



MARIANOPOLIS  
COLLEGE

## INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ON THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

### CONTENTS

1. PREAMBLE .....	1
2. POLICY OBJECTIVES .....	2
3. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING EVALUATION .....	2
4. EVALUATION PRINCIPLES .....	3
5. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA .....	4
6. STAKEHOLDERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES .....	5
6.1 The Board of Governors.....	5
6.2 Director General .....	6
6.3 Academic Dean (Director of Studies) .....	6
6.4 Academic Council.....	7
6.5 Program Dean (Coordinator of Program Evaluation).....	7
6.6 Department Chairperson .....	8
6.7 Program Assessment, Development and Evaluation Committee (PADE) .....	8
6.8 Responsibilities of the Academic Resources Professional(s).....	9
6.9 Composition of the Program Evaluation Committee.....	9
6.10Mandate of the Program Evaluation Committee .....	10
7. SOURCES OF DATA.....	10
8. STRUCTURE OF FINAL REPORT.....	11
9. THE DRAFTING PROCESS.....	11
10. EVALUATION SCHEDULE .....	12
11. POLICY REVIEW .....	12

APPENDIX I.....	13
APPENDIX II.....	17
APPENDIX III.....	18
APPENDIX IV.....	21

## 1. PREAMBLE

- 1.1. Marianopolis College is a private educational institution founded in 1908 by the Congrégation de Notre-Dame. The College offers, in a motivating and welcoming atmosphere, pre-university programs leading to the Diploma of College Studies (DEC) for which it has received Ministerial authorization. In keeping with its Mission and strategic priorities, Marianopolis College is a student-centered institution committed to academic excellence and the delivery of programs of the highest standards to improve the quality of the academic experiences of its students;
- 1.2. Given this context, Marianopolis treats program evaluation<sup>1</sup> as an essential quality assurance process and a critical mechanism in managing and developing the quality of educational programs for attaining the institution's mission and goals, and for addressing the growing complexity of academic programs as well as the increasing demands for accountability by policymakers and other stakeholders. Program evaluation at Marianopolis is intended to reflect the institution's commitment:
  - 1.2.1. to establish and maintain effective methods of management and modes of organization and communication to ensure the coordination and proper functioning of programs;
  - 1.2.2. to foster a culture of investing in rigorous academic programs and of measuring performance of various kinds to examine programs critically and constructively, and provide assurances that they are in conformity to ministerial and institutional regulation, goals and objectives, and meet predetermined standards of quality;
  - 1.2.3. to ensure the highest possible standards of educational effectiveness;
- 1.3. This document presents a framework of principles and procedures for conducting program evaluations, and significantly reinforces the importance of specific stages in the evaluation process. It clarifies the objectives of the College's evaluation policy, describes the principles informing the process, the College's responsibilities, and the performance criteria and key performance indicators to be evaluated. In addition, it identifies the relevant stakeholders, and examines the roles and mandates involved in the process, the method of determining the programs to be evaluated, the structure of the evaluation report, and the mechanisms for policy review.

---

<sup>1</sup> Notwithstanding aspects of the evaluation of the General Education Component when academic programs are evaluated, the General Education Component shall be evaluated cyclically in its entirety under the protocol established for programs.

## 2. POLICY OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Programs are:

- 2.1. To present a framework of principles and procedures for conducting program evaluations that provides useful information and sound evidence to inform and support good decision-making to enhance program quality.
- 2.2. To ensure that the principles and procedures of the evaluation of academic programs reflect ministerial goals and objectives, best practices, and the mission, vision and strategic priorities of Marianopolis.
- 2.3. To ensure the rigorous nature of program evaluation in terms of coherence, comprehensiveness, and usefulness;
- 2.4. To permit regular and, if necessary, substantial modifications to be made to the various elements of programs
- 2.5. To help integrate program evaluation into the routine operational practices of the College, as well as build institutional capacity for evaluation, and an appreciation of the benefits to be derived from the regular evaluation of the academic programs offered by the College.
- 2.6. To promote effective participation in the process of evaluation by all levels of the College community, and respect for the rights of all individuals concerned in the process.

## 3. INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES REGARDING EVALUATION

To accomplish the above objectives, it is the College's responsibility:

- 3.1. to ensure the cyclical<sup>2</sup> self-evaluation of all academic programs which lead to the Diploma of Collegial Studies (DEC.), as well as the cyclical self-evaluation of the General Education Component of studies<sup>3</sup>;
- 3.2. to ensure the self-evaluation of academic programs as requested by the CEEC;
- 3.3. to ensure that the evaluation of programs is in compliance with ministerial and institutional norms and objectives as well as best practices;
- 3.4. to use evaluation findings to determine the general and specific strengths and weaknesses of the programs and what actions need to be taken so that the program(s) will more effectively respond to objectives, standards and student needs;
- 3.5. to follow up and implement all planned actions specified in evaluation reports as well as recommendations and/or suggestions from the CEEC.
- 3.6. to provide information on the implementation of the IPEP to all interested parties such as the Ministry of Education, the Commission d'évaluation, the faculty, the students, and the universities, in order to demonstrate the manner in which the

---

<sup>2</sup> The normative schedule is a five to seven year cycle

<sup>3</sup> Hereinafter whenever there is a reference to the evaluation of program(s), it is understood that evaluation includes the General Education Component as an entity.

College meets its obligation to assure a high standard of quality in its academic programs.

#### **4. EVALUATION PRINCIPLES**

The following principles provide guidelines to help ensure that evaluative practices are well-designed and systematically organized to enhance the execution of evaluations that are practical, balanced, ethical and fair:

- 4.1 Program evaluation describes the ways in which the program's mission, goals and objectives are consistent with, or aligned with the mission and goals of the College, and provides evidence that the program is effectively carrying out its mission and attaining its goals and objectives<sup>4</sup>.
- 4.2 Program evaluation is comprehensive and covers both the specific education component and the general education component (common, specific, and complementary). The evaluation of the general education component shall include (a) how the general-education courses are adapted to the program; (b) how the general education objectives are integrated into the comprehensive assessment; (c) how the general education component contributes to achieving overall program goals and objectives;
- 4.3 Evaluation processes are practical and meaningful, that they recognize the specific particularities of the program, take the concerns of the groups and individuals affected by the evaluation into consideration, and enlist the broadest possible consultation, cooperation and participation;
- 4.4 Evaluation is based on performance criteria which allow comparison with similar and different programs inside and outside the institution;
- 4.5 Evaluation is conducted efficiently, involves the minimum of disruption, and produces information of sufficient value to justify the expenditure of resources;
- 4.6 Procedures are developed and implemented to ensure the collection of sufficiently reliable and valid data for the intended analysis, and the derivation of evaluation findings that are reliable and informative for intended users;
- 4.7 Multiple procedures for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting comprehensive sets of quantitative as well as qualitative data are employed to improve the overall validity of the process and acceptance of the evaluation findings;
- 4.8 Information-gathering procedures are designed to produce a well-rounded picture and to convey technically accurate quantitative and qualitative information about the features that determine the quality of the program being evaluated;
- 4.9 Evaluation is complete and fair in its examination and recording of strengths and weaknesses of the program being evaluated, so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed;

---

<sup>4</sup> Programs objectives refer to Ministerial objectives or the learning outcomes that provide evidence of the acquisition or mastery by students of the desired knowledge, competencies and dispositions as described in the various program exit profiles of the College

- 4.10 Evaluation conclusions regarding the relevance, coherence, effectiveness and other performance criteria are justified on the basis of the evidence gathered and judged against selected values or standards;
- 4.11 Results are reported comprehensively, clearly, honestly, and in a format that indicates the relative importance of the various elements;
- 4.12 Evaluation data enhances program planning, development and improvement;
- 4.13 Evaluation procedures adhere to principles of confidentiality, equity, impartiality, of effective participation in the process of evaluation by all levels of the College community, and of respect for the welfare and rights of all individuals concerned in the process, as well as those affected by its results.

## 5. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The Performance Criteria<sup>5</sup> evaluated by the College represent broad markers of program quality whose measurement enables the institution to collect credible data and evidence that can be used to recognize the attainment of program goals or objectives, and judge the quality or value of its academic programs. Each performance criterion is divided into a number of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) - See Appendix 1 which specifies how a program can demonstrate it is meeting each criterion;

- 5.1 **Program Relevance:** conformity between objectives, standards and program content and the socio-economic (labour market and universities) and socio-educational (expectations of society and of students) needs;
- 5.2 **Program Coherence:** organization of a program's structure, content and learning activities with respect to the objectives and standards which have been assigned to the program.
- 5.3 **Quality of Teaching Methods and Student Supervision:** means used to enable students to attain the program's objectives, and the measures put in place for student supervision.
- 5.4 **Appropriateness of Human, Material and Financial Resources according to Education Needs:** quantity and quality of resources that the college allocates to the program, and the competence and qualifications of teachers and other members of staff.
- 5.5 **Program Effectiveness:** success rates in courses and graduation rates, the quality of the evaluation of learning, and the attainment by students of program objectives.
- 5.6 **Quality of Program Management:** principles, structures and methods of management, distribution of roles and responsibilities.

---

<sup>5</sup> See Appendix II for the Performance Criteria of the General Education component which have been adapted from the Performance Criteria of program.

## 6. STAKEHOLDERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The task of planning, developing, implementing, and delivering academic programs involves partnerships and collaboration at multiple levels of the institution. This policy requires due attention to, and understanding and inclusion of, the multiple perspectives, voices, concerns and value systems of stakeholders<sup>6</sup>, namely, the persons and structures having an investment in (a) what will be learned from an evaluation; (b) what will be done with the information.

The persons or structures involved in the evaluation and associated participatory process include the following:

- Board of Governors
- Director General
- Academic Dean
- Academic Council
- Associate Academic Dean
- Program Dean
- PADE Committee
- General Education Coordinating Committee
- Relevant Program Committee(s)
- Chairperson (s) of the Academic Department within the program(s) being evaluated
- Faculty
- Academic Support and Resource Units e.g., Pedagogical Services; Academic Advising; Learning Resources Centre & Plan for Success; Information Technology Services - ITS; Library Services; Professional Development<sup>7</sup>
- Students in the program.

Stakeholders with responsibilities directly related to the implementations of program evaluation are described below

### 6.1 The Board of Governors

The Board of Governors administers the affairs of the Corporation, i.e. the College. The Board of Governors is responsible for the ultimate approval of the Evaluation Report.

---

<sup>6</sup> Program stakeholders comprise three groups: (1) those involved in program operations, (2) those served or affected by the program, and (3) the primary users of an evaluation report, namely, the specific person(s) in a position to do or decide something regarding the program.

<sup>7</sup> Pedagogical Services, Academic Advising, Learning Resources Centre and Plan for Success, ITS and Library Services perform an institutional service in support of students. While services are designed to meet strategic college goals and objectives, and are not directly program oriented, they impact the delivery of programs. PD services are also institutional in scope and in support of teachers and staff.

## **6.2 Director General**

The Director is the chief administrative and executive officer of the College. As such, the Director General is responsible for the execution of all educational and administrative policies at the College, and is therefore the individual with the overall responsibility for the administration of the College's programs of study. Regarding the evaluation of programs the Director General is responsible for:

- 6.2.1** Carrying out the decisions of the Board of Governors concerning the Policy for the Evaluation of Programs;
- 6.2.2** Ensuring that the Policy is instituted and applied;
- 6.2.3** Integrating the evaluation of programs into the overall strategic priorities of the College;
- 6.2.4** Ensuring that sufficient human and financial resources are available for implementing the evaluation policy.

## **6.3 Academic Dean (Director of Studies)**

The Academic Dean, under the Director General, is the chief academic authority in the College responsible for all academic matters. The Academic Dean also has the principal responsibility for the implementation and the revision of the Policy for the Evaluation of Programs, and as such is responsible for:

- 6.3.1** Ensuring that the procedures as described in the Institutional Policy of Program Evaluation are carried out;
- 6.3.2** Ensuring that the Policy is known and respected by both faculty and students;
- 6.3.3** Ensuring the establishment of the Program Evaluation Committee;
- 6.3.4** Appointing, in consultation the Program Dean and the PADE Committee, the *responsible* for writing the program evaluation report;
- 6.3.5** Establishing, in consultation with the Program Dean and the PADE Committee, the Program Evaluation Consultation Committee for the review and approval of each draft chapter of the evaluation report. Decision-making regarding the specific composition of this committee shall take place immediately following the formation of the Program Evaluation Committee;
- 6.3.6** Determining, in consultation with the PADE Committee, the schedule for the evaluation of programs;
- 6.3.7** Ensuring that the necessary information and resources are available for the effective operation of the Program Evaluation Committee;
- 6.3.8** Submitting the report of program evaluation to the Board of Governors;
- 6.3.9** Ensuring that program evaluation reports are available to stakeholders following their approval by the Board of Governors
- 6.3.10** Ensuring that the recommendations of the program evaluation report and of the CEEC are implemented.



#### **6.4 Academic Council**

Academic Council is the chief decision-making body concerning all of the academic policies of the College. Academic Council advises the Board of Governors and makes recommendations on all questions concerning programs of study, evaluation of learning, and program evaluation. Academic Council is responsible for:

- 6.4.1 Taking the necessary decisions to ensure both the quality of academic programs and the academic progress of students;
- 6.4.2 Adopting the Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Programs and ensuring that it is implemented;
- 6.4.3 Making the recommendations necessary to ensure the periodic evaluation of the quality of the academic programs of the College;
- 6.4.4 Approving the programs to be evaluated and the comprehensive time table for program evaluation recommended by the PADE Committee in consultation with the Academic Dean;
- 6.4.5 Reviewing and formally approving the self evaluation report when a program evaluation has been carried out;
- 6.4.6 Approving recommendations from the PADE Committee for revision of the Institutional Policy for Program Evaluation;
- 6.4.7 Approving the submission of the reports of program evaluation to the Commission (CEEC) at the appropriate times.

#### **6.5 Program Dean (Coordinator of Program Evaluation)**

6.5.1 The Program Dean has responsibilities related to program assessment, development, and evaluation. The Program Dean is therefore responsible for the overall enhancement of the quality of the College's academic programs, and the effective functioning of the PADE Committee and all committees created *ad hoc* and mandated to assist the PADE Committee in fulfilling its institutional responsibilities related to program. In this regard, the Program Dean oversees the application of the Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Programs (IPEP) on behalf the Academic Dean and Academic Council and fulfils the following responsibilities:

- 6.5.1.1 Chairs the Program Evaluation Committee;
- 6.5.1.2 Clarifies the operational evaluation schedule, and the breakdown of evaluation tasks;
- 6.5.1.3 Ensures that the Program Evaluation Committee has all materials and resources necessary to conduct the evaluation;
- 6.5.1.4 Clarifies the choice of instruments for the collection of data, and verify the validity and reliability of procedures;
- 6.5.1.5 Ensures the collection, analysis and interpretation of the relevant statistics and indicators from multiple sources;

- 6.5.1.6 Guarantees that the collection of data is done in a manner which respects and protects the rights, privacy and worth of all individuals involved, in compliance with the Marianopolis Ethics Document;
- 6.5.1.7 Acts as a resource person, liaise with relevant stakeholders, and ensures widespread consultation and participation in the evaluation process;
- 6.5.1.8 Provides the Program Evaluation Committee with the required guidance and assistance for the fulfillment of the responsibilities of members;
- 6.5.1.9 Discusses evaluation findings with the Department(s) delivering the program, the PADE Committee, and the Academic Dean to get feedback on salient issues and follow-up procedures;
- 6.5.1.10 Oversees the drafting of the program evaluation report and the executive summary of the final report;
- 6.5.1.11 Chairs the Program Evaluation Consultation Committee (see paragraph 6.3.5) to review and approve each draft chapter of the evaluation report;
- 6.5.1.12 Submits the final draft program evaluation report to Academic Council with a recommendation for approval;
- 6.5.1.13 Ensures that Program Committees implement planned actions described in the evaluation report and the recommendations or suggestions of the CEEC.
- 6.5.1.14 Attends all information sessions regarding program evaluation, program development, etc., held by the CEEC.

## 6.6 Department Chairperson

Department Chairpersons are members of Academic Council and the Academic Management Team and are responsible for seeing that the work of the Departments is carried out. By virtue of this function, the Department Chairperson shall:

- 6.6.1 Become a member of the Program Evaluation Committee when the program for which the Department Chairperson is responsible is undergoing evaluation;
- 6.6.2 Serve as the link between the Program Evaluation Committee, the teachers of the program undergoing a program evaluation, and the Curriculum Committee;
- 6.6.3 Ensure that information required by the Program Evaluation Committee is provided by the members of the Departments involved;
- 6.6.4 In the event that any of the programs within the All Arts Programs grouping, (Liberal Arts, Creative Arts, Literature and Languages), Music, Double Decs., as well as Arts & Science are being evaluated, the Academic Dean shall appoint a *responsible* to represent the program being evaluated in accordance with the protocol set out in paragraphs 6.6.1, 6.6.2 & 6.6.3.

## 6.7 Program Assessment, Development and Evaluation Committee (PADE)

The Program Assessment, Development and Evaluation Committee (PADE) is a standing committee of Academic Council. In keeping with its mandate, it is the responsibility of the PADE Committee to:

- 6.7.1 Assist the Academic Dean in the establishment of the Program Evaluation Committee no later than a month after Academic Council has ratified the schedule for program evaluation.
- 6.7.2 Approve the evaluation master plan (devis) proposed by the Program Evaluation Committee for the program being evaluated;
- 6.7.3 Promote consistent standards throughout evaluation processes and give advice to the Program Evaluation Committee as required;
- 6.7.4 Recommend to Academic Council a schedule for the regular evaluation of program;
- 6.7.5 Review recommendations from Program Evaluation Committees regarding improvements to institutional academic policies and the program evaluation process as deemed necessary;
- 6.7.6 Ensure the effective functioning of the Institutional Policy for Program Evaluation;
- 6.7.7 Assist Academic Council in all phases of the planning, preparation and coordination of the various logistical aspects for visits of the CEEC as a follow up to mandated self-evaluations;
- 6.7.8 Ensure follow through (le suivi) on the planned actions of the self-evaluation by Program Committees.

#### **6.8 Responsibilities of the Academic Resources Professional(s)**

- 6.8.1 Provide methodological support to the Program Evaluation Committee in the collection and analysis of the data;
- 6.8.2 Provide such assistance as required in the drafting of the Evaluation Report;
- 6.8.3 Undertake additional duties related to program evaluation at the discretion of the Academic Dean.

#### **6.9 Composition of the Program Evaluation Committee**

- 6.9.1 Within four weeks of the approval of the schedule for the evaluation of a program by Academic Council, the Academic Dean shall, in consultation with the PADE Committee, appoint a Coordinator of Program Evaluation and establish a Program Evaluation Committee. The Program Evaluation Committee shall consist of the following persons:
  - The Program Dean ( ex officio)
  - The Department Chairperson(s) of the program being evaluated, or the *responsable* appointed by the Academic Dean (**see paragraph 6.6.4**);
  - Two teachers from the Specific Education Component of the program, at least one of whom shall be drawn from the Program Committee;
  - Two teachers representing the General Education Component, at least one of whom shall be drawn from the General Education Coordinating Committee
  - The Academic Information System's Professional
  - The Academic Resources Professional(s) assigned to Program Evaluation

6.9.2 At any stage of its work, the Program Evaluation Committee may invite any person it deems beneficial to participate in its work.

#### 6.10 Mandate of the Program Evaluation Committee

- 6.10.1 Consult concerned parties and prepare the devis or evaluation master-plan<sup>8</sup>. This master-plan shall identify the program issues<sup>9</sup> to be addressed, and the objectives to be achieved;
- 6.10.2 Establish the time-table appropriate for each element of program evaluation;
- 6.10.3 Determine and prioritize the criteria most directly related to the issues, and which form the basis for guiding data collection and analysis;
- 6.10.4 Evaluate the Performance Criteria (see section 5) to a greater or lesser degree depending on the nature of specified program issues;
- 6.10.5 Identify the indicators and statistical information required to conduct the evaluation;
- 6.10.6 Choose the appropriate evaluation instruments for data collection;
- 6.10.7 Collect, organize, analyze, and interpret the necessary quantitative and qualitative data;
- 6.10.8 Inform the PADE Committee of its progress;
- 6.10.9 Inform and consult concerned parties regarding the results of the evaluation;
- 6.10.10 Formulate recommendations and propose the actions to be undertaken at each level of institutional responsibility/authority;
- 6.10.11 Submit the draft report to the Academic Council for review;
- 6.10.12 Recommend to the PADE Committee improvements to institutional academic policies, in particular the IPEP, and the program evaluation process as deemed necessary.

#### 7. SOURCES OF DATA

These sources shall include:

- 7.1 Data compiled by the College's Academic Information System and Program Committees as part of the ongoing monitoring of program quality<sup>10</sup>.
- 7.2 Data regarding the following from the Coordinator of Pedagogical Services:
  - 7.2.1 student recruitment, admissions and enrolment;
  - 7.2.2 rates of attendance of graduates at university and rates of admission to first choice university and programs based on annual surveys of graduates;

---

<sup>8</sup> See Appendix II: Reinforcement of Important Stages in the Process of Program Evaluation

<sup>9</sup> *Program Issues* refer to (1) difficulties or problems affecting a program of studies resulting from its particular implementation or delivery processes that require intervention to enhance program quality; (2) a set of program related questions or concerns requiring further study; (3) challenges arising out of a given situation which must be clarified and accounted for so that the program can develop properly.

<sup>10</sup> See Policy for Monitoring Key Indicators of Program Quality - Approved by Academic Council, March 2010.

7.2.3 appropriate reports produced by the College's Student Information System (CLARA).

7.3 Institutional data regarding faculty evaluation by students;

7.4 Departmental files.

## 8. STRUCTURE OF FINAL REPORT

- Table of contents
- An executive summary
- Composition of the Program Evaluation Committee
- A comprehensive but succinct description of the program
- A description of the aims, objectives and scope of the evaluation
- A detailed description of the evaluation master plan
- The evaluative text, i.e. the evidence collected with an interpretation of findings and clearly stated justifications for conclusions. The evaluative text must be supported by data in tables or other suitable graphic forms either in the text itself, the appendix, or both
- The recommendations for improving the quality of the program and the analysis that led to them based on a summary of the evaluative data concerning the effectiveness of the program
- Appendices of (a) tables, graphs, etc.; (b) sample questionnaires; (c) relevant policies and documents.

## 9. THE DRAFTING PROCESS

- 9.1 Written under the supervision of the Coordinator of Program Evaluation, the first draft of each chapter of the report is presented to the other members of the Program Evaluation Committee for an in-depth review. These drafts may then go through several revisions until the final draft report is reached. During the revision phase of the process, it is the responsibility of the Program Dean (Coordinator of Program Evaluation) and the Department Chairperson/*responsible* of (for) the program being evaluated to communicate with the teachers in the program and other concerned parties to get feedback regarding findings and ensure that their active participation in the evaluation process is maintained. Each final draft chapter is forwarded to the Program Evaluation Consultation Committee for further review and approval.
- 9.2 When all final draft chapters have completed this phase, the final draft report is approved by the Program Evaluation Consultation Committee and is forwarded to Academic Council with a recommendation for approval. The final draft report must contain an executive summary, a list of recommendations, and planned actions;
- 9.3 Once the final draft report has been approved by Academic Council, it is presented to the Board of Governors of the College by the Academic Dean for official College approval;
- 9.4 Acting on behalf of the Board of Governors, the Academic Dean submits the approved final report to the Commission d'évaluation (CEEC) as required.

## **10. EVALUATION SCHEDULE**

- 10.1** The PADE Committee, in consultation with the Academic Dean, is responsible for selecting the programs to be evaluated and for drawing up a comprehensive time table for program evaluation;
- 10.2** Program evaluation shall be scheduled on a seven-year cycle;
- 10.3** By March 1 of each year, the PADE Committee, after consultation with the Academic Dean, will present the time table for program evaluations for the following academic year to Academic Council for approval. Following approval, the time table must be made known to Program Committees, Departments, other units of the College, and to students.
- 10.4** The program evaluation time table may be modified:
- 10.5** when it is necessary to have the evaluation of a particular program coincide with the time table of a program evaluation conducted by the CEEC,
- 10.6** when a new program has been instituted and the Academic Dean, and the PADE Committee or the Program Committee wish it to be evaluated as soon as possible,
- 10.7** when information provided through the on-going process of program monitoring indicates problems in a program. In this event, the PADE Committee, in consultation with the Program Committee and Department Chairperson(s) may modify the schedule and recommend to Academic Council the evaluation of one or more elements of a program or a program in its entirety<sup>11</sup>.

## **11. POLICY REVIEW**

The Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Program shall be reviewed by the PADE Committee at least once every three years. Such review is intended to serve the following purposes:

- 11.1** ensure that the procedures of implementation conform to the specifications of the Policy;
- 11.2** consider modifications to the Policy in the light of the current experience in program evaluations and of the strategic needs of the college;
- 11.3** improve the pertinence, rigor and efficiency of the Policy;
- 11.4** clarify any elements of the Policy or add other elements considered necessary.

---

<sup>11</sup> See PADE Policy on Institutional Procedures for the Review and Approval of Program Changes - approved by Academic Council, 11March,2010

## APPENDIX I

### Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

**Key Performance Indicators** provide quantitative and qualitative tools for measuring the extent to which performance objectives linked to program quality are being achieved on an on-going basis. The College is expected to evaluate the following **Performance Criteria** and associated **KPIs** to a greater or lesser degree depending on the nature of specified *program issues*<sup>12</sup>:

#### 1. Program Relevance (see subsection 5.1)

Programs are relevant when there is “conformity between objectives, standards and program content and ... socioeconomic and socioeducational needs” (CEEC 1994, p. 12). In other words, program relevance is always linked to the broader educational goal of holistic development of the individual, as student, professional, and citizen. Program relevance is demonstrated if analysis of performance criteria provides sufficient evidence to support the following Key Performance Indicators (**KPIs**):

- 1.1 Program objectives, standards and content conform to the College’s mission, values and strategic priorities;
- 1.2 Implemented and/or reinforced ministerial objectives and standards conform to social expectations and needs
- 1.3 Program objectives, standards and content are consistent with the expectations of the university community regarding student formation for access to university studies;
- 1.4 Program responses are aligned with student needs and expectations.

#### 2. Program Coherence (see subsection 5.2)

Program coherence is achieved through the “organization of program structure, content and learning activities with respect to the objectives and standards which have been assigned to it” (CEEC 1994, p. 12). The various components must fit together and mutually reinforce each other rather than produce a fragmented experience for students. The achievement of program coherence requires a sense of institutional responsibility to agree on the purpose, structure, and content of our educational programs, and the manner in which they should be delivered, bearing in mind the elements of the General education and Specific education components. Program coherence is demonstrated if analysis of performance criteria provides sufficient evidence to support the following Key Performance Indicators (**KPIs**):

- 2.1. Clarity in the descriptions of: (a) ministerial and institutional program objectives; (b) the competencies/skills that students must acquire; (c) the standards

---

<sup>12</sup> See note #6 Of evaluation text

establishing the level to which these competencies must be mastered by the student;

- 2.2. Inclusion by the program of a combination of learning activities involving general and specific education whose objectives are clearly defined on course outlines and are aligned/consistent with the overall objectives of the program;
- 2.3. Information conveyed to students on course outlines and in classroom practices by teachers that respect ministerial and institutional regulations (i.e. the College's IPESA) regarding (a) their content and their distribution to students; (b) adherence to the Language Policy;
- 2.4. The program consists of learning activities (projects, lab reports/ assignments, etc.) whose requirements have been realistically and accurately reflected in course outlines, *pondération* and allocation of course credits;
- 2.5. Learning activities are logically ordered and sequenced to facilitate progressively more detailed study, deepening of student learning in the program, and integration of program objectives;
- 2.6. The evaluation of student learning is in conformity to the following aspects of the College's IPESA: (a) coherence and equity of evaluation of student achievement with particular attention to multi-section courses, and across disciplines and programs; (b) the implementation of an appropriate balance between formative<sup>13</sup> and summative evaluation of student achievement;
- 2.7. Evaluation tools are appropriate for attesting to the acquisition or mastery by students of the skills and competencies related to the fulfillment of the objectives of the program, including those of the Integrative Activity and the Comprehensive Assessment/*Épreuve Synthèse*;
- 2.8. Mechanisms have been implemented to promote and ensure conformity to the principles and values of academic integrity<sup>14</sup>;
- 2.9. Recruitment, selection, and orientation methods are geared to the intake of groups of students who are capable of successfully sustaining and completing the program;

### 3. Quality of Teaching Methods and Student Supervision (see subsection 5.3)

The means used to reach the objectives of the program and those of each learning activity are intrinsic to the quality of the program. Program quality is demonstrated if there is sufficient evidence to support the following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

---

<sup>13</sup> According to the CEEC, **formative evaluation** consists of practical exercises that students must develop to measure their progress in the achievement of the objectives targeted by a course. These types of exercises are not taken into account by the teacher for assigning the final mark. Their role, as the word indicates, is essentially formative.

<sup>14</sup> **Academic Integrity** is a construct comprising principles and values that are fundamental to the educational mission and academic legitimacy of the College, namely, honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in scholarship.



- 3.1 Teaching methods are relevant (i.e. adapted to), and effective with respect to the development of the targeted objectives and competencies;
- 3.2 Teaching methods are sufficiently reliable to detect learning problems;
- 3.3 Teaching methods take students' characteristics into account to help them achieve the objectives of programs and learning activities in accordance with established standards;
- 3.4 Teaching methods extend beyond the classroom to provide the guidance, supervision, support and follow-up activities which enable students to overcome learning difficulties and enhance student success;
- 3.5 Teaching methods are reviewed on a regular basis to improve them and keep them up-to-date.

#### **4. Appropriateness of Human, Material and Financial Resources according to Education Needs (see subsection 5.4)**

Program quality is a function of the quantity and quality of the human, material and financial resources allocated by the College. The institution must ensure program specific resources of sufficient quantity and quality, whose access, maintenance, and upgrading norms are in conformity with program needs. Quality is demonstrated if there is sufficient evidence to support the following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

- 4.1. The number and quality of teachers are sufficient and the areas of their expertise are diversified enough to meet the objectives of the program and the learning activities
- 4.2. The motivation and competence of teachers and other categories of personnel are maintained, among other things, through well-defined evaluation procedures and professional development activities;
- 4.3. There is a sufficient number of support staff with the qualifications needed to satisfy program needs;
- 4.4. The quantity and quality of classrooms, equipment and other physical resources are sufficient; their access, maintenance and upgrading norms are in keeping with educational needs;
- 4.5. Financial resources are sufficient to ensure the proper functioning of the program.

#### **5. Program Effectiveness**

Program effectiveness is achieved when the outcomes of student learning are aligned with “targeted [program] objectives and standards taking into account the resources allocated to the program” (CEEC, 1994, p. 14). Program coherence is demonstrated if analysis of performance criteria provides sufficient evidence to support the following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

- 5.1. Rates of applications and admissions to program are characterized by consistency and/or growth;

- 5.2. Students have pass rates in courses that meet expected standards of success, and compare favourably with those observed in other programs and institutions<sup>15</sup>;
- 5.3. Graduation rates of students within 2 years or 3 years depending on the DEC, meet expected standards of success;
- 5.4. The program is characterized by appropriate program retention (perseverance) rates, including program transfer as well as non-return<sup>16</sup> student rates;
- 5.5. Analysis of student feedback provides attestation of appropriate course delivery and teaching effectiveness;
- 5.6. A satisfactory proportion of the academic records of graduates meet expected standards of success;
- 5.7. Admission rates of graduates to university and programs meet expected standards of success;
- 5.8. Graduates feedback on program outcomes and their learning experiences meet expected standards of success;
- 5.9. College graduates show satisfactory enrolment, perseverance, and graduation rates by university program<sup>17</sup>.

## 6. Quality of Program Management

Effective program management is a function of the manner in which the organizational context, institutional principles, structures and methods of management, and the distribution of roles and responsibilities interrelate. The quality of program management is demonstrated if analysis of performance criteria provides sufficient evidence to support the following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs):

- 6.1 Program structures, methods of management and existing means of communication are clearly defined, fully operational, and ensure the coordination and proper functioning of programs;
- 6.2 The distribution of roles and responsibilities for program delivery meet institutional expectations of effectiveness;
- 6.3 Program descriptions and goals are duly distributed and explained to students and teachers alike;
- 6.4 Clear, valid, and reliable procedures, using qualitative and quantitative data, have been established for the regular monitoring of program quality.

---

<sup>15</sup> The following characteristics shall also be analyzed to determine trends and impact on overall program effectiveness: Proportion of students designated in poor academic standing and their subsequent success rate; proportion of students in courses such as ENG-002, PECS, ICS-015, FRE-009, etc. and their subsequent success rate.

<sup>16</sup> Non-return students are those students under paragraph 2.1.14.2.2 of the College's IPESA "who have been in poor academic standing for two (2) terms, not necessarily consecutive, [who] do not qualify to return to the College.

<sup>17</sup> data are provided by MELS and can be found in the *Banque de données sur le cheminement universitaire des diplômées et diplômés du collégial entreprenant des études de baccalauréat, en continuité de formation, dans les universités québécoises*, which were developed by the Comité de liaison de l'enseignement supérieur.

## APPENDIX II

### Performance Criteria: General Education

1. **Relevance of General Education:** conformity between objectives, standards and content, and the needs of (a) the programs being served, (b) socio-educational needs (expectations of the society and universities);
2. **Coherence of General Education:** organization of the component's structure, content and learning activities with respect to the objectives and standards which have been assigned to it by MELS and the College;
3. **Quality of Teaching Methods and Student Supervision:** means used to enable students to attain the component's objectives, and the measures put in place for student supervision.
4. **Appropriateness of Human, Material and Financial Resources according to Education Needs:** quantity and quality of resources that the college allocates to the component, and the competence and qualifications of teachers and other members of staff.
5. **Effectiveness of General Education:** success rates in courses, in the English Exit Exam and French Exit Exam, the quality of the evaluation of learning, and the attainment by students of program objectives.
6. **Quality of Program Management:** principles, structures and methods of management, and the distribution of roles and responsibilities.

## APPENDIX III

### Reinforcement of Important Stages in the Process of Program Evaluation

The process of program evaluation requires careful organization and planning. It is important to reinforce the importance of the following stages:

#### 1. Orientation of the Program Evaluation Committee to the IPEP

Before the Program Evaluation Committee begins its work, members must be oriented to the scope and implications of their mandate, the mandate and responsibilities of other structures and individuals in the College, as well as the specificities and underlying intent of the program evaluation policy that must be applied.

#### 2. Preparation of a Comprehensive and Focused *Devis* or Evaluation Master Plan

2.1 The front-end planning phase of preparing the Evaluation Master-plan or *devis* must be informed by the Program Logic Model (see subsection 3.8), and is intended:

- To bring the issues of greatest concern to stakeholders into sharp focus;
- To ensure using time and resources as efficiently as possible;
- To ensure the application of sound methodology;
- To enhance the overall quality of the evaluation process.

2.2 The evaluation master-plan: (a) specifies the *program issues* facing the program from which the Performance Criteria and KPIs used to evaluate the program are derived; (b) prioritizes the criteria most directly related to the *issues*; (c) defines and poses the evaluation questions that can be answered by in-depth analysis; (d) identifies the objectives and standards the evaluation plans to achieve; (e) specifies the types of data or kind of information to be acquired; (f) specifies the methods of data collection and analysis best suited to measure the program's performance, and verify that the intended learning outcomes and program objectives as described in the program Exit Profile were achieved; (g) specifies what roles and responsibilities the stakeholders have accepted; (h) establishes a time-line for the completion of evaluation tasks.

2.3 Program issues are important determining factors in conducting an evaluation. They make it possible to specify the crucial items for consideration, the evaluation criteria, and, for each item, the depth of analysis needed to carry out the work and achieve the targeted goals. Ideally, *program issues* should arise from the analysis of data collected during the process of on-going program monitoring, which is intended to develop a database for research and planning purposes to enable the College to conduct rigorous periodic self-evaluations of its programs to guide program improvement, achieve program objectives, and serve on-going program development. *Program issues* should also incorporate suggestions from the Academic Dean, the PADE Committee, the Program Committee and the relevant Department(s).

### 3. Description of the Program

Describing the program in sufficient detail is a necessary collaborative phase to convey fully a sense of program purpose, strategies, activities and mechanisms. Program description establishes a frame of reference for subsequent analysis and decision-making by:

- 3.1 Specifying the stage of development and contextual factors, (including date of previous program evaluation and the recommendations made in them), and establishing how the program being evaluated fits into the larger program structure;
- 3.2 Clarifying the mission and expected program outcomes or effects. A program's mission, goals, objectives and standards for success all represent varying levels of specificity regarding a program's expectations;
- 3.3 Clarifying the need to which the program is responding; assessing if the need is changing and in what manner and why is the change occurring;
- 3.4 Delineating the program grid, showing all courses in the program by name and number for each term, and the relationship between the courses and the program objectives or competencies;
- 3.5 Presenting a profile of the students enrolled in the program (educational background, gender, age, etc.);
- 3.6 Listing all teaching personnel associated with the program, including qualifications and recent professional development activities;
- 3.7 Identifying the resources, i.e. learning technology, academic services, equipment, information, and other assets available to conduct program activities. The description of the program should include the amount and intensity of program services and highlight situations where a misalignment exists between desired activities and resources available to execute those activities;
- 3.8 Creating a logic model of program design. A logic model is an explicit flow chart or schematic depiction of how the program should work, and illustrates relationships between program components and expected outcomes from registration to graduation. It reflects the *Institutional Program Blueprint*, and allows an understanding of how each program activity relates to another and the actions or activities that are the program's direct responsibility. A logic model enhances understanding of the overall mechanisms and direction of the program, and therefore helps to clarify evaluative strategies for the Program Evaluation Committee. A typical program logic model would show the progression from the goals of the program, the problems, issues or challenges faced by the program, the activities (i.e. inputs) required to achieve program goals and objectives, assessment plan delineating how the achievement of learning outcomes and program objectives are evaluated, and indicators that show evidence of program quality.

#### **4. Gathering Credible Evidence**

- 4.1 In this phase of the process, the Program Evaluation Committee must strive to collect information that will convey a well-rounded picture of the program. Such information must also be perceived as credible and relevant for making judgments, for answering stakeholders' questions, and for making recommendations that will be acted upon.
- 4.2 Overall credibility of the evidence can be enhanced by direct participation of stakeholders in the evaluation design process, and by giving appropriate consideration to (a) the validity and reliability of the instruments and associated indicators used for measuring the general features and characteristics of the program; (b) the data sources to be accessed and examined using multiple procedures for gathering, analysis, and interpretation; (c) the sufficiency and quality of the data derived; (d) ways of managing the logistical challenges involved in gathering and organizing data.

#### **5. Interpretation of Findings and Justification of Conclusions**

- 5.1 The quality of evaluation findings depends on the extent to which rigorous, in-depth analysis of the relevant data has been applied to examine the issues and answer the questions according to the prioritized performance criteria and key performance indicators identified in the evaluation master-plan.
- 5.2 The interpretation of evaluation findings and the drawing of fair, well balanced and insightful conclusions regarding the degree to which performance criteria have been attained depends on the skill exercised by the Program Evaluation Committee in linking the evidence gathered to the issues addressed and the questions raised, and judging such evidence on the basis of agreed-upon values and standards of the level of performance the program must achieve to be considered successful.

#### **6. Taking Action on Evaluation Findings and Recommendations, and Ensuring the Sharing and use of Lessons Learned**

The success of this final stage depends on:

- 6.1 The extent to which the evaluation is designed and organized to be meaningful to the program in terms of its capacity to promote the practical use of findings to improve program quality;
- 6.2 The dissemination of results/conclusions to relevant audiences in a timely, unbiased and consistent fashion;
- 6.3 The establishment of procedures to monitor progress in the implementation of recommendations, and the institution of safeguards to prevent the misuse of the evaluation.

## APPENDIX IV

### Sample Size Table

Determination of sample size requires consideration of the objectives underlying the gathering of data, the size of the researcher's budget and logistical issues. However, from a purely statistical perspective, the overriding concern of the researcher is to get results that reflect the target population with desired levels of precision. Two factors are of influence: (a) the margin of error or the error the researcher is willing to accept, and (b) the confidence or risk factor (alpha) that the sample size will provide the desired results. A 95% confidence level means that 95 out of 100 samples will have the true population value within the range of precision specified by the margin of error. In other words, the level of acceptable risk the researcher is willing to take that the probability the true margin of error exceeds the acceptable margin of error is only 5%. The table below is based on sampling techniques developed by Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610; and Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons. Values are based on a margin of error of 0.05, and 95% confidence.

Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
10	10	220	140	1200	291
15	14	230	144	1300	297
20	19	240	148	1400	302
25	24	250	152	1500	306
30	28	260	155	1600	310
35	32	270	159	1700	313
40	36	280	162	1800	317
45	40	290	165	1900	320
50	44	300	169	2000	322
130	97	650	242		
140	103	700	248		
150	108	750	254		
160	113	800	260		
170	118	850	265		
180	123	900	269		
190	127	950	274		
200	132	1000	278		
210	136	1100	285		

Source of Table: D. Siegle, Ph.D., Neag School of Education - University of Connecticut, at [del.siegle@uconn.edu](mailto:del.siegle@uconn.edu)