

National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council

POLICY & PROCEDURES MANUAL

Title:	Accreditation Review – Evaluation		
Policy No.	3.03.06-1	Chapter:	External Operations
Proposed:	May 5, 2005	Proposal No.:	2005-12
Adopted:	February, 2006	Adopted By:	Vote of the Board of Directors

Purpose:

The National Environmental Health Science and Protection Accreditation Council requires that all accreditation site visits are collegial and educational experiences for both the programs and the site visitors. Evaluation of the application of the accreditation process and the performance of a site visitor is important to improving the quality of the accreditation process.

Completion of the survey below is an important way in which one can contribute to improving the site visit process. Please evaluate both the process as well as individual members of the team. The purpose of the evaluation survey is to seek feedback on both the accreditation and site visit process, the performance of the site visitors. Responses to the survey will not be shared with the Council until after your accreditation review has taken place.

ACCREDITATION PROCESS EVALUATION

Name of Institution: _____

Date of Site Visit: _____

Position of person completing assessment form (Please circle one):

Program Director

Faculty Member

Other _____

Site Visit Team Members: _____

Please use the following scale to describe the **arrangements for the site visit**:

SD: Strongly Disagree

D: Disagree

N: Neutral/No Opinion

A: Agree

SA: Strongly Agree

NA: Not Applicable

Leave the question blank if you are unable to evaluate.

Category	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A
The Undergraduate/Graduate Chair was available to assist in preparing the accreditation application.						

**National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council
POLICY & PROCEDURES MANUAL**

Policy No. 3.03.06

Accreditation Process Evaluation

Page 2 of 5

Preparing the Self-Study and the self-study process was easy to understand and execute.						
A mentor was available to assist in preparing the accreditation application.						
The Undergraduate/Graduate Chair informed me in a timely manner of my site visitors, along with their contact information.						
I had no conflict of interest with the Site Visitors.						
If a conflict of interest did exist, the Undergraduate/Graduate Chair handled it to my satisfaction.						
I was able to contact my site visitor team easily.						
It was easy to schedule the site visit.						
It was easy to make accommodations/arrangements for the site visit.						
EHAC Office Staff was available to assist with any site visit details.						
The Undergraduate/Graduate Chair was easy to communicate with about problems or situations that arose during the process.						
The Site Visitors communicated in a timely manner with our program director before the visit to finalize the schedule and coordinate the final arrangements.						

Please use the rating scale below to rate the value of the following aspects of the accreditation review process in effecting positive changes in your program.

- 1: Poor
- 2: Fair
- 3: Satisfactory
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

- ___ Application for Accreditation (New Programs Only)
- ___ Self-Study Process
- ___ Submission of Self-Study
- ___ Site Visit
- ___ Outcome Assessment Process
- ___ Site Team Report & Response
- ___ Annual Meeting

Please use the following scale to evaluate the **ACADEMIC MEMBER OF THE SITE TEAM:**

- SD: Strongly Disagree
 - D: Disagree
 - N: Neutral/No Opinion
 - A: Agree
 - SA: Strongly Agree
 - NA: Not Applicable
- Leave the question blank if you are unable to evaluate.

Category	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A
Demonstrated thorough knowledge and understanding of the Council's Accreditation Standards.						
Demonstrated thorough knowledge and understanding of the accreditation process and procedures.						
Demonstrated familiarity with the self-study submitted by the program.						

Drafted:		
Approved:		

**National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council
POLICY & PROCEDURES MANUAL**

Policy No. 3.03.06

Accreditation Process Evaluation

Page 3 of 5

Requested pertinent additional information to evaluate the program (as needed.)						
Promoted an open, honest and non-threatening atmosphere during the interview and discussion sessions.						
Provided the program with sufficient opportunity to highlight its strengths.						
Demonstrated effective, appropriate interpersonal communication skills.						
Maintained an open, objective attitude about the program.						
Avoided comparison with own program and expressions of personal philosophies about environmental health education.						
Conducted site visit in an organized way.						
Conducted site visit with a professional and respectful manner.						
Reported site visit findings clearly, objectively and accurately in preliminary site visit report.						
Sent preliminary site visit report in a timely manner.						
Allowed program director ample time to respond to concerns.						
Incorporated suggestions from program director into Final Site Visit Report.						

Please provide explanations/comments below or on a separate sheet about all items rated as either SD or D (specifying the item.) Additionally, provide any other comments you wish about the items rated above or about the site visit in general.

Please indicate below your recommendation regarding this site visitor. Your recommendation should be based on the performance of the site visitor in terms of the behaviors noted in the preceding chart.

_____ I recommend this site visitor for future site visits.

_____ I recommend this site visitor for future site visits **with reservations**.

Please explain:

_____ I **do not** recommend this site visitor for future site visits.

Please explain:

Drafted:		
Approved:		

**National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council
POLICY & PROCEDURES MANUAL**

Policy No. 3.03.06

Accreditation Process Evaluation

Page 4 of 5

Please use the following scale to evaluate the **PRACTITIONER MEMBER OF THE SITE TEAM:**

- SD: Strongly Disagree
 - D: Disagree
 - N: Neutral/No Opinion
 - A: Agree
 - SA: Strongly Agree
 - NA: Not Applicable
- Leave the question blank if you are unable to evaluate.

Category	SD	D	N	A	SA	N/A
Demonstrated thorough knowledge and understanding of the Council's Accreditation Standards.						
Demonstrated thorough knowledge and understanding of the accreditation process and procedures.						
Demonstrated familiarity with the self-study submitted by the program.						
Requested pertinent additional information to evaluate the program (as needed.)						
Promoted an open, honest and non-threatening atmosphere during the interview and discussion sessions.						
Observed the critical aspects of the program.						
Provided the program with sufficient opportunity to highlight its strengths.						
Demonstrated effective, appropriate interpersonal communication skills.						
Maintained an open, objective attitude about the program.						
Avoided comparison with own experience and expressions of personal philosophies about environmental health education.						
Conducted site visit in an organized way.						
Conducted site visit with a professional and respectful manner.						
Reported site visit findings clearly, objectively and accurately in preliminary site visit report.						
Sent preliminary site visit report in a timely manner.						
Allowed program director ample time to respond to concerns.						
Incorporated suggestions from program director into Final Site Visit Report.						

Please provide explanations/comments below or on a separate sheet about all items rated as either SD or D (specifying the item.) Additionally, provide any other comments you wish about the items rated above or about the site visit in general.

Please indicate below your recommendation regarding this site visitor. Your recommendation should be based on the performance of the site visitor in terms of the behaviors noted in the preceding chart.

_____ I recommend this site visitor for future site visits.

Drafted:		
Approved:		

**National Environmental Health Science & Protection Accreditation Council
POLICY & PROCEDURES MANUAL**

Policy No. 3.03.06

Accreditation Process Evaluation

Page 5 of 5

_____ I recommend this site visitor for future site visits **with reservations**.

Please explain:

_____ I **do not** recommend this site visitor for future site visits.

Please explain:

Thank you so much for your participation. Please return completed evaluations to:

EHAC
8620 Roosevelt Way NE, Suite A
Seattle, WA 98115
Fax: 206-985-9805
Email: ehacinfo@aehap.org

Drafted:		
Approved:		