

INQAAHE GUIDELINES OF GOOD PRACTICE  
EXTERNAL REVIEW REPORT

Commission d'évaluation de  
l'enseignement collégial (CEEC)

**Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

June 13 - 16, 2016

## Table of Content

<b>A. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>B. Foreword .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>C. CEEC in the Québec Educational System .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>D GGP compliance .....</b>	<b>10</b>
S1 1. The Governance of the EQAA.....	10
S1 2. Resources .....	12
S1 3. Quality Assurance of the EQAA .....	14
S1 4. Reporting Public Information .....	16
S2 5. The Relationship Between the EQAA and Higher Education Institutions.....	17
S2 6. The EQAA's Requirements for Institutional / Program Performance .....	19
S2 7. The EQAA's Requirements Institutional Self-Evaluation and Reporting to the EQAA .....	21
S3 8. The EQAA's Evaluation of the Institution and/or Program.....	23
S3 9. Decisions.....	25 S3
10. Appeals .....	27 S4
11. Collaboration.....	28 S4
12. Transnational/Cross-Border Higher Education.....	29
<b>ANNEX A – Agenda of the Site Visit.....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>ANNEX B – Members of the Review Panel.....</b>	<b>34</b>

## A. Executive Summary

The Québec external quality assurance agency for college education Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial (CEEC) was assessed against the Guidelines of Good Practice (GGP) of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE). The review was processed by an independent team of international experts nominated by INQAAHE. Following the pre-defined procedure the CEEC conducted a self-assessment along the guidelines of INQAAHE and documented the results in a report that was then reviewed by the external experts. Evidence was made available to substantiate the evaluation. Based on the thoroughly done self-assessment submitted by the CEEC the panel of experts visited the Commission in from June 13.-16, 2016. The panel met with representatives of every group that is involved in the activities and decision-making of the CEEC, including students and stakeholders. Some of the meetings took place in Montreal on the first day but the majority of them were in Quebec, in the commission's office. The detailed schedule outlining the interview groups and individuals is attached to this report as Annex 1 (Agenda).

The panel of experts concludes that the **CEEC fully meets eight out of the twelve INQAAHE standards**. For **two standards the group found the CEEC to be substantively compliant** while for **two standards the CEEC was found to be only partially compliant**. Particularly the two guidelines with partial compliance have to be seen in the specific context of the CEECs work and the Québec system, leading the panel to conclude that this currently **partial compliance should not be overestimated**.

Out of the six standards specified in paragraph five of the INQAAHE alignment process, five standards are assessed to be fully met, while one standard is assessed to be substantively met. Consequently the panel assesses that the **CEEC is in compliance with the INQAAHE Guidelines of Good Practice** and outlines some observations for each standard.

Looking at the **governance of the CEEC** it is obvious that the CEEC is an independent public quality assurance organization whose mission is to contribute to and demonstrate the development of the quality of college education in Québec. Within the CEEC a quality culture underlies the relevant procedures. The governance system of the CEEC has reached a high level of maturity. The implemented system strongly aims to build consensus thus increasing acceptance of the results among colleges. Looking at the appropriateness of the top-level governance structure the system might benefit from an increased diversity in the decision-making commission.

Currently the CEEC has adequate human as well as financial **resources** in order to fulfil its mission. Recognizing the repeated budget cuts of the past years it became obvious that additional cuts would put the achievement of the CEEC's mission at risk and limit the adequate development of the CEEC in the future.

The CEEC's **quality assurance** procedures are comprehensive and fit for purpose. The various QA activities of the CEEC cover all parts of the work and procedures. However, a systematic inclusion of external actors in the QA system is not foreseen beyond the level of the -colleges. Particularly recognizing the maturity of the CEEC's work and procedures, the expert group could not identify any reasons speaking against a stronger involvement of students, employers or universities.

Reporting and **public information** is at the heart of the CEEC's mission. The documentation is accessible, excellently structured, consistent as well as precise and detailed. The conception of its reports is adequate for the needs of institutions as well as the ministerial administration. There is a high level of transparency regarding the dissemination of the CEEC's work. The panel strongly supports the efforts of the CEEC to reach out to a broader public with new methods of public relations.

In its **relationship with the colleges**, the CEEC recognizes that a college has the primary responsibility for quality within the institution. The CEEC evaluation methodology allows every college the flexibility necessary to put in place a quality assurance system that reflects its particular institutional concept of quality management. The procedures implemented by the CEEC contribute to the quality improvement as well as the accountability of the colleges in Québec. However, looking at the relationship with the Higher Education Institutions (HEI), one of the main stakeholders of any QA system – students- are not fully included in the process. The CEEC should intensify their efforts towards student's involvement.

The **requirements of the CEEC towards the colleges** represent a mature system of external quality assurance. While the criteria are clearly defined and published, the CEEC implements a dialogue oriented and supportive approach towards the colleges, leading to a deeper understanding of the principles underlying the criteria amongst the actors of the system. The reference framework used by the CEEC and published on their website presents all information required by colleges when carrying out their self-evaluation. Among other subjects, it defines the issues, purpose, conceptual foundation, and the evaluation approach adopted. Consequently it also presents the criteria, the stages of the evaluation process, and the rulings that may be rendered. A self-evaluation guide is available to assist colleges in the production of their report.

The CEEC has clear **documentation concerning its evaluations** that state the standards, assessment methods and processes, as well as decision criteria. There are also criteria and standards on the characteristics, selection and training of reviewers. Hence the mechanisms in place ensure that each institution is evaluated in an equivalent way, even with different external panels. At this point the lack of student involvement is obvious, but also actors from outside the Québec college system would help the colleges to benefit from different perspectives

The CEEC does not take any formal **decisions** in a yes/no understanding. A decision in light of the CEEC's methodology lies in the adoption and publications of evaluation reports and thus the formulation of recommendations. The methodology of the CEEC uses pre-defined criteria but also reflects strongly on the individual character of each HEI. Since the CEEC does not have any power to force a college to implement a recommendation with its enhancement oriented approach it offers support actions to the colleges on how to deal with recommendations. To the panel of experts, this practice reflects the consensual and supportive character of the CEEC'S work. Since no coercive measures are taken, there is no **appeal** procedure in place. However, before the Commission formally adopts a report, publishes it, and delivers recommendations, the college is invited to comment on a preliminary version. Aside from this option for the college to comment on a report, there is no mechanism in place allowing the publication of the college's comments unfiltered by the CEEC. The panel of experts thus recommends looking into options on how the right of the college to independently state its point can be accommodated.

There are some activities of the CEEC in the field of **international collaboration**. These lead to a review of decisions and build capacity within the CEEC. While recognising the budgetary constraints, which limit international activities, internationalization of the higher education sector will inevitably create the need for an internationally connected external QA provider. In that sense the CEEC is highly encouraged to continue their efforts to strengthen their international activities.

While it seems that the phenomenon of **cross-border education** is of very limited scope in Québec, it seems questionable that the procedures in place can appropriately consider the challenges of these activities. Currently the same methodology is used for cross-border activities as for providers in Québec. Due to the flexibility of the approach this can succeed. However, in the long run the panel of experts believe that the very mature system of the CEEC should challenge itself to better include this type of education in its evaluation methods.

Concluding, the experts found the CEEC to be a mature provider of external quality assurance for the colleges in Québec. The position of the Commission was well founded regarding all standards under review. For the two standards with only partial compliance the CEEC's line of argumentation was consistent and also convincing, supporting the experts' belief that these areas are much less shortcomings of the past than challenges for the future. The experts particularly appreciate the open dialogue they experienced in the interviews with all groups. This underlines the experts' belief that the CEEC acts with

a high level of self-reflection in which undergoing the INQAAHE GGP review is one step to include critical external expertise.

## B. Foreword

### Procedural Remarks

The Québec external quality assurance agency for college education Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial (CEEC) requested the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) to conduct an external review of its work, policies and procedures. Open for all members and interested agencies, INQAAHE offers such review based on agreed and published criteria, the Guidelines of Good Practice (GGP). The secretariat of INQAAHE processed all necessary preparatory steps in collaboration with the CEEC and also agreed on a language for the review. A team of international experts was suggested by INQAAHE. The CV's and fields of expertise of the panel members were made available to the CEEC and no opposition was raised against the team composition.

The review team consisted of:

- Bruno Curvale, Research engineer, Senior project manager at *Centre international d'études pédagogiques* (CIEP), France. Former president of ENQA. (Chair)
- Hélène Lamicq, former Rector of the *University Paris 12*, France.
- Ronny Heintze, Senior-Consultant, Commissioner for International Affairs, *Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes* (AQAS), Germany. (Secretary)

The CEEC delivered a Self-Evaluation Report and also made available a number of additional supporting documents in an online platform that is used as part of regular CEEC tools. After comprehensive consultation of the documentation, the review panel visited the office of the CEEC in Quebec and held meetings in Montreal as well as Québec City, Québec, Canada, from 13 - 16. June 2016.

The interviews on site were held in French and partially in English. The panel met with all relevant stakeholders and actors to collect different perspectives on the work of the CEEC. Interviews were held with the Commissioners and the Secretary General of the CEEC as well as staff members of different fields of the Commission's work, representatives of the colleges, reviewers who were involved in the CEEC evaluations, and also representatives of different departments of the Ministry for Education and Higher Education.

After the site visit was completed, the Secretary of the panel drafted a report considering the presented evidence, the discussions on site and the conclusions of the panel. All members of the panel then contributed to the draft and agreed on a final version that was then delivered to the CEEC for comments.

The report reviews the CEEC's compliance with the GGP of INQAAHE. It therefore is based on the descriptions provided in the Self-Evaluation Report of the CEEC, the additional information gathered in the discussions on site and by consulting the comprehensive additional evidence that was made available online. Every guideline of the GGP is assessed individually to allow a detailed assessment of compliance.

### Substantive remarks

Based on the impressions gathered during the on-site visit and the perceived spirit of enhancement-orientation within the CEEC, the panel considers that in order to reflect the complex nature of the CEEC's work based on an advanced understating of the role of quality assurance in higher education, the mature system might also benefit from some remarks not strictly related to one of the guidelines. These thoughts reflect the impressions of an appreciative external observer.

The CEEC is very much aware that the methodological shift towards the assessment of the ability of a college to ensure its quality was a profound change. To go from the role of an evaluator of the

implementation of programmes to that of an accreditor of skills of colleges to ensure the quality of implementation of their programmes was not a simple move. The panel of experts highly agrees to the descriptions of the CEEC staff itself, that this change in methodology was a paradigm shift. With this shift the CEEC provoked a profound change that must be accompanied at every level: in the institutions, in the ministries, and in the public. This change also has an impact on the required participation and representation of the various stakeholders interested in the quality of education: students, parents, employers, as well as policy and decision makers.

This assessment against the *INQAAHE Guidelines of Good Practice* showed the commitment to clarity, the aim of integrating the world of education in the design of the new approach and the will to include evaluation results in a robust methodological framework. This assessment is also an opportunity to draw the attention of the CEEC to the fact that – already in the short term - communication of results is likely to require a stronger explanation towards different audiences interested in the quality of education delivered by Québec colleges. In this respect, it is not only important to produce reports and analysis up to the high standards the CEEC has chosen for itself, but also to develop pedagogical communication for the different audiences that need to fully grasp the outcomes of the evaluation processes. This is an important issue for an organization for which the notion of consensus is an indicator of its own competence to produce meaningful and lasting changes in Québec colleges and on the governance of college education in general.

The panel of experts is fully confident that the CEEC has the right capacities and organisational structures to appropriately discuss and consider the observations presented in this report and address the challenges ahead for the future development of external quality assurance for the colleges of Québec.

## C. CEEC in the Québec Educational System

### The education system of Québec and the positioning of colleges

In Canada you find two levels of government – a federal and a provincial. The responsibilities of these two levels are clearly split. Except for certain shared powers, the competency of the federal level is limited to all matters that are not exclusively identified to be under provincial jurisdiction. The sector of education is a provincial responsibility. Consequently there is not one Canadian education system, but each province organises and regulates its own educational framework.

In the province of Québec the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) is in charge of the educational system that is made up of four instructional levels. The elementary level takes six years and is followed by the secondary level lasting five years. The third level of education is the college level delivered in *collèges d'enseignement général et professionnel* (CEGEPs) and other collegial institutions, which is then followed by the university level. College and university education are the two levels of Higher Education (HE). Within Canada, it is a unique feature of the Québec educational system to split HE in two levels and offer a college education.

Colleges offer different types of training, especially programmes leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DCS) and an Attestation of Collegial Studies (AEC). The DCS programmes either prepare for university or for technical careers in the work place. Among these colleges there are 48 CEGEPs and 22 subsidized private institutions offering DCS and AEC programmes and also 31 non-subsidised private institutions offering AEC programmes. 4 institutions affiliated to either a university or a ministry also offer college-level programmes leading to DCS or AEC.

The evaluation of all these colleges is the mission and responsibility of the CEEC. The second half of the HE system of Québec – universities – is not subject to the evaluation of the CEEC.

### The work of the CEEC

The CEEC was founded in 1993 together with a change in the organisation of collegial education. The MEHE chose a competency-based approach defining the learning objectives for DCS while leaving considerable leeway to institutions for their implementation. This change increased in the autonomy of the colleges in matters of study program management. In order to ensure the quality of this newly defined DCS the CEEC was created.

The CEEC's mission, as defined by the *Act respecting the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial* is to contribute to the development of the quality of college education and to report thereon. The Commission fulfils its mission with regard to all educational institutions of Québec's college network. The 48 public CEGEPs, 22 subsidized private colleges, 31 non-subsidized private colleges, and 4 institutions affiliated with a ministry or a university are all affected by the Commission's mandate, as are the numerous campuses and training centres that belong to these institutions. Its function is essentially to evaluate the institutions' policies concerning the evaluation of student achievement and programs of study, and the implementation of these policies and programmes. In regards to public colleges (CEGEPs) and subsidized private colleges, its mandate also includes the evaluation of activities related to their educational mission, comprising planning for student success and also for CEGEPs, strategic plans.

From the beginning it was the mandate of the CEEC to evaluate the college's fulfilment of their responsibilities and publicly report on it. While the CEEC is under the authority of the Minister of HE it defines its own internal rules and procedures as well as the criteria and conditions of its evaluation process.



From the outset, the Commission's work was targeted toward providing support for college education institutions with the main objective of helping them assume responsibility in matters of evaluation. The initial focus of the CEEC methodology was to support an evaluation of study programmes on the basis of common criteria across Québec.

Since 2000, the Public Administration Act requires that government departments and agencies write their planning into a results-based management framework. This requirement applies to CEGEPs since 2002. Beyond its initial mission the Commission was entrusted with the additional responsibility of ensuring that these strategic plans, including planning for student success, comply with the government management framework.

After 14 years of work aimed at helping colleges acquire an expanding expertise in matters of program evaluation, the evaluation of student learning and results-based management, **in 2007 the Commission announced his intention to make significant changes** to its evaluation approach. Within the framework of its work, the Commission established a new approach modifying how it fulfils its mandate and the way colleges assume their responsibilities in the area of evaluation. Implemented in 2013, this **new approach consists in a change of perspective** of the Commission's oversight: instead of examining the quality and implementation of programs of study and the effectiveness of policies and plans, **its evaluation focus became the effectiveness of each institution's quality assurance system.**

Considering the progress achieved by colleges, this change of approach entailed on the one hand an evolution in the Commission's own practices and processes in accordance with the evaluation expertise developed by colleges, and on the other, confirmed the pertinence of the external viewpoint that it provides to them. Colleges are invited to take part in the proposed paradigm shift with a view to casting a critical eye on the effectiveness of their quality assurance mechanisms. In this sense, they must verify if the mechanisms implemented achieve the institutional objectives for which they were designed, and if appropriate measures to ensure continuous quality improvement have been taken, where needed.

The Commission is composed of **four commissioners**, including a chairperson, **appointed by the government (cabinet)** on the basis of their relevant professional experience and knowledge of the college network, with a five-year mandate, renewable once. The chairperson is the Commission's official spokesperson. The secretary general assumes the administrative management and a team of approximately twenty employees, members of Québec's public service, assist the Commission in its work. About twelve research officers are directly assigned to evaluation activities and three have a coordinating role related to evaluation operations. Another professional is in charge of communications, while a team of seven employees provide technical and administrative support.

Since its founding, the work of the CEEC has led to the evaluation of over 1,125 institutional policies and plans and to 790 on-site visits. It has exercised its power of recommendation on over 1,790 occasions. Finally, it generated the publication of approximately 2,400 institution evaluation reports, 18 operation summary reports and over 60 related publications.

## D GGP compliance

### S1 1. The Governance of the EQAA

The EQAA has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account the cultural and historical context of the EQAA. The statement explicitly provides that external quality assurance is a major activity of the EQAA, and it requires a systematic approach to achieving the mission or objectives of the EQAA. There is evidence that the statement of objectives is implemented pursuant to a practical management plan that is linked to EQAA resources. The ownership and governance structure is appropriate for the objectives of the agency.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

Created in 1993 by the Québec Government, the **CEEC is an independent public quality assurance organization** whose mission is to contribute to and demonstrate the development of the quality of college education. The scope of the CEEC's mission covers primarily the evaluation of institutional policies and their implementation for approximately one hundred institutions composing the Québec college network governed by the College Education Regulations. The CEEC's **Mission Statement** is established by law and from the experts point of view is well adapted to Québec's cultural and historical context. By way of its external quality assurance process, the CEEC fulfils its mission by evaluating the effectiveness of the quality assurance system of each institution with a view toward continuous improvement.

**The CEEC responsibilities are** defined and mandated by law. These powers are to **verify, to make recommendations, and to make its work publicly available**. It establishes the terms and conditions for conducting evaluations. As such, it undertakes the evaluations that it deems appropriate following notice addressed to the educational institution, which is given an opportunity to present observations. The CEEC produces evaluation criteria and tools, sets up consultative committees and recruits experts. In the context of its evaluations, it may also authorize any individual to collect information necessary for the accomplishment of its mission from educational institutions.

**The Commission is made up of four members**, including the chairperson. The body's decisions are made by a majority vote of members present at formal meetings, convened by the chairperson. In addition, the members of the Commission form an executive committee, whose status is advisory with the chairperson in regards to operations management. The secretary general is in charge of the logistics of these two types of meetings and draws up the resulting minutes and official records.

As positively confirmed by the reviewing expert team, the CEEC establishes a **strategic plan covering a period of over five years**. The plan includes a description of its mission, the context in which it is operating and the main issues it is facing, its strategic guidelines, the objectives and priorities put forward, the targeted results at the end of the period covered by the plan, as well as the performance indicators used to measure the achievement of these results.

Commissioners must abide by a *Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct for Members of the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial* and the *Regulation respecting the ethics and discipline in the public service*. The CEEC employees, who are civil servants appointed under the Public Service Employment Act, must comply with the *Regulation on ethics and discipline in the public service*.

## Observations

It is obvious that the CEEC meets the defined criteria for this standard. The context of HE in Québec is well reflected in the CEEC structures and work methods. It is an autonomous body that is independent from MEHE influence and by its defined structures and processes also not vulnerable to direct political influence. The fundamental change of the evaluation methodology in 2013 clearly shows that the CEEC adapts well to the progress in the field of HE and aims to continuously support the colleges covered by its mandate. Evaluation is the major activity of the CEEC and there is a systematic approach towards the achievement of the CEEC's mission. The resources available are well linked through an advanced management approach and the implemented governance structures fits well with the defined objectives.

Taking into account the well-documented structures and division of responsibilities it became obvious to the members of the expert panel that **within the CEEC a quality culture** underlies all procedures. The governance system of the CEEC has reached a high level of maturity. The implemented system strongly aims to build consensus thus increasing acceptance of the results among colleges. Looking at the appropriateness of the decision-making processes **the system could benefit from more diversity**. Considering **a broader definition of the CEEC stakeholders** the **inclusion of more diverse stakeholder backgrounds and views is advisable**. Essentially a more **institutionalized stakeholder dialogue**, not only involving the MEHE and colleges (as yet defined main stakeholders), but also **representatives of the labour market, universities and inevitably students**, would clearly strengthen the existing structures of the CEEC and **create new input** to develop the system.

## S1 2. Resources

The EQAA has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach. The EQAA's resources are also adequate for the appropriate development of the agency.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

The Commission's annual budget is approximately 2.5 million Canadian \$ allocated from a ministerial programme. This budget is therefore contingent upon governmental priorities. Although it has been relatively stable over the past few years, for the 2014-2015 fiscal year for instance, departments and agencies have been asked to **reduce** their compensation **budget by 2%** and their operating **budget by 3%**. Compared to the 2013-2014 fiscal year, this resulted in an expenditure cut of \$54,000 for the CEEC. Furthermore, in 2015-2016 the **CEEC suffered an additional remuneration budget cut** of \$33,200.

The CEEC's human resources are composed of four commissioners, including a chairperson, appointed by the government (cabinet) on the basis of their relevant professional experience and knowledge of the college network, with a five-year mandate, renewable once. The chairperson is the Commission's official spokesperson. The secretary general assumes the administrative management and a team of approximately twenty employees, members of Québec's public service, assist the Commission in its work. About twelve research officers, with a status of civil servant called *Agent de recherche et de planification socio-économique* are directly assigned to evaluation activities and three have a coordinating role in evaluation operations. Another professional is in charge of communications, while a team of seven employees provide technical and administrative support.

**The CEEC also engages external experts.** Chosen on the basis of their expertise, they participate in the visiting committees and sit on the consultative committees that are set up for each evaluation operation. Experts generally come from the college education environment, where they hold managerial, teaching or professional positions. Depending on the subject of evaluation, experts may be drawn from universities or a professional setting. **Expert participation is on voluntary basis**, excluding travel expenses that are incurred, which are reimbursed according to scales established by the government.

Based on the facts presented, the panel of experts concludes that at this time the **CEEC has adequate human as well as financial resources** in order to fulfil its mission. However, recognizing the cuts of the last years, a continuous reduction in available funds might put the achievement of the CEEC's mission at risk. While at this time not persistent, this would **limit the adequate development of the CEEC in the future.**

### Observations

Looking at the human resources available to the CEEC it can clearly be stated that its staff is not only dedicated and competent, but also committed to the achievement of the CEEC's mission. Taking a further look the CEEC clearly benefits from a large pool of voluntary experts coming from the college sector. While this pool is a strong backbone for the work of the CEEC, it would also be worthwhile to consider increasing diversity in it. Including representatives of employers, civil society, as well as students in the pool and thus in the review procedures would add new perspectives that would help colleges in the development of their QA systems. Even without adding new groups to the pool, an increased use of experts from outside Québec (other provinces, neighbouring countries or countries with equal cultural

backgrounds) would create new input for the HEI of Québec. In regard to these suggestions understandably the decrease in financial resources becomes even more critical since the reimbursement of volunteer expenses would increase with longer travel distances.

It can also be observed that despite a strongly consensus-oriented process, the composition of the final decision-making body is homogenous considering the involvement of different stakeholders and also small in numbers. While this speaks for a lean and cost efficient structure, it limits the diversity of perspectives involved in the process.

Finally it became obvious that the limitations of the budget also limit the ability of staff development regarding exchange with other systems and methodology that could easily be reached by an increased exchange with other agencies. The CEEC could benefit from experiences made in other external Quality Assurance Agencies in Canada and abroad. Undoubtedly this would support the effectiveness and the reputation of the college quality assurance system of Québec.

## S1 3. Quality Assurance of the EQAA

The EQAA has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives.

The EQAA conducts internal self-review of its own activities, including consideration of its own effects and value. The review includes data and analysis.

The EQAA is subject to external reviews at regular intervals. There is evidence that any required actions are implemented and disclosed.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      x Substantially compliant      ! Fully compliant

Within the CEEC different mechanisms ensure that operations are carried out in an efficient, rigorous manner in compliance with the Commission's current standards and in consideration of ongoing feedback on the quality of the work. (for instance detailed work-flow-charts are used for the evaluation procedure of the colleges). These flow-charts include every step of the process including the foreseen time available for each single task. Also the CEEC uses annual work plans for their evaluation activities. Additionally the CEEC publishes an annual report of operations that is submitted to the Québec National Assembly. Regarding the **effectiveness of its operations** as well as the **contribution of the internal QA for the achievement of its mission** the expert panel can positively confirm that the **implemented mechanisms are fit for purpose**.

The CEEC also regularly updates the tools used in its evaluation processes and implements organizational procedures to optimize its use of resources. A good example is the CEEC's decision to move to a paperless work environment, which led to changes in the way files are transferred to colleges, in the method of communicating with experts, as well as in data storage practices. **The approach** towards that change **seems professional and systematic to the panel of experts**. The CEEC formed a working group with the mandate of addressing the issues and challenges stemming from the implementation of digital work processes, to research and document existing practices in comparable organizations, and to make recommendations on possible courses of action. Besides the enhancement of internal procedures, clearly this new approach can also be reflected in the light of the already discussed budget cuts, as in the long run increased efficiency leads to a reduction in shipping and printing costs.

Additionally, the CEEC implemented a strategic monitoring system on quality assurance in higher education, in order to allow the CEEC to update its expertise on quality assurance in higher education and to inform reflection on decisions concerning its evaluations.

Regular consultations with its collaborators and with the colleges are also implemented aiming to adapt the CEEC's work to new developments at the college level and to the development of evaluation expertise within the colleges. **Recognizing the comprehensive QA system implemented by the CEEC**, the expert group was able to identify that clearly **the focus, but also the main external partner, for the CEEC's QA activities are the colleges**, and respectively their representatives. Even though some activities to reach out for **additional stakeholder involvement** are conducted, they seem more periodic and **it remained unclear how this feedback is regularly or systematically included in the QA mechanisms**.

Positive mention should be given to the fact that at the end of each year of an audit cycle, the CEEC publishes an annual report concerning on-site visits, a critical summary that allows it to make adjustments, where applicable, to the process or the tools, and draw a portrait of the outcomes of the audit in the colleges visited.

## Observations

The CEEC's **quality assurance procedures are comprehensive and fit for purpose**. The site visit also **highlighted the high level of responsibility** that is shared amongst the CEEC commissioners as well as staff. It is also obvious that the **CEEC is not subject to a regular external review**, while the review for GGP alignment clearly can be seen as a first step towards developing the openness for external input. Additionally the lack of **systematic inclusion of external actors in the QA system is evident**. Particularly recognizing the maturity of the CEEC's work and procedures, the expert group could not identify any reasons speaking against a stronger involvement of externals.

The various **QA activities of the CEEC cover all parts of the work and procedures**. The question of how far these activities are integrated in a clearly defined system of internal QA remains and the appropriate measures are not yet fully clear. However the expert group concludes that the approach and "system" used by the CEEC meets the requirements and solves its purpose very well.

Recognizing the external and internal dimension of the QA process, it is also obvious that **at this time there is not yet established a systematic dialogue with the actors of the system** like Ministry of HE, universities, employer associations, or foreign stakeholders. The fact that the CEEC's periodic outreach towards some actors has encountered certain difficulties in regards to their collaboration shall not deter future efforts of the CEEC towards encouraging input from externals in their QA system.

## S1 4. Reporting Public Information

The EQAA informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA. This includes full and clear disclosures of its relevant documentation such as policies, procedures and criteria.

The EQAA also demonstrates public accountability by reporting its decisions about higher education institutions and programs. The content and extent of reporting may vary with cultural context and applicable legal and other requirements.

If the external evaluation leads to a decision about the higher education institution or program, the procedures applied and the criteria for decision-making are public, and the criteria for review are transparent, public, and ensure equality of treatment.

The EQAA also discloses to the public the decisions about the EQAA resulting from any external review of its own performance.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

By law the CEEC is requested to submit its evaluation reports to the colleges concerned and to the Minister responsible for post-secondary education in Québec. It is also required that all the CEEC reports must be made public in the manner it considers appropriate. From the beginning, the **CEEC chose to publish its reports in their entirety on its website**. Furthermore, the electronic version of these reports is deposited at the *Bibliothèque et Archives Nationales du Québec*. **The publication of the reports includes the publication of recommendations** given to the HEI.

Furthermore, **all official documents produced by the CEEC** – such as annual reports, evaluation guides for the colleges, orientation documents, analytical frameworks, etc. – **are available on its website**.

The CEEC also posts the comprehensive summary report produced at the end of its operations in a communications strategy that targets audiences particularly affected by the content of the report.

### Observations

Clear reporting and public information is at the heart of the CEEC's mission. **The documentation is accessible, excellently structured, consistent as well as precise and detailed**. The conception of its reports is adequate for the needs of institutions as well as the ministerial administration. There is a **high level of transparency** regarding the dissemination of the CEEC's work.

It must be noted that the CEEC has limited power to force institutions to work on their recommendations, thus making the transparent **publication and information for the public one of the strongest instruments that is well used and implemented by the CEEC**. The fact that the CEEC identified **room for improvement in how to reach a broader public** and even adopted a communication plan clearly speaks for a high level of self-reflection within the CEEC. At the same time it shall not be underestimated that in identifying this issue, the CEEC shares a challenge many external quality assurance agencies face, given that its work is mainly of interest for a community of experts and less by the general public.



## S2 5. The Relationship Between the EQAA and Higher Education Institutions

The EQAA:

- recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves;
- respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs;
- applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and
- aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

The CEEC's evaluation approach is based on the colleges' self-evaluation; it requires them to participate in the process, draw up an action plan outlining the most appropriate measures to put in place in order to correct, where applicable, the shortcomings observed during their self-evaluation procedure. Most of the reviews (with the exception of those based on the texts of policies or plans) include a visit to the college concerned in a given operation. The visiting committees are made up of a commissioner, a professional researcher from the CEEC, and three outside experts. Most of the experts are from within the Québec college network.

It became obvious to the team of experts, **that while preserving its independence and the autonomy of the colleges**, the CEEC maintains close relations with them, as the CEEC recognizes that only a constructive dialogue allows for a meaningful role for both parties in the evaluation process. The **CEEC recognizes that a college has the primary responsibility for quality** within the institution and must adopt mechanisms that will allow it to ensure the quality of the programs of study that it offers, as well as the quality of the evaluation of student achievement.

Clearly the shift of methodology in 2013, that was subject to **appropriate discussion with the actors**, can be seen as an indicator of the recognition of college autonomy and responsibility. **The new methodology no longer addresses the quality of the programmes explicitly, but focuses on the effectiveness of the QA system the college implements to do so itself.** The experts agree that the key to the quality and success of the CEEC's operations mainly lies in the dynamic nature of the colleges and in their capacity to carry out a critical assessment of their practices and take appropriate measures to improve their quality. **The CEEC evaluation methodology allows every college the flexibility necessary to put in place a quality assurance system that reflects its particular institutional concept of quality management. The procedures implemented by the CEEC contribute to the quality improvement as well as the accountability of the colleges in Québec.**

One indicator supporting the general orientation towards dialogue and consensus in the CEEC procedures is the creation of a *Liaison Committee* in fall 2013 in order to facilitate and consolidate dialogue between the CEEC and the colleges. The *Liaison Committee* includes nine people from the college network: five representing public colleges (CEGEPs), two representing subsidized private colleges, one representing non-subsidized private institutions, and one representing institutions under the authority of a ministry or a university. The four commissioners are also members of this committee, as well as the secretary general of the CEEC. The committee is an important venue for the exchange of information and for the discussion necessary to ensure constructive communication between the CEEC and the colleges.

## **Observations**

The CEEC has a constant, **constructive and dialogue-oriented relationship with the colleges** of the Québec education system. The exchange is constant and meaningful at all levels of the CEEC's activities and at every step of the procedure. Even more it becomes obvious that the procedures are set up in a way that they **facilitate and encourage consensus amongst the actors** while not relying on it.

However, looking at the relationship with the HEIs, one **of the main stakeholders of any QA system – students- is not fully included in the process**. The CEEC relies on their involvement at in the colleges' self-evaluations; however there is very little student involvement in the CEEC's procedures, either in the pool of experts, or as a (consultative) member of the commission. Considering the developments in quality assurance worldwide, measures to solicit greater participation from students in the process of design and implementation of assessment procedures is an issue which the CEEC should be addressing.

## S2 6. The EQAA's Requirements for Institutional / Program Performance

The EQAA has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution. Those expectations (which may for example be called standards or factors or precepts) are appropriate for the core activities of an institution of higher education or program. The standards should explicitly address all areas of institutional activity that fall within the EQAA's scope, such as teaching, learning, research, community work, etc. and necessary resources such as finances, staff/faculty, and learning resources. Standards may refer to specific areas, levels of achievement, relative benchmarking and types of measures, and may provide general guidelines. They may also include specific learning goals.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

Due to the methodology chosen by the CEEC, GGP guideline six (Requirements for Institutional / Program Performance) and GGP guideline seven (Requirements Institutional Self-Evaluation and Reporting to the EQAA) are closely related as the focus of the CEEC activities is the effectiveness of the QA system of a college which is based on a self-evaluation report. Consequently both issues have strong interdependencies.

For the procedure of evaluation of the effectiveness of the college's quality assurance systems, the CEEC has produced a comprehensive reference framework presenting all of the information of use to colleges when carrying out their self-evaluation. Among other subjects, it defines the issues, purpose, conceptual foundation, and the evaluation approach adopted. **It transparently presents the criteria**, the stages of the evaluation process, and the rulings that may be rendered. The information is supplemented in the appendices, which include a self-evaluation guide to assist colleges in their process and in the production of their report.

The criteria for the assessment have four components while each of the components is again divided in different sub-components.

- Component one: *Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Programmes of Study*. The sub-criteria cover areas like mechanisms to ensure relevance, mechanisms to ensure coherence, as well as mechanisms to ensure the value of teaching methods and student supervision. Aspects of alignment of human, financial and material resources with educational needs and mechanisms to ensure the quality of programme management are equally covered.
- Component two: *Quality Assurance Mechanisms for the Evaluation of Student Achievement*. The sub-criteria of this component cover mechanisms to ensure a fair evaluation of student achievement, as well as mechanisms to ensure an equitable evaluation of student achievement.
- Component three: *Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Strategic Planning within a Context of Results-Based Management*. In this component the focus is on mechanisms ensuring the implementation of strategic planning as well as mechanisms ensuring the follow-up of the results achieved.
- Component four: *Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Success Planning within a Context of Results-Based Management*. In this component the focus is on mechanisms ensuring the implementation of success planning as well as mechanisms ensuring the follow-up of the results achieved.

**Observations**

The requirements of the CEEC towards the colleges represent **a mature system of external quality assurance**. While the **criteria are clearly defined and published**, the CEEC implements a dialogue-oriented and supportive approach towards the colleges, leading to a deeper understanding of the principles underlying the criteria amongst the actors of the system. The defined criteria also reflect the requirements resulting from the GGP guideline while presenting a Québec adaptation of it. Particular recognition should be given to the fact that the **criteria presented are demanding and require a high level of involvement and commitment** towards quality enhancement from the colleges. These demands and requirements could only have been met by recourse to institutional tools that have been developed progressively through interaction with the CEEC over the past 23 years.

## S2 7. The EQAA's Requirements Institutional Self-Evaluation and Reporting to the EQAA

The documentation concerning self-evaluation explains to the institutions of higher education the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution. Typically, an EQAA review process includes a self-evaluation through self-study by the institution or program, external peer review, and a follow-up procedure.

As necessary and appropriate, the EQAA guides the institution or program in the application of the procedures of the quality assurance process, such as self-evaluation, external review, or solicitation of assessment/feedback from the public, students, and other constituents.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

As already outlined before, due to the methodology chosen by the CEEC, GGP guideline seven (Requirements Institutional Self-Evaluation and Reporting to the EQAA) and GGP guideline six (Requirements for Institutional / Program Performance) can hardly be separated as the focus of the CEEC activities is the effectiveness of the QA system of a college which is based on a self-evaluation report. Consequently the assessment of this criterion can only base on what has already been outlined in the assessment of GGP guideline six.

The reference framework used by the CEEC and published on their website presents all the information required by colleges for carrying out their self-evaluation. Among other subjects, **it defines the issues, purpose, conceptual foundation, and the evaluation approach adopted. Consequently it also presents the criteria, the stages of the evaluation process, and the rulings that may be rendered.**

Appendices supplement the information, **including a self-evaluation guide** to assist colleges in their process and in the production of their report. The guide provides a sample self-evaluation report, with the different subject headings colleges are requested to follow. For each subject, it details the elements of description and demonstration that must be included in the report and suggests evaluation questions intended to direct the college's attention towards relevant information regarding the criteria and sub-criteria. Thus the colleges receive various sources of useful information and clear guidelines on carrying out an evaluation.

Furthermore, it should be noted that in addition to published materials, **customized assistance is provided** to each college in the form of a one-day training workshop with content adapted to the particular college. This training aims at ensuring an accurate understanding of the reference framework for the (quite) new and more complicated evaluation approach, and that the colleges have a clear idea of the CEEC's expectations. Colleges also have the chance to participate in a supplementary group meeting one year before submission of their report, in which they can exchange with other colleges in the same round of the audit cycle.

### Observations

The assessment on this criterion clearly is very positive. There is **good documentation and guidance provided to HEI on how to perform their self-evaluation.** The CEEC uses publications, face-to-face communication and peer learning activities by arranging group meetings. Additional assistance and guidance is provided through the process of assigning each college a **CEEC research officer who supports the**

**institution between evaluation** cycles and thus **contributes to the development of a quality culture in the institution** as they have a clearly identified contact partner within the CEEC.

The CEEC's interpretation of a follow-up procedure reflects the **generally supportive approach** of the agency, as there is no coercive leverage in place in the event that a HEI institution does not act on the recommendations delivered by the CEEC. In line with its other procedures, such recommendations remain public, making it transparent to the public that the improvement process remains unfinished.

## S3 8. The EQAA's Evaluation of the Institution and/or Program

The EQAA has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review. The EQAA also has specifications on the characteristics, selection and training of reviewers. The EQAA's system must ensure that each institution or program will be evaluated in an equivalent way, even if the external panels, teams, or committees (together, the "external panels") are different.

The system ensures that:

- The external reviewers meet the EQAA specifications, and the external reviewers are adequate to the tasks to be accomplished.
- External reviewers have no conflicts of interest.
- External reviewers receive necessary training
- External reviewers' reports are evidence-based and clear, with precisely stated conclusions.

When practicable, the EQAA should include at least one external reviewer from another country or jurisdiction in the external panel.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

There is a **clear and comprehensive description of the procedures** for each type of evaluation within the CEEC's mandate. For an evaluation of an institutional policy or plan, which is done through the analysis of documentation and doesn't comprise a site visit, a professional researcher examines the documents submitted by the college and drafts a preliminary report. This report is then examined and adopted at an official Commission meeting before the final version of the report is published and sent to the college and forwarded to the Minister of HE of Quebec.

Evaluations involving a site visit require input from external experts. Usually the panel consists of three external experts who are accompanied by a CEEC staff member as well as a commissioner. The involvement of permanent CEEC staff **ensures in an appropriate way the consistent use of the defined criteria as well as equivalent assessment** across different expert panels.

The **process for expert nomination is well defined** and published. **Selection criteria are clearly formulated** and – based on the discussions on site – also consistently used. **Experts receive specific training and guidance** for each procedure preparing them for the specifics of the college under review. Beyond these face-to-face interactions the CEEC provides written material clarifying the role and tasks of the experts and helping them fulfil their task. Preparation and training was highly appreciated by the interviewed external experts and confirmed to be very helpful. The CEEC ensures that there is **no conflict of interest**.

The evaluation procedure is evidence based and, by pre-structuring the site visit and arranging a preparation-meeting, experts are adequately prepared so they can concentrate on the assessment of their respective area of expertise.

### Observations

The panel of external experts always **consists of peers** who are **free of any conflict of interest**, which allows a high level of acceptance of the outcomes. Based on the information provided by the CEEC during the interviews, it is understood that occasionally a non-academic expert is part of the review team. Given that in general experts are drawn from the network of colleges in Québec, an **area of improvement clearly for the CEEC lies in diversifying the panel composition**. As stated before, there is a **lack of student involvement**. Also, the participation of actors from outside the Québec system would allow the colleges to benefit from

different perspectives. In this light the expert panel recognized that the absence of foreign experts is also related to **financial constraints** (particularly in light of recent budget cuts). However, the CEEC should look into possible ways to **increase the participation of experts from outside Québec**. In this context the experts highly appreciate the open culture of communication within the CEEC as it became obvious that the Commission itself has started thinking about these issues.



## S3 9. Decisions

The EQAA evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation. An EQAA must be independent, i.e. it has autonomous responsibility for its operations, and its judgments cannot be influenced by third parties. The EQAA's decisions must be impartial, rigorous, thorough, fair, and consistent, even if the judgments are made by different panels. Consistency in decision-making includes consistency and transparency in processes and actions for imposing recommendations for follow-up action. The EQAA's reported decisions are clear and precise.

When the EQAA advises the government or other public bodies, the decisions made by each agency should be made as independently as practicable.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      x Fully compliant

The CEEC'S decision-making body is the Commission, made up of four commissioners including its chairperson. A decision in light of the CEEC's methodology lies in the adoption and publication of evaluation reports, together with the formulation of recommendations. The **methodology of the CEEC considers external, pre-defined criteria but also reflects strongly on the individual character of each HEI.**

By following well-defined processes, outlining evaluation orientations and criteria, as well as analysis models and reference frameworks, the CEEC ensures fair and equal treatment of the colleges. Commissioners preside over the evaluation panels and each is accompanied by a CEEC researcher in order **to ensure consistency** and efficiency in the work of the panels. To ensure **diligence, impartiality, and equivalence in its rulings**, the CEEC relies heavily on its permanent team of researchers responsible for writing the reports and the commissioners who carefully review them. All rulings and opinions issued are compiled by means of various tools that ensure that equal treatment is given in response to similar observations. In this regard, the expert team **highly values the special attention the CEEC pays to the precision, fairness and clarity of their reports.** It clearly benefits from a rigorously processed management, reinforcing the use of clearly defined procedures contributing to the high quality of the outcome.

As previously noted, the CEEC evaluations may result in published recommendations for the HEI. **Recommendations require a follow-up action** by the college, whereby it must demonstrate, by a **deadline agreed upon** with the Commission, that it has implemented improvements to address the shortcomings identified in the evaluation. If the follow-up measures taken by the college are deemed satisfactory, the Commission withdraws the recommendation in question. As it was discussed with different stakeholders on site, the CEEC does **not have any power to force a college to implement a recommendation.** Instead it offers support actions to the colleges on how to deal with problematic decisions. A bi-annual verification reveals if a college has not followed up on recommendations as expected. To the panel of experts **this practice reflects the consensual and supportive character of the CEEC's work** and seems in line with the educational tradition of the province. Finally it should be noted that the CEEC also has the authority to submit **recommendations to the Minister of HE** that is, nonetheless, free to act as it sees fit.

### Observations

The panel of experts is clearly convinced that the structures implemented by the CEEC in order to ensure equal, fair and independent procedures leading to recommendations for the colleges are appropriate. Recognizing the key role of the commissioners in this process – as they are the final deciders – it **might be helpful to explain publicly the process by which commissioners are appointed.** While the panel found no

evidence to suggest and has no reason to suspect partiality in this regard, the fact that the government appoints them could be put into perspective by providing increased transparency about the process. Clearly this will be beneficial in the international perspective of exchange with other systems and **strengthen the notion of independence of the CEEC.**

## S3 10. Appeals

The EQAA has appropriate methods and policies for appeals. Appeals should be conducted by reviewers who were not responsible for the original decision and who have no conflict of interest, but appeals need not necessarily be conducted outside the EQAA.

! Not compliant      x Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      ! Fully compliant

First of all it must be recognized that the CEEC does **not make any formal decisions** with consequences that could be subject to an appeal. As described above in Guideline nine, the Commission adopts resolutions to **publish reports and deliver recommendations**.

The CEEC has put in place mechanisms that invite **colleges under review to comment upon the content of preliminary versions of reports**, including the conclusions and opinions expressed therein. The Commission takes note of a college's reaction to a given report, makes any changes to the report that it deems appropriate, and includes a section summarizing the college's comments in the final version of the report. It is clear to the panel of experts that the CEEC evaluations are carried out in a **perspective of continuous improvement and are not accompanied by sanctions**. The CEEC representatives clearly stated that a need to put a formal appeal mechanism in place has never been felt by the CEEC. On the other hand, the interviews conducted by the panel of experts revealed that across the Québec college network **different perceptions** exist.

### Observations

While colleges are invited to comment on the preliminary version of a report, **it remains at the discretion of the Commission** whether or not to adjust the report. While this practice is clearly a reflection of the decision-making role of the Commission and reflects international practice, it nonetheless leaves to the Commission the presentation of a college's comments in the report. In this sense the final publication of the college's view lies with the CEEC. Consequently **there is no mechanism in place allowing a college to express its point of view unfiltered by the CEEC. The panel of experts thus recommends that the CEEC look into options** to expand the final stage of its evaluation approach, balanced and fair as it is, **to ensure that** – even if no official appeal seems required – **the right of a college to state its point of view independently**.

## S4 11. Collaboration

The EQAA collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.

! Not compliant      ! Partially compliant      x Substantially compliant      ! Fully compliant

The CEEC has been a member of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) since the mid-1990s and – based on its own assessment - has been an active participant in that organization’s work for about 10 years.

In the past the CEEC sent a delegation to Europe to visit two higher education quality assurance agencies and examine their practices and processes. These initial meetings led the CEEC to carry out research and monitoring work on higher education quality assurance. Other delegations (three to Europe in 2011 and another to Ontario in 2012) were sent to visit not only quality assurance agencies but also the institutions those agencies were evaluating. Also with the recent creation of a new Network of Francophone Agencies, in which the CEEC is an active member, its international outreach and cooperation activities progress.

From an experts point of view the CEEC’s international collaboration have been **sporadic** in the past but **these activities were well-selected and led to specific action based on the exchange/ collaboration**. This clearly reflects the beneficial input from cooperation with actors outside Québec. With the recent creation of a new Network of Francophone Agencies, in which the CEEC is a member, its international outreach and cooperation activities progress and shall be intensified.

### Observations

There are some activities of the CEEC in the field of international collaboration. These led to a **review of decisions** and **built capacity within the CEEC**. **Staff exchange or larger joint projects are not implemented**.

Clearly the CEEC is faced with **budgetary constraints**, which usually lead to a reduction in international activities in order to focus on matters related to core mission. Recognizing the specific environment of a largely French-language higher education system in North America, language also appears as a factor limiting opportunities close at hand. However, internationalization of the higher education sector will **inevitably create the need for an internationally connected external QA provider in Québec**. In that sense the **CEEC is strongly encouraged to continue their efforts to strengthen their international activities**. Developing a dialogue with other northern American agencies either in the US or other provinces might be worth exploring.

## S4 12. Transnational/Cross-Border Higher Education

The EQAA has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education. These policies may be the same as those for domestic providers and domestic provision. In formulating its policies and practices, the EQAA should consider relevant guidelines issued by international agencies and other associations. All EQAAs should consult with appropriate local agencies in the exporting or importing countries, although this might not be possible or appropriate in situations such as those involving distance learning or small enrollment.

! Not compliant      x Partially compliant      ! Substantially compliant      ! Fully compliant

The internationalisation of HEI and their programmes has not been a particular focus of the CEEC's attention. The methodology used by the CEEC ensures that every programme leading to the award of a DCS or ACS is subject to the same quality assurance procedure, regardless of whether it is offered either partially or completely outside of Québec or whether it is offered to students from outside the province.

In this regard, the CEEC also covers programmes with a cross-border character or at branch campuses by evaluation of the quality assurance systems of the institutions offering these programmes. As the application of the methodology is consistent with the individual particularities of an institution, it can't be argued that in these cases the specifics of their branch offerings are subject to evaluation. However, there are two aspects left unaccounted for in this approach: 1.) the number of Québec colleges providing education at branch campuses is extremely small (during the site visit only one private actor was referred to); and, 2.) usually cross-border education and branch campuses follow a different dynamic than the other procedures of an institution due to their significantly different character.

### Observations

While it seems that the phenomena of cross-border activities is of limited scope in Québec, it unclear as to how far the procedures in place can appropriately take into account the challenges of these activities. Recognizing how well embedded the CEEC procedures are in the HE system of Québec and how much they are in line with the development of this educational sector in the province, it is questionable as to how fit its procedures are for campuses outside of Québec.

It is important to understand these comments in the context of the limited impact this issue currently has on the Québec collegial system; this is not an area of great concern. However, in the long run the very mature system of the CEEC should challenge itself to better include this type of education.

## ANNEX A – Agenda of the Site Visit

### Évaluation de la CEEC par l'INQAAHE

#### Horaire détaillé de visite

14 au 16 juin 2016

Heure	Activité	Participants	Noms
<b>Jour 0 - 13 juin</b> – voyage à Montréal & Rencontre de travail (membres du comité de visite)			
<b>Jour 1 - 14 juin</b> – Montréal			
7h45	Départ de l'hôtel vers la salle de réunion	Membres du comité de visite	
8h30 à 9h45	Rencontre avec le conseil de l'agence	Membres de la Commission et du comité de régie interne : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Présidente</li> <li>Commissaires</li> </ul> Greffière de la Commission et secrétaire du comité de régie : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secrétaire générale</li> </ul>	M <sup>me</sup> Céline Durand M. Benoît Dubreuil M. John Keyes M <sup>me</sup> Sylvie Poiret  M <sup>me</sup> Nathalie Savard
10h00 à 11h00	Rencontre avec des représentants d'associations professionnelles	Membres de l'exécutif de : <u>la FEC</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Président</li> <li>Vice-Président : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professeur de biologie au Cégep de Sainte-Foy</li> </ul> </li> <li>Membre : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>professeure de science politique au Cégep de Sainte-Foy</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <u>la FPPC</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Présidente</li> <li>deux membres : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>conseiller pédagogique au Cégep Beauce-Appalaches</li> <li>psychologue au Collège Lionel-Groulx</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	M. Sébastien Paradis,  M <sup>me</sup> Nadine Bédard-St-Pierre  M <sup>me</sup> Suzanne Tousignant  M. Éric Cyr  M. Antoine Charbonneau,
11h15 à 12h15	Rencontre avec des étudiants et des représentants d'associations étudiantes	Représentants de la FECQ : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Présidente</li> <li>Vice-présidente</li> </ul> Étudiants des collèges suivants : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Méridi</li> <li>Saint-Hyacinthe</li> </ul>	M <sup>me</sup> Rose Crevier-Dajenais M <sup>me</sup> Élyse Tremblay-Longchamps  M. Jean-Nicolas Delisle M <sup>me</sup> Kateryna Chernavska M. Kevin Basseur

		• André-Grasset	Mme Michelle Naoum
12h15 à 13h30	<i>Dîner sur place (boîtes à lunch)</i>	<i>Membres du comité de visite</i>	
13h30 à 14h45	Rencontre avec des cadres	Membres externes du Comité de liaison : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 des collègues publics + 2</li> <li>• 2 des privés subventionnés</li> <li>• 1 des privés non subventionnés</li> </ul>	M. Raymond-Robert Tremblay et M. John Alpin (successeur) M <sup>me</sup> Hélène Allaire et M <sup>me</sup> Carolle Lavallée (substitut) M <sup>me</sup> Élise Tousignant  M <sup>me</sup> Marie-France Tassé M. Pierre L'Heureux  M. Guy Côté
15h00 à 16h30	Rencontre avec des administrations de collègues ayant vécu l'opération d'évaluation des systèmes d'assurance qualité des collèges (SAQC)	Directeurs généraux : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lanaudière</li> <li>• Saint-Jérôme</li> <li>• Trois-Rivières</li> </ul> Directeurs des études <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marie-Victorin</li> <li>• Saint-Laurent</li> <li>• Saint-Jérôme</li> </ul>	M. Marcel Côté M <sup>me</sup> Nadine LeGal M. Raymond-Robert Tremblay  M <sup>me</sup> Hélène Allaire M <sup>me</sup> Carolle Lavallée M <sup>me</sup> Carole Rivest-Turgeon
16h30 à 18h00	Rencontre de travail	<i>Membres du comité de visite</i>	
18h00 à 20h00	<i>Souper au restaurant</i>	<i>Membres du comité de visite</i>	
<b>Jour 2 - 15 juin – Québec</b>			
8h00	Départ vers Québec	Membres du comité de visite	
11h00 à 12h00	Rencontre avec le personnel administratif de l'agence	Techniciens  Secrétaires  Opérateur et analyste en informatique  Secrétaire générale	M <sup>me</sup> Nadine Desjardins M. Nicolas Lacroix M <sup>me</sup> Danielle Maheux  M <sup>me</sup> Hélène Arsenault M <sup>me</sup> Gina Larouche M. Jean-François Bélanger M. André Boucher  M <sup>me</sup> Nathalie Savard
12h00 à 13h00	<i>Dîner sur place (repas chauds)</i>	<i>Membres du comité de visite :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Président</i></li> <li>• <i>Experte</i></li> <li>• <i>Secrétaire</i></li> </ul> <i>Membres de la Commission et du comité de régie interne :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Présidente</i></li> <li>• <i>Commissaires</i></li> </ul>	<i>M. Bruno Curvale M<sup>me</sup> Hélène Lamicq M. Ronny Heintze  M<sup>me</sup> Céline Durand M. Benoît Dubreuil M. John Keyes M<sup>me</sup> Sylvie Poiret</i>

		<i>Secrétaire générale</i>  <i>Accompagnatrice de la Commission :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>agente de recherche</i></li> </ul>	<i>M<sup>me</sup> Nathalie Savard</i>  <i>M<sup>me</sup> Claudia Pilote</i>
13h00 à 13h30	Rencontre de travail	Membres du comité de visite	
13h30 à 14h45	Rencontre avec des représentants du Ministère de l'Éducation et de l'Enseignement supérieur	Personnel de la Direction générale de l'enseignement collégial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directeur de la planification de l'offre et de la formation continue et représentant désigné au nom de la sous-ministre</li> <li>• Directeur de l'enseignement collégial par intérim</li> <li>• Directeur des programmes de formation technique par intérim</li> <li>• Professionnelle à la Direction de la conformité de l'enseignement privé</li> </ul>	M. Jean-Pierre Forgues  M. Raymond Boulanger  M. Ronald Bisson  M <sup>me</sup> Marianne Jolicoeur
15h00 à 16h00	Rencontre avec des représentants de comités de visite formés par l'agence	Experts membres des comités de visite : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Directrice des études à la retraite du Cégep Garneau (SAQC, évaluation de programme 2005-2008)</li> <li>• Adjointe à la direction des études, CNDP (SAQC)</li> <li>• Professeur à la retraite du Cégep Sainte-Foy (SAQC, application PIEA)</li> <li>• Conseillère pédagogique, Cégep de Sainte-Foy (SAQC, application PIEA)</li> <li>• Adjoint à la direction des études au Cégep de Lévis-Lauzon (SAQC, application PIEA, efficacité des plans stratégiques)</li> <li>• Adjointe à la direction des études au Collège Mérici (SAQC, efficacité des plans de réussite)</li> </ul>	M <sup>me</sup> Danielle Malboeuf  M <sup>me</sup> Odette Napert  M. Louis Pilote  M <sup>me</sup> Lucie-Marie Magnan  M. Jean Gaudreau  M <sup>me</sup> Luce Poulin
16h00 à 18h00	Rencontre de travail	Membres du comité de visite	
18h00 à 20h00	Souper au restaurant	Membres du comité de visite	



<b>Jour 3 - 16 juin – Québec</b>			
8h30 à 9h30	Rencontre avec le personnel professionnel de l'agence	Coordonnatrices (3)  Agentes de recherche (7)  Agente d'information	M <sup>me</sup> Katie Bérubé M <sup>me</sup> Johanne Cloutier M <sup>me</sup> Nathalie Thibault M <sup>me</sup> Evelyne Drouin M <sup>me</sup> Isabelle Drouin M <sup>me</sup> Claudia Martinez M <sup>me</sup> Alla Mitriashkina M <sup>me</sup> Marie Paré M <sup>me</sup> Claudia Pilote M <sup>me</sup> Anne-Marie Soulard  M <sup>me</sup> Marie-Alexandra Fortin
9h45 à 10h45	Rencontre avec des membres du personnel professionnel de l'agence ayant une expérience dans les évaluations de programmes	Coordonnatrices (3)  Agentes (3)	M <sup>me</sup> Katie Bérubé M <sup>me</sup> Johanne Cloutier M <sup>me</sup> Nathalie Thibault  M <sup>me</sup> Marie Paré M <sup>me</sup> Claudia Pilote M <sup>me</sup> Alla Mitriashkina
11h00 à 11h30	Retour avec des membres de l'agence (au besoin)	Personnel à déterminer selon la nature des besoins	
11h30 à 12h30	Retour avec le conseil de l'agence	Membres de la Commission et du comité de régie interne : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Présidente</li> <li>• Commissaires</li> </ul> Greffière de la Commission et secrétaire du comité de régie : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secrétaire générale</li> </ul>	M <sup>me</sup> Céline Durand M. Benoît Dubreuil M. John Keyes M <sup>me</sup> Sylvie Poiret  M <sup>me</sup> Nathalie Savard
12h30 à 14 h00	Dîner au restaurant	<i>Membres du comité de visite :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Président</i></li> <li>• <i>Experte</i></li> <li>• <i>Secrétaire</i></li> </ul> <i>Membres de la Commission et du comité de régie interne :</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Présidente</i></li> <li>• <i>Commissaires</i></li> </ul> <i>Secrétaire générale</i>	<i>M. Bruno Curvale</i> <i>M<sup>me</sup> Hélène Lamicq</i> <i>M. Ronny Heintze</i>  <i>M<sup>me</sup> Céline Durand</i> <i>M. Benoît Dubreuil</i> <i>M. John Keyes</i> <i>M<sup>me</sup> Sylvie Poiret</i>  <i>M<sup>me</sup> Nathalie Savard</i>
14h00 à 16h00	Rencontre de travail	Membres du comité de visite	
18h00 à 20h00	Souper au restaurant	Membres du comité de visite	
<b>Jour 4 - 17 juin – départ à la maison</b>			

## **ANNEX B – Members of the Review Panel**

- Bruno Curvale, Research engineer, Senior project manager at *Centre international d'études pédagogiques* (CIEP), France. Former president of ENQA. (Chair)
- Hélène Lamicq, former Rector of the *University Paris 12*, France. (Expert)
- Ronny Heintze, Senior-Consultant, Commissioner for International Affairs, *Agency for Quality Assurance through Accreditation of Study Programmes* (AQAS), Germany. (Secretary)