4.0 PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITY: EACH COLLEGE PROGRAM IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM COMMITTEE. THE PROGRAM COMMITTEE CONTAINS 4 MEMBERS FROM GENERAL EDUCATION, 4-6 MEMBERS FROM SPECIFIC PROGRAM COURSES, AND THE FACULTY DEAN. THIS COMMITTEE MEETS AT LEAST ONCE A SEMESTER.

It is the faculty dean’s responsibility to ensure that each semester, each of the DEC programs forms a program committee with the appropriate membership.

DEC courses offered in Continuing Education would fall under the jurisdiction of the day programs and the appropriate faculty dean. AEC programs do not have formal program committees.

FINDINGS

 Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by reports from each faculty dean that over the last five years, all programs have had a program committee and that the membership of each program committee included 4 members from General Education, 4-6 members from specific program courses, and the Faculty Dean.

Each of the three faculty deans reported that all programs in their jurisdiction, each semester have a program committee with the appropriate membership according to the IPESA.

 Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their program committee has met at least once per semester with a full membership.

Program committee representatives were asked to indicate in which of the semesters from A’03 to A’07 did their full program committee meet at least once. Only 6 program committee representatives responded to this question. Two of the 6 respondents reported that their full program committee met at least once each semester on a fairly regular basis. Two met in H07 only and 1 in A07 only. In this group of 6 the number of program committee meetings was few if at all.

Anecdotal evidence from various coordinators suggests the requirement of one program committee meeting with all members per semester is not often met. Some coordinators were not sure exactly what a program committee was and/or were confusing it with their curriculum committee where most of the work of program committee nature was being done. Others had a more informal approach in that program representatives from outside of the main department were consulted on an ad hoc basis. Others worked via “sub-committees” of the program committee, which usually did not include representatives from the General Studies courses.

Due, at least in part, to the large number of programs in the Faculty of Applied Technologies, they have taken a slightly different approach. Some release time has been made available for a faculty member to assist the Faculty Dean in overseeing the program committee meetings for each of the programs in the faculty. This structure seems to have increased the frequency and effectiveness of the various program committees with most full program committees meetings ranging in frequency from at least once a year up to several times a semester if necessary, especially when a program is undergoing revision.
CONCLUSION

All DEC programs in the College have a program committee with the appropriate membership. However, due to the limited data collected in this study, it is difficult to estimate the actual frequency of full program committee meetings throughout the College. The limited findings do suggest that in many programs the frequency is probably less than the required once per semester, if at all. This does not necessarily mean that the work of the program committee is not being done, it is more likely that this work done by other groups or individuals.

Recommendation: An IPESA Revision Committee will consider revising the IPESA so that:

- the minimum required frequency of full Program Committee meetings is reduced from at least once a semester to at least once a year
- the day to day work of the program committee could be accomplished by a subcommittee of the program committee with membership to be determined by each program committee as they see fit
4.1 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 1: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT ALL OF THE PROGRAM’S OBJECTIVES AND STANDARDS OR COMPETENCIES ARE ADEQUATELY REPRESENTED IN THE CURRICULUM PRESENTED TO STUDENTS AND THE CURRICULUM IS COORDINATED AMONGST THE DISCIPLINES.

Many programs at Vanier College do not use program committees as defined in the IPESA but the responsibilities are often still being met by other groups or persons. Therefore, in the surveys used to collect data for this portion of the study, when asked if their “full Program Committee” performed a certain activity, representatives were instructed to answer positively if the activity was performed by the Program Committee or a substitute. In cases where a substitute was used, they were asked to describe the substitute.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their Program Committee has, as necessary, focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that all of the program’s objectives and standards or competencies were adequately represented in the curriculum presented to students and the curriculum was coordinated amongst the disciplines.

Of the program committee representatives who responded to this portion of the survey, the majority i.e. 9 out of 14 or 64% reported that their Program Committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that all of the program’s objectives and standards or competencies were adequately represented in the curriculum presented to students. Similarly, 9 out of 13 or 70% reported that their Program Committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that the curriculum was coordinated amongst the disciplines. For both items, at least one representative could only report for the last year rather than the last five. In areas where this work was not done by a full program committee, representatives reported that the work was done in a variety of ways: One reported that this work was done during a recent program evaluation (presumably by the Program Evaluation Committee), another that the work was done by the program’s Curriculum Committee, another by teachers involved in the program and another by a subcommittee of the Program Committee (General Studies representatives not included on a regular basis).
CONCLUSION

It appears that this responsibility is most often assumed by either a subcommittee of the Program Committee or some other body, most commonly the program’s Curriculum Committee. The problem with this situation is that General Studies are not involved in decision making on a regular basis but seem to be consulted by the program specific representatives as they deem necessary, which might not always be the best way to function.

Recommendation: A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA so that:

- The minimum required frequency of Program Committee meetings with a full membership is reduced from at least once a semester to at least once a year to review the previous year’s work and progress and to plan for future semesters
- The day to day work of the program committee could be accomplished by a subcommittee of the program committee with membership to be determined by each program committee as they see fit
4.2 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 2: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENTS THAT EQUITABLY ASSESS WHETHER THE STUDENT HAS INTEGRATED THE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES ARE DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED.

FINDINGS

*Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their Program Committee has, as necessary, focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that comprehensive assessments that equitably assess whether the student has integrated the program objectives are developed and implemented.*

Of the program committee representatives who responded to this portion of the survey, the majority i.e. 8 out of 14 or 57% reported that their Program Committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure the development and implementation of comprehensive assessments that equitably assess whether the student has integrated the program objectives. Four of the respondents reported that this function was not performed by a full program committee but rather: by teachers and other involved in the program (1 program) and at department level with or without input from other departments (3 programs). Anecdotal evidence from informal discussions with departmental coordinators also suggests many programs perform this function at the departmental level with input from other departments as required.

CONCLUSION

This responsibility is also listed under “Departmental Responsibilities” in the IPESA and this is where it appears that the majority of programs are addressing the issue. Perhaps this responsibility should be left to the departments with the program committee taking on more of a supervisory role.

Recommendation: A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA so that the main responsibility for developing and implementing the comprehensive assessments is given to the program-specific departments with input from other departments as they deem necessary and the role of the Program Committee is altered to one of overseeing that the departments associated with the program have developed and implemented comprehensive assessments appropriately.
4.3 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 3: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT LEARNING ACTIVITIES DEVELOPED BY THE DEPARTMENTS ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE NEEDS OF THE STUDENTS AND THE GOALS OF THE PROGRAM, AND ARE COHERENT WITH THOSE OF ALL DEPARTMENTS CONTRIBUTING TO THE PROGRAM.

At Vanier College, learning activities should be examined by Program Evaluation Committees during program evaluations and revised as necessary following the evaluation. Learning activities should also be examined by Program Revision Committees. Both of these committees would have representation from each discipline involved with the program, similar to the membership of a program committee.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their Program Committee has, as necessary, focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students.

Of the program committee representatives who responded to this portion of the survey, the majority i.e. 9 out of 13 or 69% reported that their Program Committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students. Three respondents reported that this work was not done by an official program committee but rather: via a recent program evaluation; by the Curriculum Committee; or by a subcommittee of the Program Committee.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of graduates in a representative sample reporting that the learning activities in their program of study were consistent with their needs.

Although a measure of effectiveness, in an indirect way, this indicator is also a measure of compliance i.e. if programs develop learning activities that are consistent with the needs of the students, then students should report that the learning activities in their program of study were consistent with their needs.

When graduates were asked if they agreed, in general, that the learning activities in their program of study met their needs, 97 out of 115 respondents or 84% agreed that they did, 4% disagreed and 11% had no opinion.

Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their program committee has, as necessary, focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the goals of the program.

Eight out of 13 or 62% of the representatives who responded to the survey reported that their program committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the goals of the program. Four respondents reported that this work was not done by a program committee but rather: via a recent program
revision; by a subcommittee of the program committee; by maintaining contact (not specified with whom); or not yet given specific attention due to specifications provided by an outside body.

**Indicator 4: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their Program Committee has, as necessary, focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program.**

Finally, 6 out of 12 or 50% reported that their program committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program. One respondent noted that this work was done by a subcommittee of the Program Committee.

**CONCLUSION**

If the findings of this portion of the study can be considered representative of the situation in all programs throughout the College, then it appears that full program committees rarely assume the responsibility of ensuring learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students and the goals of the program, and are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program. In some programs this responsibility is assumed by other bodies, such as subcommittees of a program committee or a curriculum committee or a program revision committee (the latter would happen infrequently given the frequency of program revisions). However, in approximately half of the programs represented in this study, program committees or their substitutes did not focus on this responsibility.

It is possible that the question confused the respondents and they did not realize they could have listed substitutes. However, for other questions that were worded quite similarly, several respondents did list substitutes. It would seem then, that this responsibility is not being addressed on regular basis by many program committees or their substitutes. Yet, in spite of this, the majority of graduates who responded to the survey did report that the learning activities in their program of study did meet their needs.

Given the time-consuming nature of this work and given that this work is done at least every 10 years via an internal program evaluation perhaps program committees can be encouraged to carry out this function at least once in the interval between program evaluations. This would not be as onerous a task as performing this function annually and yet this would permit this important task to be accomplished at least every five years.

**Recommendation:** A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA so that the responsibility to “focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students and the goals of the program, and are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program” be shared with the Program Evaluation, Program Revision and Program Committees so that the activities required to fulfill this responsibility are performed at least once every 5 years and more often if necessary.
4.4 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 4: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT MODEL COURSE OUTLINES ARE DEVELOPED THAT ENSURE EQUITY OF ASSESSMENT BETWEEN DIFFERENT COURSES HAVING THE SAME COMPETENCY BUT TAUGHT BY DIFFERENT TEACHERS AND DIFFERENT DEPARTMENTS.

It should be noted here that some programs rarely, if ever, have situations where different courses have the same competency but are taught by different teachers in different departments. The situation seems to arise most commonly in the Social Sciences.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, their Program Committee has, as necessary, focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that model course outlines are developed that ensure equity of assessment between different courses having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments.

Of the program committee representatives who responded to this portion of the survey, only 3 out of 14 or 21% reported that their Program Committee attempted to ensure that model course outlines were developed that ensure equity of assessment between different courses having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments. Four respondents reported that this activity was not applicable to their program and 7 reported their Program Committee did not ensure that model course outlines were developed.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the existence of model outlines and departments reporting they believe that the model outlines do ensure equity of assessment between different course having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments

Of the 3 programs reporting the existence with model course outlines, the persons involved in their development included: teachers teaching the involved courses (1 program), departmental curriculum committees (2 programs) and/or the program committee (1 program). All 3 felt that the model course outlines ensure equity of assessment.
CONCLUSION

From the evidence presented here it is difficult to determine how many programs are in the situation of having different courses with the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments. Of the three programs who reported using model outlines to ensure equity of assessment in such situations, all three representatives felt the outlines were useful. Perhaps these programs could be encouraged to share their experience in this area with others in similar situations.

**Recommendation:** Programs using model course outlines to ensure equity of assessment between different courses having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments should be encouraged to share their experience with other programs in similar situations. This could be done informally or via workshops, for example, during a pedagogical day.
4.5 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 5: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT IN CONSULTATION WITH DEPARTMENTS, CHARACTERISTICS OF INCOMING STUDENTS ARE MONITORED AND CURRICULUM, PEDAGOGY, EVALUATION AND SERVICES ARE MODIFIED AS REQUIRED.

On an annual basis, the Academic Dean’s office provides all programs with a set of key performance indicators (KPI) for each cohort of students in their program over the previous 10 years or for the length of the program. These indicators include high school averages of incoming students.

Other characteristics of incoming students, such as age, mother tongue, gender and source of previous education (e.g. Quebec high school, non-Quebec high school, adult education or university) are usually supplied when each program is evaluated.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by over the last five years the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years their program committee focused on curriculum reporting that their Program Committee received relevant information on the characteristics of each cohort of incoming students on an annual basis.

Of the program committee representatives who responded to this portion of the survey, only 3 out of 13 or 23% reported that their Program Committee received relevant information about incoming student characteristics such as gender, age, mother tongue etc. consistently or most of the time. Three or 23% reported that they received this information sometimes; 3 reported that they had never received such information and 4 did not know.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years their program committee focused on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that in consultation with departments the characteristics of each cohort of incoming students were monitored.

Three out of 11 reported that their Program Committee reviewed student characteristics consistently or most of the time and 5 or 46% reported that they never did. Several respondents noted that this review was done by others i.e. interested members of the department (1 program), program evaluation committee (1 program), Admissions (1 program), program or department coordinator (2 programs).

Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by there is evidence that curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation and services are modified as required, based on the characteristics of incoming students

The results of this portion of the study are summarized in Table 4.2 below.
Table 4.1: Summary of Findings Concerning the Program Committees’ Modification of Curriculum, Pedagogy, Evaluation and Services, Based on the Characteristics of Incoming Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas reported modified as required on the basis of student characteristics</th>
<th>Total Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Reports of program committee (or Substitute)</th>
<th>Compliance with the Activity</th>
<th>List Of Who Actually Performed the Activity (number of programs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Curriculum | 13 | 7 |  | • Program evaluation committee (3)  
• program committee but not on a regular basis i.e. during a program evaluation or revision (2)  
• Curriculum committee (1)  
• Coordinator (1)  
• Individual teachers (1) |
| Pedagogy | 13 | 7 |  | • Program evaluation committee (5)  
• program committee but not on a regular basis i.e. during a program evaluation (1)  
• Sub-committee of program committee, no General Education representatives (1) |
| Evaluation | Not assessed |  |  |  |
| Services | 13 | 6 |  | • Program evaluation committee  
• program committee but not on a regular basis i.e. during a program evaluation (1)  
• Department (1)  
• Sub-committee of program committee (1) |
CONCLUSION

As these data show most of the respondents reported that their Program Committee or a substitute do make modifications to their program based on the characteristics of incoming students. However, for most this appears to be done during program evaluations and subsequent revisions. If program evaluations and revisions occur with adequate frequency, then this timing may be sufficient. However, evidence shows that most evaluations and revisions occur every 10 years or more, which may not be adequate. Again, perhaps program committees could be encouraged to carry out this function at least once in the interval between program evaluations.

Recommendation: The Office of Institutional Development and Effectiveness (OIDE) should collect the data regarding the characteristics of incoming students and distribute this information to each program on an annual basis.

Recommendation: A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA so that the responsibility of ensuring that the characteristics of incoming students are monitored and curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation and services are modified as required is included in the departmental responsibilities in consultation with the Program Committee.

Recommendation: Program Committees should determine the frequency with which they need to monitor the various topics as listed in the IPESA, for example, the characteristics of incoming students.
Rendement Scolaire

The Rendement Scolaire is an internally produced document that provides information on course pass rates, course averages and, in some cases, high school averages by section. This report comes in printed and, more recently, in electronic format. Both versions are not without problems. In the printed version, the high school averages are not accurate and data must be entered by hand into excel spreadsheets before any meaningful data analysis can be done. The electronic version does not always contain SRAM produced high school averages but it does come in excel format. However, the entire document must be reformatted before it can be used for data analysis, to the point where most do not use it except for major evaluations such as this one or formal program evaluations.

Each semester the Registrar sends a printed version of the Rendement Scolaire to each of the faculty deans and the Academic Dean. Coordinators are invited to review these in their respective Faculty Dean’s office. One faculty dean sends photocopies of each program/department’s portion of the Rendement Scolaire and sends them to the Department Coordinators. The electronic version is sent to the faculty deans on request.

Neither of the two Continuing Education divisions is provided with such a report. The day division maintains its own records for the purposes of monitoring student course success.

Retention and Graduation Rates

The Academic Dean’s office provides information on retention rates and graduation rates by program and by cohort on an annual basis. These are sent to the appropriate faculty dean and from there, distributed to the appropriate coordinators.

University Access & Success Rates and Employment Rates for Graduates

Data regarding success rates in university or in the workforce are not collected in any systematic way. Some departments collect this information on their own. An annual Graduate Survey was used to collect some of this information, which was shared with the College community. However, due to budgetary constraints and an inefficient survey system, this survey has not been conducted since the 2005-2006 academic year.
FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that each semester, over the last five years their program committees have received and reviewed the following relevant information concerning the success rates of its students:

- Rendement scolaire
- Retention rates
- Graduation rates
- Access to university programs
- Success rates in university programs
- Employment rates for graduates (technology programs)

Eleven respondents reported on the information received and reviewed by their program committees over the last five years concerning indicators of student success. The results are shown in Figures 4.1 and 4.2 below.

Figure 4.1: Indicators of Academic Success Received by program committees or their Substitute as Reported by a Total of 11 Program Representatives
CONCLUSION

These data show that the majority of representatives surveyed reported that their program committees or a substitute received information concerning retention rates and graduation rates. Less, but still more than half reported receiving the Rendement Scolaire. According to the majority of program committee representatives, this information was reviewed by the Program Committee or a substitute.

Information regarding access to university programs, success rates in university and employment rates for graduates was not received or reviewed by as many programs. The fact that the data was not separated into pre-university and technologies programs could account for some of these lower statistics but even so the numbers are still low. The College needs to devise some means of collecting this information on a regular basis and providing it to the programs with other key performance indicators once a year.
**Recommendation:** The Office of Institutional Development and Effectiveness (OIDE) should:

- Explore with the Information Technology Department (IT), the possibility of extracting the data contained in the Rendement Scolaire from our new registration system (CLARA) in an electronic and more “user-friendly” version. These data should then be circulated to each dean, continuing education coordinator, program committee and department each semester.
- Reinstate the Graduate Survey using a more cost effective survey system and include questions on access and success in university and in the workforce.
- Explore ways of collecting data from our main target universities i.e. McGill, U de M, Concordia and ETS on the access and success of our graduates and if feasible provide such information to the programs in a user-friendly format.
4.7 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 7: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT RECOMMENDATIONS ARE MADE TO THE COLLEGE REGARDING ADMISSIONS AND STANDING AND ADVANCEMENT.

Before each new semester, the Registrar requests that a program representative, usually the departmental or program committee coordinator consult with the Registrar to recommend changes to the admissions or standing and advancement criteria as necessary. This was done recently for all programs just before the College switched to the SRAM admission system in 2006. Subsequently changes are made as required before each new semester and again by a program representative consulting with the Registrar. How each program determines the criteria is left up to the program to decide.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years their program committees have made recommendations to the College as necessary regarding admissions and standing and advancement.

In this section of the survey, 10 of 14 respondents or 71% reported that over the last five years their program committees have made recommendations to the College as necessary regarding admissions and standing and advancement. One reported that this was done as part of the program evaluation and one reported that this was done at the departmental level.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the Registrar reporting that over the last five years the majority of program committees or their representatives have made recommendations to the College as necessary regarding admissions and standing and advancement.

An interview with the Registrar revealed that all programs throughout the College had made recommendations to the College as necessary regarding admissions and standing and advancement with the introduction of the SRAM admissions system in 2006 and that updates have been provided as necessary.

CONCLUSION

It appears that recommendations are being made to the Registrar appropriately and regularly, although not always by the program committees but rather a substitute. Perhaps a report by the program committee substitute to the program committee once a year to demonstrate that this responsibility is being met would be sufficient to enable the program committee to fulfill this responsibility.

Recommendation: Program Committees should determine the frequency with which they need to monitor the various topics as listed in the IPESA, for example, the characteristics of incoming students and indicators of success.
Additional program requirements are handled in a similar manner to that previously described for standing and advancement criteria. Usually the Registrar requests that the Departmental or program committee Coordinator consult with the Registrar before each new semester to recommend changes to the Additional Program Requirements as necessary. This was done recently for all programs shortly before the College switched to the SRAM admission system in 2006. Subsequently changes are made as required before each new semester and again by a program representative consulting with the Registrar. How each program determines the criteria is left up to the program to decide. The Faculty of Social Science, Commerce, Arts & Letters (FSSCAL) deliberately have no additional requirements, with the exception of the Music Program.

**FINDINGS**

*Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years their program committees have taken responsibility for determining new, adjusted or changed Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement and for maintaining the appropriate template of such information.*

Six of the 14 respondents reported that their program has Additional Program Requirements. Out of those 6, 3 reported that their program committees have taken responsibility for determining new, adjusted or changed Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement. One reported that theirs was done by the departments and one by the curriculum committee. Four reported that their program committees have taken responsibility for maintaining the appropriate template of such information and one reported that this was done by the department.

*Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the Registrar reporting that over the last five years the majority of program committees or their representatives have made recommendations to the College as necessary regarding Additional Program requirements.*

An interview with the Registrar revealed that all programs throughout the College had made recommendations to the College as necessary regarding Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement with the introduction of the SRAM admissions system in 2006 and that updates have been provided as necessary.

Furthermore, templates for such additional requirements are provided and all programs with additional program requirements are using these.

**CONCLUSION**

It appears that Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement are being provided by the programs to the Registrar appropriately and regularly, suggesting that the mechanisms in place to ensure that this responsibility is met are adequate and should be maintained.
CHAPTER FOUR: PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

4.9 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 9: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT PROGRAMS WITH ADDITIONAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS CONDUCT AND DOCUMENT THEIR PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS.

The College requirements for the Program Review Process for programs with Additional Program Requirements are described in detail in Appendix C of the Standing and Advancement policy (http://www.vaniercollege.qc.ca/academy/policy/7210_2006.pdf). This review process is for students who fail to achieve the Additional Requirements of their specific program in order to advance in that Program. This process is usually coordinated by the faculty deans in consultation with the appropriate department/program coordinators. Documentation of each Program Review and the outcome are stored in the Faculty Dean’s office as well as forwarded to the Registrar. As mentioned previously, with the exception of the Music program, no FSSCAL have additional program requirements.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by for programs with Additional Program requirements, the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years their program committees have conducted and documented their Program Review Process.

Only 5 representatives responded to this part of the survey. None reported their Program Committee performed this function. One reported that this was done by their department and one reported being unclear as to what the “Program Review Process” was.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the three faculty deans reporting that they maintain statistics showing numbers of students reviewed due to “not in Good Academic Standing” in their program of study.

All three faculty deans reported that they maintain statistics showing numbers of students reviewed due to “not in Good Academic Standing” in their program of study.

CONCLUSION

Although the data suggests that many program committees are not fulfilling this responsibility, it should be remembered that many do not have additional program requirements. This would also explain why many were not familiar with the Program Review Process. Furthermore, the Standing and Advancement Policy was revised in 2006 and new terminology introduced. The Review Board process in the previous version of the policy used to include students who were Not In Good Academic Standing in their program and so the term "Review Boards" included what is now call Program Review Process. Anecdotal evidence from teachers and coordinators suggests many are still using the previous terminology.
FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that, with respect to the development of curriculum and pedagogy in their program, over the last five years their program committee has liaised with:

- Academic and other support services within the College e.g. Learning Center, Math & Science resource Center etc.
- High schools
- School boards
- Adult education facilities
- Other Cegeps
- Universities
- The workplace
- Professional bodies (for example, the Order of Nurses of Quebec)

Ten representatives responded to this portion of the survey. The liaisons reported are shown in Figure 4.3 below.

Figure 4.3: Frequency of Reported Liaisons between Program Committees or its Substitute and Various Other Bodies
The most frequently reported liaisons were with Academic and other Support Services within the College as well as liaisons with other Cegeps. Two representatives reported no liaisons. Four respondents reported that liaisons were not established by the program committee but rather via the Departmental Coordinator.

CONCLUSION

If the findings of this study can be considered indicative of the situation in the College as a whole, then the proportion of programs liaising with other services within the College and with other colleges is adequate but could still be improved. The proportion liaising with our feeder institutions is low especially with Adult Education facilities. However, the students in most of the programs do not come from this source, so these liaisons will only be important to those programs with many students coming from Adult Education facilities. This situation is a good example of one of the reasons why programs need information about the characteristics of their students, such as prior educational experience in this case.

Recommendation: Faculty Deans and the Academic Dean will encourage and support programs to establish relationships with their major feeder institutions to exchange information useful in improving the transition to college for the students in their program.
CHAPTER FOUR: PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

4.13 PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITY 13: TO FOCUS ON CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY, TO ENSURE THAT PROGRAM EVALUATIONS ARE CONDUCTED AS REQUIRED AND INDICATED ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PROGRAM ARE MADE.

Each program undergoes continuous annual review by the Faculty Dean with the assistance of its program committee. This review includes proposing strategic plans and reviewing their progress, as well as documenting the year’s activities given in annual reports, and also looking at the KPI’s (key performance indicators) for the program.

The timing of the formal program evaluations is usually determined by the Academic Dean in consultation with the Academic Affairs Committee, and the involved Faculty Dean or Continuing Education (CE) Coordinator. The formal evaluation must be conducted at least every ten years. The process is described in detail in the Program Evaluation Policy (http://www.vaniercollege.qc.ca/acad Dean/policy/7210s24.pdf).

The formal program evaluation is conducted by a Program Evaluation Committee designated by the Faculty Dean and approved by the Academic Dean. Membership includes, among others, the Faculty Dean responsible for the program, or the equivalent individual from Continuing Education, at least two faculty members from the program, one of whom must be the Department Coordinator and one or more representatives from General Studies, all of whom could be members of the Program Committee but not necessarily.

FINDINGS

*Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by most, if not all of the departmental coordinators have submitted an annual report each year over the last five years.*

The three faculty deans reported that all programs and departments under each of their jurisdictions have submitted an annual report each year that they have held the position (2 for 4 years and 1 for 2 years).

*Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of program committee representatives in a representative sample reporting that their program committee has conducted program evaluations as required and made adjustments to the program as indicated by the evaluations.*

Of the 14 representatives who responded to this portion of the survey, three were not sure when their program had last been evaluated and the rest reported dates ranging from 1999/2000 to “in progress”.

In terms of the recommendations that arose from each evaluation, 6 out of 10 representatives reported that *all or almost all* of the adjustments addressing the recommendations had been made. One respondent noted that lack of adequate resources was the main reason for not making all of the recommended adjustments.

*Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of programs having undergone an evaluation in the last 10 years.*

A list of all DEC programs and the dates of their evaluations and revisions is provided in Appendix C4. This table shows that at least 20 programs out of 24 plus General Education have been evaluated at least once between 1997 and 2007. None of the AEC programs have gone through an
evaluation process yet, as all were revised from course-based to competency-based programs with the last few years.

CONCLUSION

The evidence demonstrates that the majority of programs have undergone a formal evaluation within the last 10 years. The mechanism for deciding which programs to evaluate and when appears adequate. Of course it would be better to formally evaluate programs more frequently but resources are the rate limiting step. This, therefore, places additional importance on annual reviews to be done by the departments and programs.

**Recommendation:** The Office of Institutional Development and Effectiveness (OIDE) should:

- Work with the programs as necessary to assist with the structuring of annual reviews, as well as the associated strategic plans and annual reports.
- Supply the statistical data (key performance indicators) required by each program for their annual evaluations.
4.14 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter presents the evidence regarding the exercise of the program committees’ responsibilities in accordance with the Vanier College IPESA. The IPESA attributes thirteen responsibilities to the program committees:

0. Each college program is responsible for establishing a program committee. The program committee contains 4 members from general education, 4-6 members from specific program courses, and the faculty dean. This Committee meets at least once a semester.

1. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that all of the program’s objectives and standards or competencies are adequately represented in the curriculum presented to students and the curriculum is coordinated amongst the disciplines.

2. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that comprehensive assessments that equitably assess whether the student has integrated the program objectives are developed and implemented.

3. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students and the goals of the program, and are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program.

4. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that model course outlines are developed that ensure equity of assessment between different courses having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments.

5. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that in consultation with departments, characteristics of incoming students are monitored and curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation and services are modified as required.

6. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that student success is monitored. This includes a review of the Rendement Scolaire (for example, pass/fail rates in courses), retention rates, graduation rates, access to and success rates in university programs and employment rates for graduates.

7. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that recommendations are made to the College regarding admissions and standing and advancement.

8. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that programs take responsibility for determining new, adjusted or changed Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement and for maintaining the appropriate template of such information.

9. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that programs with Additional Program Requirements conduct and document their Program Review Process.

10. – 12. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that liaison is established and maintained with other Cegeps and other levels of education (10), workplace and professional bodies (11), & other support services within the College (12) with respect to the development of curriculum.

13. To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that program evaluations are conducted as required and indicated adjustments to the program are made.
Responsibility 0: Each college program is responsible for establishing a program committee. The program committee contains 4 members from general education, 4-6 members from specific program courses, and the faculty dean. This Committee meets at least once a semester.

All DEC programs in the college have a program committee with the appropriate membership. However, due to the limited data collected in this study, it is difficult to estimate the actual frequency of full program committee meetings throughout the College. The limited findings do suggest that in many programs the frequency is probably less than the required once per semester, if at all. This does not necessarily mean that the work of the program committee is not being done, it is more likely that this work done by other groups or individuals.

Responsibility 1: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that all of the program's objectives and standards or competencies are adequately represented in the curriculum presented to students and the curriculum is coordinated amongst the disciplines.

It appears that this responsibility is most often assumed by either a subcommittee of the program committee or some other body, most commonly the program's Curriculum Committee. The problem with this situation is that General Studies are not involved in decision making on a regular basis but seem to be consulted by the program specific representatives as they deem necessary, which might not always be the best way to function.

Responsibility 2: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that comprehensive assessments that equitably assess whether the student has integrated the program objectives are developed and implemented.

This responsibility is also listed under Departmental Responsibilities in the IPESA and this is where it appears that the majority of programs are addressing the issue. Perhaps this responsibility should be left to the departments with the program committee taking on more of a supervisory role.

Responsibility 3: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students and the goals of the program, and are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program.

If the findings of this portion of the study can be considered representative of the situation in all programs throughout the College, then it appears that full program committees rarely assume the responsibility of ensuring learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students and the goals of the program, and are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program. In some programs this responsibility is assumed by other bodies, such as subcommittees of the program committee or a curriculum committee or a program revision committee (the latter would happen infrequently given the frequency of program revisions). Yet, in spite of this, the majority of graduates who responded to the survey did report that the learning activities in their program of study did meet their needs.

Given the time-consuming nature of this work and given that this work is done at least every 10 years via an internal program evaluation perhaps program committees can be encouraged to carry out this function at least once in the interval between program evaluations. This would not be as
onerosous a task as performing this function annually and yet this would permit this important task to be accomplished at least every five years.

**Responsibility 4: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that model course outlines are developed that ensure equity of assessment between different courses having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments.**

From the evidence presented here it is difficult to determine how many programs are in the situation of having different courses with the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments. Of the three programs who reported using model outlines to ensure equity of assessment in such situations, all three representatives felt the outlines were useful. Perhaps these programs could be encouraged to share their experience in this area with others in similar situations.

**Responsibility 5: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that in consultation with departments, characteristics of incoming students are monitored and curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation and services are modified as required.**

As these data show most of the respondents reported that their program committee or a substitute do make modifications to their program based on the characteristics of incoming students. However, for most this appears to be done during program evaluations and subsequent revisions. If program evaluations and revisions occur with adequate frequency, then this timing may be sufficient. However, evidence shows that most evaluations and revisions occur every 10 years or more, which may not be adequate. Again, perhaps program committees could be encouraged to carry out this function at least once in the interval between program evaluations.

**Responsibility 6: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that student success is monitored. This includes a review of the Rendement Scolaire (for example, pass/fail rates in courses), retention rates, graduation rates, access to and success rates in university programs and employment rates for graduates.**

These data show that the majority of representatives surveyed reported that their program committees or a substitute received information concerning retention rates and graduation rates. Less, but still more than half reported receiving the Rendement Scolaire. According to the majority of program committee representatives, this information was reviewed by the program committee or a substitute.

Information regarding access to university programs, success rates in university and employment rates for graduates was not received or reviewed by as many programs. The fact that the data was not separated into pre-university and technologies programs could account for some of these lower statistics but even so the numbers are still low. The College needs to devise some means of collecting this information on a regular basis and providing it to the programs with other key performance indicators once a year.
Responsibility 7: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that recommendations are made to the College regarding admissions and standing and advancement.

It appears that recommendations are being made to the Registrar appropriately and regularly, although not always by the program committee but rather a substitute. Perhaps a report to the program committee once a year to demonstrate that this responsibility is being met would be sufficient to enable the program committee to fulfill this responsibility.

Responsibility 8: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that programs take responsibility for determining new, adjusted or changed Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement and for maintaining the appropriate template of such information.

It appears that Additional Program Requirements for Standing and Advancement are being provided by the programs to the Registrar appropriately and regularly, suggesting that the mechanisms in place to ensure that this responsibility is met are adequate and should be maintained.

Responsibility 9: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that programs with Additional Program Requirements conduct and document their Program Review Process.

Although the data suggests that many program committees are not fulfilling this responsibility, it should be remembered that many do not have additional program requirements. This would also explain why many were not familiar with the Program Review Process. Furthermore, the Standing and Advancement Policy was revised in 2006 and new terminology introduced. The Review Board process in the previous version of the policy used to include students who were Not In Good Academic Standing in their program and so the term "Review Boards" included what is now call Program Review Process. Anecdotal evidence from teachers and coordinators suggests many are still using the previous terminology.

Responsibilities 10-12: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that liaison is established and maintained with other Cegeps and other levels of education (10), workplace and professional bodies (11), & other support services within the College (12) with respect to the development of curriculum.

If the findings of this study can be considered indicative of the situation in the College as a whole, then the proportion of programs liaising with other services within the college and with other colleges is adequate but could still be improved. The proportion liaising with our feeder institutions is low especially with Adult education facilities. However, the students in most of our programs do not come from this source, so these liaisons will only be important to those programs with many students coming from Adult education facilities. This situation is a good example of one of the reasons why programs need information about the characteristics of their students, such as prior educational experience in this case.
Responsibility 13: To focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that program evaluations are conducted as required and indicated adjustments to the program are made.

The evidence demonstrates that the majority of programs have undergone a formal evaluation within the last 10 years. The mechanism for deciding which programs to evaluate and when appears adequate. Of course it would be better to formally evaluate programs more frequently but resources are the rate limiting step. This, therefore, places additional importance on annual reviews to be done by the departments and programs.
CHAPTER FOUR: PROGRAM COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

4.15 CHAPTER RECOMMENDATIONS

The Steering Committee made the following recommendations as a result of the information presented in this chapter of the report:

1. An IPESA Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA so that:
   • The minimum required frequency of program committee meetings with a full membership is reduced from at least once a semester to at least once a year to review the previous year’s work and progress and to plan for future semesters
   • The day to day work of the program committee could be accomplished by a subcommittee of the program committee with membership to be determined by each program committee as they see fit
   • The main responsibility for developing and implementing the comprehensive assessments is given to the program-specific departments with input from other departments as they deem necessary and the role of the program committee is altered to one of overseeing that the departments associated with the program have developed and implemented comprehensive assessments appropriately
   • The responsibility to “focus on curriculum and pedagogy, to ensure that learning activities developed by the departments are consistent with the needs of the students and the goals of the program, and are coherent with those of all departments contributing to the program” be shared with the Program Evaluation, Program Revision and program committees so that the activities required to fulfill this responsibility are performed at least once every 5 years and more often if necessary
     • The responsibility of ensuring that the characteristics of incoming students are monitored and curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation and services are modified as required is included in the departmental responsibilities in consultation with the program committee.

2. Programs using model course outlines to ensure equity of assessment between different courses having the same competency but taught by different teachers and different departments should be encouraged to share their experience with other programs in similar situations. This could be done informally or via workshops, for example, during a pedagogical day

3. The Office of Institutional Development and Effectiveness (OIDE) should:
   • Collect the data regarding the characteristics of incoming students and distribute this information to each program on an annual basis.
   • Explore with the Information Technology Department (IT), the possibility of extracting the data contained in the Rendement Scolaire from our new registration system (CLARA) in an electronic and more “user-friendly” version. These data should then be circulated to each dean, continuing education coordinator, program committee and department each semester.
   • Reinstate the Graduate Survey using a more cost effective survey system and include questions on access and success in university and in the workforce.
   • Explore ways of collecting data from our main target universities i.e. McGill, U de M, Concordia and ETS on the access and success of our graduates and if feasible provide such information to the programs in a user-friendly format.
• Work with the programs as necessary to assist with the structuring of annual reviews, as well as the associated strategic plans and annual reports.

• Determine with each program the specific key performance indicators (KPI) required and supply these statistical data along with the KPI already provided.

4. Program committees should determine the frequency with which they need to monitor the various topics as listed in the IPESA, for example, the characteristics of incoming students and indicators of success.