



Commission d'évaluation
de l'enseignement collégial

Evaluating
Institutional Policies for the
Evaluation of Academic Programs

Framework
Third edition



This document can be consulted on the website
of the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial :
www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca

The original French version of this document was adopted by
the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial
at its 332nd meeting held in Quebec City on March 9, 2020.

In case of discrepancies between the French original
and this English translation, the French version will prevail.

Legal Deposit – 2020
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec
ISBN : 978-2-550-86426-4 (3rd print version)
978-2-550-86406-6 (3rd PDF version)
2-550-09724-6 (1st print version)
© Gouvernement du Québec

Table of contents

Foreword.....	5
Introduction	7
1. The Commission’s Guiding Principles for the Evaluation of the Programs of Study.....	10
2. The Essential Components of the Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Academic Programs	13
3. Commission’s ruling on the policy	21
Appendix I Description of the criteria for evaluating the quality of the programs of study and the aspects to be observed.....	25
Appendix II Summary of Commission expectations	28



Foreword

This document is an update of the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial framework concerning the evaluation of the potential effectiveness of Institutional Policies for the Evaluation of Academic Programs (IPEP), published in March 2011.

With this new version of the framework, the Commission aims to:

- adapt its expectations regarding IPEPs to the current context and the changing practices in Quebec colleges;
- make these expectations more explicit so as to enhance the guiding role that the framework can play with colleges;
- provide consistency in the evaluation criteria it uses to evaluate the potential effectiveness of the policies, as well as the rulings it renders;
- align the evaluation of the potential effectiveness of these policies with the Commission evaluation undertakings, namely the evaluation of the effectiveness of Québec college quality assurance systems and the preliminary approach to evaluating the effectiveness of quality assurance systems.

This document is intended for cegeps as well as subsidized private colleges, non-subsidized private institutions and institutions under the authority of a ministry or a university.



Introduction

In Québec, the continuous improvement of the quality of college education is based on the complementarity between the colleges' internal quality assurance process and the external viewpoint of the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial.

Created in 1993, the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial is an external, public and independent evaluation agency whose mission is to contribute to and demonstrate the development of the quality of college education. The Commission has been granted three major powers through legislation: the power to verify, the power to make recommendations, and declaratory powers. Operating with a considerable degree of autonomy, the Commission can, as a result, develop its own tools based on best practices in evaluation in the field of higher education. It can also collect from institutions any relevant information required to do its work, set forth recommendations on actions to improve quality in a specific area, and make its evaluation reports publicly available. For their part, colleges are required to report on any follow-up activities undertaken to address the Commission's recommendations.

The Commission's mission covers all college-level institutions governed by the College Education Regulations (RREC). Currently this comprises a network of 120 institutions¹:

- 48 general and vocational colleges (cegeps);
- 21 subsidized private colleges;
- 47 non-subsidized private institutions;
- 4 institutions under the authority of a ministry or a university.

As mandated by law, the primary function of the Commission is to evaluate the following elements for each institution²:

- institutional policies on the evaluation of student achievement (IPESA), including procedures for the certification of studies, and their implementation;
- institutional policies for the evaluation of academic programs and their implementation;

1. Current information at the time of publication.

2. The mission and powers of the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial are mainly set out in sections 13 to 19 of the *Act respecting the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial*. More details can be found at: <http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/commission-2/mandate/>.

- implementation of programs of study authorized by the Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur, taking into account the prescribed objectives and standards assigned to them;
- objectives, standards, and implementation of programs of study established by the institution, taking into account the needs these programs are designed to meet.

In addition, the Commission's mandate³ includes, for cegeps and subsidized private colleges⁴, the evaluation of:

- activities related to their educational mission regarding administrative and academic planning and management as well as teaching and support services; for cegeps this includes an evaluation of their strategic plans.
- In order to fulfil its mandate, the Commission evaluates, the potential effectiveness of institutional policies as well as the effectiveness of quality assurance systems in Québec colleges.
- To evaluate the potential effectiveness of policies, the Commission examines the extent to which their implementation can contribute to continuous quality improvement. This evaluation is based on the Commission's guiding principles, expectations and criteria, which are set out in the Commission's frameworks, including this one on the evaluation of IPEPs. The evaluation is based on the documents submitted by colleges to the Commission and leads to the publication of a report. It should be noted that in the case of a policy covering the whole management cycle of the programs of study, the Commission's evaluation is focused on the provisions concerning the evaluation of the programs of study.
- In assessing the effectiveness of quality assurance systems in Quebec colleges, the Commission examines the extent to which the quality assurance system (the main mechanisms of which are the IPESA, the IPEP and, where applicable, the strategic plan and the success plan) and its management ensure continuous quality improvement. During this process, institutions are asked to critically review the effectiveness of their quality assurance system and to provide evidence of this through a self-evaluation report. The Commission's evaluation is based on an audit process, which includes the analysis of the self-evaluation report submitted by the college and a visit to the institution

3. In compliance with the 2002 Act to amend the *General and Vocational Colleges Act* and the *Act respecting the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial*, all cegeps are required to adopt a strategic plan and submit a copy to the Commission.

4. As stipulated in Schedule 039 of the *Régime budgétaire et financier des établissements privés d'ordre collégial*, private institutions that submit their success plan to the Ministère de l'Éducation, de l'Enseignement supérieur and to the Commission, receive funding allocated for the implementation of this plan.

and leads to the publication of a report. The relevant information in relation to this undertaking is presented in the guidelines and frameworks available on the Commission's website.

- For new colleges or those that have not yet developed fully their quality assurance system, the Commission has introduced a preliminary approach to facilitate the evaluation of the effectiveness of their internal quality assurance system. In this process, colleges are asked to carry out a thorough evaluation of a given program of study, to critically assess the application of their policies (the IPESA and the IPEP), and to document this in a self-evaluation report. The Commission's evaluation is based on the analysis of the self-evaluation report submitted by the college and a visit to the institution and leads to the publication of an evaluation report. Information useful in connection with this operation is set out in the guidelines and frameworks available on the Commission's website.

The following framework is divided in three parts. The first section sets out the guiding principles for the Commission in evaluating the potential effectiveness of institutional policies for the evaluation of academic programs. The second part presents the essential components to be included in an IPEP, as expected by the Commission. In this section, insets seek to provide additional explanations, examples or suggestions of elements that a college may include into its IPEP. Finally, the third section describes the evaluation criteria used by the Commission and the opinions and ruling rendered at the end of the evaluation.

Two appendices complete the document. The first describes the six criteria for assessing the quality of the programs of study and the aspects to be observed for each of them. The second presents a table summarizing the expectations set by the Commission for the content of an IPEP.



1. The Commission's Guiding Principles for the Evaluation of the Programs of Study

Every institution providing general or vocational education services at the college level must adopt an Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Academic Programs (IPEP), adopted by its board of directors after consultation with its board of studies, and ensure its application (*College Education Regulations* (RREC), section 24, *Act respecting general and vocational colleges*, sections 17.0.1 and 17.0.2, and *Act respecting private education*, section 44).

The institutional policy for the evaluation of academic programs is a management tool guiding program evaluation as a means of ensuring their quality. The application of this policy is an essential component of a quality assurance system. It makes it possible to adjust program on an ongoing basis, to detect problematic situations and to address them as needed. The IPEP an official document in which the institution describes how it will assume its responsibility to evaluate its programs of study. The document also describes how the institution will ensure the application of its policy.

The Commission's evaluation of the IPEPs is based on the following guiding principles:

Principle 1: Relevance, feasibility and rigour are the characteristics of quality evaluations

A relevant evaluation leads to an accurate assessment of the program, taking into account its overall goals and various components. It provides a comprehensive view of the program and allows to render a ruling on its development and implementation. The process of evaluating a program of study is an opportunity to encourage discussion and better cooperation among the people involved in the program's implementation, thus promoting a clear and shared vision of the education project from a program approach perspective. It allows a critical assessment of the program and provides concrete answers to the problems observed, thus ensuring continuous improvement.

Feasibility refers to a realistic approach, a method which is adapted to the college's reality and an inclusion of the different interests of the individuals and bodies involved. It therefore implies that the policy generates work that is feasible in terms of time, available resources, interests and opportunities to take action.

Rigour concerns the quality of the approach to obtain relevant and sufficient information from a variety of sources which contributes to producing reliable evaluations. It also involves an explicit and detailed analysis of the data collected in order to render credible rulings.

These three characteristics are interdependent: to be relevant, evaluations must be feasible and rigorous.

Principle 2: Leadership, participation and respect for ethics are essential components of quality evaluations

The completion of the different phases of the evaluation process is the responsibility of individuals or bodies with adequate leadership to ensure its success and provide the necessary follow-up. It is also based on the establishment and maintenance of a climate of trust that fosters the participation of the individuals and bodies involved in the implementation of the programs of study and in the evaluation process.

The Commission encourages the participation of all categories of interested stakeholders in order to contribute to the development of an organizational culture conducive to producing quality program evaluations. The Commission also promotes the integration of the program evaluation into the management of programs of study. This requires the commitment of all stakeholders to the need to carry out the evaluation process.

To ensure the success of its evaluations, it is important for the institution to have ethical principles in place. These principles guide the individuals and bodies responsible for implementing the policy, particularly with regard to the dissemination of information, taking into account the confidential nature of personal information and the public's right to information.

Principle 3: The institutional policy for the evaluation of academic programs is an essential mechanism of a quality assurance system

Binding and institutionally guiding, the policy is a mechanism that provides an effective framework for the individuals and bodies involved in academic programs evaluations, including a clear definition of their roles and responsibilities.

The application and the management of the policy demonstrate that the college is concerned with the quality of programs of study and that it includes this concern in its on-going administrative and pedagogical activities.



2. The Essential Components of the Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Academic Programs

In order to ensure that evaluations of the programs of study are carried out effectively, the Commission considers that any policy should include the following elements or their equivalent:

- Aims and objectives;
- Scope;
- Criteria for evaluating the quality of the programs of study;
- Selected program evaluation methods and overall picture;
- Data required for the evaluation of the programs of study;
- Delineation of responsibilities;
- Mechanisms for continuous policy improvement:
 - mechanism for evaluating the application of the policy;
 - mechanism for modifying the policy.

A college may wish to add additional elements to its IPEP in order to, among other things, reflect its reality. For example, a college may want to align its evaluation process with an evaluation conducted by external accrediting bodies. The Commission's analysis will focus on the essential elements of the policy and will take into account any additional elements provided by the college.

2.1. Aims and objectives

The policy sets out goals and objectives that include concerns for continuous improvement in the quality of programs of study.

Aims express the values and orientations that determine the fundamental choices of policy as reflected in the objectives. These aims may be based on the college's mission, its educational project and its values or its strategic vision.

Objectives are derived from aims. They are clearly stated and formulated in such a way that the college can evaluate their achievement.

The policy can distinguish between two types of objectives: on the one hand, objectives specific to the evaluation of programs of study, which relate to aspects such as the establishment of an accurate and precise diagnosis of the programs or appropriate actions to improve them; on the other hand, objectives relating to the implementation of the policy, such as the policy management and its dissemination.

2.2. Scope

The policy provides for the evaluation of all programs of study leading to a diploma awarded by the Minister on the recommendation of the or by the college under the RREC, regardless of how the program is developed or delivered.

The IPEP may include separate provisions for specific programs of study, such as programs developed in consortia, off-site programs, distance learning programs or online programs, as appropriate.

2.3. Criteria for assessing the quality of the programs of study

The policy provides the following criteria to ensure that the various dimensions of a program are taken into account:

- relevance of the program of study;
- coherence of the program of study;
- suitability of pedagogical methods and student supervision and support;
- alignment of human, material, and financial resources with educational needs;
- effectiveness of the program of study;
- quality management of the program of study.

If the college chooses to describe the criteria and the aspects covered by each of them, this description must be consistent with the description of the criteria and aspects to be observed that appears in the appendixes to this document.

The college may choose to include additional criteria, if need be.

2.4. Selected program evaluation methods and overall picture

Selected program evaluation methods

The policy outlines the evaluation method(s) used by the college to evaluate its programs of study.

Several methods of program evaluation are possible and can be combined, for example:

- *periodic evaluation of all the criteria at once (also called in-depth evaluation);*
- *ongoing evaluation of several or all the criteria;*
- *targeted evaluation of certain criteria based on a specific problem.*

For each method selected, the policy describes the planning, implementation and follow-up of the program evaluation, including:

- methodology used and the timetable for carrying out the work;
- methods for consulting the professors involved in the planning, implementation and follow-up of the evaluation, either directly or through pedagogical and administrative bodies.
- description of the documents adopted by the college authorities presenting the results of the program evaluation;
- methods for determining actions to be carried out as a result of the evaluation of the program of study;

- results dissemination process which ensure respect for the confidential nature of personal information;
- arrangements for implementing the evaluation methods, i.e. the circumstances or conditions in which each method is to be applied.

Evaluation planning may be described in the policy or its development may be assigned to a specific body.

The policy may specify certain related means:

- *for planning: development of an evaluation plan, for example;*
- *for implementation: development and content of an evaluation report, summary sheets, etc;*
- *for follow-up: implementation of an action plan, integration of the actions into a management dashboard or into the work plans of administrators, departments, committees or program teams, etc.*

If the policy provides for the formation of an evaluation committee, general rules for its composition may be established. The policy may also provide for the use of external experts.

Overall picture

The policy leads the college to examine the overall picture of each of the study programs at a maximum frequency of 10 years. This examination takes into account:

- all criteria selected by the Commission for assessing the quality of programs of study;
- all program components;
- all available data on the program.

The overall picture of the program makes it possible to assess the program as a whole and to determine actions to ensure the continuous improvement of the quality of the program. Its preparation is based on the results of the implementation of one or more program evaluation methods. It can take various forms, such as an evaluation report, a summary sheet, a program monitoring table, etc.

2.5. Data required for the evaluation of the programs of study

The policy provides for the data needed for the evaluation of the programs of study, namely:

- documentary data;
- statistical data, including data on enrolment, academic progress, completion and graduation as well as on labour market placement or university admission, depending on whether the program is a technical or pre-university program;
- perceptual data, including teaching staff, student and graduate perspective on any aspect of the program being evaluated, as well as labour market representatives' perspective on technical programs.

The college may use a wide variety of documentary data such as competency flow-charts, program descriptions, course outline and course framework, program reviews, action plans, or any other document related to program management.

Depending on the nature of the evaluation, the college may find it useful to collect statistical and perceptual data on integration measures or on the use of guidance, support and follow-up measures for success. Perceptual data may also be collected from professional and support staff who work directly with students, such as individual teaching assistants or lab technicians, and from university representatives in the case of pre-university programs.

The policy may specify the contribution of the institutional information system(s) to the evaluation of the programs of study. For example, the college may choose to collect data on an ad hoc basis, at the time of conducting an evaluation, or on an ongoing basis in its information system. This ongoing data collection can support monitoring activities and allow the college to take immediate corrective action on identified problems.

2.6. Delineation of responsibilities

The policy defines responsibilities in a clear and precise manner and assigns them to individuals and bodies with the authority required to carry them out.

With regard to its management, the policy specifies the individuals and bodies responsible for:

- its adoption;
- its implementation;
- the evaluation of its application;
- its modification.

With respect to the evaluation of the programs of study, the policy specifies the individuals and bodies responsible for:

- planning and carrying out program evaluation;
- determining actions to be carried out as a result of the specific areas targeted for improvement in the evaluation;
- disseminating the results of the evaluation;
- implementing the actions.

2.7. Mechanisms for continuous policy improvement

The policy provides for mechanisms to ensure its continuous improvement and its continued alignment with the practices and needs of the institution, namely:

- mechanism for evaluating the application of the policy;
- mechanism for modifying the policy.

The mechanism for evaluating the application of the policy

The policy describes how the institution evaluates the application of its policy. It requires that at least once every 10 years, the college reports on its application, taking into account:

- the consistency between what the policy provides and how it is being implemented (i.e., the conformity of the application of the policy);
- the extent to which the objectives of the policy have been achieved (the effectiveness of the policy's application).

The policy stipulates that the individuals and bodies responsible for its implementation are consulted for the purpose of evaluating its application.

The policy may specify the individuals and bodies involved in the evaluation of its application. It may also provide some methodological details (administrative process, plans or tools to be developed, analyses to be carried out or data to be collected, scope of the work, schedule, etc.).

The conformity criterion of the application of the policy may cover aspects such as the exercise of responsibilities as set out in the policy, and the implementation of mechanisms, processes, procedures and rules as set out in the policy. As for the effectiveness criterion of the application of the policy, it may cover aspects such as the capacity of the policy to support program management decisions, lead to a fair and accurate diagnosis of the programs of study and lead to the identification of appropriate actions to improve them.

The policy may also include additional assessment criteria.

The college may specify in its policy that the cycle for evaluating the implementation of the policy will be consistent with the cycle for evaluating the effectiveness of its quality assurance system. Data collection in support of the evaluation of the implementation of the policy may be collected on an ad hoc basis, at some point in the cycle, or continuously throughout the cycle.

The mechanism for modifying the policy

The policy describes how the institution will modify its policy to ensure that it can meet the needs of the college.

These needs may arise from the evaluation of a program of study, the evaluation of the application of the policy or any other ad hoc or special contingency.

The policy provides that the individuals and bodies responsible for its implementation are consulted on proposed modifications.

The policy may state that once adopted by the college's highest authority, the modified version will be forwarded to the Commission for evaluation.



3. Commission's ruling on the policy

The Commission's evaluation concerns the potential effectiveness of the policy submitted by the college. To this end, the Commission verifies whether the policy includes the elements deemed essential to guide the work of the individuals and bodies responsible for its implementation, to produce relevant evaluation and to have the expected impact with regard to the quality of the programs of study.

3.1. Evaluation criteria

The Commission assesses the policy as a whole and its essential elements according to three criteria, i.e.:

Compliance with legal and regulatory requirements and with the Commission's expectations

- This criterion makes it possible to establish whether the policy exhaustively and explicitly contains elements deemed essential by the Commission, including those set out in the College Education Regulations (RREC) and, where applicable, the Act respecting general and vocational colleges.

Internal coherence of the policy elements

- This criterion refers to the alignment of the aims, objectives and means provided for in the policy with their potential contribution for ensuring the quality of the programs of study. During the evaluation of the policy, the Commission pays particular attention to the means chosen to ensure that the programs of study are evaluated and that the results of these evaluations are taken into account in the management of the programs.
- The coherence criterion also makes it possible to assess whether all the elements of the policy form a harmonized, consistent whole. The Commission examines the logical links between the elements and the articulation of each one.

Clarity of the text

- This criterion makes it possible to assess the wording and the structure of the text. The Commission ensures that the terms used are unambiguous and that the text is easily understood by all the individuals and bodies responsible for implementing the policy.

3.2. Opinions

In its evaluation report, the Commission delivers, if necessary, opinions on the elements of the policy that should be improved. Depending on the content of the improvement to be made and the impact it has on the potential effectiveness of the policy, the opinions can take the form of invitations, suggestions, or recommendations.

The main purpose of these opinions is to support the institution in improving the potential effectiveness of its policy. The Commission considers that all the opinions issued should be taken into account by the college with a view to improve its policies, but only recommendations require a follow-up by the college.

Where appropriate, the Commission also makes comments to encourage the college to make minor adjustments to the text of its policy.

3.3. Ruling

In its evaluation report, the Commission uses the following assessment scale to rule on the potential effectiveness of the college's policy:

- The policy is **entirely satisfactory**. It meets each of the criteria (compliance, consistency, clarity). Its implementation should contribute to ensuring continuous improvement in the quality of the programs of study.
- The policy is **satisfactory**. It almost fully meets the criteria (compliance, consistency, clarity). Its implementation should contribute to ensuring continuous improvement of the quality of the programs of study, but the Commission believes it is useful to make some suggestions for improving the elements contained in the policy.
- The policy is **partly satisfactory**. It partly meets the criteria (conformity, consistency, clarity), but amendments are required so that its implementation can contribute to ensuring continuous improvement in the quality of the programs of study. It needs to be sent again to the Commission for evaluation.
- The policy is **unsatisfactory**. It does not meet any of the criteria (conformity, consistency, clarity). The policy needs to be substantially amended so that its implementation can contribute to ensuring continuous improvement in the quality of the programs of study. It should be sent again to the Commission for evaluation.

3.4. Dissemination of the evaluation report

The Commission adopts the evaluation report of the policy, which is then sent to the college. It is also forwarded to the Minister and made public on the Commission's website.



Appendix I

Description of the criteria for evaluating the quality of the programs of study and the aspects to be observed

The Commission considers that the evaluation of the quality of the programs of study should include an examination of the aspects to be observed for each evaluation criteria.

The importance to be given to each of the criteria and aspects to be observed may vary from one program to another. It may also depend on the circumstances surrounding the conduct of an evaluation.

Criteria / Description	Aspects to be observed
<p>Relevance of programs of study</p> <p>This criterion examines the alignment of the program’s objectives, standards and content with the expectations and needs of the labour market or university, as well as student and societal expectations, in order to adjust the program on an ongoing basis.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives, standards and content of the programs of study are aligned with the expectations and needs of the labour market or universities; • The objectives, standards and content of the programs of study take student expectation into account; • The educational project of the institution, regional development priorities, government policy directions, and general societal expectations are taken into account, when appropriate, in the objectives, standards, and content of the programs of study offered by the college.
<p>Coherence of programs of study</p> <p>This criterion examines the structure and content of the program and, in particular, the relations of courses in the program of study given the competencies to be developed, as well as the course sequence based on student learning progress and course load.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs of study include a set of learning activities making it possible to meet program objectives and standards; • Learning activities are organized in a logical and sequential fashion to facilitate acquiring an in-depth and comprehensive understanding of program content; • The requirements specific to each learning activity (courses, laboratories, personal work) are established clearly and realistically and they correspond to college-level competencies; these requirements are accurately represented in course outlines as well as in the calculation of credits and in course weighting; • The objectives of programs of study leading to an AEC clearly define the competencies to be developed; the standards establish college-level competencies.

Criteria / Description	Aspects to be observed
<p>Suitability of teaching methods and student supervision and support</p> <p>This criterion is used to evaluate the alignment of pedagogical methods with the course objectives and their adaptation to student characteristics as well as student supervision and support and the availability of teaching staff to enable students to achieve the objectives of the program of study.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching methods are aligned with both the program objectives and each of the learning activities, and take into account student characteristics, facilitating the achievement of these objectives in compliance with set standards; • Guidance, support and follow-up services, as well as screening measures designed to identify at-risk students, facilitate student success; • The availability of teachers is sufficient to meet the needs of students with respect to supervision and support.
<p>Alignment of human, material, and financial resources with the educational needs</p> <p>This criterion makes it possible to examine, with regard to the needs of the program, the number of teachers and their qualifications, the contribution of professional and support staff, staff development and evaluation, and the alignment of teaching facilities (premises, sets and stages, laboratories, etc.) and equipment, and the adequacy of financial resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers are sufficient in number, they have suitable qualifications, and their competencies are diversified enough to take charge of all learning activities and meet program objectives; • Professional and support staff are sufficient in number, they have suitable qualifications, and their competencies are diversified enough to meet the needs of programs of study; • The motivation and competencies of instructors and other categories of personnel are maintained or developed through clearly-defined professional development activities and evaluation procedures from a professional development perspective; • Teaching facilities, equipment and other material resources are adequate in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility; • Financial resources are sufficient to ensure the proper functioning of programs of study.
<p>The effectiveness of programs of study</p> <p>This criterion relates to the capacity of the college to examine the successful completion and graduation rates students in relation to the objectives and standards of the and proficiency in program competencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student recruitment, selection and integration measures are effective in admitting candidates capable of succeeding in the programs; • Student evaluation tools and methods used in the programs of study are effective in the evaluation of students' achievement of objectives according to the established standards; • Course success rates are satisfactory and comparable to other programs of study and other institutions; • A satisfactory proportion of students complete the programs within a reasonable time frame, depending on their status and characteristics; • Graduates meet the established standards for the acquisition of competencies required by the programs of study.

Criteria / Description	Aspects to be observed
<p>Quality on the management of programs of study</p> <p>This criterion examines the management structures and functions, as well as the delineation of responsibilities and the means of communication between professors and the administrative or pedagogical authorities of the institution, the implementation and evaluation of the programs of study and the application of the Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The organizational structure, methods of management, and means of communication are well articulated and promote the proper functioning of the programs of study and a program-based approach; • Clearly-defined procedures, using valid qualitative and quantitative data, facilitate regular assessment of the strengths and shortcomings of the programs and of each of the learning activities; • Program descriptions are duly distributed and explained to both teaching staff and students; • The implementation of the Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA) is conformed to the policy and effective in the programs.



Appendix II

Summary of Commission expectations

Essential components (or their equivalent)	Summary of expectations
<p>Aims and objectives (Ref. section 2.1)</p>	<p>Statement of purpose.</p> <p>Provide objectives that stem from the aims, are clearly stated and formulated so that their achievement can be assessed.</p> <p>Include concerns for continuous improvement of the quality of the programs of study.</p>
<p>Scope (Ref. section 2.2)</p>	<p>Provide for the evaluation of all programs of study leading to a diploma awarded by the Minister on the recommendation of the college or by the college under the RREC, regardless of how the program is developed or delivered.</p>
<p>Criteria for evaluating the quality of the programs of study (Ref. section 2.3)</p>	<p>Provide the following criteria to ensure that the various dimensions of a program are assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • relevance of the program; • coherence of the program; • suitability of pedagogical methods and student supervision and support; • alignment of human, material and financial resources to education needs; • effectiveness of the programme; • quality management of the program.
<p>Selected program evaluation methods (Ref. section 2.4)</p>	<p>Identify the evaluation method(s) used by the college to evaluate its programs of study.</p> <p>Describe, for each method selected, the planning, conduct, and follow-up of the evaluation.</p>
<p>Overall picture (Ref. section 2.4)</p>	<p>Provide for an overall picture for each of the study programs at a maximum periodicity of 10 years. This overall picture takes into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all criteria selected by the Commission for assessing the quality of the study programs; • all program components; • all available data on the program.

Essential components (or their equivalent)	Summary of expectations
<p>Data required for the evaluation of the programs of study (Ref. section 2.5)</p>	<p>Provide for the data required for the evaluation of the programs of study, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documentary data; • statistical data; • perceptual data.
<p>Delineation of responsibilities (Ref. section 2.6)</p>	<p>Define responsibilities clearly and precisely and assign them to individuals and bodies with the authority to carry them out.</p> <p>Specify the individuals and bodies responsible for managing IPEP and for programs of study evaluation.</p>
<p>Mechanism for evaluating the application of the policy (Ref. section 2.7)</p>	<p>Describe how the application of the policy will be evaluated at least once every 10 years, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the consistency between what the policy provides and how it is implemented (compliance); • the extent to which the objectives of the policy have been achieved (effectiveness). <p>Provide for consultation with the individuals and bodies responsible for implementing the policy.</p>
<p>Mechanism for modifying the policy (Ref. section 2.7)</p>	<p>Describe the process for modifying the policy.</p> <p>Provide for consultation with the individuals and bodies responsible for implementing the policy.</p>



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

Québec 

