

**ECCE**

EUROPEAN  
COUNCIL ON  
CHIROPRACTIC  
EDUCATION

# ECCE Training Seminar

## The Evaluation Team

23 March 2019

ECU Conference, Berlin

**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](http://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?

