

# CIQA Annual Report

Murcia – 21st May 2014

L. Rossi - M. Wanner - P. Horin  
(U. Deimel, Z. Nagy)

Eight meetings so far  
(two since the last GA)

1)December 2013 (Wien)

2)May 2014 (Murcia)

June 2013: CIQA involved in ENQA visit

## 5th CIQA meeting • **List of procedures to monitor regularly**

- 1) List of Major Deficiencies: updating status;
- 2) List of Visiting Experts: updating status, completeness of the information;
- 3) List of Visiting Teams: composition as per guidelines;
- 4) Post visit questionnaires: return rate, analysis of results;
- 5) Office: performance in retrieving documents dealing with visitations and accreditation;
- 6) ExCom: sticking to the rules given by the GA;
- 7) all EAEVE bodies: respect of all published guidelines.

# Updating the list of Major Deficiencies

[http://www.eaeve.org/fileadmin/downloads/visitation\\_schedule/List\\_of\\_Major\\_Def.pdf](http://www.eaeve.org/fileadmin/downloads/visitation_schedule/List_of_Major_Def.pdf)

Analysis single ECOVE Meeting (October 2013).

Overall, 15 major deficiencies were found in 3 visitations. All of them were consistent with those appearing in the official list, hence:

**no new Major Deficiency's definition is proposed.**

# Checking Post-visit questionnaires

11 Faculties visited and 3 revisited

Potentially, 104 questionnaires in the EAEVE archives: 14 by the Deans, 14 by the LOs, 76 by the visiting experts (students included).

Overall, 64 questionnaires (**61.5% of the potential ones**)

Return rate of post-visit questionnaires has substantially increased compared with 2011-2013 (**23.8%, 33.3% and 39.1%, respectively**);

Still necessary to promote full awareness amongst Experts (including those involved in revisits and in joint international visits), Deans and **LOs**.

CIQA was also pleased to observe that the **proportion of post-visit questionnaires containing stimulating comments and suggestions has increased.**

Based on the questionnaires, suggestions for improvement of the evaluation procedure will be made by CIQA

Very few problems signaled **by the Faculties:**  
discomfort for unexpected request of document  
retrieval by the experts during a Stage 2  
visitation.

Suggestions to:

i) expand to 5 days (as in Stage 1) the stay on  
site of Stage 2 experts;

ii) improve transparency of Stage 2 guidelines on  
thresholds for satisfactory status, and on  
documents to be retrievable.

Main problems signaled in the **post-visit questionnaires returned by the experts** (the student included) and the Coordinators were as follows:

i) poor and confusing English in SERs (o weak SERs);

ii) confusion of roles between coordinator and chairperson (in two visits);

iii) poor performance of the coordinator (one visit);

iv) the template for final report (questions in red) not fitting SOPs.

It was suggested by experts or Faculties to:

- 1) expand the time of the visit (team on site since Sunday evening);
- 2) improve transparency of Stage 2 guidelines on thresholds for satisfactory status and on documents to be retrievable;
- 3) have documents retrievable for QA assessment translated in English;
- 4) consider (by EAEVE) “some sort of Stage 2 pre-visit scheme that could clearly explain what *quality assurance and enhancement* means, and help universities, for whom this is relatively new, understand how they could embrace this principle and create meaningful and lasting structures for this purpose in their academic management structures”;**
- 5) have one of the two QA experts playing the role of Chairperson in Stage 2 visits;
- 6) have a dinner with peers scheduled in the official program of the student member, eventually on Wednesday**
- 7) have the tasks of Chair and Coordinator more clearly separated in front of the Faculty.

# Composition Visiting Teams upcoming 2014-2015

i) no deviations from guidelines for Stage 1 visits;

ii) there was deviation in two of three Stage 2 visits, in that both selected team members in each visit are newbies. Both deviations could be rectified

Stage 2 experts are still in limited number and that 8 of 14 are newbies.

It was also verified that all appointed LOs are staff members of the Faculties to be visited

# **Checking all EAEVE bodies for respect of all published guidelines**

The Office made available the minutes of the ExCom meetings held since May 2013, and of the single ECOVE meeting held since then.

**No deviations from published guidelines were found.**

# Updating the List of Visiting Experts

Evidence was obtained by the Office that the list of visiting experts has been correctly updated.

It is now composed of 189 experts. Of these, 46 are experts in Basic Sciences, 27 in Animal Production, 22 in Food Hygiene, 81 in Clinical Sciences and 13 in Quality Assurance for Stage 2 visits. Of the experts, 39 (21%) are not Academic.

**EAEVE Office: performance in  
retrieving documents dealing with  
visitations and accreditation**

CIQA Approved/Accredited!

# ENQA report: analyses of the ENQA recommendations

Delusion for the unfavourable outcome of the External Review of EAEVE, but it is recognized **that recommendations in the Final Report of the ENQA Review Panel may help eliminating errors and gaps in the organization, and are largely practicable.**

Reaction to most recommendations entails decisions which are intrinsically “political”, hence beyond the mandate of the Committee. Nevertheless, CIQA suggests that a range of guidelines is developed or updated in the near future. These guidelines will have to deal (at least) with:

- 1) evaluation methodology for Stage 2 (as also requested by experts and visited Faculties);
- 2) selection criteria of the students to involve in the visiting teams;
- 3) criteria for inclusion in the list of experts (with special attention to Stage 2 candidate experts);
- 4) procedure for nomination of the visiting teams;
- 5) minimum training requirements for members of the visiting teams;
- 6) criteria for preparation, implementation and approval of the recommended periodic system-wide analyses of the veterinary education in Europe.

# Experts' performance list

CIQA members agree that EAEVE needs guidelines for reaction to poor performance by the experts .

Suggestions:

1) post-visit questionnaires will be the only source of information that EAEVE will take into account to open a procedure of poor performance by an expert. The only exception will be failure by the expert to reply – for three times - to invitation by the Office to join a visiting team.;

2) a procedure of poor performance will be open provided that a supplement of investigation (usually an interview of the Chairperson and the Coordinator, carried out by ExCom or eventually CIQA) will have supported reliability of the information in the questionnaire/s and the severity of the deficiency/s in performance;

3) the expert will be immediately excluded from the official list in case of: i) evidence of very poor English, hampering communication with the visited Faculty and the Team, and the provision of the expected written contributions to the Chairperson; ii) evidence of ineptitude in the use of basic IT resources (eg, a laptop, a word processor);

4) if not immediately excluded from the official list, the expert will be provisionally included in a “poor performance list” and informed by Excom (or eventually CIQA) of the reasons leading to the new situation;

5) experts in the list will be excluded from the official list when a second procedure of poor performance will have certified that a similar or different deficiency was found during another on site visit.

# Any other business

## Comparison and harmonisation of the reports

In a letter to the President of EAEVE and the Chairman of CIQA, dated 17 September 2013, Prof. J. Braun has raised two important issues:

- i) the actual role of visiting teams (*“should teams act as a consulting agency to a school or simply check for the existence of major deficiencies?”*)
- ii) the consistency between SOPs and the template (questions in red) currently in use to help harmonizing the Final Reports of the visits.

The unanimous view of CIQA is the following:

i) the role of the visiting team is well defined at pg. 10 of the SOPs , namely in the part saying that “*(The aim of the visit) ..... is also to try to put forward practical suggestions for improving training*”. Based on this statement, teams wishing to go beyond the minimum goal of checking for the existence of major deficiencies **are clearly not trespassing their mandate**. Visits are a sort of peer review process (somewhat similar as the one in use for acceptance or rejection of scientific papers) and some degree of variability in the interpretation of their role by reviewers is inevitable and must be accepted as intrinsic to this (and all) evaluation processes.

On the other hand, CIQA agrees with Prof. Braun that excessive variability may undermine the credibility of EAEVE. To harmonize behavior of the teams and limit the discomfort of (few) visited Faculties for inappropriate comments and suggestions in the reports (eg, when suggestions ignore national or regional legislation), specific training of chairpersons and all visiting experts is advisable, **as explicitly requested by ENQA visiting team**

As a member of the SOP Working Group, PH has been requested by ExCom his **opinion about merging the role of Coordinator and Chair** (see minutes ExCom meeting held on 30 October 2013). PH kindly asks for the informal opinion of the remaining CIQA members. All agree that: i) Coordinator and Chair must remain separate roles in the team; ii) current guidelines are sufficiently clear in defining these roles; iii) it would be not appropriate to load Chairpersons with the additional task of representing the association in front of the visited establishments.

Prof. Stuart Reid, as ECOVE Chairman, had written a letter to CIQA, asking an **opinion on timeliness and consistency of the reports of on site visitations** (the so called Draft A and Draft B). The conclusion of CIQA is that both characteristics are important and that published guidelines (see several Annexes in the SOPs) are explicit in:

- 1) the **definition of deadlines** for delivery of the respective written contributes by all team members, and delivery of Draft A and Draft B to the visited Faculties;
- 2) the attribution to the Coordinator of major responsibility for “**consistence and congruence**” of Draft A.

DELICATE ITEMS

# **GAME OVER**

**Thanks to EAEVE for great opportunity**

**Thanks to all colleagues who  
authentically believe in QA**