



Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Academic Programs

PURPOSE & OBJECTIVES

- 1.1 Centennial College is a private college located in Montreal. The College aims to provide a successful educational experience for students who have diverse learning needs. Its mission is to develop autonomous resilient learners through collaboration and innovation. In order to achieve this mission, the College has adopted the philosophical framework of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). UDL is an educational framework based on research in the learning sciences that guides the development of flexible learning environments that can accommodate individual learning differences. UDL is intended to increase access to learning by reducing physical, cognitive, intellectual, and organizational barriers to learning.
- 1.2 Given its mission, Centennial views program evaluation as a critical mechanism in managing and developing the programs it is offering as well as supporting the unique intellectual, emotional and psychological needs of the students it serves. This policy specifically seeks to:
 - 1.2.1 Make program evaluation an ongoing and integral component of a dynamic planning and review process which builds a shared community knowledge about program delivery and outcomes;
 - 1.2.2 Present a framework of principles and procedures for conducting program evaluation that informs and supports ongoing curriculum decisions;
 - 1.2.3 Establish and maintain effective methods of management and modes of organization and communication in order to ensure the coordination and proper functioning of the program;
 - 1.2.4 Foster a culture of constant improvement measuring performance of various kinds, and provide assurance that they are in conformity with ministerial and

institutional regulations, goals and objectives and meet predetermined standards of quality;

1.2.5 Identify professional development needs of the faculty and professional staff that may be required to support and maintain the quality of the Social Science program;

1.2.6 Assist in facilitating a smoother transition when there is staff turnover.

2. EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

The following principles provide guidelines to ensure that the program evaluation process is practical, balanced, ethical and fair. Specifically, the goal is to:

2.1 Describe the ways in which the program's mission, goals and objectives are consistent with and aligned with the goals of the College;

2.2 Complete a comprehensive evaluation that covers both the specific education component and the general education component. The evaluation of the general education component shall include (a) how the general education courses adapt to and enhance the program courses; (b) how the general education objectives are integrated into the comprehensive assessment; (c) how the general education component contributes to achieving overall program goals and objectives;

2.3 Create a highly credible, independent and transparent process;

2.4 Confine the process to one which is technically and administratively reasonable;

2.5 Conduct the process in an ethical way including the responsible handling of confidential information;

2.6 Use multiple measures and procedures for gathering, analyzing, and interpreting comprehensive sets of quantitative as well as qualitative data;

2.7 Produce a process that is complete and fair in its examination and recording of strengths and weaknesses of the program being evaluated, so that strengths can be built upon and problem areas addressed.

3. PROCEDURES

Program evaluation at Centennial College will be done on an ongoing basis. This will foster an atmosphere of ongoing communication and continuous improvement.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA & SOURCES OF DATA

Centennial College will evaluate the Social Science Program based on the criteria listed below. For each criterion, the goal is to identify program strengths and to address areas needing improvement. Each evaluation criteria is outlined below as well as the sources of data.

- 4.1 Program Relevance
- 4.2 Program Coherence
- 4.3 Program Effectiveness
- 4.4 Value of Teaching Methods
- 4.5 Value of Student Supervision
- 4.6 Alignment of human, Financial and material resources
- 4.7 Quality of Program Management

4.1 Program Relevance

4.1.1 Objectives, standards and content are aligned with needs of universities and society.

4.1.1.1 The Program Exit profile is aligned with the skills identified by employers and universities as essential for success in higher education and integration into the work force. The Exit profile is a summary of the competencies and skills a graduate from the program will have acquired upon completion of their Program.

4.1.1.2 Course objectives, content, and skills taught in all courses are aligned with the Program Exit Profile.

4.1.1.3 The Experiential Activities included in all courses are perceived as relevant by students. Student perception of the experiential learning activities is solicited and collected in each course.

4.1.2 Students see the relevance of the program and preparing for future studies.

4.1.2.1 Centennial graduates will be asked for their feedback on the relevance of the program through a semi-structured phone interview.

4.1.2.2 Student perception on the relevance of the curriculum will be collected through the data obtained from course evaluations.

4.2 Program Coherence

4.2.1 Objectives, content and assessments in the Program represent the competencies to be acquired.

4.2.1.1 All course objectives are aligned with the ministry requirements and all course assessments are aligned with course objectives. This process is reviewed at the beginning of each semester in a meeting with the instructor and the Academic Dean.

4.2.1.2 Course tests, exams, instructions for assignments, and grading rubrics are collected and reviewed at the end of each semester by The Universal Design Committee (UDL Committee). This committee evaluates the degree to which the course objectives align with the course assessments.

4.2.2 Varied learning activities are used in the program.

4.2.2.1 Learning activities are connected to the objectives of each course and are varied to create greater access to the course content.

4.2.3 Learning activities are organized in a sequential and logical fashion to facilitate acquiring the course objectives and program objectives.

4.2.3.1 Course objectives and assessments are designed to demonstrate the sequential trajectory students must follow to attain program objectives.

4.2.3.2 The level of cognitive complexity increases as a student progresses through the program. The linear progression of the competencies acquired by the students as they progress through the program is intentional.

4.2.3.3 The Program Approach is designed into the curriculum. Common themes have been identified and designed into the courses and assessments in collaboration with other instructors in order to increase the relevance, coherence and quality of learning in the program.

4.2.4 Course requirements related to each learning activity and assessment are clear and realistic.

4.2.4.1 The UDL Curriculum Committee determines that the objectives, learning activities and assessments in the courses are aligned and are appropriately weighted.

4.2.4.2 Multiple sections of each course are aligned on objectives and assessments (horizontal Alignment).

4.3 Program Effectiveness

4.3.1 Student recruitment and selection measures are effective in admitting college candidates.

4.3.1.1 Admissions procedures will be evaluated.

4.3.2 Student integration measures are effective in admitting students who will be successful in the program.

4.3.2.1 Integration services and student supports will be evaluated.

4.3.3 Course success rates are satisfactory.

4.3.3.1 Data on course success rates will be collected.

4.3.3.2 Courses with high failure rates will be analyzed.

4.3.4 A satisfactory number of students complete the program in a reasonable time.

4.3.4.1 Data on the number of semesters required before graduation for Cohorts A and B students will be collected.

4.4 Value of teaching Methods

4.4.1 Teaching methods and learning activities are aligned with program and course objectives and take into account the diverse learning styles of the student population.

4.4.1.1 The UDL committee will assess whether teaching methods in the courses are varied and support the course objectives.

4.4.1.2 Student perception of the value of the teaching methods will be extracted from the course evaluations.

4.4.2 The availability of faculty is sufficient to meet the needs of students
Faculty availability is centered in a program called C-space. Student satisfaction with C-space and faculty availability will be evaluated through course evaluations.

Each Course includes a mandatory additional one hour period called C-Space. This is a working period that counts towards a student's final grade. The purpose of C-Space is to provide opportunity for students to actively work with course content and ask questions under the guidance of their teachers and a learning specialist. Teachers use this time to design activities that help students engage in course material and learn the skills to complete the requirements of the course. The

learning specialist documents the activities occurring in the C-Space as well as the students who are struggling and require further support. This service supports the entire student population.

4.5 Value of Student Supervision

4.5.1 Student support measures and screening measures to identify at risk students will be evaluated. This includes:

- C-Spaces
- Weekly Student Success Follow-up meetings
- Workshops
- Academic Advising
- University and transfer advising
- Student teacher meetings with or without parent presence
- Drop-ins or check ins
- Level 2 tutoring services
- Accommodations

4.5.1.1 Support Services will be evaluated by the support team, administration, teachers and students to determine their effectiveness.

4.6 Alignment of human, financial and material resources

4.6.1 The number of qualified faculty is sufficient to meet the needs of the program and the learning activities.

4.6.1.1 Student teacher ratio will be collected.

4.6.2 Qualifications of staff are sufficient to meet the needs of the program.

4.6.2.1 Analysis of teachers' background and qualification to teach the courses they are assigned is evaluated.

4.6.3 Motivation and skills of the faculty is maintained and developed through clearly defined evaluation procedures and professional development activities.

4.6.3.1 All Professional development activities will be collected and analyzed.

4.6.3.2 Faculty feedback on professional development needs will be solicited.

4.6.3.3 Faculty motivation will be examined through the quality of the planning materials submitted to the administration and the extent to which faculty meet outlined expectations.

4.6.3.4 Teacher motivation and skills will be examined through course evaluations.

4.6.3.5 Instructors will complete a self-assessment survey regarding their teaching effectiveness at the end of each semester.

4.6.4 Teaching facilities, classrooms, equipment and other material resources are adequate in terms of quality, quantity and accessibility.

4.6.4.1 Information will be collected through a survey of administration, faculty, support staff, and students.

4.6.5 Financial resources are sufficient to ensure the proper functioning of the programs.

4.6.5.1 Business office will provide data about financial resources and their effectiveness.

4.7 Quality of program management

4.7.1 The organizational structure, methods of management and means of communication are well articulated and promote proper functioning of the program and the program approach.

4.7.1.1 Data will be collected from the administration, faculty and support staff.

4.7.2 Clearly defined procedures using valid quantitative and qualitative data facilitate regular assessment of the strengths and deficiencies of the program.

4.7.2.1 Data will be collected from the administration, faculty and support staff about the communication and sharing of data and its use in identifying strengths and areas of improvement of the program.

4.7.3 The implementation of the IPESA is effective.

4.7.3.1 Evaluation of how IPESA is known and adhered to at the college will be solicited from faculty, students and support staff.

5. STAKEHOLDERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The task of planning and delivering academic programs involves partnerships and collaboration at multiple levels of the institution. Below is a list of stakeholders who have a vested interest in what will be learned from an evaluation and what will be done with the information.

The persons or structures involved in the evaluation include:

- Board of Governors
- Director General
- Academic Dean
- College Council

- UDL Committee
- Faculty
- Students

5.1 The Board of Governors

The Board of Governors is responsible for the ultimate approval of the Evaluation Report.

5.2 Director General

The Director General is responsible for the execution of all educational and administrative policies at the College, and is therefore the individual responsible for the administration of the college's programs of study. Regarding program evaluation, the Director General is specifically responsible for:

- 5.2.1 Carrying out the decisions of the Board of Governors concerning the Policy for the Evaluation of Program
- 5.2.2 Ensuring that the Policy is instituted and applied.
- 5.2.3 Integrating program evaluation into the overall strategic priorities of the College.
- 5.2.4 Appoint a person responsible for writing the program evaluation report.
- 5.2.5 Ensuring that sufficient human and financial resources are available for implementing the evaluation policy.

5.3 Academic Dean

The Academic Dean is responsible for program assessment, development and evaluation. The Academic Dean is therefore responsible for the overall enhancement of the quality of the College's academic programs and the effective functioning of the UDL committee and the College Council.

- 5.3.1 Oversees the application of the Institutional Policy of the Evaluations of Programs (IPEP - French PIEP) and fulfills the following responsibilities:
- 5.3.2 Chairs the UDL committee.
- 5.3.3 Clarifies the operational evaluation schedule and the breakdown of evaluation tasks.
- 5.3.4 Ensures that the college council and UDL Committee have all the materials and resources necessary to make recommendations.
- 5.3.5 Clarifies the choice of the instruments for the collection of data and verifies the validity and the reliability of the procedures.
- 5.3.6 Ensures the collection, analysis and interpretation of the relevant statistics and indicators from multiple sources.
- 5.3.7 Guarantees that collection of data respects the rights and privacy of the individuals involved.
- 5.3.8 Oversees the drafting of the program evaluation report and the executive summary of the report.
- 5.3.9 Submits the final draft to the UDL committee, College council and Board of Directors for approval.

- 5.3.10 Ensures that the planned actions described in the evaluation report and recommendations are implemented.

5.4 College Council

The College council is the chief consulting body for all policies and procedures at the college. This committee is comprised of two teaching staff, two members of the Student Success Team, two student representatives and the Academic Dean. Its responsibilities are to:

- 5.4.1 Consult on the development, implementation or modification of college policies and procedures.
- 5.4.2 Review official documents such as the Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA), The Code of Conduct and the Program Evaluation Policy (IPEP).
- 5.4.3 Communicate to the faculty and/or student body on changes in policy and their potential impact on the individuals involved.

5.5 Universal Design for Learning Committee (UDL)

The UDL committee is the chief consulting body for the methodology, data collection and data analysis for Program evaluation. The committee is comprised of teachers and the Academic Dean. It:

- 5.5.1 Ensures IPESA is implemented and reviewed.
- 5.5.2 Taking the necessary decisions to ensure the quality of academic programs.
- 5.5.3 Makes recommendations necessary to ensure periodic evaluation of the quality of the academic programs of the College.
- 5.5.4 Approves the tools and sources for collecting data.
- 5.5.5 Analyze and interpret the necessary qualitative and quantitative data.
- 5.5.6 Formulates recommendations and proposes the actions to be undertaken based on the analysis of the data.
- 5.5.7 Reviews and approves the self-evaluation report when the program evaluation has been carried out.

6. STRUCTURE OF THE FINAL REPORT

- a. Table of contents
- b. An Executive summary
- c. Composition of the UDL committee
- d. A description of the program evaluated
- e. A description of the aims, objectives and scope of the evaluation
- f. A detailed description of the evaluation master plan
- g. The evaluative text including the evidence collected and the interpretations and findings as well as the justification for the conclusions that were made.

- h. The recommendations for improving the quality of the program and the analysis based on the collected data
- i. Appendices of a) tables, graphs, etc. b) sample questionnaires and evaluation tools, c) relevant policies and documents

5. THE DRAFTING PROCESS

- a. The final report will be written by the Academic Dean in cooperation with the UDL committee as the draft is being formulated.
- b. When the final draft report is complete, it will be approved by the UDL committee
- c. The final draft will be shared with the Director General and Administration
- d. The final draft will be shared with the entire faculty
- e. The final draft will be reviewed by College Council
- f. The final draft will be sent to the board for an official resolution
- g. The Final version along with the resolution will be sent to the CEEC by the Academic Dean on behalf of the college.

6. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

- a. Program evaluation will be done on an ongoing basis by selecting 4-5 courses per semester to examine. These courses are selected based on the Program Progression Grid. The curriculum review cycle takes two years to complete.
- b. The UDL committee will review the data for each criterion at the end of each semester.
- c. A summary of the data will highlight areas of strengths and areas that need improvement. If immediate changes need to be made, these changes will be outlined and brought to the attention of the Administration.
- d. The semester report will be shared with the faculty, College Council and the Board of Directors.
- e. Every two years, a report will be drafted analyzing and summarizing the combined data of the four previous semesters.

7. POLICY REVIEW

The Institutional Policy for the evaluation of Program shall be reviewed by the UDL Committee at least once every two years. This review will serve to:

- a. Ensure that the procedures of implementation conform to the specifications of the policy
- b. Consider modifications to the policy based on the current experience in program evaluations and based on the needs of the college
- c. Improve the rigor and efficiency of the Policy
- d. Clarify any elements of the policy or add other elements considered necessary