

ECCE INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES

The European Council on Chiropractic Education is dedicated to continuous self-assessment and improvement in conducting its institution/programme monitoring and accreditation procedures. To this end, the ECCE has the following Internal Quality Assurance Procedures:

Accreditation Evaluation Procedures:

1. The head of the Quality Assurance Committee creates feedback questionnaires using Survey Monkey, sends these to each member of a site evaluation team and the head of the institution evaluated shortly after completion of an accreditation site visit. (Appendix 1).
2. The responses from the feedback questionnaires are evaluated by the head of the Quality Assurance Committee and a summary report for each institution is written based on the responses. The reports are then included in the documentation for the ECCE general council meetings. The Chair of the Quality Assurance Committee also presents these reports verbally during the annual ECCE general council meetings and is open to questions and comments.
3. Any necessary actions based on these reports are discussed in the Executive committee in the first instance and dealt with accordingly.

Evaluation of internal ECCE Meetings:

1. The head of the Quality Assurance Committee also creates feedback questionnaires, using Survey Monkey after every meeting of the ECCE bodies, including the General Council, Executive, Quality Assurance Committee and Commission on Accreditation Committee and sends these to each council or committee member (Appendix 2).
2. The head of the Quality Assurance committee evaluates all responses, and a summary report for each meeting is written and sent to each council or committee member and included in the documentation for the next meeting. The head of the Quality Assurance Committee also speaks to these reports in the annual General Assembly as needed.
3. Any necessary actions based on these reports are discussed in the Executive committee in the first instance and dealt with accordingly.

External feedback to the ECCE is provided through its evaluation by ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education) every 5 years.

Institution feedback for evaluation visit

Welcome.

The European Council on Chiropractic Education would like to thank you for taking the time to complete the following feedback questionnaire for the recent evaluation visit to the Durban University of Technology Education.

Institution feedback for evaluation visit

Before the visit

* 1. The institution received clear and full information regarding arrangements and the documentation required for the visit, and in good time.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 2. Before the visit communication with the ECCE and the Evaluation Team Secretary was helpful and informative, and there was a quick response time.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 3. Information about completing the Self Evaluation report was clear and informative.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

During the visit

* 1. The Evaluation Team seemed well informed and adequately prepared for the visit.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 2. The Evaluation Team was open, receptive and responsive to input by the institution.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 3. The Visit was well-structured and organised.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 4. The Visit was not overly disruptive to the normal routine of the institution.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

P 4. Reflections on the Visit

* 1. The Visit was carried out in a professional and appropriate manner.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 2. The overall impression of the process was that it was fair and unbiased.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 3. The process of preparing the Draft Report was well organised.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 4. The draft evaluation report was received by the institution for correction within 30 days of the visit.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* 5. The institution was given sufficient time to correct errors of fact in the draft evaluation report.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Strongly
Agree

Agree

Neither agree
nor disagree

Disagree

Strongly
disagree

* 6. Overall, the strong points of the institution's experience as a member of the process were:

* 7. Overall, the weak points of the institution's experience as a member of the process were:

* 8. Suggested changes to improve the process in the future are:

* 9. Please feel free to make additional comments here.

Thank you for your valuable contribution to quality assurance of chiropractic education in Europe.

- ECCE Quality Assurance Committee

Feedback questionnaire on the ECCE Executive meeting.

1. How efficiently was the meeting conducted?
 - Extremely efficiently
 - Very efficiently
 - Somewhat efficiently
 - Not so efficiently
 - Not at all efficiently

2. How professionally and effective do the members of the meeting behave?
 - Extremely professionally and effective
 - Very professionally and effective
 - Somewhat professionally and effective
 - Not so professionally and effective
 - Not at all professionally and effective

3. How well do the members of your team meeting communicate with each other?
 - Extremely well
 - Very well
 - Somewhat well

- Not so well
 - Not at all well
4. Was there enough time during the meeting to address all points satisfactorily?
- Too much time
 - Enough time
 - Not enough time
5. How quickly does your team act on its decisions?
- Extremely quickly
 - Very quickly
 - Somewhat quickly
 - Not so quickly
 - Not at all quickly
6. How often does your team meet its deadlines?
- Always
 - Most of the time
 - About half the time
 - Once in awhile
 - Never
7. Would you say that your team has too many meetings, too few meetings, or about the right number?
- Much too many
 - Somewhat too many
 - Slightly too many
 - About the right number
 - Slightly too few

- Somewhat too few
- Much too few

8. Do you have comments or suggestions resulting from answering above questions?

9. What were the strong points of this meeting?

10. Which points were not addressed at the meeting that you feel should have been addressed?

11. Which comments would you add to the meeting which you did not have the opportunity or forgot to do so?