



INSTITUTIONAL POLICY ON THE MANAGEMENT OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS



This policy was adopted for the first time by Board of Governors resolution number 2883 on March 20, 2015.

Table of Contents

Preamble	1
Article 1 FOUNDATIONS OF THE POLICY	2
1.1 Purpose and Objectives	2
1.2 Application and Scope.....	2
1.3 Guiding Principles and Orientations	3
1.4 The Distinctive Nature of AEC Programs.....	3
1.5 Program Management Procedures.....	3
1.6 Planning for Program Management Activities	3
1.6.1 Regular Day Sector	3
1.6.2 Continuing Education	3
1.7 Reporting on Program Management Activities.....	4
1.7.1 DEC programs	4
1.7.2 AEC programs	4
1.8 The Program Management Cycle.....	5
Article 2 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	6
2.1 Developing a New DEC Program or Option in the Regular Day Sector	6
2.1.1 Feasibility and rationale	6
2.1.2 Ministry authorization & notifications	6
2.1.3 Determining the contributing disciplines	6
2.1.4 Developing a program framework.....	7
2.1.5 Additional requirements for program approval	7
2.1.6 Obtaining approval for a new program or option	7
2.1.7 Validating the program with the Ministry	8
2.1.8 Developing an implementation plan	8
2.1.9 Timelines for development.....	8
2.2 Developing a New Profile within an Existing DEC Program	8
2.3 Developing a New AEC Program	9
2.3.1 Feasibility and rationale	9
2.3.2 Developing a program framework for an AEC.....	9
2.3.3 Acquiring a program code	10
2.3.4 Obtaining approval for a new AEC.....	10
Article 3 PROGRAM LAUNCH	11
3.1 Launching a New DEC Program, Option or Profile in the Regular Day Sector	11
3.2 Launching a New AEC Program	11
Article 4 PROGRAM MONITORING	11
4.1 Monitoring DEC Programs in the Regular Day Sector	11
4.1.1 Monitoring within General Education	12
4.2 Monitoring AEC Programs.....	12

Article 5	PROGRAM EVALUATION.....	12
5.1	Evaluating DEC Programs Offered in the Regular Day Sector	12
5.1.1	Conducting focused evaluations.....	12
5.1.2	Synthesis reports	13
5.1.3	Approval of the synthesis report	13
5.2	Evaluating AEC Programs	13
5.2.1	Conducting program evaluations for AECs	14
5.2.2	Reporting on AEC program evaluations.....	14
5.2.3	Approval of the AEC program evaluation report	14
5.3	Program Evaluation Criteria and Sub-criteria for DEC and AEC Programs	14
5.3.1	Program relevance	15
5.3.2	Program coherence	15
5.3.3	Program effectiveness.....	15
5.3.4	Quality of teaching methods and student support.....	15
5.3.5	Adequacy of human, material, and financial resources	15
5.3.6	Quality of program management	16
Article 6	PROGRAM REVISIONS	16
6.1	Revisions to DEC Programs in the Regular Day Sector	16
6.1.1	Ministry validation.....	17
6.1.2	Proposing revisions.....	17
6.1.3	Approval of proposed revisions to a DEC program.....	17
6.1.4	Implementing approved revisions.....	17
6.2	Revisions to AEC Programs	18
6.2.1	Proposing revisions to an AEC program.....	18
6.2.2	Approval of proposed revisions to an AEC program.....	18
Article 7	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM.....	18
7.1	Content Areas	19
Article 8	IMPLEMENTATION AND APPLICATION OF THE POLICY.....	19
8.1	Dissemination	19
Article 9	EVALUATION OF THE POLICY	19
9.1	Evaluation at the End of the Implementation Period	19
9.2	Evaluation of the Policy Text.....	20
9.3	Evaluation of the Application of the Policy.....	20
9.4	Annual Monitoring.....	20
9.5	Circumstances Leading to an Unscheduled Evaluation.....	20
Article 10	REVISIONS TO THE POLICY	21
10.1	External Factors	21
10.2	Internal Factors	21

Article 11 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.....	21
11.1 Board of Governors.....	21
11.2 Campus Director	22
11.3 Commission of Studies.....	23
11.4 Department.....	23
11.5 Designated Academic Administrator (DAA).....	23
11.5.1 Regular Day Sector	23
11.5.2 Continuing Education Sector	24
11.6 Director of Studies	25
11.7 Director of Studies' Office.....	26
11.8 Information Technology Services.....	26
11.9 Local Academic Advisory Council or Pedagogical Committee	26
11.10 Program Committee in the Regular Day Sector	27
Article 12 DEFINITIONS	28
EXTERNAL REFERENCE DOCUMENTS.....	31

PREAMBLE

The *Institutional Policy on the Management of Academic Programs* is a reflection of Champlain Regional College's ongoing commitment to offering programs of the highest quality to students. It offers an effective way of managing academic programs by providing an integrated approach to program development, evaluation, and revision including the facilitation of ongoing monitoring of established programs.

The Policy takes a comprehensive view of program management, defining it as:

The coordinated management of all aspects of academic programs, individually and collectively, throughout their life cycles. It encompasses the initial planning, development, and launch of new or substantially revised programs as well as the monitoring, evaluation, and revision of established programs. Program management is a collective endeavour, with specific responsibilities assigned to different College authorities and stakeholder groups.

For programs, the application of this policy will increase the ability to gain up-to-date portraits of program health and allow for a more timely and efficient response to opportunities and challenges. The introduction of an *annual focused approach* to program evaluation will spread the process of evaluation over a six-year cycle.

For the College, the concerted efforts of all stakeholders in managing the quality of academic programs will ensure the ability to successfully carry out its educational vision and mission: *"...offering students unique and innovative high-quality programs and services, graduating students who are recognized for the excellence of knowledge and skills they have acquired, attracting and retaining outstanding faculty and staff, and being a learning-centred college."*

ARTICLE 1 FOUNDATIONS OF THE POLICY

1.1 Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this policy is to define the context, principles, and goals that govern the way Champlain Regional College assumes its responsibility with respect to the management of academic programs. It provides faculty, staff, and management with a common framework and shared vocabulary in addressing all aspects of program management.

The objectives of this policy are to assure:

- The quality of academic programs and their management;
- Continuous improvement of academic programs and their management;
- Timely response to changing academic program needs or emerging opportunities and challenges;
- Stakeholders involved in the stages of the management of academic programs are clear about their roles and responsibilities;
- Effective implementation and application of the program approach;
- Consistency and coherence across the College in approaches to program management while taking into account local campus needs.

1.2 Application and Scope

The *Institutional Policy on the Management of Academic Programs* applies to all stages of program management for the academic programs offered at Champlain Regional College that lead to either a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) or an Attestation of College Studies (AEC).

This policy supersedes and replaces the following institutional policies: *Policy for the Evaluation of Programs Leading to a Diploma of College Studies*, *Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Programs Leading to an Attestation of Studies (A.E.C.)*, and *Policy on the Revision of Academic Programs Leading to a D.E.C.*

Program management at Champlain Regional College is carried out within the framework set by the provisions of the [General and Vocational Colleges Act](#) (*Loi sur les collèges d'enseignement général et professionnel*), the [College Education Regulations](#) (*Règlement sur le régime des études collégiales*), the collective agreements (*Fédération des enseignantes et enseignants de cégep* [FEC], *Fédération nationale des enseignantes et enseignants du Québec* [FNEEQ]), and the *Protocol d'entente entre les Cégeps concernant la gestion des programmes menant à une Attestation d'Études Collégiales* (AEC).

Certain aspects of program management are governed by relevant College bylaws and policies in the application of this policy. These include the *Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement* (IPESA), *Bylaw Concerning Students' Admission to DEC and AEC Programs* (Bylaw 7), and *Bylaw Concerning Student Success* (Bylaw 8).

The application of this policy is under the joint responsibility of the Director of Studies and the Campus Directors. Campus Directors can delegate the responsibility of ensuring the application of given articles of the Policy to a designated academic administrator (DAA) at their campus.

1.3 Guiding Principles and Orientations

This policy is based on the following set of guiding principles and orientations:

- A concern for fostering student success and student development are at the core of efforts to ensure quality and continuous improvement within all academic programs offered at the College;
- As a learning-centered college, Champlain takes a self-regulating approach to program management, based on ongoing monitoring and self-reflection;
- The program approach entails the active engagement of all stakeholders associated with a program;
- General Education plays an essential role in contributing to the richness and quality of education offered to students;
- All aspects of program management, from program development through to program evaluation and revision, require the responsible and effective use of human, physical, environmental, and financial resources.

1.4 The Distinctive Nature of AEC Programs

The management of academic programs must take into account the distinctive nature and context of AEC programs. For example, AEC programs must respond rapidly to the labour market and range in mode and length of delivery. AEC programs are also most often developed by the College, unlike DEC programs which are developed by the Ministry.

1.5 Program Management Procedures

Each campus, under the responsibility of the Campus Director, will establish their own procedures to fulfil the requirements of this policy. The Director of Studies' Office (DSO) will work collaboratively with each campus to assist in the development of guidelines and tools that will support the application of local procedures to aspects of this policy.

1.6 Planning for Program Management Activities

At the campus level, the Campus Director will develop an annual calendar of program management activities in collaboration with the Director of Studies. The program management calendar will take into consideration the institutional strategic plan, information on program health, annual reports from the prior year, action plans for the upcoming year from program committees, former evaluation reports, and any other information deemed necessary for program management planning.

1.6.1 Regular Day Sector

At the program level, each program committee will prepare an annual action plan to be submitted to the DAA(s) for validation.

1.6.2 Continuing Education

For AEC programs, the annual action plan will be developed by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education and submitted to the Campus Director.

1.7 Reporting on Program Management Activities

The Director of Studies' Office will develop guidelines to assist in the development of the program annual report.

1.7.1 DEC programs

A program annual report will be prepared by the Program Committee and submitted to the DAA(s) for approval. The program annual report will include the results of program management activities that were undertaken during the year.

Program annual reports are distinct from department annual reports. Annual reports from departments, including General Education, do not include program-specific data.

The DAA(s) will ensure that program annual reports are submitted to the Campus Director and the Director of Studies.

1.7.2 AEC programs

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education will ensure that an annual report on program management is submitted to the Campus Director and the Director of Studies.

1.8 The Program Management Cycle

Program management can be thought of as cyclical in nature, moving iteratively through a series of stages during the lifespan of the program (see Figure 1). The starting point for any new program is *development* (Article 2): the stage of program management during which the program is initially proposed, designed, approved by the Board of Governors, and prepared for delivery, e.g., development of marketing and recruitment materials, development of generic course plans, formalization of the program in the Ministry's information system (SOBEC).




Figure 1. Program management cycle

Once the program has been developed, it then moves into the *launch* stage (Article 3). This encompasses the period of time in which the program is initially delivered (e.g., once the students have been registered and most of the preparatory work has been completed). Throughout the program launch period, information is gathered and a follow-up is conducted to ensure the effectiveness of choices made during the development stage.

At the conclusion of the launch stage, a program enters a phase of on-going delivery and is considered to be an established program during which three interrelated kinds of program management activities gain prominence: *program monitoring* (Article 4), *program evaluation* (Article 5), and *revision* (Article 6).

Program monitoring involves the on-going review of data that provides a portrait of the program's health. Program evaluation involves the examination of the program in terms of the criteria identified in this policy (Article 5.3) and, optionally, specific issues identified by either the Program Committee or the Departments. Revisions involve modifications to the program in order to improve its educational effectiveness. The impetus for program revision can be either internal (e.g., results of annual monitoring, or program evaluation) or external (e.g., Ministry direction, changes in the labour market).

Central to all aspects of the program management cycle is a concern with both *quality assurance* and *continuous improvement*. All stages of the program management cycle require the participation of all stakeholders, first and foremost faculty and students, and also management and staff, working together in a climate of trust and respect.

ARTICLE 2 PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

The development of a new academic program consists of a set of activities and procedures that lead to its design, its courses, and to the learning activities that are based on the competencies prescribed by either the Ministry or the College, and written in the form of objectives and standards. The impetus for development may be either external or internal and may involve the development of an entirely new DEC or AEC program, a new DEC option, or a new DEC profile.

2.1 Developing a New DEC Program or Option in the Regular Day Sector

2.1.1 Feasibility and rationale

The development of a new program or option begins with a preliminary assessment to determine the feasibility and potential need for the program to be developed. Before proceeding to the development stage, a brief report on the feasibility and rationale for offering the program or option is submitted by the Campus Director to the Director of Studies for approval. This report should be produced in consultation with relevant professionals, support staff, faculty, and management.

Upon approval, the Director of Studies will notify the Commission of Studies and the Board of Governors of the project, and the DAA(s) will notify the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee.

2.1.2 Ministry authorization & notifications

Requests for authorization will be submitted according to Ministry policies and procedures in force at the time. The Campus Director is responsible for preparing all requests for authorization to deliver a new program or option for submission by the Director of Studies to the Board of Governors, regional tables, and the Ministry.

When official confirmation is received from the Ministry that a particular campus of Champlain Regional College is authorized to provide a new DEC program or option, the major stakeholders must be notified in a timely fashion. At the College level, the Director of Studies will immediately inform the Campus Director and the DAA(s) responsible for DEC programs. The Director of Studies will also notify the Commission of Studies and the Board of Governors.

2.1.3 Determining the contributing disciplines

Prior to the existence of a program committee, the DAA(s) will ensure that a determination is made of the academic departments that will contribute to the delivery of the program. The DAA(s) must utilize a procedure that provides all departments wishing to contribute to the program with the opportunity to present their reasons for doing so.

In the event that a dispute arises with regard to the allocation of disciplines, the Campus Director ensures that a fair and timely process is used to resolve the dispute. The Campus Director, in collaboration with Director of Studies, will make the final decision in resolving the dispute.

2.1.4 Developing a program framework

The program framework is the official reference description of the program. It contains several components that together officially describe and define the program's structure. Once the program is approved by the College (Article 2.1.6) the program framework is kept up to date and housed within the program management information system at each campus location (Article 7).

The program framework must include the following elements:

- An overview of Ministry specifications, program goals, General Education components, program-specific components, program duration, and admission requirements;
- A section that describes the local orientations for the program;
- A flowchart showing the sequencing of competency attainment;
- Course grids showing the General Education and program-specific courses by semester, including, course weightings, credits, and hours;
- Pre-requisites or co-requisites;
- The exit profile which describes the outcomes that students will be able to demonstrate upon graduation;
- A correspondence table linking the competencies and their corresponding courses. (The distribution of competencies should not be spread across too many courses.);
- A correspondence table showing the courses and the competencies they will cover, including an indication of whether the course fully or partially covers the competency;
- Course descriptions;
- A preliminary description of the comprehensive assessment.¹

2.1.5 Additional requirements for program approval

The following information must also accompany the program framework as part of the program's approval process:

- The rationale for developing the new program;
- A description of the development process that was followed and an overview of the stakeholders and members of committees involved;
- Enrolment projections for the first three years;
- Preliminary estimates of financial, material, and human resource requirements.

2.1.6 Obtaining approval for a new program or option

The process for obtaining approval of the program will consist of:

¹ The comprehensive assessment is governed by the IPESA (Article 4.1)

- Submission by the Dean to the DAA(s) responsible for registrar services for validation, and then to the Director of Studies for preliminary approval;
- Submission to the contributing departments and Program Committee (for a new option or profile of an existing program) for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission to the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee for consultation;
- Submission to the Commission of Studies for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission to the Board of Governors for discussion and approval.

2.1.7 Validating the program with the Ministry

When the proposed program or option has been approved by the Board of Governors, the Director of Studies submits it to the Ministry for validation during the months of November or April preceding the semester in which the program will be launched.

2.1.8 Developing an implementation plan

For a new DEC program or option the DAA(s) is responsible for ensuring that an implementation plan is developed to ensure that the major stakeholders involved are aware of the tasks to be completed prior to the launch phase.

The implementation plan must be submitted by the DAA(s) to the Campus Director for approval and a copy of the approved plan submitted to the Director of Studies.

2.1.9 Timelines for development

The timeframe to complete the necessary activities related to the development stage is generally between 1.5 - 2 years prior to program launch. The scheduling of development activities must take the following key factors into account:

- The time required to develop the program framework components and assemble other program-specific information requiring approval;
- The time for the program approval process to be completed;
- Timelines for submission to SOBEC;
- The time it takes to develop the implementation plan;
- The timing of publicity for recruitment purposes.

2.2 Developing a New Profile within an Existing DEC Program

Program options and profiles are associated with a particular DEC program. DEC programs and program options are established and authorized by the Ministry, whereas program profiles are created by the College and approved by the Board of Governors.

The process involved in the development of a new profile is similar to that of a new DEC program or option, but with the following exceptions:

- A new profile does not require Ministry authorization (Article 2.1.2);
- The approval process ends at the level of the Commission of Studies (Article 2.1.6) and not the Board of Governors;

- For a new DEC profile, the DAA(s) develops an implementation plan in collaboration with the Program Committee.

2.3 Developing a New AEC Program

In general, AEC programs serve one of three primary purposes:

- Initial technical training for employment in a specific labour market field or subfield;
- Advanced specialized training within a specific labour market field or subfield;
- Technical training to update the skills and knowledge of individuals already employed in a specific labour market field or subfield.

There are two general circumstances in which the development stage takes place for AEC programs: (a) The acquisition of a new AEC program that is not currently offered at the campus, but exists in the college network; and (b) the creation of an entirely new AEC program.

The responsibility for the development of new AEC programs is assumed by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education who may delegate specific development tasks.

2.3.1 Feasibility and rationale

Before proceeding with the development stage, a brief written report on the feasibility and rationale for offering the program is submitted by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the Campus Director and Director of Studies for approval. This report must contain the following elements:

- Description of the labour market need that the program will address, including (a) the labour market field or subfield, and (b) the educational purpose/type of training needed (initial training, advanced specialization, or technical updating);
- Identification of any existing AEC programs within the college network that could address the identified need and be acquired by the College;
- If a completely new AEC program must be created, an indication of whether the program will be developed independently or in collaboration with other colleges, and the reasons for this choice.

Upon approval of the report, the Director of Studies will notify the Commission of Studies and the Board of Governors of the project, and the DAA(s) for Continuing Education will notify the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee of their intention to develop the new program.

2.3.2 Developing a program framework for an AEC

The program framework contains the documents that are used to describe and define the structure of the program. Once approved, the program framework becomes the official reference description for the program throughout its lifecycle and is housed within the program management information system at each campus location ([Article 7](#)).

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education ensures that a program framework is developed and proposed to the Board of Governors for approval. The program framework for a new AEC should include the following elements:

- A rationale for developing the program which includes a description of existing programs in the network, the need for the program, key members of the development team, career outlooks for graduates and program-specifics (number of hours and units);
- Identification of the reference DEC (s);
- Targeted clientele;
- The exit profile;
- Admissions requirements;
- Program goals;
- A description of program objectives and standards related to each competency, including the performance criteria for each competency element;
- A flowchart that illustrates the sequencing of competency attainment throughout the program;
- A flowchart that illustrates the sequencing of the courses to be offered in each semester, and the links between each course and their prerequisite(s) if any;
- A correspondence table that includes each of the course titles and codes to be offered, course weightings, contact hours, units, prerequisites and associated competencies;
- A correspondence table that relates each competency to the courses to be offered in the program;
- A full description of each course to be offered which includes course placement within the program, course objectives, course content, instructional methods to be used, and the human and material resource requirements for course delivery.

2.3.3 Acquiring a program code

When the program framework has been developed, the DAA(s) for Continuing Education initiates the request for a program code from the Ministry.

2.3.4 Obtaining approval for a new AEC

The approval process for a new AEC program includes the following:

- Submission of the new program by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the Director of Studies for preliminary approval;
- Submission by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee for consultation;
- Submission by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the Commission of Studies for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission to the Board of Governors for discussion and final approval.

ARTICLE 3 PROGRAM LAUNCH

3.1 Launching a New DEC Program, Option or Profile in the Regular Day Sector

The launch period is two years for pre-university programs, and three years for technical programs. This period begins with the registration of the first cohort of students.

In the first semester during which a new program is launched, the Campus Director is responsible for ensuring that a program committee is established in a manner that is consistent with Article 4-1.0 of the relevant collective agreements (FEC, FNEEQ). The Program Committee oversees the launching of a new program, option or profile.

3.2 Launching a New AEC Program

The launch period for a new AEC program begins with the registration of the first cohort of students entering the program, and ends when the first cohort graduates from the program.

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education oversees the progress of the program launch by identifying challenges that arise and aspects that are going well, while making adjustments that are needed along the way.

ARTICLE 4 PROGRAM MONITORING

Ongoing monitoring refers to the regular review and analysis of key indicators associated with program health. Due to its ongoing nature, annual monitoring will increase the ability of programs to maintain a portrait of program health, identify emergent problems before they become critical, and make adjustments in a more timely fashion. Monitoring activities are particularly important during the launch phase.

Program monitoring enables the identification of emerging issues that:

- Can be addressed rapidly through minor modifications; or
- Can be addressed through a major program revision; or
- Signal the need for further investigation through a focused program evaluation.

4.1 Monitoring DEC Programs in the Regular Day Sector

At a regularly scheduled time in the academic year, the Director of Studies' Office will provide each program committee with monitoring reports related to the following aspects of program health:

- Applications and enrollment;
- Academic performance;
- Retention within the program;
- Graduation from the program;
- Performance on the Ministerial Examination of College English (the English Exit Exam).

Each program committee, in collaboration with the DAA(s), will review the monitoring reports provided by the Director of Studies' Office along with locally acquired information in order to assess the health of the program and identify any potential issues that need to be addressed. Contributing departments may also provide input to the Program Committee regarding the monitoring of program health.

4.1.1 **Monitoring within General Education**

The Director of Studies' Office will provide the departments in General Education with reports to assist in monitoring the health of courses offered within each General Education department. The departments in General Education will submit a report on the results of monitoring activities to the DAA(s) for approval as part of their annual report.

4.2 **Monitoring AEC Programs**

The Director of Studies' Office will provide monitoring reports on each AEC program as the data becomes available. The monitoring reports will include the following aspects of program health:

- Applications and enrollment;
- Academic performance;
- Retention within the program;
- Graduation from the program;

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education in conjunction with the AEC program professors will assess the health of the program and identify any potential issues that need to be addressed.

ARTICLE 5 PROGRAM EVALUATION

5.1 **Evaluating DEC Programs Offered in the Regular Day Sector**

Program evaluations for DEC programs will be carried out using an ongoing, focused approach to evaluation. Each program will undergo an annual focused evaluation of at least one criterion per year² as identified in Article 5.3 of this Policy; over a six-year cycle. Additional criteria or issues may also be examined as identified by the Program Committee or contributing departments.

5.1.1 **Conducting focused evaluations**

All programs must be fully evaluated over a six year cycle. The DAA(s), in collaboration with each program committee, will establish a schedule to ensure that each program is fully evaluated within the maximum timeframe. In the event that extenuating circumstances affect the program's capacity to complete the full evaluation within the 6-year cycle, the program committee will submit an explanation and recommendations to the DAA(s) and the Campus Director. The

² In exceptional circumstances, the DAA(s) upon consultation with the Campus Director and the Director of Studies may decide that it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive program evaluation.

Campus Director and the Director of Studies will then determine an appropriate course of action.

Each year, the DAA(s) and program committee will develop a work plan which identifies the criterion to be evaluated during that year. The work plan will also identify the resources needed, a timeline for completion, and a breakdown of responsibilities. The work plan will be approved by the Campus Director who will ensure that the necessary resources are made available. The results of each focused evaluation will be reported on as part of the program annual report.

Guidelines for conducting focused evaluations will be provided by the Director of Studies' Office and will be pre-approved by the Board of Governors.

5.1.2 Synthesis reports

In the sixth year of the evaluation cycle, each program must produce a brief synthesis report that summarizes how focused evaluation findings have been addressed during the previous five years. Each program committee ensures that the synthesis report is written and submitted to the DAA(s) who will submit it to the Board of Governors for approval. A template for the report will be provided by the Director of Studies' Office.

5.1.3 Approval of the synthesis report

The process for approving the synthesis report is as follows:

- Submission of the report by the DAA(s) to the Campus Director and subsequently, the Director of Studies for preliminary approval;
- For DEC programs in the regular day sector, submission to the program committee and contributing departments for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission to the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee for consultation;
- Submission to the Commission of Studies for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission to the Board of Governors for discussion and approval.

Upon approval by the Board of Governors, the Director of Studies' Office provides the DAA(s) with official copies of the synthesis report. The DAA(s) then ensures that the report is distributed to the program committees, departments, other college staff as required, and to others upon request.

5.2 Evaluating AEC Programs

Given the distinctive nature of AEC programs (Article 1.4), it will not be feasible to carry out annual focused evaluations in the same manner as DEC programs. Therefore, AEC programs will carry out comprehensive program evaluations every four years, or after eight cohorts have completed a given program. The maximum amount of time between evaluations will not exceed six years, unless otherwise approved by the Director of Studies.

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education, in collaboration with the Campus Director, will choose the programs to be evaluated in a given year. The likelihood that the program will be offered again in the next two years should be taken into account when making the decision.

5.2.1 Conducting program evaluations for AECs

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education will ensure that program evaluations are conducted in accordance with the guidelines established by the CEEC³.

In order to facilitate and plan the evaluation process, the Director of Studies' Office will provide evaluation tools, templates, and guidelines to the DAA(s) for Continuing Education.

5.2.2 Reporting on AEC program evaluations

The DAA(s) for Continuing Education prepares an evaluation report which includes the following content areas:

- A brief description of the program, its history, and current status;
- A description of the methodology and the issues addressed in the evaluation;
- An analysis of the relevant data;
- Evaluation results that address the specific evaluation questions and criteria retained for the evaluation;
- A conclusion giving a general appraisal of the program and recommendations deriving from the evaluation. Recommendations must be clearly linked to the evaluation's findings;
- A limited set of appendices required to ensure the transparency of the evaluation;
- An action plan for responding to the recommendations.

5.2.3 Approval of the AEC program evaluation report

The AEC evaluation report must be submitted to the Board of Governors for approval. The process for submitting the evaluation report for approval is as follows:

- Submission of the report by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the Director of Studies for preliminary approval;
- Submission by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee for consultation;
- Submission by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the Commission of Studies for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission to the Board of Governors for final approval.

5.3 Program Evaluation Criteria and Sub-criteria for DEC and AEC Programs

The six (6) criteria and sub-criteria to be used for evaluation purposes are the same for both DEC and AEC programs. Guiding questions, suggested methodologies for data analysis, data collection, and possible data sources are provided in the evaluation guidelines provided by the Director of Studies' Office. The six criteria and sub-criteria are outlined as follows:

³ Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (2010). *Autoévaluation de programmes menant à une attestation d'études collégiales*. Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/publications/GUIDES/Programmes_AEC_2010.pdf

5.3.1 Program relevance

- Program objectives, standards, and content are aligned with the needs and expectations of universities and/or the labour market;
- Program objectives, standards, and content are consistent with the expectations of society;
- Program objectives, standards, and content are consistent with student expectations;

5.3.2 Program coherence

- Program objectives and content clearly define the competencies to be acquired; the standards establish the levels at which these competencies must be mastered in college;
- Programs comprise a set of learning activities that enable the program objectives and standards to be achieved;
- Learning activities (courses) are organized in a logical fashion, and the sequence of learning activities (courses) facilitates the in-depth understanding and synthesis of the elements of program content;
- Requirements related to each learning activity (in-class, laboratory, and personal work) are established in a clear and realistic fashion; these requirements are accurately reflected in course outlines, as well as in the course weightings and the calculation of credits.

5.3.3 Program effectiveness

- Student recruitment, selection and integration measures are effective in admitting college candidates capable of succeeding in the programs;
- Course success rates are satisfactory and comparable to other programs of study and other institutions;
- A satisfactory proportion of students complete the programs within a reasonable timeframe, depending on their enrolment status and characteristics;
- Student evaluation tools and methods used in the programs of study are effective in the evaluation of students' achievement of objectives according to the established standards;
- Graduates meet established standards for the acquisition of skills required by the programs of study.

5.3.4 Quality of teaching methods and student support

- Teaching methods are aligned with both the program objectives and each of the learning activities; teaching methods take student characteristics into account so as to enable them to master the objectives in accordance with the established standards;
- Guidance, support, and follow-up services, as well as screening measures designed to identify at-risk students, facilitate student success;
- The availability of faculty is sufficient to meet the support needs of students.

5.3.5 Adequacy of human, material, and financial resources

- The number of qualified faculty is sufficient, and the respective areas of specialization diversified enough, to meet the objectives of both the programs and the learning activities;

- The number of professional and support staff needed for the program is adequate and their qualifications are sufficient to satisfy the needs of the programs;
- The motivation and skills of faculty and other categories of staff (support, professional, management) are maintained and developed through clearly-defined evaluation procedures and professional development activities;
- Teaching facilities, equipment and other material resources are adequate in terms of quantity, quality and accessibility;
- Financial resources are sufficient to ensure the proper functioning of the programs.

5.3.6 Quality of program management

- The organizational structure, methods of management, and means of communication are well-articulated and promote the proper functioning of the programs of study and a program-based approach;
- Clearly-defined procedures, using valid qualitative and quantitative data, facilitate regular assessment of the strengths and deficiencies of the programs and of each of the learning activities;
- Program descriptions are duly distributed and explained to both faculty and students;
- The implementation of the Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement in the programs is effective.

ARTICLE 6 PROGRAM REVISIONS

Program revisions are sometimes required due to changes in Ministry specifications, the changing needs of prospective employers, or recommendations stemming from annual monitoring or program evaluations. Program revisions must be carried out with careful thought and planning and should take several key factors into consideration. These include such things as organizational, operational, and material resource requirements, timelines, submissions to SOBEC, the integration of IT, and the integration of CSST standards where appropriate.

Program revisions involve modifications to programs that can include such things as, but are not limited to, changing the courses attached to a competency, adjustments to course hours, weightings, objectives, the comprehensive assessment, pre-requisites, co-requisites, or course sequencing.

The program framework must be updated to reflect all modifications that are made to a program and should be easily accessible by all members of the program. The updated program framework must be housed within the program management information system at each campus location ([Article 7](#)).

6.1 Revisions to DEC Programs in the Regular Day Sector

The DAA(s) and program committees play key roles in managing program revisions. Together, they are responsible for: determining whether revisions are necessary, ensuring that they are submitted for approval by the College when necessary, and for their implementation and follow-up.

All program revisions require approval by the Board of Governors with the exception of:

- Changes to course sequencing (approved by the program committee which may consult with the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee, with the agreement of the DAA(s)).
- Changes to course pre-requisites or co-requisites (approved by the program committee which may consult with the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee, with the agreement of the DAA(s)).
- Changes to the comprehensive assessment (approved by the Commission of Studies).

6.1.1 Ministry validation

Submissions to the Ministry involving minor adjustments to a program will be processed in April. Revisions involving a major structural change to a program will be processed in either April or November preceding the semester in which the approved revisions will be implemented.

6.1.2 Proposing revisions

The Program Committee is responsible for ensuring that a revision proposal is prepared for approval, including the following elements:

- A description of each of the proposed changes to be made;
- A rationale for each proposed change;
- An implementation plan which includes timelines, resource requirements, and details about the integration of IT and CSST standards where appropriate;
- An updated program framework (flowcharts, course grids, correspondence tables, course descriptions, etc.).

6.1.3 Approval of proposed revisions to a DEC program

The process for obtaining approval of a revision proposal is as follows:

- Submission by the DAA(s) responsible for the proposed revisions to the DAA responsible for registrarial services for validation;
- Submission by the DAA(s) to the Campus Director and the Director of Studies for preliminary approval;
- Submission by the DAA(s) to the contributing departments and program committee for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission by the DAA(s) to the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee for consultation;
- Submission by the DAA(s) to the Commission of Studies for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission by the Director of Studies to the Board of Governors for discussion and approval.

6.1.4 Implementing approved revisions

The DAA(s), in collaboration with the Program Committee, is responsible for ensuring that program revisions are implemented as approved by the Board of Governors.

The timeframe for the implementation of a revision is two years for pre-university programs and three years for technical programs. The monitoring activities and analysis that occur throughout the implementation period should be reported on as part of the program annual report.

6.2 Revisions to AEC Programs

In recognition of the need for AECs to be able to respond to changes and adjustments in business and industry needs, minor revisions on an ongoing basis are anticipated. This article, therefore, refers to proposed revisions that require approval by various College bodies based on a recommendation by the DAA(s), the Campus Director, and the Director of Studies.

A revision to an AEC program is typically undertaken by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education and/or their delegate who will ensure that the appropriate frameworks provided by the MESRS are followed. Throughout the revision process, the program revision proposal is presented for feedback to faculty currently teaching in the program and at least one expert from a relevant industry.

6.2.1 Proposing revisions to an AEC program

A revision proposal must include the following elements:

- A clear indication of the nature of the adjustment (s) being made;
- A description of each of the proposed changes being made;
- For each proposed change, an explanation of the reasons for the modification;
- Work plan, timelines, and required resources;
- An updated program framework.

6.2.2 Approval of proposed revisions to an AEC program

The approval process for proposed revisions is as follows:

- Submission by the DAA(s) for Continuing Education to the Campus Director and the Director of Studies for preliminary approval;
- Submission by the DAA(s) to the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee for consultation;
- Submission by the DAA(s) to the Commission of Studies for discussion and endorsement;
- Submission by the Director of Studies to the Board of Governors for discussion and approval.

Upon approval by the Board of Governors, the DAA(s) for Continuing Education sends notification of the approval to the Ministry.

ARTICLE 7 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

The College maintains a program management information system as part of its quality assurance system. The program management information system will serve as an important mechanism for

ensuring the effective management of program quality by collecting and storing data and documents essential for making informed decisions at each phase of the program management cycle. Each campus location is responsible for maintaining its information system in collaboration with Information Technology Services and the Director of Studies' Office.

7.1 Content Areas

The program management information system will include but not be restricted to elements pertaining to the following content areas:

- Program information;
- Program action plans and reports;
- Information and data pertaining to program health;
- Information and data pertaining to program evaluation.

ARTICLE 8 IMPLEMENTATION AND APPLICATION OF THE POLICY

The Director of Studies is responsible for ensuring the implementation of this Policy. Its application is under the joint responsibility of the Director of Studies and the Campus Director at each campus. Upon approval of the Policy by the Board of Governors, certain aspects will be phased in gradually over a two year period.

8.1 Dissemination

Upon its approval by the Board of Governors, a copy of this policy will be submitted to the CEEC. Any subsequent amendments or revisions to the Policy will similarly be submitted to the CEEC immediately upon their approval by the Board of Governors.

A copy of the Policy will be distributed to all teachers and other College personnel affected. The Policy will also be made readily available on the main College website and on the websites of each of the College's campuses.

ARTICLE 9 EVALUATION OF THE POLICY

The Director of Studies is responsible for three types of evaluation pertaining to this policy: its text, its initial implementation, and its application. The initial implementation of the Policy will be evaluated six years after its initial approval by the Board of Governors. The text and its application will be evaluated every six years.

9.1 Evaluation at the End of the Implementation Period

Six years after its initial approval, an evaluation of the initial implementation of the Policy will be conducted. Special attention will be paid to the state of the program management information system and the local procedural guides.

9.2 Evaluation of the Policy Text

For the purpose of evaluating the text of the Policy, the College has chosen to adopt the following criteria that are based on those used in the Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA, 2011) and the CEEC framework for evaluating policies on the evaluation of student achievement.⁴

- **COMPREHENSIVENESS:** The extent to which the Policy [and its associated procedures] contains all of the necessary elements for guiding the management of academic programs, particularly those prescribed by the College Education Regulations and the specific requirement concerning methods for evaluation and revision of the Policy.
- **COHERENCE:** The extent to which all of the elements of the Policy form an articulated and harmonized whole without internal contradictions. In this regard, it concerns both the wording of the text and the logical relationships between elements.
- **CLARITY:** The extent to which the elements of the Policy are presented in a clear and understandable manner. This includes, but is not limited to, the formatting and organization of the text, and how well each element is explained.
- **RELEVANCE:** The extent to which the measures set forth in the Policy are (a) appropriate for the stated objectives of the Policy, and (b) likely to contribute to ensuring the quality of academic programs.

9.3 Evaluation of the Application of the Policy

The primary criteria for evaluating the application of the Policy are based on those used in the IPESA (2011) and the CEEC framework for evaluating policies on the evaluation of student achievement.⁴

- **CONFORMITY:** The extent to which activities governed by the Policy are carried out in conformity with the Policy.
- **EFFECTIVENESS:** The extent to which the objectives of the Policy are being achieved.

9.4 Annual Monitoring

Annual monitoring of the implementation of the Policy consists of two aspects: feedback from those who have engaged in program management activities during the academic year, and a review by the Director of Studies of the products of program management activities such as program annual reports.

The combination of annual monitoring and a comprehensive evaluation every six years is intended to facilitate both quality assurance and continuous improvement of the Policy.

9.5 Circumstances Leading to an Unscheduled Evaluation

An unscheduled evaluation of the Policy or its implementation may be necessitated by external circumstances (e.g., modifications to the Colleges Act or to the College Education Regulations).

⁴ Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (2012, Mai). Évaluation des politiques institutionnelles d'évaluation des apprentissages: Cadre de référence. Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/publications/ORIENTATION-DOC/Evaluation_PIEP_Cadre2011.pdf

ARTICLE 10 REVISIONS TO THE POLICY

Policy revisions and their implementation will be coordinated by the Director of Studies. The revision process will be initiated by either the Director of Studies or by a recommendation from the Board of Governors. Upon completion of necessary consultations with campus stakeholders, a final draft of the revised policy will be prepared by the Director of Studies and presented to the Commission of Studies for review and recommendation to the Board of Governors for final approval. Revisions to this policy may be triggered by either external or internal factors.

10.1 External Factors

External factors that may necessitate a revision of this policy or its related procedures include, but are not limited to:

- A request or recommendation from the CEEC;
- Changes in either the Colleges Act or the College Education Regulations;
- Changes in the collective agreements with faculty unions;
- Changes in memoranda of agreement concerning AEC programs and their supporting documents.

10.2 Internal Factors

Internal factors that may lead to a revision of this policy or its related procedures include, but are not limited to:

- Recommendations for revisions received from:
 - Program committees;
 - Local academic advisory committees or pedagogical committee;
 - Academic administrators;
 - Commission of Studies;
 - Board of Governors.
- Results of annual monitoring;
- Results of an evaluation of the Policy.

ARTICLE 11 DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES

11.1 Board of Governors

Developing New Programs

- Approves new DEC and AEC programs (Articles 2.1.6 & 2.3.4).

Program Evaluation

- Approves program evaluation synthesis reports for DEC programs (Article 5.1.3).
- Approves program evaluation reports for AEC programs (Article 5.2.3).
- Pre-approves guidelines to be used in focused evaluations for DEC programs (Article 5.1.1).

Program Revisions

- Approves proposed revisions for DEC and AEC programs (Articles 6.1.3 & 6.2.2).

Approval of the Policy

- Approves the Policy (Article 8)

Revisions to the Policy

- May initiate a policy revision (Article 10).
- Approves revisions that are made to the Policy (Article 10)

11.2 Campus Director

Application of the Policy

- Is jointly responsible for the application of this Policy with the Director of Studies (Article 1.2).
- Is responsible for ensuring that procedures are established to fulfil the requirements of the Policy (Article 1.5).
- Will develop an annual calendar of program management activities in collaboration with the Director of Studies (Article 1.6).

Developing New Programs

- Submits the feasibility and rationale report for a new DEC program to the Director of Studies for approval (Article 2.1.1).
- Prepares the request for Ministry authorization for a new DEC program and submits it to the Director of Studies (Article 2.1.2).
- Ensures that a fair and timely process is used to resolve disputes related to contributing disciplines and makes the final decision in collaboration with the Director of Studies (Article 2.1.3).
- Ensures that a program committee is established for a new DEC program (Article 3.1).
- Approves the implementation plan for a new DEC program (Article 2.1.8).
- Approves the feasibility and rationale report for a new AEC program (Article 2.3.1).

Program Evaluation

- Approves program evaluation work plans and arranges for the necessary release times and resources to carry out focused evaluations (Article 5.1.1).
- With the Director of Studies, determines an appropriate course of action when extenuating circumstances affect a program's capacity to complete a full evaluation within the six-year cycle (Article 5.1.1).
- Provides preliminary approval of the program evaluation synthesis report (Article 5.1.3).
- Chooses the AEC programs to be evaluated in a given year in collaboration with the DAA(s) for Continuing Education (Article 5.2).

Program Revisions

- Provides preliminary approval of proposed revisions for DEC and AEC programs (Articles 6.1.3 & 6.2.2).

11.3 Commission of Studies

- Endorses and makes recommendations to the Board of Governors concerning the approval of:
 - New DEC and AEC programs (Articles 2.1.6 & 2.3.4).
 - Program evaluation synthesis reports for DEC programs and program evaluation reports for AEC programs (Articles 5.1.3 & 5.2.3).
 - Revisions to DEC and AEC programs (Articles 6.1.3 & 6.2.2).

11.4 Department

Developing New Programs

- Discusses and endorses new DEC profiles or options in the regular day sector (Article 2.1.6).

Monitoring

- Contributing departments may also provide input to the Program Committee regarding the monitoring of program health (Article 4.1).
- The departments in General Education will submit a report on the results of monitoring activities carried out during the year as part of their annual report to the DAA(s) for approval (Article 4.1.1).

Program Evaluation

- May identify specific issues to be examined in addition to the criterion to be evaluated in a given year (Article 1.8).
- Endorses synthesis reports for DEC program evaluations in the regular day sector (Article 5.1.3).

Program Revisions

- Contributing departments endorse proposed revisions (Article 6.1.3).

11.5 Designated Academic Administrator (DAA)

11.5.1 Regular Day Sector

Program Management Planning

- Validates annual program action plans (Article 1.6).

Program Annual Reports

- Approves program annual reports and submits them to the Campus Director and Director of Studies (Article 1.7.1).

Developing New Programs

- Notifies the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee when a preliminary feasibility report for a new DEC program has been approved by the Director of Studies (Article 2.1.1).
- Determines which academic departments will contribute to the delivery of a new DEC program (Article 2.1.3).

- For a new DEC program, ensures that the program framework and additional elements are developed and submitted for approval (Articles 2.1.4, 2.1.5, 2.1.6).
- Ensures that an implementation plan is developed for a new DEC program or option (Article 2.1.8).
- For a new DEC profile, the DAA develops the implementation plan in collaboration with the Program Committee (Article 2.2).

Program Monitoring

- Works with each program committee to review and discuss monitoring data, including the results of monitoring activities carried out by General Education departments, as well as overall program health (Article 4.1& 4.1.1).

Program Evaluation

- Develops a program evaluation schedule and work plan with each program committee and ensures that each program is fully evaluated within the maximum timeframe (Article 5.1.1).
- Submits the program evaluation synthesis report to the Campus Director and, subsequently, to the Director of Studies for preliminary approval (Article 5.1.3)
- Ensures the distribution of the program evaluation synthesis report once approved by the Board of Governors (Article 5.1.3).

Program Revisions

- Works with the Program Committee to determine whether a program revision is necessary (Article 6.1).
- Submits proposed revisions for validation and approval (Article 6.1.3) and, with each program committee, ensures that revisions are implemented as approved (Article 6.1.4).

11.5.2 Continuing Education Sector

Program Annual Report

- The DAA (s) for Continuing Education submits a program annual report to the Campus Director and the Director of Studies (Article 1.7.2).

Developing New Programs

- Assumes responsibility for the development of new AEC programs (Article 2.3).
- Prepares a report on the feasibility and rationale for offering a new AEC program and submits it to the Campus Director and Director of Studies for approval. Once approved, the DAA for Continuing Education notifies the local academic advisory council or pedagogical committee of the project (Article 2.3.1).
- Ensures that the program framework for a new AEC is developed and submitted for approval (Articles 2.3.2 & 2.3.4).
- Initiates requests for a program code from the Ministry for a new program (Article 2.3.3).
- Oversees the launch of new programs (Article 3.2).

Program Monitoring

- Continuously monitors the health of programs offered through Continuing Education (Article 4.2).

Program Evaluation

- In collaboration with the Campus Director will choose the programs to be evaluated in a given year (Article 5.2).
- Ensures that programs are evaluated and that reports are prepared and submitted for approval (Articles 5.2.1, 5.2.2, & 5.2.3).

Program Revisions

- Ensures that the appropriate frameworks provided by the MESRS are followed (Article 6.2).
- Ensures that program revision proposals are written, submitted for approval, and then implemented as approved (Articles 6.2, 6.2.1 & 6.2.2).
- Upon approval of proposed revisions by the Board of Governors, submits notification of the approval to the Ministry (Article 6.2.2)

11.6 Director of Studies

Application of the Policy

- Jointly responsible for the application of this policy with the Campus Directors (Article 1.2).
- Will develop an annual calendar of program management activities in collaboration with the Campus Director (Article 1.6).
- Reviews the products of program management activities, including the feedback from campus bodies and program annual reports (Article 9.4).

Developing New Programs

- Approves feasibility and rationale reports for offering a new DEC program and notifies the Commission of Studies and Board of Governors about the project (Article 2.1.1).
- Approves feasibility and rationale reports for offering a new AEC program and notifies the Commission of Studies and Board of Governors of the project (Article 2.3.1).
- Submits requests for authorization of a new DEC program to the Regional tables and to the Ministry and notifies the Campus Director, DAA(s) concerned, the Commission of Studies, and the Board of Governors when authorizations are obtained (Article 2.1.2).
- Works in collaboration with the Campus Director to make the final decision in resolving disputes related to contributing disciplines (Article 2.1.3).
- Provides preliminary approval of new DEC programs (Article 2.1.6).
- Provides preliminary approval of new AEC programs (Article 2.3.4).

Program Evaluation

- With the Campus Director, determines an appropriate course of action when extenuating circumstances affect a program's capacity to complete a full evaluation within the six-year cycle (Article 5.1.1).
- Provides preliminary approval of program evaluation synthesis reports for DEC programs (Article 5.1.3).
- Provides preliminary approval of program evaluation reports for AEC Programs (Article 5.2.3).
- Approves requests for deadline extensions related to program evaluations for AEC programs (Article 5.2).

Program Revisions

- Provides preliminary approval of program revisions for DEC and AEC programs (Articles 6.1.3 & 6.2.2).

Implementation of the Policy

- Responsible for the implementation of the Policy (Article 8).

Evaluation of the Policy

- Responsible for the evaluation of the Policy (Article 9).

Revisions to the Policy

- Responsible for the coordination of revisions to the Policy, and ensures the preparation of the final draft of the revised Policy to be presented to the Commission of Studies (Article 10).

11.7 Director of Studies' Office

Application of the Policy

- Assists each campus in the development of guidelines and tools to support the application of this policy (Articles 1.5 & 1.7).
- Maintains the program management information system in collaboration with each campus location and Information Technology Services (Article 7).

Program Monitoring

- Provides each program committee and General Education department with a set of monitoring reports (Articles 4.1 & 4.1.1).

Program Evaluation

- Provides program committees with guiding questions, suggested methodologies for data analysis, data collection, and possible data sources in the form of program evaluation guidelines (Articles 5.1.1 & 5.3).
- Assists each campus in the development of evaluation guidelines tools, and templates to support the evaluations of AEC programs (Article 5.2.1).

Program Annual Report

- Provides guidelines to assist in the development of the program annual report (Article 1.7).

11.8 Information Technology Services

- Supports each campus to maintain its local program management information system in collaboration with the Director of Studies' Office (Article 7).

11.9 Local Academic Advisory Council or Pedagogical Committee

- Provides feedback, advice, and recommendations on the approval of new programs, program evaluation synthesis reports, and program revisions for DEC programs (Articles 2.1.6, 5.1.3, & 6.1.3).

- Provides feedback, advice, and recommendations on the approval of new programs, program evaluation reports, and program revisions for AEC programs (Articles 2.3.4, 5.2.3, 6.2.2).

11.10 Program Committee in the Regular Day Sector

Program Management Planning

- Prepares annual program action plans for submission to the DAA(s) (Article 1.6).

Program Annual Report

- Prepares the program annual report for submission to the DAA(s) for approval (Article 1.7.1).

Developing New Programs

- Discusses and endorses new DEC options or profiles in the regular day sector (Article 2.1.6).
- Assists the DAA (s) in the development of an implementation plan for a new DEC profile (Article 2.2).
- Oversees the progress of the launch of a new program (Article 3.1).

Program Monitoring

- In collaboration with the DAA(s), reviews monitoring data and any accompanying analyses provided by the Director of Studies' Office in order to assess the health of the program and identify any potential issues that need to be addressed (Article 4.1).

Program Evaluation

- May identify specific issues to be examined in addition to the criterion to be evaluated in a given year (Article 1.8).
- In collaboration with the DAA(s), establishes a schedule to ensure that each program is fully evaluated within the maximum timeframe (Article 5.1.1).
- In the event that extenuating circumstances affect the program's capacity to complete a full evaluation within the six-year cycle, the program committee will submit an explanation and recommendations to the DAA and Campus Director (Article 5.1.1).
- Ensures that the synthesis report is written and submitted to the DAA(s) (Article 5.1.2).
- Prepares and endorses the program evaluation synthesis report for DEC programs in the regular day sector (Articles 5.1.2 & 5.1.3).

Program Revisions

- In collaboration with the DAA(s), participates in the decision to carry out a program revision, ensuring that the revision proposal is prepared and submitted for approval, and the follow-up of the implementation of approved revisions (Article 6.1).
- Endorses proposed revisions (Article 6.1.3).
- In collaboration with the DAA(s), is responsible for ensuring that program revisions are implemented as approved by the Board of Governors (Article 6.1.4).

ARTICLE 12 DEFINITIONS

ACADEMIC PROGRAM	An integrated set of learning activities leading to the achievement of educational objectives based on set standards. [<i>programme</i>] (RREC, Article 1)
AEC	<i>Attestation d'études collégiales</i> ; also used to refer to an Attestation of College Studies.
APPROVAL	Refers to the formal acceptance of a proposal, report, or plan of action by a particular College body. Only the Board of Governors can grant approval of such documents for the College as a whole.
CEEC	<i>Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial</i> .
COMPETENCY	An integrated set of knowledge, skills (cognitive or psychomotor), and attitudes whose acquisition or mastery is necessary for either (a) performing a task or carrying out an activity in the labour market, or (b) success in a particular field of university study.
CONSULTATION	The solicitation of feedback and advice from stakeholders and college bodies.
COURSE	A set of learning activities for which credits are attributed and comprising at least 45 periods of instruction or, in the cases determined by the Minister, the number of periods of instruction set by the Minister. (RREC, Article 1)
COURSE OUTLINE	The session-specific description of a course that is distributed to students registered in the course. The required elements and approval process for course outlines are defined in the Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA).
CREDIT	A unit equivalent to 45 hours of learning activities. [<i>unité</i>] (RREC, Article 1)
CURRENT PROGRAM	The academic program, currently offered on a campus of Champlain Regional College, that is the subject of an implementation, evaluation or revision process.

DEC	<i>Diplôme d'études collégiales</i> ; also used to refer to a Diploma of College Studies.
DESIGNATED ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATOR (DAA)	The academic administrator designated by the Campus Director as being responsible for particular academic matters in either the Regular Day sector or the Continuing Education sector. For the Regular Day sector the DAA is usually the Academic Dean. For Continuing Education, it is usually the Director of Continuing Education or Coordinator.
ENDORSEMENT	A positive recommendation to the next College body in the approval process for the current policy or for specific program management documents (e.g., program proposal, revision proposal, evaluation plan, evaluation report, action plan, implementation report).
EXIT PROFILE	A set of general statements that broadly describe the outcomes students will be able to demonstrate upon graduation from a particular academic program.
GENERIC COURSE PLAN	Specifies the competencies, objectives, standards, and course content. It also provides recommendations or suggestions for instructional and assessment methods, weighting of evaluation activities in calculating the final course grade, and textbooks or other needed material. “[I]t is an important tool for ensuring that course competencies are met and that consistency exists between different sections of the same course taught in the same session, as well as from one session to another.” (IPESA, Article 8.1)
LOCAL ACADEMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL	The local advisory bodies on each campus: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lennoxville campus: Academic Advisory Council• St. Lambert campus: Academic Council• St. Lawrence campus: Pedagogical Committee
MINISTRY	The term “Ministry” is used throughout the Policy to refer to the <i>Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et de la Science</i> (MESRS).
MINISTRY PROGRAM	The academic program defined by the MESRS, specifying its purpose, goals, objectives, standards, and resources. The Ministry only defines DEC programs.

OBJECTIVE	The competency, skills or knowledge, to be acquired or mastered. [<i>objectif</i>] (RREC, Article 1)
PROGRAM-BASED APPROACH	A concerted action involving teachers from different disciplines, professionals, support staff, and management, working together in mutual respect toward creating a curriculum that will facilitate the acquisition, integration, and application of knowledge, and the development of generic and specific skills and attitudes by the student
PROGRAM FRAMEWORK	A collection of reference documents that contain the structural elements of a program. These include such things as the program description, competency flowcharts, course flowcharts, course grids, the exit profile, correspondence tables. Once approved by the Board, the program framework becomes the official reference description for the program.
REVISED PROGRAM	The academic program that results from the revision process and is intended for implementation on a campus of Champlain Regional College.
SESSION-BASED INDICATORS	Indicators of student performance or perception that are linked to the specific academic session in which they occur rather than to the cohort to which the student belongs (e.g., the pass rate in a given course in the Fall 2012 session).
SOBEC	Ministry information system (<i>Système des objets d'études collégial</i>)
STANDARD	The level of performance at which an objective is considered to be achieved. [<i>standard</i>] (RREC, Article 1)
RREC	College Education Regulations (<i>Règlement sur le régime des études collégiales</i>)

EXTERNAL REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (1994, May). *General Guide to the Evaluation of Programs of Studies by the Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial*. Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec.

Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (2011, Mars). *Évaluation des politiques institutionnelles d'évaluation des programmes d'études: Cadre de référence*. Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/publications/ORIENTATION-DOC/Evaluation_PIEP_Cadre2011.pdf.

Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (2012, Mai). *Évaluation des politiques institutionnelles d'évaluation des apprentissages: Cadre de référence*. Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/publications/ORIENTATION-DOC/Evaluation_PIEP_Cadre2011.pdf.

Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (2013a, March). *Evaluating the effectiveness of quality assurance systems in Québec colleges: Guidelines and framework*. Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/publications/anglais/Effectiveness_Quality_Assurance_Orientation_Framework_2013.pdf.

Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial. (2013b, Mars). *Évaluation de l'efficacité des systèmes d'assurance qualité des collèges québécois: Orientations et cadre de référence*. Québec, QC: Gouvernement du Québec. Retrieved from http://www.ceec.gouv.qc.ca/publications/ORIENTATION-DOC/Efficacite_Systemes_Assurance_Qualite.pdf.