CHAPTER FIVE: FACULTY DEAN AND CE COORDINATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

In Continuing Education at Vanier College, the three CE coordinators fulfill many of the responsibilities that are designated to the faculty deans in the regular day programs. Therefore, the CE coordinators will be included, where appropriate, in this chapter of the report.

5.1 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY 1: TO ENSURE THAT COMPLETE AND ACCURATE COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, COHERENT WITH BOTH MINISTERIAL REQUIREMENTS AND COLLEGE POLICY ARE DISTRIBUTED IN THE FIRST WEEK OF CLASSES AND ARE FILED BOTH IN THE FACULTY OFFICE AND WITH THE ACADEMIC DEAN.

The Steering Committee assume the term “course description” to be synonymous with the more frequently used term “course outline”.

The Vanier College Course Outline Policy ([http://www.vaniercollege.qc.ca/acadean/policy/7210s10.pdf](http://www.vaniercollege.qc.ca/acadean/policy/7210s10.pdf)) was last revised in 1996 and last approved February 15, 2000. It is due to be reviewed again. The policy is based on Ministry requirements. Faculty deans have input into the policy review process either as members of the Policy Revision Committee directly or when the policy is presented to the Academic Advisory Committee for review and approval.

As described earlier in this report, in the regular day programs, teachers distribute their course outlines to their students during the first week of classes. They also submit a copy to their departmental coordinator, ideally before they are given to the students. The course outlines are reviewed for compliance with policy requirements at the departmental level and then copies are forwarded to the appropriate faculty dean. Any missing course outlines would be requested by the faculty dean’s secretary. After another review in the faculty dean’s office, not usually as extensive as at the department level, another set of copies are forwarded to the Academic Dean. The Academic Dean does an additional spot check. One faculty dean has provided a template to all teachers in the faculty in an attempt to ensure that teachers comply with the College and Ministerial requirements.

According to the IPESA, course outlines should be filed in the faculty dean’s office and with the Academic Dean. According to the Policy on course outlines, after review by the Academic Dean, these copies are forwarded to the College Library. Course outlines from previous semesters are recorded and stored in the College Library. Copies are available upon request to the Registrar’s Office. The two policies are not congruent with respect to the storage of course outlines. In reality, copies are kept within the department, the faculty deans’ offices, the Academic Dean’s office and the Registrar’s Office. Copies are no longer kept in the library and are not consistently forwarded to the Registrar’s Office. Obviously this situation needs to be rectified as soon as possible.

In the past course outlines have been stored in paper format. The College is currently attempting to switch to an electronic version.

Faculty deans encourage departmental and program coordinators to remind teachers each semester to distribute their course outlines to students during the first week of classes. There are no formal mechanisms to monitor if this is done, other than the student complaint system if it is not. Therefore, it is crucial that all students are aware of their right to obtain a course outline within the first week of classes as well as recourse that can be taken if their teacher fails to comply with this responsibility. The IPESA informs students of this right, unfortunately, as evidence presented in a previous chapter of this report suggests, many students are not familiar with the IPESA.
In the two divisions of Continuing Education the same Course Outline Policy is followed, however, the teachers submit their course outlines directly to the CE coordinator of their division. The coordinators, follow up on any missing course outlines, review the course outlines, maintain a copy and send another copy to the Academic Dean where they are stored with those from the regular day programs.

**FINDINGS**

*Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the College Policy on Course Outlines complying with Ministerial requirements.*

The College Policy on Course Outlines was compared to the Ministry Requirements for Course Outlines to determine if the college policy addressed all of the Ministry requirements. Appendix C3 summarizes the results. As can be seen in the table, the College policy addresses all of the Ministry Requirements. Additional requirements over and above those of the Ministry are also included.

*Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of course outlines in representative sample are complete in terms of the requirements as listed in the IPESA and the Vanier College Policy on Course Outlines (VCPCO).*

If the majority of course outlines in a random sample contain all of the required elements as listed in the IPESA and the VCPCO, then this would suggest that teachers are following the requirements, which may be due, at least in part to actions taken on the part of the faculty deans and CE coordinators. A review of 99 course outlines selected randomly from each program from each of the 3 faculties and the two divisions of Continuing Education from the H’08 semester revealed that of the 19 required elements, 16 were present in the majority of course outlines. Three required elements were present in less than half of the course outlines, they were:

1) Mid-term statement of progress (IPESA)
2) Estimated cost of textbooks and manuals (IPESA,VCPCO)
3) Detailed estimates of additional purchases or expenses (IPESA,VCPCO)

None of these latter three requirements were Ministry requirements but were College requirements over and above Ministry ones. One requirement i.e. "Mid-term statement of progress was listed in the IPESA but not in the VCPCO, which could explain why many course outlines did not include it.

Estimated costs of textbooks are no longer needed on the course outlines as these are readily available on line on the bookstores web page. Most course outlines sampled had no additional purchases or expenses but of those that did, the items were listed but for most, not the cost. Perhaps this requirement needs to specifically state that estimated costs should be included.

---

1 Règlement sur le régime des études collégiales, Article 20 (Quebec Government, 2008)
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Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of departmental coordinators in a representative sample reporting that they have an effective mechanism in place for ensuring that course outlines comply with College policy.

The majority of departmental coordinators surveyed (17 out of 22 or 77%) reported that their department checks each course outline to ensure that it is consistent with the College Policy on Course Outlines consistently or most of the time. Department or curriculum coordinators reportedly did this task most often and several used a checklist. Three reported comparing with the policy directly.

Indicator 4: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of students in a representative sample reporting that most or all of their course outlines were distributed in the first week of class.

Of the 723 students surveyed, 717 or 99% reported that they received their course outlines within the first week of classes in all (83%) or most (16%) of their courses.

Indicator 5: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that over the last five years, each semester, mechanisms were in place to ensure that all course outlines were received and filed in the faculty deans’ or CE coordinators’ offices.

Five of the 6 faculty deans or CE coordinators reported that their office has all of the course outlines for each semester over the last five years on file. The sixth dean/CE coordinator reported having some of them. In the regular day programs, departmental coordinators usually collect these from the teachers and submit them to the appropriate faculty dean’s office. In Continuing Education teachers submit their course outlines directly to the appropriate CE coordinator. Secretaries were usually responsible for ensuring that all course outlines were received by checking course outlines received against the Master Schedule. In the regular day programs involved departmental coordinators were usually contacted to round up any missing outlines, in continuing education the CE coordinators contacted the teachers with missing course outlines directly.

Indicator 6: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the Academic Dean reports that over the last five years, each semester, mechanisms were in place to ensure that course outlines from each faculty were received and filed in the office of the Academic Dean.

The Academic Dean’s office receives copies of all of the course outlines each semester from each faculty or division of Continuing Education. These are kept on file in the Academic Dean’s office. The Secretary in the Academic Dean’s office checks that each area has submitted their course outlines each semester but does not check that each individual course outline is present. That would be a huge task. Therefore we must rely on the faculty deans and CE coordinators are relied on to ensure this.

At present some course outlines are received in hard copy and others in electronic version. It would certainly save paper and space if all could be submitted in electronic version.
CONCLUSION

In working on this portion of the study, the Steering Committee took the term “Course Description” to be synonymous with the term “course outline”. The Steering Committee agreed that some of the required elements of the course outline may need updating. Furthermore, teachers new to the College should be made aware of the course outline requirements and this should be done in a systematic fashion. The official repository for these important documents should be decided and all policies adjusted accordingly. Some of the following recommendations were made in a previous chapter and will be repeated here.

Recommendation: An IPESA Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA to:

- Include a glossary of commonly used terms, such as, for example, “Course Outlines” and to ensure that it uses consistent terminology throughout the policy and in all other policies subsumed under it
- Give the Registrar, instead of the library, the responsibility of storing all course outlines in perpetuity after they have been reviewed by the Academic Dean and others.

Recommendation: An ad hoc committee consisting of students, teachers and faculty deans should be struck to review the course outline requirements as listed in the Vanier College Course Outline Policy and the IPESA and suggest revisions as required to better reflect current needs.

Recommendation: A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the Course Outline Policy to include a suggested template containing all of the required and optional elements of a course outline as listed in the policy.

Recommendation: Faculty deans, CE coordinators or their delegates should bring the Course Outline Policy to the attention of all teachers commencing their first semester at the College.
5.2 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY 2: TO VERIFY THAT ALL TEACHERS SUBMIT MID-TERM ASSESSMENTS, FOLLOW UP MARK UPDATE REQUESTS, FULFILL COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES ESPECIALLY IN SUCH AREAS AS MEDIATION AND GRADES REVIEW, SUBMIT THEIR MARKS IN A TIMELY MANNER, AND PARTICIPATE APPROPRIATELY IN THE ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans reporting that they have mechanisms in place to verify that all teachers submit mid-term assessments.

The Registrar notifies teachers approximately two weeks before of the upcoming deadline to submit mid-term assessments. The departmental and program coordinators, at the Joint coordinators meetings, have been reminded of the importance of this activity and asked to pass this information on to their teachers. The three faculty deans reported that they do not verify that all teachers submit mid-term assessments.

As reported previously in Chapter 3 of this report, an examination of the records for the fall semesters from A'03 to A07 (excluding A04) revealed an 81% rate of compliance with this responsibility.

At present, the day division of Continuing Education does not require teachers to use the formal midterm assessment mechanism used in the other areas because of the varied length and timing of their programs, which do not always match the typical 15 week semesters of the other areas.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that they have mechanisms in place to verify that all teachers follow up Mark Update requests.

Mechanisms to follow up on Mark Update and Grades Review requests were variable. In Continuing Education Mark Update and Grades Review requests are followed by records clerks or academic advisors in the Continuing Education office. Teachers are called if they have not completed the task within the allotted time.

In the regular day programs, Mark Update and Grades Review requests are handled by the Registrar’s office and the departments directly. It is up to the Registrar or the student to let the faculty deans know if requests were not followed up appropriately. The faculty deans reported that they follow up with the teacher or department when they receive a complaint.

Of the 301 students who reported submitting Mark Update requests, 31 or 10% (2 from Continuing Education and 29 from regular day programs) reported not receiving a response. Similarly, of the 292 students who reported making a formal Grades Review request, 29 or 10% (3 from Continuing Education and 26 from regular day programs) reported not receiving an answer to their request.
Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans and CE coordinators report that they have mechanisms in place to verify that all teachers fulfill committee responsibilities especially in such areas as mediation and grades review.

The majority of committees, including Grades Review and Mediation for both the regular day programs and the Continuing Education Evening division are formed in each of the academic departments, which are under the supervision of the three faculty deans.

Each semester, the faculty deans request a list from each department of the departmental committees and their memberships, including the Mediation and Grades Review committees. Two of the faculty deans reported that they do not actively verify that teachers are participating appropriately in this process but rather they rely on student and/or teacher complaints. The faculty deans then follow up on all such complaints with the involved teacher and/or department.

For the day division of Continuing Education, situations requiring a Grades Review Committee were referred to the appropriate Grades Review Committee in the same discipline in the day program. For issues requiring mediation, the same rules were followed as for the regular day programs but Student Services provided the committee members. The Academic Dean was also consulted as required. The CE coordinator of the day division reported that incidences requiring either grades review or mediation are rare.

Indicator 4: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that they have mechanisms in place to verify that all teachers submit their marks in a timely manner.

In terms of verifying that teachers submit their marks in a timely manner, for the regular day programs, teachers submit their marks to the Registrar’s office via the Omnivox system. The Registrar contacts any teachers who have not submitted their marks by the afternoon of the deadline and encourages them to do so that day. The Registrar then sends a list of any teachers who submit their marks late to the appropriate faculty dean. All faculty deans reported that they contact all teachers who submit marks late directly and inform them of the consequences of their actions. Letters can be placed in the teacher’s file if they still do not comply. As reported previously, the majority of teachers in the regular day programs do submit their marks on time (Average rate of compliance for the seven semesters from A’04 to A’07 = 98%).

In Continuing Education, the Records Department tracks marks submissions and CE coordinators contact all teachers who are late.

Indicator 5: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans reporting that they have mechanisms in place to verify that all teachers participate appropriately in the academic review process.

For the DEC programs, review processes are addressed by the departments and are under the supervision of the faculty deans.

Review processes per se are not used in the AEC programs. Lists of students who are not in good academic standing are reviewed by the CE Academic Advisor, who sends them to the appropriate CE coordinator. Subsequently, Continuing Education governs them according to the Standing and Advancement policy.
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With respect to the Academic Review process, there seemed to be some confusion about the term. Some deans/coordinators appeared to be addressing the Grades Review process and others, the review process for Standing and Advancement in a program. This may be due to the recent changes in the Standing and Advancement policy and the discontinuation of the long used term “Review Boards”. To further complicate the situation the term “Academic Review Process” is used in the IPESA but not in the Standing and Advancement policy, and the term “Program Review Process” is used in the Standing and Advancement Policy but only in relation to Additional Program Requirements. Obviously there needs to be some clarification of terminology.

The Standing and Advancement Policy (http://www.vaniercollege.qc.ca/academy/policy/7210_2006.pdf) describes the specific role of teachers in the academic review process and hence the specific tasks that faculty deans should verify are completed. The main roles for teachers and programs in this process are to develop Additional Program Requirements as necessary as well as formal Program Review Process procedures for students who fail to achieve any of the Additional Program Requirements, as established by each program.

All faculty deans reported that they review and approve all Program Review Process protocols submitted by each program in their jurisdiction. No problems with this process were expressed.

CONCLUSION

Mid-term Assessments: The process of submitting mid-term assessments and follow-up with “at risk” students is a valuable service for students, one that is definitely worth maintaining. That being said, then it is the College’s responsibility to attempt to ensure that it is done properly. A compliance rate of 81% for teacher submission of mid-term assessments is not acceptable. The Steering Committee, therefore, has made the following recommendations:

**Recommendation: The Registrar should consider:**

- Reminding teachers, shortly before mid-term assessments are due, of the importance of and rationale for submitting mid-term assessments. The process for submitting these assessments can also be reviewed. Perhaps this could be done online, via Omnivox.
- Sending a list of all teachers who do not submit their mid-term assessments to the faculty deans for follow-up in much the same manner as is done for grades submission at the end of the term.

**Recommendation: An IPESA Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA to give teachers the responsibility to submit mid-term assessments for each of their students, each semester and in a timely fashion.**

Mark Update and Grades Review Requests: For Mark update and Grades review requests, approximately 10% of our student respondents reported that their requests for a Mark update or Grades review were not answered. The majority of these students were enrolled in one of the day
programs. It is possible that the question was misleading, as it asked the respondent to address two actions at the same time or the answers did truly reflect the respondents’ situations. The questions are shown below:

69. Have you ever submitted a formal request for a Mark Update and not received an answer to your request?

70. Have you ever submitted a formal request for a Grades Review and not received an answer to your request?

For the purposes of this study, we assumed that the students understood the question and answered appropriately. Therefore, if the results of our student survey are indicative of the entire student population, then it would seem that approximately 10% of the Mark Update and Grades Review requests, mostly in the day programs were not addressed.

**Recommendation:** The Registrar and faculty deans should review together the process for ensuring that Mark Update and Grades Review requests are followed up within the time specified in the Mark Update and Grades Review Policy and revise the process as required.

**Committee Responsibilities:** The mechanisms in place to ensure that teachers fulfill their committee responsibilities especially in such areas as Mediation and Grades Review appear to be adequate. The same can be said for the mechanisms to ensure that teachers submit their final grades on or before the prescribed submission deadline and to ensure that teachers participate in the Academic Review Process appropriately. However, for the Academic Review Process, terminology needs to be clarified.

**Recommendation:** An IPESA Revision Committee should consider revising the IPESA to include a glossary of commonly used terms and to ensure that it uses consistent terminology throughout the policy and in all other policies subsumed under it.

Similarly, the mechanisms in place to ensure that teachers submit their grades in a timely fashion appear to be adequate.
5.3 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY 3: WHERE NECESSARY, FOLLOWING UP ON MATTERS PERTAINING TO STUDENT COMPLAINTS ABOUT FACULTY OR FACULTY COMPLAINTS ABOUT STUDENTS, TO ENSURE THAT PROPER PROCEDURES ARE FOLLOWED FOR THE TIMELY AND EQUITABLE RESOLUTION OF ALL SUCH DIFFICULTIES.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans and CE coordinators report that they have mechanisms in place to ensure that proper procedures are followed for the timely and equitable resolution of student complaints about faculty.

For student complaints about teachers, all 6 deans/CE coordinators reported some form of personal intervention. Two reported their first response was to encourage the student to speak with the teacher about the problem, if they have not done so already. Most reported discussing the issue with the teacher directly, referring the student to the appropriate committee e.g. Mediation or Grades Review Committee, and/or taking disciplinary action in collaboration with the Academic Dean and Director of Human Resources.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that they have mechanisms in place to ensure that proper procedures are followed for the timely and equitable resolution of faculty complaints about students.

For teacher complaints about students, again all 6 deans/CE coordinators reported some form of personal intervention, the nature of which was determined by the particulars of each case. Actions taken could involve talking to the student, a referral to the Mediation Committee or disciplinary action in collaboration with the Coordinator of Student Services and/or the Academic Dean.

The faculty deans and CE coordinators also have various resource people that they can consult with as necessary including the Academic Dean, the Coordinator of Student Services, the Human Rights Officer and the Director of Human Resources. In addition, the Human Rights Officer has provided training for all managers, including faculty deans in the area of human rights.

CONCLUSION

The mechanisms in place to follow up on matters pertaining to student complaints about faculty or faculty complaints about students, to ensure that proper procedures are followed for the timely and equitable resolution of all such difficulties appear adequate.
5.4 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY 4: TO ENSURE THAT THE REGISTRAR RECEIVES CORRECT INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO SCHEDULING OF COURSES AND REPORTING OF GRADES.

For the regular day programs, the Registrar sends information concerning the expected number of students in each course, usually in March for the upcoming Fall semester and November for the upcoming Winter semester. An internally developed system is currently used to project enrolments in each program and hence workloads. Departmental coordinators base their scheduling information on these estimates and then submit this scheduling information to the faculty deans. The faculty deans, in consultation with the coordinators, assess the accuracy of the information and forward it to the Registrar. Continuing Education does their scheduling internally without the assistance of the Registrar.

For the regular day programs, teachers submit their grades directly to the Registrar’s office. Any problems with inaccuracies would be taken by the student back to the teacher via the Marks Update and Grades Review processes. The coordinators in Continuing Education also collect grades from the teachers directly and again, do not use the Registrar’s office for this process.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans reporting that over the last five years, each semester, their office submitted accurate scheduling information to the Registrar’s office.

The three faculty deans reported that they send scheduling information collected from departmental coordinators to the Registrar each semester. They check the information for accuracy before forwarding to the Registrar. They further reported that the information is accurate at the time that it is submitted but only in-so-far as are the projection data upon which it is based. Almost every semester, increases in allocation have necessitated changes after the data has been submitted.

Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans reporting that over the last five years, each semester, their office followed up appropriately with any teachers who did not submit their grades on time.

Reports from the faculty deans and CE coordinators indicate that they contact all teachers who submit their grades late either by phone, email or personal interview and explain the seriousness of their actions. Second offences are dealt with in a similar fashion but a letter can also be placed in the teacher’s file.

CONCLUSION

With regards to ensuring that the Registrar receives correct scheduling information, the faculty deans and coordinators are doing the best they can with the information that is available to them. The current system used to establish teaching allocation is not acceptable. The College needs a reliable and efficient system to address enrolment projections and manage workloads.
Recommendation: The Registrar should consider replacing the current system used to predict enrolments and calculate teaching allocation with a more reliable and efficient system as soon as possible.
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5.5 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY 5: TO MEET WITH PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT COORDINATORS TO ASSIST IN THE APPROVAL OF NEW COURSES, COURSE PLANNERS, DECISIONS REGARDING ASSESSMENT EQUITY, FORMULATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT MEASURES, AND EVALUATIONS AND/OR REFINEMENTS TO THIS POLICY

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of department/program coordinators in a representative sample reporting that over the last five years, the faculty dean met with them as required to assist in the approval of new courses, course planners, decisions regarding assessment equity, formulations and implementation of comprehensive assessment measures, and evaluations and/or refinements to this policy.

A summary of the findings regarding coordinators reports of the roles of the faculty deans in each of the various aspects of this responsibility is provided in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1: Summary of the Findings Regarding Coordinators’ Reports of the Roles of the Faculty Deans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Department Coordinators (n=22)</th>
<th>Program Committee Representatives (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance Received (%)</td>
<td>Assistance Not Received (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of new courses</td>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
<td>3 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval of course planners (Course outlines)</td>
<td>17 (77.3)</td>
<td>5 (22.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making regarding assessment equity</td>
<td>6 (27.3)</td>
<td>7 (31.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulations and implementation of comprehensive assessment measures</td>
<td>9 (40.9)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinements to this policy (the IPESA)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department Coordinator and Program Committee Representative Surveys conducted in May & June of 2008
Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that over the last five years, they met with program/department coordinators as required to assist in the approval of new courses.

For the approval of new courses, all faculty deans/CE coordinators but two reported that they play an active role in the approval process for new courses. A variety of mechanisms were reported usually involving some sort of scrutiny of competencies after departmental and program approval and before dissemination to the Academic Dean and Academic Council. In General Studies, new versions of generic courses happen all the time. Each of the General Studies Departments has an active Curriculum Committee that approves these courses. The faculty dean monitors the situation through annual reports, course outlines and scheduling formation but rarely plays a direct role in the process.

Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that over the last five years, they met with program/department coordinators as required to assist in the approval of course outlines (course planners).

For the approval of course outlines, two CE coordinators reported checking all course outlines before they are sent out to students. The remaining CE coordinator and faculty deans defer to the teacher and/or departments as there are just too many for one person to review. Spot checks were done in one area. Any problems with course outlines that could not be resolved at the program/department level would be sent to the faculty dean to address.

Indicator 4: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that over the last five years, they met with program/department coordinators as required to assist in decision-making regarding assessment equity.

Of the day programs, two faculty deans reported distributing the Rendement Scolaire to the departmental and program coordinators on a regular basis. There were few, if any duplicate courses in Applied Technologies. The faculty dean in this area reported distributing the Rendement Scolaire only occasionally. When asked about receiving the Rendement Scolaire from their faculty dean, 16 or 73% of the department coordinators and 7 or 54% of the program committee representatives reported that they did. One dean reported occasionally checking for anomalies and two reported following up on problem areas with the department coordinator and/or teacher directly.

When asked what else faculty deans do to promote assessment equity, 3 department coordinators reported that the faculty deans communicated with them and 3 reported that the deans act on specific complaints. When faculty deans were asked the same question, all 3 deans reported that they take every opportunity to remind teachers of the importance of assessment equity and to promote it at the departmental level. For the day programs again situations requiring assistance with assessment equity occur more often in the FSGS and FSSCAL faculties.

CE coordinators reported that there are few duplicate courses in their area so assessment equity is not an issue. Continuing Education does not participate in the Rendement Scolaire tracking system.
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**Indicator 5: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that over the last five years, they met with program/department coordinators as required to assist in the formulation and implementation of Comprehensive Assessment (CA) measures.**

The 3 CE coordinators reported that CA’s are addressed in the departments of the day programs or are not applicable in their programs.

For the regular day programs, 9 of 22 department coordinators and 5 of 10 program Committee Representatives reported that their faculty dean played some role in the formulation or implementation of the CA. The remaining coordinator respondents reported that CA issues were not applicable to their departments/programs or that they did not know (3 department coordinators). The coordinators reported a variety of roles that the faculty deans assumed in this area, which followed no particular pattern. These are listed in Appendix B5 (section 5.D.)

The 3 faculty deans reported limited involvement in the implementation of the CA, aside from ensuring that marks are submitted and dealing with specific problems that may arise. In terms of CA formulation, all participate in this at the program Committee level or its equivalent when changes to the exam are made. One dean reported reviewing the exams to determine that they meet program requirements.

**Indicator 6: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that over the last five years, they met with program/department coordinators as required to assist in evaluations and/or refinements to this policy (the IPESA).**

Evaluations and revisions of the IPESA are drafted by an evaluation or revision committee. Drafts are then circulated to the various formal College bodies for feedback and approval i.e. the Academic Dean, Academic Council, Joint coordinators and the Board of Directors. Usually coordinators will take drafts back to their departments for review. Similarly if teachers within a department recognized a need to change any portion of the policy, they could transmit this to their faculty dean directly or via their coordinator.

In this study, only one faculty dean or CE coordinator reported collaborating with department/program coordinators to assist them with the process of evaluating and/or revising the IPESA.

**CONCLUSION**

**Approval of New Courses:** The majority of department/program coordinators and faculty deans/CE coordinators who responded to the surveys reported that the faculty deans/CE coordinators played an active role in the approval of new courses before these are vetted by other College committees. The only exception to this is in General Studies where, due to large volume of new versions of generic courses, this is done by very active Curriculum Committees, which report to the faculty dean via annual reports. No complaints were received about this system leading the Steering Committee to believe that the mechanisms in place are sufficient.
Course Outlines: Again, due to large volumes, course outlines are reviewed and approved mainly at the departmental/program level in the regular day programs with faculty deans becoming involved if a problem is noted. In Continuing Education the CE coordinators check course outlines directly and consult with teachers as required.

Based on our review of a random sample of course outlines discussed earlier in this report, it seems that there is room for improvement in terms of the inclusion of required content in the course outlines. Perhaps the role of the faculty deans would be stronger if it were more proactive in nature, for example, assisting faculty to develop templates, explaining importance/rationale of certain requirements, deciding with faculty what is important when revising the Policy on course outlines and IPESA.

**Recommendation:** An ad hoc committee consisting of students, teachers and faculty deans should be struck to review the Course Outline requirements as listed in the Vanier College Course Outline Policy and the IPESA and suggest revisions as required to better reflect current needs.

**Recommendation:** A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the Course Outline Policy to include a suggested template containing all of the required and optional elements of a Course Outline as listed in the policy.

Assessment Equity: All areas should be tracking course pass rates over time to determine if there are any trends that should be addressed. For example, steady increases or declines, sudden changes and possible rationale for these. As well, those areas where more than one teacher teaches the same course in the same semester, again trends should be examined over time, and any anomalies addressed at the departmental or program level. As mentioned previously, this is difficult to do with the current system of reporting course pass rates.

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

- Explore with the Information Technology Department (IT) the possibility of extracting the data currently available in the Rendement Scolaire from the new registration system (CLARA) in an electronic and more “user-friendly” version
- Explore with the Information Technology Department (IT) the possibility of providing the same Rendement Scolaire-type data for Continuing Education courses
- Send these Rendement Scolaire-type data to all programs and academic departments including those in Continuing Education.
Comprehensive Assessment: The CA is a program committee responsibility, the role of the faculty dean is to approve CA development and ensure implementation is performed appropriately. CA changes are done at the program committee level, of which the faculty dean is a member. The deans become involved in implementation only when a problem is referred to them. These mechanisms appear adequate.

IPESA Evaluation and Revision: Regarding the revision of the evaluation and revision of the IPESA, coordinators have various avenues through which their opinion can be heard, including via the faculty dean. Faculty deans can meet with program or department coordinators to assist with revisions or evaluations but this is not the usual procedure. These mechanisms appeared effective.

Recommendation: The College consider revising the IPESA to remove the faculty dean responsibility of “meeting with program/department coordinator to assist in the evaluation and/or refinement of the IPESA”.

5.6 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY: TO ADVISE TEACHERS, PROGRAM AND DEPARTMENT COORDINATORS, AND STUDENTS WHO ARE EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTY IN THE INTERPRETATION OR IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS POLICY.

FINDINGS

**Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of students in a representative sample, who reported seeking the advice of their faculty dean when experiencing difficulty interpreting the IPESA, reporting receiving assistance from their faculty dean.**

For this portion of the study, students were asked a series of questions all related to various aspects of the IPESA and if they had sought the advice of the faculty dean for each. The areas are summarized in Table 5.2 along with the number who sought this type of advice and the number who reported receiving no assistance or that the assistance was not helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice Regarding:</th>
<th>Number Seeking Advice (Percent of Total Respondents n=723)</th>
<th>Number Reporting No Assistance or Assistance Not Helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is expected of them in their program</td>
<td>20 (3%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course marks</td>
<td>10 (1%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints process about teacher behaviour</td>
<td>10 (1%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course evaluation methods</td>
<td>7 (1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These findings show that the majority of student respondents have not sought the advice of their faculty deans for matters pertaining to the interpretation of the IPESA. However, of those that did, the majority reported that they received helpful advice or information.

**Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of Teacher, department coordinator and program Committee Representative respondents reported that over the last five years their faculty dean has advised them in the interpretation of policies summarized in the IPESA when necessary.**

Twenty-two percent of the 87 teacher respondents; 50% of the 22 department coordinator respondents; and 17% or 2 of the 12 program Committee Representative respondents reported that over the last five years they have sought the advice of their faculty dean at least once regarding the interpretation or implementation of the IPESA or any policies summarized in it. Issues for which advice/clarification was sought included: attendance or the attendance policy; plagiarism; course outlines; Grades review process; competencies for particular courses, contractual responsibilities; updating of comprehensive assessments and the standing and advancement policy. Several
respondents commented on the usefulness of the advice and none commented that the assistance was not useful.

**Indicator 3: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the majority of faculty deans and CE coordinators reporting that they advise teachers, program and department coordinators, and students who are experiencing difficulty in the interpretation or implementation of the IPESA.**

The three CE coordinators reported that they do not advise teachers or department coordinators on the IPESA, knowing that the faculty deans are doing this. However, they do circulate a CE Teacher Handbook, which includes a copy of the IPESA.

The 3 faculty deans reported that they assist coordinators and teachers with the interpretation of the IPESA and the policies summarized within it on a case-by-case basis.

Faculty deans and CE coordinators reported that they advise students in the interpretation on a case-by-case basis, which is often in the context of disagreements with teachers over grades or personal interactions, and ensure that the students understand their responsibilities and possible courses of action.

**CONCLUSION**

The faculty dean’s and CE coordinators’ roles of advising teachers, program and department coordinators, and students who are experiencing difficulty in the interpretation or implementation of this policy are addressed on a case-by-case basis. If the respondents in this study can be considered representative of all those in the rest of the College, then these findings suggest that the deans and CE coordinators are performing this responsibility appropriately.
CHAPTER FIVE: FACULTY DEAN AND CE COORDINATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

5.7 & 5.8 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY: TO ORGANIZE AND CONDUCT ACADEMIC PROBATION PROCESSES FOR STUDENTS WHO ARE NOT IN GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING (5.7). TO OVERSEE THE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS FOR PROGRAMS WITH ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS (5.8).

For the DEC programs, Academic Probation Processes for students who are not in Good Academic Standing in the College and Program Review Process for students who are not in Good Academic Standing in their program of study are under the supervision of the faculty deans.

Review processes per se are not used in the AEC programs. Lists of students who are not in good academic standing are reviewed by the CE Academic Advisor, who sends them to the appropriate CE coordinator. Subsequently, Continuing Education governs them according to the Standing and Advancement policy.

The roles of the teachers, departments/programs and faculty deans in the Academic Probation Processes for students who are not in Good Academic Standing and the Program Review Process are described in detail in the Standing and Advancement policy (http://www.vaniercollege.qc.ca/acadecan/policy/7210_2006.pdf). To summarize, the faculty dean is responsible for:

- Approving the formal Program Review Process procedures for students who fail to achieve any Additional Program Requirements, as established by each program.
- Notifying students who have failed to meet the College or program requirements for advancement of their status. (The Registrar provides each faculty dean with a list of these students and blocks the students from registering.)
- Ensuring that the appropriate review process is conducted, the outcome documented and the appropriate Records Supervisor notified for removal of the block.

In all three faculties, both review processes are coordinated at the faculty dean level. Each student is required come to the faculty dean’s office where they meet with the faculty dean or a committee of teachers or an individual teacher from the program to review their situation.

With regards to this rather complex part of the evaluation process that deals with students in poor academic standing, in an attempt to ease the learning process for other administrators, one faculty dean has put together a written description of the process. This document has been shared with the other deans, the Registrar, Academic Advising, and some coordinators. Perhaps this could be included in the handbooks for all of the coordinators.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by statistics showing numbers of students reviewed due to “not in Good Academic Standing” in the College and/or their program of study.

All three faculties have documentation showing the number of Academic Probation processes and program review processes done each semester.
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Indicator 2: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans reporting that they review and approve all Program Review Process protocols and requirements for each program in their jurisdiction.

All faculty deans reported that they review and approve all Program Review Process protocols submitted by each program in their jurisdiction. No problems with this process were expressed.

CONCLUSION

The Standing and Advancement Policy was recently revised to better clarify the conditions for Standing Advancement, particularly the differentiation between Standing in the College vs the Program and the impact of each on the other. Review processes for each situation were tightened up and the evidence suggests that the faculty deans are following up on these appropriately.

As mentioned previously, there does still seem to be some confusion with the new terminology, as well as the process, which may require some additional clarification in the IPESA and the Standing & Advancement policy.

**Recommendation:** With regards to the rather complex part of the student evaluation process that deals with students in poor academic standing, in an attempt to ease the learning process for those involved with it, the Academic Dean should consider developing and distributing a step-by-step description of the generic process.
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5.9 FACULTY DEAN RESPONSIBILITY 9: TO REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC DEAN ON ALL MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT THAT FALL WITHIN THEIR JURISDICTION

At Vanier College, faculty deans are under the supervision of the Academic Dean. However, CE coordinators are not, although they can seek the advice of the Academic Dean, for example, on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement.

FINDINGS

Indicator 1: Responsibility fulfilled as evidenced by the faculty deans reporting an appropriate list of matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement that they report to the Academic Dean.

Two of the faculty deans and 1 CE coordinator indicated that they had reported matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement to the Academic Dean. The focus of such reports included issues of plagiarism, unfair or abusive behavior between students and teachers, or students not accepting suspensions for a second instance of poor academic standing. Some reporting is done on a regular basis via annual reports that include, for example, the number of students placed on probation etc.

CONCLUSION

For the faculty deans and their jurisdictions, the reporting mechanism to the Academic Dean on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement appears adequate. However, for the CE coordinators, their inclusion in this responsibility i.e. to report to the Academic Dean on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement in Continuing Education may be required.

Recommendation: The Academic Dean and CE coordinators should explore the possibility of having the CE coordinators report to the Academic Dean on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement that fall within their jurisdiction.
5.10 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter presents the evidence regarding the exercise of the faculty dean responsibilities in accordance with the Vanier College IPESA. In Continuing Education (CE) at Vanier College, the three CE coordinators fulfill many of the responsibilities that are designated to the faculty deans in the regular day programs. Therefore, the CE coordinators were included, where appropriate, in this chapter of the report. Perhaps a future version of the IPESA could include the CE coordinators where appropriate.

With respect to the evaluation of student achievement, the faculty deans are responsible for the following:

1. Ensuring that complete and accurate course descriptions, coherent with both Ministerial requirements and college policy are distributed in the first week of classes and are filed both in the Faculty office and with the Academic Dean.
2. Verifying that all teachers submit mid-term assessments, follow up Mark Update requests, fulfill committee responsibilities especially in such areas as Mediation and Grades Review, submit their marks in a timely manner, and participate appropriately in the Academic Review Process.
3. Where necessary, following up on matters pertaining to student complaints about faculty or faculty complaints about students, to ensure that proper procedures are followed for the timely and equitable resolution of all such difficulties.
4. Ensuring that the Registrar receives correct information with respect to scheduling of courses and reporting of grades.
5. Meeting with program/department coordinators to assist in the approval of new courses, course planners, decisions regarding assessment equity, formulations and implementation of comprehensive assessment measures, and evaluations and/or refinements to this policy.
6. Advising teachers, program and department coordinators, and students who are experiencing difficulty in the interpretation or implementation of this policy.
7. Organizing and conducting Academic Probation Processes for students who are not in Good Academic Standing.
8. Overseeing the Program Review Process for Programs with Additional Requirements.
9. Reporting to the Academic Dean on all matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement that fall within their jurisdiction.

Responsibility 1: Ensuring that complete and accurate course descriptions, coherent with both Ministerial requirements and college policy are distributed in the first week of classes and are filed both in the Faculty office and with the Academic Dean.

In working on this portion of the study, the Steering Committee took the term “Course Description” to be synonymous with the term “course outline”. The Steering Committee agreed that some of the required elements of the course outline may need updating. Furthermore, teachers new to the College should be made aware of the course outline requirements and this should be done in a systematic fashion. The official repository for these important documents should be decided and all policies adjusted accordingly. Some of the resulting recommendations were made in a previous chapter and will be repeated here in the section on “Chapter Recommendations”.
Responsibility 2: Verifying that all teachers submit mid-term assessments, follow up Mark Update requests, fulfill committee responsibilities especially in such areas as Mediation and Grades Review, submit their marks in a timely manner, and participate appropriately in the Academic Review Process.

Mid-term Assessments: The process of submitting mid-term assessments and follow-up with “at risk” students is a valuable service for students, one that is definitely worth maintaining. That being said, then it is the College’s responsibility to attempt to ensure that it is done properly. A compliance rate of 81% for teacher submission of mid-term assessments is not acceptable.

Mark Update and Grades Review Requests: For Mark update and Grades review requests, approximately 10% of our student respondents reported that their requests for a Mark update or Grades review were not answered. The majority of these students were enrolled in one of the day programs. It is possible that the question was misleading, as it asked the respondent to address two actions at the same time. For the purposes of this study, we assumed that the students understood the question and answered appropriately. Therefore, if the results of our student survey are indicative of the entire student population, then it would seem that approximately 10% of the Mark Update and Grades Review requests, mostly in the day programs were not addressed. The Steering Committee recommendation is included in the recommendations section of the chapter summary to follow.

Committee Responsibilities, Grades Submission & Academic Review Process: The mechanisms in place to attempt to ensure that teachers fulfill their committee responsibilities especially in such areas as Mediation and Grades Review appear to be adequate. The same can be said for the mechanisms to ensure that teachers submit their final grades on or before the prescribed submission deadline and to ensure that teachers participate in the Academic Review Process appropriately. However, for the Academic Review Process, terminology needs to be clarified.

Responsibility 3: Where necessary, following up on matters pertaining to student complaints about faculty or faculty complaints about students, to ensure that proper procedures are followed for the timely and equitable resolution of all such difficulties.

The mechanisms in place to follow up on matters pertaining to student complaints about faculty or faculty complaints about students, to ensure that proper procedures are followed for the timely and equitable resolution of all such difficulties appear adequate.

Responsibility 4: Ensuring that the Registrar receives correct information with respect to scheduling of courses and reporting of grades.

With regards to ensuring that the Registrar receives correct scheduling information, the faculty deans and coordinators are doing the best they can with the information that is available to them. The current system used to establish teaching allocation is not acceptable. The College needs a reliable and efficient system to address enrolment projections and manage workloads.
Responsibility 5: Meeting with program/department coordinators to assist in the approval of new courses, course planners, decisions regarding assessment equity, formulations and implementation of comprehensive assessment measures, and evaluations and/or refinements to this policy.

Approval of New Courses: The majority of department/program coordinators and faculty deans/CE coordinators who responded to the surveys reported that the faculty deans/CE coordinators played an active role in the approval of new courses before these are vetted by other College committees. The only exception to this is in General Studies where, due to large volume of new versions of generic courses, this is done by very active Curriculum Committees, which report to the faculty dean via annual reports. No complaints were received about this system leading the Steering Committee to believe that the mechanisms in place are sufficient.

Course Outlines: Again, due to large volumes, course outlines are reviewed and approved mainly at the departmental/program level in the regular day programs with faculty deans becoming involved if a problem is noted. In Continuing Education the CE coordinators check course outlines directly and consult with teachers as required.

Based on our review of a random sample of course outlines discussed earlier in this report, it seems that there is room for improvement in terms of the inclusion of required content in the course outlines. Perhaps the role of the faculty deans would be stronger if it were more proactive in nature, for example, assisting faculty to develop templates, explaining importance/rationale of certain requirements, deciding with faculty what is important when revising the Policy on course outlines and IPESA.

Assessment Equity: All areas should be tracking course pass rates over time to determine if there are any trends that should be addressed. For example, steady increases or declines, sudden changes and possible rationale for these. As well, those areas where more than one teacher teaches the same course in the same semester, again trends should be examined over time, and any anomalies addressed at the departmental or program level. As mentioned in a previous chapter, this is difficult to do with the current system of reporting course pass rates.

Comprehensive Assessment (CA): The CA is a program committee responsibility, the role of the faculty dean is to approve CA development and ensure implementation is performed appropriately. CA changes are done at the program committee level, of which the faculty dean is a member. The deans become involved in implementation only when a problem is referred to them. These mechanisms appear adequate.

IPESA Evaluation and Revision: Regarding the revision of the evaluation and revision of the IPESA, coordinators have various avenues through which their opinions can be heard, including via the faculty dean. Faculty deans can meet with program or department coordinators to assist with revisions or evaluations but this is not the usual procedure. These mechanisms appeared effective.

Responsibility 6: Advising teachers, program and department coordinators, and students who are experiencing difficulty in the interpretation or implementation of this policy.

The faculty dean’s and CE coordinators’ roles of advising teachers, program and department coordinators, and students who are experiencing difficulty in the interpretation or implementation of this policy are addressed on a case-by-case basis. If the respondents in this study can be
considered representative of all those in the rest of the College, then these findings suggest that the faculty deans and CE coordinators are performing this responsibility appropriately.

Responsibility 7 & 8: Organizing and conducting Academic Probation Processes for students who are not in Good Academic Standing. Overseeing the Program Review Process for Programs with Additional Requirements.

The Standing and Advancement policy was recently revised to better clarify the conditions for Standing Advancement, particularly the differentiation between Standing in the College vs the program and the impact of each on the other. Review processes for each situation were tightened up and the evidence suggests that the faculty deans are following up on these appropriately.

As mentioned previously, there does still seem to be some confusion with the new terminology, as well as the process, which may require some additional clarification in the IPESA and the Standing & Advancement policy.

Responsibility 9: Reporting to the Academic Dean on all matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement that fall within their jurisdiction.

For the faculty deans and their jurisdictions, the reporting mechanism to the Academic Dean on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement appears adequate. However, for the CE coordinators, their inclusion in this responsibility i.e. to report to the Academic Dean on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement in Continuing Education may be required.
5.11 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 to:
   - Include a glossary of commonly used terms, such as, for example, “course outlines” and to ensure that it uses consistent terminology throughout the policy and in all other policies subsumed under it
   - Give the Registrar, instead of the library, the responsibility of storing all course outlines in perpetuity after they have been reviewed by the Academic Dean and others
   - Give teachers the responsibility to submit mid-term assessments for each of their students, each semester and in a timely fashion.
   - Remove the faculty dean responsibility of “meeting with program/department coordinator to assist in the evaluation and /or refinement of the IPESA”.

2. An ad hoc committee consisting of students, teachers and faculty deans should be struck to review the course outline requirements as listed in the Vanier College Course Outline Policy and the IPESA and suggest revisions as required to better reflect current needs.

3. A Policy Revision Committee should consider revising the Course Outline Policy to include a suggested template containing all of the required and optional elements of a course outline as listed in the policy.

4. Faculty deans, CE coordinators or their delegates should:
   - Bring the Course Outline Policy to the attention of all teachers commencing their first semester at the College
   - Encourage departments and programs to examine the data on course pass rates and class averages (Rendement Scolaire) regularly.

5. The Registrar should consider:
   - Reminding teachers, shortly before mid-term assessments are due, of the importance of and rationale for submitting mid-term assessments. The process for submitting these assessments can also be reviewed. Perhaps this could be done online, via Omnivox
   - Sending a list of all teachers who do not submit their mid-term assessments to the faculty deans for follow-up in much the same manner as is done for grades submission at the end of the term
   - Replacing the current system used to predict enrolments and calculate teaching allocation with a more reliable and efficient system as soon as possible.

6. The Registrar and faculty deans should review together the process for ensuring that Mark Update and Grades Review requests are followed up within the time specified in the Mark Update and Grades Review Policy and revise the process as required.

7. The Office of Institutional Development and Effectiveness (OIDE) should:
• Explore with the Information Technology Department (IT) the possibility of extracting the data currently available in the Rendement Scolaire from the new registration system (CLARA) in an electronic and more “user-friendly” version
• Explore with the Information Technology Department (IT) the possibility of providing the same Rendement Scolaire-type data for Continuing Education courses
• Send these Rendement Scolaire-type data to all programs and academic departments including those in Continuing Education.

8. With regards to the rather complex part of the student evaluation process that deals with students in poor academic standing, in an attempt to ease the learning process for those involved with it, the Academic Dean should consider developing and distributing a step-by-step description of the generic process.

9. The Academic Dean and CE coordinators should explore the possibility of having the CE coordinators report to the Academic Dean on matters pertaining to the evaluation of student achievement that fall within their jurisdiction.