

ECCE

EUROPEAN
COUNCIL ON
CHIROPRACTIC
EDUCATION

ECCE Training Seminar

The Evaluation Team

26 May 2018

ECU Conference, Budapest

Maria Browning, BSc, DC, MSc, Cert MEd

Deputy Director of Clinic/Senior Lecturer, AECC University College, UK

Chair of Quality Assurance Committee, ECCE

Role of the Evaluation Team

- To **verify** statements made in Self Study Report (SSR) and supporting documentation supplied by the Institution applying for accreditation/reaccreditation
- To produce written report on Evaluation Team's findings and submit report to ECCE Council of Accreditation (CoA)

Role of the CoA

- Prior to the evaluation visit
 - read the Self Study Report and accompanying documentation to provide observations and direction to the Evaluation Team
- After the visit
 - receive the Evaluation Team report and decide on award of Accredited status

Responsibilities of the Evaluation Team

- Read and be familiar with the ECCE Standards and the Evaluation Team Manual
 - www.cce-europe.com/downloads
- Read and evaluate the Self Study Report and other documentation
 - Make notes, highlight areas for clarification or closer inspection
 - Consider comments from CoA

Other Documentation (from the institution)

- Programme/course specification
- Unit/module specification
- Clinic manual/handbook
- Student/programme handbook
- Student feedback questionnaires
- External examiner reports
- Minutes of relevant meetings

Other Documentation

- Examples of student work
 - patient files
 - research projects
 - coursework
 - examination scripts
- Annual Monitoring Reports (AMoR)
- Previous Evaluation Reports
 - commendations, recommendations and **concerns**

Evaluation Visit

- Day of arrival
 - Preliminary meeting of Evaluation Team (on location)
- Days One to Two/Three
 - Initial meeting with the Institution
 - Meeting with staff
 - Meeting with students
 - Private meetings of the Team
 - Draft write-up of the Report
- Final day
 - Verbal feedback to the Institution
 - commendations, recommendations (and concerns, if any)
 - Complete the draft write-up of the Report

Responsibilities

- Adhere to schedule
- Adhere to team member specification
- Be professional
- Participate in the Evaluation Visit
 - Test by means of
 - observation at the on-site visit
 - analysis of documentation provided and statements in Self Study Report
 - ❖ Do they match?

Responsibilities

- Make judgments on the institution with regard to its provision in meeting the Standards
 - triangulate evidence to develop conclusions, including commendations, recommendations and concerns
 - to what degree does the institution comply with each of the Standards?

Responsibilities of the Chair and Secretary

- planning and preparing the evaluation visit, schedule and timetable for the visit, including booking accommodation
 - team members usually make their own travel arrangements, e.g. flights
- organising and managing the review process
- editing and submitting the Final Evaluation Report to CoA for consideration

Purpose of the Evaluation Report

- To inform the Commission on Accreditation (CoA)
 - to aid the decision on accreditation
- To inform the institution being evaluated
- External peer-review
- Review weaknesses and concerns
- Continuous improvement

Format of the Evaluation Report

- Standard format
- Much of the Report can be written in advance by the Chair of the Evaluation team
 - based on the Self Study Report (SSR) submitted by the Institution
- Appendix to the Report
 - Evaluation Visit Timetable
 - meetings, times, institutional representatives, team members, standard(s) addressed

Sections of the Evaluation Report

- Executive Summary
 - Description of the institution, current provision, application for accreditation/re-accreditation, time and place of evaluation visit, the outcomes of the visit
 - Commendations
 - Recommendations
 - Concerns

Sections of the Evaluation Report

- Introduction
 - Submission of SSR
 - Details of the Evaluation Visit
 - Time
 - Members of the Team
 - Pre-visit meeting
 - Evidence considered
 - SSR, on-site written and oral evidence
 - Production of draft report
 - Preliminary findings to the institution

Sections of the Evaluation Report





- Institution
 - Description of institution
 - Historical
 - Current provision
 - Strategy and mission statement

Sections of the Evaluation Report

- ECCE Standards and Compliance
- Aims and Objectives
 - Statement of Aims and Objectives
 - STANDARD
 - ❖ Description
 - ❖ Analysis
 - ❖ Conclusion

Sections of the Evaluation Report

The colour coded system outlined below is used by the Evaluation Team to indicate the level of compliance with each standard:

-  **Green** = Fully compliant/no risk (This is on track and good)
-  **Light Green** = Substantially compliant/low risk. (Broadly on track with some areas which need to be addressed)
-  **Yellow** = Partially compliant/medium risk. (Some significant areas which could be detrimental if not addressed)
-  **Red** = does not comply/high risk. (Serious concerns threaten this area; high risk in the organisation's overall performance)

Description

- ▶ Factual and accurate
- ▶ No evaluation or judgement
 - Avoid comparison with other institutions
- ▶ Avoid emotive language
 - e.g. only, good, better, worse
- ▶ Avoid vague inaccurate language
 - e.g. mainly, few, usually, frequently
- ▶ Be specific

Analysis

- Evaluation of experience against SSR
- How does the evidence compare with what they say they do?

Conclusion

- Judgement based on description and analysis
- To what degree do you feel the institution complies with the standard in question;
 - fully, substantially, partially, does not comply
- Ensure that the conclusion fits the analysis
- Remember the report is a public document

37 standards

- Against each standard a member(s) of Team is
 - allocated in advance
 - responsible for writing up that Standard

Conclusions

- Overall summary of standard reached
- Verbal report given by the Chair to the Institution at end of evaluation visit
 - Commendations, Recommendations and Concerns
 - Acknowledgements
- NO decision on accreditation is made by Evaluation team to the Institution
- NO recommendation on accreditation is made by Evaluation team to CoA
- both of the above are the CoA's decision

How it works in practice

- Before the visit
 - SSR and outline of Evaluation Team Report sent out to Team
 - Team members briefed on their specific areas of responsibility
- During the visit
 - the Team acts as a single unit
 - 2 members per meeting
 - splits up only when necessary
 - adheres to the timetable
- Built into timetable are times to start writing the report, and one 'writing' day at the end of the visit

Writing the Report

- Discussion and debate
- Quiet times for writing
 - Writing needs concentration!
- It is essential to complete the (draft) Report before leaving!

How it works in practice

- After the visit
 - Draft report circulated:
 - Team Members
 - Institution
 - Final report circulated to CoA
 - Presented to CoA by Chair of the Team, on behalf of the Team

Pointers

- Know the areas you are responsible for writing up before you go
- Take a laptop/tablet that won't let you down, and is fully compatible
- Take a USB (and adaptor plug if in a different country)
- Be prepared to compose your judgements and opinions, and write these down to be read by others
 - not least the institution
- It's tiring, you are totally in your own 'team' world for 3-4 days, enjoy the social side, learn, have fun
 - It is a very rewarding experience

Any questions?

