



# Writing the Evaluation Report

ECCE Training September 2014



# Purpose

- To inform the CoA
  - Informed decision on accreditation
- To inform the institution
  - External peer-review
  - Review weaknesses and concerns
    - Continuous improvement



# Format

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



# Sections

- 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

- 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

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



# Sections

- ECCE Standards and Compliance
  - Aims and Objectives
    - Statement of Aims and Objective
      - STANDARD
        - Description
        - Analysis
        - Conclusion
          - Institution fully complies with Standard..
          - Institution substantially complies with Standard
          - Institution partially complies with Standard...
          - Institution does not comply with Standard.....



# Description

- Factual and accurate
- No evaluation or judgement
- Avoid emotive language
  - only, good, better, worse
- Avoid vague inaccurate language
  - mainly, few, usually, frequently
- Be specific






# Analysis

- Evaluation of experience against SSR
- How does the evidence compare with what they say they do
- Evaluative language appropriate
- Do not compare with other institutions



# 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

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



- Conclusions

- Overall summary of standard reached
- Commendations, Recommendations and Concerns
- Acknowledgements
  
- NO recommendation on accreditation made to COA



# How it works in practice

- Before the visit
  - Outline of Report sent out
  - Members briefed on their areas of responsibility
- During the visit
  - The team acts as a single unit
    - splits up only when necessary
  - Sticks to the timetable
  - Built into timetable are times to start writing the report, and then one day at the end of the visit



# Writing the Report

- Iterative process
  - 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:
    - Members
    - Institution
    - Members
  - Final report circulated
    - COA
    - Presented by Chair of the Team, on behalf of the Team



# Pointers

- ‘Bond’ with your fellow team members
- Know the areas you are responsible for writing up before you go
- Take a laptop that won’t let you down, and is fully compatible
- Take a USB
- Be prepared to compose your judgements and opinions, and write these down to be read by others
  - Not least the institution
- It’s exhausting, you are totally in your own ‘team’ world for 4 days, enjoy the social side, learn, have fun
  - It should be a very rewarding experience
- Take the rest of the week off.....