

Informed Consent

Please, read the information below before filling in the questionnaire

Using the specially designed questionnaires the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement ensures the mutual assessment of the parties involved in the accreditation process in order to improve both the quality of education and services.

The information you provide is confidential, used for the preparation of the internal analytical report of the Center and should not be transferred to third parties, either by the Center or by the persons responsible for the assessment. The mentioned information is also used in the preparation of research documents and/or presentations only in a summarized, generalized form, with the protection of the anonymity of the assessed individuals and legal entities.

Most of the questions in the evaluation form are accompanied by the answers to be selected and you will need about 5-7 minutes to complete the whole questionnaire (the actual duration depends on your need to fill in the open questions and the number of individuals to be evaluated).

Your participation in this survey is extremely important for the improvement of the accreditation process. Therefore, we would like to thank you in advance for filling out the questionnaire and for the contribution that you make by filling out this form to the development of the accreditation process.

The information reflected in the questionnaire should express the position of the relevant interested party (institution, Council member, expert), who is responsible for the correctness and objectivity of the reflected information.

For more information, please, contact us: Phone/Fax: (+995 322) 200 220; E-mail:

higher.ed@eqe.ge

By proceeding to the next page, you confirm that you have read the above information and agree to participate in the survey.

Next

Evaluation of the activities of the Accreditation Experts Panel by the Chair of the Accreditation Expert Panel of higher education Programmes¹

The survey results are confidential and will be used only for improvement of the quality development process

Name of the Institution _____

Assessment order number _____

1. How many members were in your Accreditation Experts Panel (excluding the Chair)?

- 1 member
- 2 members
- 3 members
- 4 members
- 5 members
- 6 members
- 7 members

2.1[-2.4] Please, evaluate the performance of each member of the Experts Panel: Member of Accreditation Experts Panel (Name and Surname) _____

[Points on the evaluation scale are as follows: 1 - "Completely disagree", 2 - "Leaned to disagree 3 - "Partly agree", 4 - "Mostly agree", and 5 - "Completely agree"]

Nº	Assessment Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
1	Before carrying out the accreditation assessment, the expert studied the materials related to the educational programme <i>[In case of reaccreditation, the previous history of the programme(s) was also reviewed for comparison with the previous history of accreditation for comparison]</i>					
2	The expert took part in drawing up the agenda					

¹ Is filled in after the discussion of the issue at the session of the Accreditation Council or when the session is over.

3	For the preparatory meeting, the expert prepared and presented clarifying questions and opinions					
4	During the process of accreditation assessment, the expert attended all the activities/sessions included in the agenda.					
5	During the interview, the questions asked by the expert were clearly and comprehensibly formulated					
6	During the interviews, the expert examined all the important issues to write a report					
7	The expert was involved in the elaboration of key findings					
8	The relevant part of the draft report presented by the expert is clear and linguistically correct					
9	The relevant part of the draft report submitted by the expert includes all the important issues identified in the evaluation process					
10	The relevant part of the draft report presented by the expert is substantiated and evidence-based					
11	The relevant part of the draft report submitted by the expert includes a full assessment of the corresponding standard component					
12	The relevant part of the draft report prepared by the expert is submitted within the timeframes set by the Chair					
13	Taking into account the feedback from the Center, the expert participated in the process of drawing up a revised draft report <i>[If the Center has not shared its feedback, leave this field blank]</i>					
14	In the relevant part of the final report, the expert reflected the information about sharing/not sharing the argumentative position of the institution <i>[If the institution has not shared its feedback, leave this field blank]</i>					
15	The expert attended the session of the Accreditation Council and, if necessary, took part in the discussion of the issue					
16	During both the accreditation assessment and the oral hearing, the expert followed the code of ethics					

3.1[-3.7] Please, provide additional comments and suggestions regarding the member of the experts panel (if any)

4 Please, provide additional comments and suggestions (if any) in order to develop the activities of experts:

Thank you for taking your time