

**Commission d'évaluation
de l'enseignement collégial**

Analytical framework

Evaluating the implementation
of institutional policies on the evaluation
of student achievement (IPESAs)

June 2006

Québec 

Introduction

In the spring of 2006, the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial launched its evaluation of the implementation of institutional policies on the evaluation of student achievement (IPESAs). On that occasion, a document entitled *Guidelines for evaluating the implementation of institutional policies on the evaluation of student achievement (IPESAs)*¹ was sent to all college-level institutions, explaining the specific elements they are required to analyze and the evaluation procedure used by the Commission.

The present document² was prepared with the assistance of an advisory committee composed of representatives of public and private colleges and of universities. It sets out the criteria the Commission will use to examine the self-evaluation reports submitted by the colleges. In its subsequent evaluation report, the Commission will appraise the value of the methodology used, the college's findings and conclusions and the action plan produced by the college to follow up its self-evaluation procedure.

-
1. Québec, Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial, *Guidelines for evaluating the implementation of institutional policies on the evaluation of student achievement (IPESAs)* (Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, 2006).
 2. This document was adopted by the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial on June 5, 2006.

Part 1

Self-evaluation procedure

To conduct their self-evaluation, colleges will use, in particular, the terms and conditions set out in their policy concerning the evaluation of the implementation of the IPESA and its revision. Thus, each college will explain in an outline how it intends to conduct this self-evaluation, addressing the aspects to be evaluated in the manner it deems appropriate depending on its specific context. The college shall describe in its report the procedure it used to carry out its self-evaluation.

A. Compliance with the Commission's requirements

1. The college has prepared a self-evaluation plan based, in particular, on the terms and conditions set out in its policy concerning the evaluation of the implementation of the IPESA and its revision.
2. The college has examined all of the elements specified by the Commission:
 - exercise of the responsibilities of all partners in accordance with policy requirements;
 - implementation of the terms and conditions for recognizing prior scholastic and experiential learning in accordance with policy requirements (or in accordance with a document to which the policy refers) and their effectiveness;
 - achievement of the policy objectives.
3. Both regular and continuing education programs are included in the self-evaluation procedure.

B. Methodology used

4. The information used was drawn from various sources.
5. This information is relevant to the elements examined.
6. The college validated the tools used to gather information.
7. The tools used to gather information are adequate.
8. Where the college used sampling methods (surveys), it ensured that the samples were representative.
9. There is sufficient data and information to conduct a in-depth evaluation.
10. The college has justified the methodology used.

C. Community participation

11. The authorities, groups and individuals concerned by the implementation of the policy were invited to take part in the self-evaluation.
12. The authorities and groups concerned by the implementation of the IPESA were consulted on the self-evaluation plan, the report and the action plan in accordance with the terms and conditions set out in the college's policy.
13. The college established procedures to guarantee the confidentiality of information in accordance with the *Act respecting Access to documents held by public bodies and the Protection of personal information*.

D. Information analysis

14. The college conducted an objective, in-depth analysis of the information it gathered.
15. The analysis was rigorous.
16. The conclusions of the college are relevant and based on the analysis.

Part 2

Evaluating the implementation of the IPESAs

A. The terms and conditions for recognizing prior scholastic and experiential learning

During the evaluation of the policies themselves, the Commission made a number of comments, in the form of recommendations or suggestions, concerning the terms and conditions that should govern the granting of equivalencies or exemptions and the authorization of course substitutions. In most cases, the shortcomings observed in the preliminary versions of the policies have been rectified. The implementation of these terms and conditions, as well as those governing the recognition of prior experiential learning and the effectiveness thereof, have not yet been examined. The Commission is very sensitive to the area of recognition of prior learning as a whole.

Recognition of scholastic learning

1. The college has implemented the terms and conditions for recognizing prior scholastic learning set out in its IPESA.
2. These terms and conditions have been implemented in accordance with policy requirements (or with the requirements of a document to which the IPESA refers).
3. Where these terms and conditions have not been implemented, the college is able to provide a satisfactory explanation.
4. The terms and conditions for recognizing prior scholastic learning are effective.

Recognition of experiential learning

5. Where the college has not established terms and conditions for recognizing experiential learning (whether in the IPESA or another document), it is able to provide a satisfactory explanation.
6. The college has implemented the terms and conditions for recognizing prior experiential learning set out in its IPESA or another document.
7. These terms and conditions have been implemented in accordance with policy requirements (or with the requirements of the document in which they are described).
8. The terms and conditions for recognizing prior experiential learning are effective.
9. The college has identified strengths and weaknesses in its implementation of the terms and conditions for recognizing prior scholastic and experiential learning.
10. The college has identified the action to be taken as a result of its self-evaluation.

B. Exercise of responsibilities

Compliance will be reviewed based on one of the essential components of the IPESA, i.e. the sharing of responsibilities. The Commission would like the colleges to ensure that all those involved exercise their responsibilities in accordance with policy requirements.

1. All those concerned by the policy are exercising their responsibilities in accordance with policy requirements.
2. Where responsibilities are not being exercised, the college is able to provide a satisfactory explanation.
3. The conclusions of the college are relevant and based on the analysis.
4. The college has identified strengths and weaknesses in the exercise of its responsibilities.
5. The college has identified the action to be taken as a result of its self-evaluation.

C. Achievement of objectives

The college shall determine whether its goals and the anticipated results of the policy implementation have been achieved. This will be an opportunity to verify that the policy guarantees the quality of student achievement evaluations as specified by the Commission in its *General Guidelines*,³ that is, that they are carried out in a fair, equitable and coherent manner. In this way, the credibility of the diplomas and attestations awarded by the college is ensured.

1. The college has taken into account all the objectives⁴ of its IPESA.
2. According to the college, the objectives of its IPESA have been achieved.
3. The demonstration that these objectives have been achieved is based on accurate interpretations.
4. Where the objectives have not been achieved, the college is able to provide a satisfactory explanation.
5. The college has identified strengths and weaknesses in terms of achieving its objectives.
6. The college has identified the action to be taken as a result of its self-evaluation.

3. Québec, Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial, *Evaluating Institutional Policies on the Evaluation of Student Achievement – General Guidelines* (Québec: Gouvernement du Québec, 1994).

4. In most policies, the goals and anticipated results of the policy implementation are specified under different headings, with the term “objectives” being used most frequently.

D. The Commission's overall appraisal

1. The college's institutional policy on the evaluation of student achievement has been implemented in accordance with policy requirements.
2. The college's institutional policy on the evaluation of student achievement has been implemented effectively.

Part 3

The action plan

The college shall prepare an action plan for the purpose of making the improvements required. This plan shall designate the authorities, groups or individuals responsible for each measure and specify the implementation schedule.

1. The college has produced an action plan.
2. The action plan is based on the results of the college's self-evaluation.
3. The college has specified how responsibilities will be shared.
4. The college has specified an implementation schedule.
5. The measures adopted are likely to improve the implementation of the IPESA.
6. Some measures have already been undertaken or are fully implemented.