted to the institution at various stages of the evaluation process, the institution's response during the evaluation process, and other documents issued by the institution and the AUK are provided to the Commission. In addition, self-assessment reports and Octets are forwarded to the Commission under the supervision of the AUK.

(2) The institution is expected to provide a response to the AUK assessments on which the accreditation decision previously sent to it by the AUK is based. The institution may also submit other necessary evidence to support its objection. However, such evidence must have been provided to the AUK by the institution during the evaluation process of the program for which the accreditation decision has been taken.

(3) The program arrangements made after the meeting at which the AUK took the accreditation decision are not taken into account by the Commission.

(4) AUK may submit other written documents to the Commission in October in addition to the evaluations on which the accreditation decision is based and the response given to the institution in order to explain its own views. Such evidence must be provided to the institution and the Commission at least sixty (60) days before the Commission meeting. The objections and counter-statements of the institution that may be related to this evidence must be submitted to the Commission at least thirty (30) days before the Commission meeting.

(5) In the recommendation decision to be taken at the Appeal and Complaint Commission meeting, only the written documents issued by the institution and the AUK will be taken into account. Representatives of the institution or AUK cannot attend this meeting. The decision to be taken by the Commission is limited by the decision options that the AUK can take. The decision of the Objection and Complaint Commission is communicated to the AUK members by a written report by the Chairman of the Commission.

(6) After the Appeal and Complaint Commission report, the accreditation decision taken by AUK for the relevant psychological counselor training program is final.

The decision and its reasons are notified to the institution in writing by the AUK within fifteen (15) days after the decision is taken.

Complaint

ARTICLE 11 - (1) Persons who are dissatisfied with the services provided by the Board may file a complaint in writing or electronically with appropriate justification and evidence within fifteen days of the occurrence of this dissatisfaction situation. (2) Complaints are subjected to preliminary examination by the secretariat of the Commission within seven days. As a result of the preliminary examination, complaints made without proper justification and evidence are rejected. (3) Complaints that are not rejected are forwarded to the Commission within seven days following the preliminary examination. (4) Complaints submitted to the Commission shall be evaluated and submitted to the AUK within thirty days at the latest. The Commission may negotiate with the parties if it deems necessary. The Commission includes an opinion on the proposal for the acceptance or rejection of the complaint in the evaluation of the complaint. (5) The final decision on the complaints is made by the AUK taking into account the Commission's recommendation opinion. (6) The final decision shall be notified in writing to the person or institution making the complaint within thirty days. (7) The decision regarding the complaint is final.

THE FOURTH PART

Various Provisions

Enactment

ARTICLE 12- (1) This directive consists of 12 articles, including this article
(2) This directive enters into force on the date of its acceptance by the PDR-EPDAB AUK.
(3) The provisions of this directive shall be executed by the President of the AUK.