

**INSTITUTIONAL POLICY FOR THE
EVALUATION OF STUDENT
ACHIEVEMENT (IPESA)**

*Politique institutionnelle d'évaluation
des apprentissages – (PIÉA)*

ACADEMIC DEAN
June 2015

Policy as adopted by the Board of Governors on 22 June 2015.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	5
1. Scope of application	5
2. Policy intentions	6
3. Policy objectives	6
4. Principles of evaluation	7
4.1 Learning assessment is an integral part of the teaching and learning processes	7
4.2 Quality learning assessment is contingent on the quality of the tools employed and the judgements rendered	7
4.3 Evaluation must be fair and unbiased	7
4.4 Learning assessment must reflect coherence within institutional procedures and acknowledge diversity in evaluation practices	7
5. Norms and regulations	8
5.1 Course outline	8
5.2 Rules for assessing learning	9
5.3 Additional aspects to assess	10
5.4 <i>Épreuve Synthèse de Programme / Integrative Project</i>	11
5.5 Transcript and certification of studies	12
5.6 Grievances	15
6. Responsibilities	17
6.1 Students	17
6.2 Teachers	17
6.3 Departements	18
6.4 Program Committee	19
6.5 Academic Dean	19
6.6 Academic Council	19
6.7 Board of Governors	19
7. Policy evaluation and revision	20
7.1 Frequency of evaluation	20
7.2 Purpose of evaluation	20
7.3 Evaluation criteria	20
7.4 Evaluation process	20
7.5 Policy update	20
8. Implementation	20
8.1 Date of enactment	20
8.2 Policy disclosure	20
GLOSSARY	21

FOREWORD

This policy is in keeping with the rules and provisions established by the *General and Vocational Colleges Act* and the *College Education Regulations*. It acknowledges the various policies and regulations of this Cegep, including the *Politique institutionnelle de la langue française – PILF* / French Language Institutional Policy. It complies with the provisions of the teachers' collective agreement and builds upon the rich pedagogical heritage constituted by the Cegep over the years. It is in line with the Cegep's *Mission*, with its *Educational Project* and its *Strategic Plan*.

The present policy is based on the policy of 2004 to which necessary modifications were made following the evaluation of its application in 2008 and the recommendations of the *Commission d'évaluation de l'enseignement collégial* (CEEC). This revised version is the result of the collective considerations of a workgroup representing the pedagogical interests of the Cegep.

This policy is based on the belief that the task of evaluating is a fundamental part of teaching.

1. SCOPE OF APPLICATION

This policy maintains that all evaluations must be fair, unbiased and transparent, and it is meant to assist teachers and departments in fulfilling their responsibilities.

The Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA) / *Politique institutionnelle d'évaluation des apprentissages (PIÉA)* applies to General Education as well as to Continuing Education and to all credited courses offered at Cégep Édouard-Montpetit.

2. POLICY INTENTIONS

1. Ensure best practices in evaluation.
2. Vouch for the quality of the diploma with students, teachers and other members of Cegep personnel, the public and the Minister.

3. POLICY OBJECTIVES

1. Make public the provisions of the policy concerning the evaluation of student achievement.
2. Define the norms and principles concerning the evaluation of student achievement in order to make certain all evaluations are fair and unbiased, and uphold this postulate.
3. Describe the regulations and mechanisms which ensure quality and equity in the evaluation of student achievement and conformity in evaluation practices throughout courses and study programs.
4. Ascertain that the policy is applied consistently by all persons involved and specify their roles and responsibilities concerning the evaluation of student achievement and the certification of studies.
5. Specify the procedures for evaluating and revising this policy.

4. PRINCIPLES OF EVALUATION

It is the Cegep's responsibility to answer publicly for the quality of its evaluations and for the value of its diplomas. It must also make certain its evaluation process is transparent and accessible.

4.1 Learning assessment is an integral part of the teaching and learning processes

Learning objectives and the valuation of their attainment are the foundations on which teaching and learning activities are planned, as is promoted in the course outlines handed to students.

A course is dependent upon the subject taught, the program said subject belongs to and the students to whom it is addressed. Learning assessment must take into account the learning objectives as defined for the course and recognize that the acquisition of knowledge and the development of student capabilities are gradual processes.

4.2 Quality learning assessment is contingent upon the quality of the tools employed and the judgements rendered

Learning assessment must always reflect the achievement of course objectives. Valid judgement on a student's achievement may be given only if based on quality evaluation. Said judgement will be formed as objectively as possible and be based on sufficient relevant data gathered according to recognized criteria that are clearly defined.

4.3 Evaluation must be fair and unbiased

Evaluation must be based on a transparent process which specifies:

- the objectives being evaluated;
- the standards and criteria being applied;
- the evaluation methods selected;
- the timeframe.

Fairness requires:

- that students be informed of what is expected of them during evaluation activities and of the manner in which their results will be interpreted;

- that students be adequately prepared for evaluation activities through appropriate learning experiences enabling them to achieve the required learning objectives of a course or to develop the competencies of a program;
- that judgement be imparted on the basis of correction criteria which take into account the learning process, knowledge acquisition and the development of student capabilities throughout the program;
- that students be given evaluation results within the designated timeframe and opportunity to seek recourse;
- that evaluations be coherent, which means that evaluation requirements for all groups of a same course be specified according to identical learning objectives and comparable criteria, and be graded similarly.

This prescription for equivalency does not imply that learning activities selected by teachers to reach learning objectives be the same, nor does it require that evaluation means be identical.

Ensuring fairness may mean adapting learning activities to certain students with special needs, as long as consistency is maintained in evaluation requirements.

4.4 Learning assessment must reflect coherence within institutional procedures and acknowledge diversity in evaluation practices

As a member of a public school system whose programs must be universal and equivalent in nature, the Cegep makes certain that learning evaluation be in keeping with Ministerial objectives and standards as specified in study programs. It also makes certain that evaluation practices be in keeping with institutional rules and principles and that learning assessment be carried out coherently.

Therefore, the Cegep proposes an institutional model for course outlines which reflects the school's evaluation practices, and it offers its support to its departments and to the Center for Continuing Education in analyzing and approving their course outlines.

5. NORMS AND REGULATIONS

5.1 Course outline

The course outline is more than a document containing information, it is a pedagogical planning tool prepared by teachers for their students for a specific course. It provides the students with a coherent learning process highlighting the objectives pursued, the corresponding subject matter and the chosen evaluation activities.

The course outline is developed in accordance with the course specifications and the curriculum framework, when applicable. It includes the following:

- a) the cover page on which are noted :
 - i) Cegep identification
 - ii) ministerial course number
 - iii) semester during which the course takes place
 - iv) name of department responsible for the course
 - v) title of the course
 - vi) program name and code and, when applicable, the specialization or the option the course is associated with¹
 - vii) name and number of the subject taught
 - viii) weighting of the course
 - ix) name of the teacher and space in which to note teacher availability and contact info (office number and school phone extension)
 - x) name of the Department Coordinator or his Continuing Education counterpart.
- b) the prescribed course sequence
- c) the graduating student's profile¹
- d) the course codes and ministerial objectives
- e) the terminal objective of the course or of the integrative course²
- f) the educational orientations of the course: the teaching methods and specifications regarding the competencies the student will have attained or developed
- g) the periods when learning activities take place
- h) the learning objectives*³
- i) the subject-specific content* in relation to learning objectives
- j) a description of the learning activities in relation to the objectives being assessed and the chosen assessment models, the context of their implementation, their grading and their sequencing.*

In cases where assessment criteria are not all available when the course outline is submitted, the following note will appear: *The evaluation criteria will be submitted to students in writing at least one week before the summative assessment takes place.*
- k) the required material
- l) a mediagraphy*
- m) the conditions for passing the course:
 - i) the minimum passing grade of 60% indicating that a student achieved course objectives at the minimum required level
 - ii) when applicable,
 - a) the objectives which, if not attained to a minimum requirement, lead to a failing grade
 - b) multiple threshold grading
 - iii) attendance at summative assessments
 - iv) homework submission deadlines
 - v) formatting and presentation of work
 - vi) quality of French.**
- n) the course attendance rules* (behavior during class, dress code, field trips or events outside of Cegep walls, on-the-job training sessions, etc.)
- o) a reference to existing policies posted on the Cegep website or, when applicable, to specific departmental rules concerning evaluation activities, especially those relating to formatting and presentation of written work, quality of language, sanctions for late submission of homework and course attendance, (art. 5.2.5.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.4).

¹ In the case of general education common courses and complementary courses, this requirement may be deferred.

² In the case of courses comprising theory and practice, two terminal objectives may appear.

³ In the case of integrative courses that do not require new learning and for which the Integrative Project is the only activity, no learning objective is required.

* These components are prescribed by article 20 of the RREC.

** All provisions relative to the French language will be adapted to the specific context of English language programs.

5.2 Rules for assessing learning

5.2.1 *Assessing learning*

To ensure the validity of the evaluation process, learning assessment is based on the achievement of course objectives and, where the Integrative Project is concerned, on the development of program competencies. In consequence of which the final grade will reflect the level at which the course's learning objectives have been met in relation to determined standards and levels of achievement. The Integrative Project will reflect the development of competencies as prescribed by Ministerial standards.

Students with special needs may benefit from measures adapted to their condition unless these accommodations impose undue constraints on the Cegep.

5.2.2 *Number of summative assessments⁴*

Each course must contain a minimum of three summative assessment activities.

5.2.3 *Sequencing of a course's summative assessments*

Teachers are responsible for planning and sequencing their summative evaluation activities in such a way as to make certain a minimum of 15% of the final grade is accumulated by the student at mid-semester.

5.2.4 *Course final assessment activities⁵*

Each course must include at least one final assessment at the end of the semester. Final assessments attest that students have integrated knowledge and met course objectives in accordance with Ministerial standards.

The total weighting for this or these assessment(s) cannot be worth less than 30% of the final grade.

5.2.5 *Attendance at summative assessments and homework deadlines*

5.2.5.1 *Summative assessments*

Attendance at summative evaluation activities is mandatory. Students must conform to instructions concerning activities organized by their teachers and scheduled in the course outline.

Students arriving late to a summative evaluation activity without a valid reason may be refused access to said activity.

Unsubstantiated absence of students for serious reasons (sickness, death, a fortuitous event, etc.) at a summative evaluation activity may lead to a grade of 0 for this activity.

It is up to students to contact their teachers, explain the reasons for their absence and provide supporting documents. If reasons are serious and recognized as such by teachers, arrangements to make up for a summative assessments may be made and must be mutually agreed upon.

5.2.5.2 *Homework deadlines*

Homework must be submitted when and where teachers require. It is up to the department to set the sanctions incurred by lateness in its departmental rules and to make certain those sanctions are specified in the course outlines and available to students for consultation.

5.2.6 *Homework and exam correction*

Students must be informed at least one week in advance of the nature, criteria and weighting of an evaluation.

All homework and exams are corrected within three weeks following submission to teachers. These must be annotated in such a way that students may understand their mistakes, and where lay their weaknesses and their strengths. Teachers must keep in their possession all exams and homework during the semester, according to departmental rules. They must also make these available for consultation on demand.

⁴ This article does not apply to integrative courses.

⁵ In some courses, a number of learning activities may lead to one final summative evaluation. The total weighting of these activities will equal at least 30% of the final grade.

5.2.7 Transmitting results

Throughout the semester, teachers must transfer evaluation results to the Cegep's official electronic grade management system.

Confidentiality of results must be observed in accordance with the *Act Respecting Access To Documents Held By Public Bodies And The Protection Of Personal Information*

5.3 Additional aspects to assess

5.3.1 Assessment of language**

In its *PILF / French Language Institutional Policy*, the Cegep states that *"using quality French is a priority and a firm collective commitment founded on the participation of all. [...] The Cegep considers that improving the quality of French [...] is a process to encourage and to uphold."* It also maintains that *"the procurement of a Diploma of College Studies attests as much to the knowledge and competencies acquired in a study program as to a sanctioned command of the French language."*

In consequence of which student proficiency in the French language is assessed in all courses where French is the language of instruction.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

In accordance with article 7.3 of the *PILF / French Language Institutional Policy*, it is every department's responsibility to implement an evaluation procedure of the French language in homework and examinations and to submit said procedure to the Academic Dean for approval. Once adopted, this evaluation procedure will be specified in every course outline.

In addition, in accordance with article 7.4 of the same language policy, *"Program committees are responsible for establishing requirements concerning the quality of French, especially in regards to Integrative Projects. These requirements are submitted to the Academic Dean for approval."*

The department procedure for evaluating French must:

- define and specify requirements concerning the evaluation of French;
- institute a common grading scale;
- inform students of the possibility to make up for lost points by reviewing and correcting work;
- forewarn students that teachers may return homework when language mistakes hinder comprehension of work, or postpone its acceptance until submitted work demonstrates appropriate language proficiency. Late submission of work may then be subject to such sanctions as stated in departmental policies.

As a rule, summative evaluation of French proficiency applies to oral and written work where language skills are significant (long answer questions, oral presentations, essays, etc.), whether produced in the classroom or elsewhere.

When quality of language is an integral part of the evaluation assessment, this criterion must be worth at least 10% of the grade or be weighted according to established departmental procedures.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Students need to be guided and properly informed in order to improve their language skills. Teachers of all departments are invited to comment and annotate their corrections and encourage students who need more support to seek help at the *Centre d'aide en français* (French help center) and to avail themselves of all the services provided by the Cegep.

** All provisions relative to the French language will be adapted to the specific context of English language programs.

5.3.2 *Formatting guidelines*

All Cegep courses promote quality of work and a high degree of conscientiousness. Teachers take into consideration the quality of students' written work and exams when assessing them. Students must observe all formatting guidelines adopted by the Cegep.

Teachers may take away a certain percentage of a grade for work that does not conform to formatting guidelines. In this case, sanctions concerning non respect of said guidelines must have been established by departments and these rules specified in course outlines for students to consult. Teachers may postpone accepting work until it conforms to Cegep formatting guidelines. Late submission of work may then be subject to sanctions as stated in departmental policies.

5.3.3 *Teamwork*

Teamwork helps develop students' capacity to interact in groups. Types of groupings and their functions may vary.

However, course objectives must at all times contain some measure of individual evaluation. A team grade may not, by itself, represent student achievement.

A maximum of 25% of a course's final grade may be attributed to team work.

5.3.4 *Course attendance*

Course attendance demonstrates commitment to their studies on the students' behalf and is an essential requirement for attaining course objectives and successfully completing a course.

In order to promote student commitment and the attainment of course objectives, absenteeism may be the subject of disciplinary measures.

Any department that wishes to apply exclusion rules in case of repeated absenteeism must submit them beforehand to the Academic Dean and make certain these rules are specified in the course outlines. Teachers will need to register non-attendance either in the electronic attendance management system or somewhere available to students for consultation. The Academic Dean will be notified of any exclusion from a course and will keep a record.

Attendance or non-attendance at classes is not a criterion of summative evaluations unless it is directly linked to the achievement of the course objectives.

In cases where student behavior is a component of a learning activity (practical training, clinic, laboratory, etc.), article 5.2.5 may apply.

5.4 ***Épreuve synthèse de programme / Integrative Project***

5.4.1 *Official regulations*

Students admitted to a program leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) will need to complete an Integrative Project in conformity with article 25 of the *College Education Regulations*. Results to this activity will be noted on the students' transcripts.

5.4.2 *Definition*

The Integrative Project testifies to the development of a program's competencies according to requirements established by Ministerial standards. It is different from the course assessments which verify the achievement of course competencies. The Integrative Project requires graduating students to demonstrate they have functionally integrated the competencies targeted by the program objectives, whether for specific training or general education, in preparation for the work or study environment they will be entering upon graduation.

5.4.3 *Admission requirements*

To be admitted to the Integrative Project, students must be enrolled in the final course programs of their final semester, except when said courses are part of complementary general education.

5.4.4 Registration procedures

The Integrative Project is an integral part of one or a few integrative courses taking place during the last semester of a program. When students enroll in these courses, they are also enrolling in the Integrative Project.

5.4.5 Framework for the Integrative Project

The Integrative Project may take various forms. It can be made up of one or more comprehensive examination tasks. It must, however, always include a written segment. The framework for the Integrative Project will help define its particular components. All frameworks must conform to the standards adopted by the Cegep.

5.4.6 Program specifications

The Cegep prepares an informational document for students containing specifications on each program's Integrative Project. Students are handed this document when they enroll.⁶ This document presents a graduating student's profile, discloses the goals and objectives of the program, those of general education and of technical programs, as well as the courses involving the Integrative Project, its context and a summary of its evaluation plan.

5.4.7 Certification

Passing an integrative course means passing the Integrative Project. However, because of its unique nature, weighting of the Integrative Project must be superior or equal to 60% of the integrative course's final grade.

Results to the Integrative Project are marked RE (*Réussite* / Pass) or EC (*Échec* / Fail) in students' transcripts under the heading "*Épreuve synthèse de programme*".

It is mandatory for students to pass the Integrative Project in order to receive their Diplomas of College Studies (DEC).

5.5 Transcript and certification of studies

5.5.1 Note to transcript

Besides grades, the transcript issued at the end of each semester may bear the following comments:

5.5.1.1 DI – *Dispense* / Exemption

The Cegep may give permission for students to be exempted from a course. This course does not have to be replaced with another and the exemption does not award students the credits corresponding to this course. The number of credits corresponding to the course from which students are exempted is subtracted from the total number of credits in the program. Allowing an exemption may never jeopardize the attainment of program standards and objectives.

An exemption is an exceptional measure granted only when the following criteria are met:

- students have an authenticated, permanent disability which prevents them from taking the course;
- the Cegep cannot offer a replacement course for students to enroll in.

To invoke this right, students must provide proof of permanent disability.

It is up to students to request an exemption from a course and to provide the Academic Dean with all the documents necessary to validate their request. The Academic Dean will analyze the documents provided and consult with the Department Coordinator or Continuing Education Administration before agreeing to the request. Formal notice of the decision rendered and all information relative to said decision are recorded in the students' files.

When an exemption is granted, a DI comment appears on the transcript.

5.5.1.2 EC – *Échec* / Failure

An EC comment, as well as the grade obtained, is noted in the transcripts of students who have received a failing grade for a course (59% or less).

The same rule applies for students who have not met the Integrative Project requirements or who have failed a Ministerial examination. In these cases, only the EC comment, not the grade, appears in the transcript under the corresponding heading.

⁶ According to article 17 or the RREC.

5.5.1.3 EQ - Equivalency

The Cegep may grant an equivalency to a course when students have demonstrated they have attained the objectives of the course for which they are requesting one, whether through prior studies or extracurricular training⁷. Equivalencies mean students may be granted the credits corresponding to a course, which does not need to be replaced with another course.

It is up to students to request an equivalency for a course and to provide the Academic Dean with all documents necessary to validate their requests. The Academic Dean will gather all documents required to justify the granting of an equivalency and refer to pre-established equivalency criteria. If required, the Academic Dean may consult with the department concerned or with Continuing Education.

Formal notice of the decision rendered and all information in relation to said decision are recorded in the students' files.

When an equivalency is granted, an EQ comment appears on the transcript.

5.5.1.4 Incompletes

There are two types of Incomplete comments.

IT – *INCOMPLET TEMPORAIRE* / TEMPORARY INCOMPLETE

An IT (temporary incomplete) comment appears on students' transcripts when they have not met course requirements within the prescribed timeframe because of special circumstances. This means homework, tests or examinations scheduled in the course's evaluation process have not been completed. Students in this situation are required to meet with their teachers and come to a mutual agreement for procuring an IT comment on their transcripts, which teachers are required to forward to the Academic Dean along with the students' cumulative results.

This agreement must also state that course requirements need to be met by students ten (10) days at the latest after the grade submission deadline. Upon teacher request, this deadline may be exceptionally extended by the Academic Dean. Once the learning activity is completed, the teacher must forward the new grade through the *Grade modification* form within the prescribed time limit. If no new grade is forwarded before the new deadline, the IT comment is stricken and the students' cumulative results appear.

IN - PERMANENT INCOMPLETE

The IN comment appears on students' transcripts when they are unable to complete courses for serious, fortuitous reasons, and must withdraw from said courses after the Ministerial deadline. Reasons invoked must have prevented students from studying for a course over a period of three (3) weeks or more. Reasons invoked may concern an accident, an extended illness, duty to assist a close family member or death of a close family member. Students must file their requests before the end of the current semester and provide the required supporting documentation. Said requests must then be approved by the Academic Dean or by the Department for Continuing Education. The IN comment remains permanently to students' files and the course for which a permanent incomplete was granted must be retaken in order for credits to be awarded.

5.5.1.5 RE – *Réussite* / Pass

An RE comment appears on the transcripts of students who have successfully met the requirements of an Integrative Project or of a Ministerial examination. In these cases, only the comment RE appears under the corresponding heading.

When students have successfully completed a course, it is the students' results in this course which appear on the transcript

5.5.1.6 SU - Substitution

The Cegep may allow the substitution of a course by another after careful analysis of students' files. Course substitution is authorized only between college-level credited courses.

Course substitution exempts students from enrolling to a program-required course on the condition they replace said course with another admissible one. This measure applies when students change programs or educational institutions, for example, or following a program review or a change in program organisation.

⁷ Equivalence does not apply to Quebec college-level courses.

Course substitution may be allowed in the following situations:

- students have already reached course objectives to required standards through another course or series of college-level courses;
- students cannot enroll in a required course because said course is no longer offered, and another course allows them to reach the same objectives, to required standards.

The Academic Dean will gather all documents required to justify the granting of a substitution and refer to pre-established substitution criteria.

If needed, the Academic Dean may consult with the department concerned or with Continuing Education. Formal notice of the decision rendered and all information in relation to said decision are recorded in the students' files.

When a substitution is authorized, a SU comment appears on the transcript.

5.5.2 *Passing requirements*

5.5.2.1 Passing grade

The passing grade for a course is 60%. This minimum grade reflects the achievement of learning objectives or competency development at required levels, according to the provisions of the present policy.

Some learning objectives are of such importance that, if not achieved, lead to a failure, regardless of cumulative grades. Students will be warned in advance of the critical importance of these specific objectives in the course outline.

5.5.2.2 *Multiple threshold grading*

When a Department decides that more than one threshold will determine successful completion of a course, students must obtain a minimum grade of 60% for each threshold being assessed (theory, practice, laboratory, practicum, etc.) in order to pass said course or practical training. If this requirement is not met, students will see their lowest grade recorded to their transcripts.

Students will be advised in advance of this particular condition in the course outlines.

The difference in weighting between the various thresholds of a course may not exceed 20%.

In cases where other grading models may apply, departments must seek authorization beforehand from the Academic Dean.

5.5.3 *Certification of studies*

5.5.3.1 Recommendation to the Minister to grant a Diploma of College Studies (DEC)

The Board of Governors, on advice from the Academic Dean, makes a recommendation to the Minister to grant a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) to students who have met the requirements of the program leading to said diploma, and to which they were admitted, if they:

- a) prove they have achieved the Ministerial objectives of the program;
- b) pass all the courses of the program in which they enrolled as well as the Integrative Project and all Ministerial standardized tests;
- c) obtain all the course credits for their programs or have been granted exemptions or equivalencies under the rules, and according to article 5.5.1 of this policy.

5.5.3.2 Recommendation to the Minister to grant an *Attestation d'études collégiales* (AEC)

The Academic Dean makes the recommendation to the Board of Governors to grant an AEC (*Attestation d'études collégiales*) to students who have met the requirements of the program leading to said diploma, and to which they were admitted, if they:

- a) prove they have achieved the institutional objectives of the program;
- b) pass all the courses of the program in which they were enrolled;
- c) obtain all the course credits of their programs or have been granted exemptions or equivalencies under the rules, and according to article 5.5.1 of this policy.

5.6 Grievances

5.6.1 *Plagiarism and other breaches of intellectual honesty*

DEFINITION

Unduly copying, translating, rephrasing in part or in whole the work of another person to one's own benefit, with or without their consent, is considered plagiarism, regardless of the material support (paper or electronic) or of the source of the aforementioned work. Impersonation of another student during summative evaluations, deception, cheating or falsifying documents or results is considered fraud. Both plagiarism and fraud are breaches of intellectual honesty, as well as any collaboration in such acts or attempts to commit such acts.

The following examples are considered breaches of intellectual honesty:

- copying other students' answers on tests or reproducing other people's work;
- helping other students copy;
- accessing unauthorized information concerning evaluation activities underway;
- copying, with or without consent of the author, excerpts of texts, no matter where they were published, without acknowledging their sources;
- using quotes without acknowledging their sources;
- stealing or distributing documents or any material used for evaluation activities.

These are only a few classic examples of plagiarism or fraud; this list is in no way comprehensive.

SANCTIONS

Any breach of intellectual honesty, as well as any attempt of, or collaboration with, such acts lead to the attribution of a grade of 0 for the examination, homework or evaluation activity in question, in which case teachers must submit written reports to the Department Coordinator who then forwards them to the Academic Dean.

Repeat offenses within the same course leads to a grade of 0 for the course, in which case teachers must submit written reports to the Department Coordinator who then forwards them to the Academic Dean. Copies of the reports are kept by the Academic Dean and the incidents recorded in the students' files.

If more than one report is forwarded to the Academic Dean concerning a same students, it is the responsibility of the Assistant Academic Deans to follow-up on the file, meet with the students and impose appropriate sanctions which may range from temporary suspension to permanent expulsion from the Cegep.

RESPONSIBILITIES

It is the Cegep's responsibility to implement mechanisms to ensure the confidentiality of any material used for summative evaluations. Teachers have the responsibility to use these mechanisms and to protect confidential documents (test questionnaires, marking grids, etc.) in their possession. Furthermore, teachers are responsible for supervising their students during exams in order to counter and prevent all forms of breaches of intellectual honesty (copying, fraud, etc.).

5.6.2 *Grade review*

Students have the right to request the review of a summative evaluation grade.

A request for grade review may be made during or at the end of the semester.

Before making an official request for a grade review, students must meet with their teachers to verify the criteria on which their assessments were based.

In the case where students find this process difficult, they can approach the Department Coordinator.

During the semester, this process must be implemented within two weeks of receiving results. At the end of the semester, the Cegep will inform the students of the prescribed timeframe for their requests to be made.

PROCEDURES FOR AN OFFICIAL REQUEST FOR GRADE REVIEW

1. After meeting with teachers, students still considering themselves adversely affected by the decisions rendered may make an official request for a grade review within the week following their meeting with teachers or within the prescribed timeframe. They must file their request by filling out a form at the Registrar's Office.
2. Students must make their request in writing, specify their grievances, and must provide, when possible, the assignments or examinations in question. Students must also specify whether they wish to be heard by the grade review committee, in which case they may be accompanied by a representative from the Student Association.
3. All requests for grade reviews are forwarded to the Department Coordinator whose responsibility it is to form the grade review committee. Teachers involved in the disputes are automatically appointed to sit on this committee, along with two other teachers.
4. When the committee renders a final decision, it is noted on the grade review form, along with teachers' comments and initials. The committee forwards this form to the Academic Dean or to the Director of the Center for Continuing Education who then communicates the decision to students.

Teachers involved in the disputes and the grade review committee are the only intervening parties allowed to either raise or lower student grades or choose not to modify them at all.

The grade review committee must forward its decisions to the Academic Dean no more than one week after the Department Coordinator receives the request. The Academic Dean is then required to follow up on the decisions rendered.

GRADE REVIEW FOR THE CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

Grade review procedures are the same for students of the Center for Continuing Education. Official requests are filled out at the Center. The Coordinator of the Center for Continuing Education is responsible for the creation of the grade review committee and its Director then communicates the decisions to students.

6. RESPONSIBILITIES

Applying the Institutional Policy for the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA) / *Politique institutionnelle d'évaluation des apprentissages (PIÉA)* is a responsibility shared by all: the students, the teachers, the departments, the program committees, the Academic Dean, the Academic Council and the Board of Governors.

6.1 Students

Students have the primary responsibility for their own learning. It is up to them to actively participate in their studies.

To this end, students must:

- a) carefully read the course outlines to plan their work during the semester, understand course objectives and plan and organize their work in accordance with teacher specifications;
- b) attend all classes;
- c) use all resources provided by the Cegep if they are experiencing learning difficulties;
- d) make arrangements to keep informed of what took place in class and of upcoming evaluation activities when they are absent;
- e) study, read, complete assignments and learning activities as required by teachers, during class and after;
- f) use quality language in written assignments, meet teacher requirements and observe Cegep formatting standards;
- g) attend all scheduled evaluations, whether formative or summative, according to requirements and deadlines;
- h) ensure the authenticity of work submitted for evaluation;
- i) keep in their possession all tests, reports and examinations handed back by their teachers, in the event of a grade review.

6.2 Teachers

Teachers' responsibilities in terms of evaluation, and as listed below, fall into the broader context of their professional responsibility to teach. The Cegep advocates teacher responsibility in evaluating, but also recognizes their professional expertise and their freedom to practice. With respect to the rights and duties inherent to their profession, teachers plan, organize and implement the tasks and teaching functions that are entrusted to them. More specifically, they are responsible for assessing their students' learning as stated in this policy, according to the regulations adopted by their own departments and in conformity with the course outlines. In this context, teachers must:

- a) contribute, in collaboration with other members of the department, to identify the learning objectives being assessed, to specify the relative value of each of these objectives in relation to the other objectives of the course, and to determine the learning assessment procedures (examinations, written assignments, oral presentations, practical training reports, etc.) which will be retained for each of the courses under their department's responsibility;
- b) create a course outline for each course by referring to the institutional model and to the course specifications and curriculum framework. They must forward an electronic version of their course outlines to their departments for approval;
- c) at the beginning of each semester, distribute the course outlines to students and inform them of their content and of the content of the summative evaluations they will undertake;
- d) perform formative and summative assessments of students;
- e) prepare the material required for each class and use it adequately to ensure proper assessment of learning and the development of program competencies;
- f) supervise students during examinations and use the necessary means to ensure the confidentiality of the documents used for summative evaluations;

- g) correct assignments, reports, examinations, tests, etc. using a correction grid specifying all evaluation criteria and their weighting. Communicate their results to students within the prescribed timeframe;
- h) for each course, retain all copies or all records of all the final assessments or Integrative Projects of their students for one additional semester;
- i) for program evaluation purposes, retain and make available upon request, to their departments, all the material used for the summative evaluation of their students for a period of three (3) years;
- j) within the scope of their personal responsibilities, and in compliance with departmental rules and regulations, ensure quality and equity in student learning assessment;
- k) keep a record of student attendance to classes;
- l) forward final assessment results to the Academic Dean to be recorded to student transcripts, within prescribed deadlines;
- m) participate in grade reviews, when necessary;
- n) forward in writing to the Department Coordinator any breach of intellectual honesty on the part of students, according to the provisions of article 5.6.1 of the present policy.

6.3 Departments

Departments make sure that quality and equity evaluations take place in the courses for which they are responsible, including learning assessment and, if applicable, assessment of competency development through Integrative Projects. As part of their responsibilities, departments carry out the following functions:

- a) creating course curriculums by referring to the institutional model for curriculum frameworks for each of the courses for which they are responsible; establishing learning sequences for students, objectives to be assessed and the required performance levels; making sure their course outlines conform to course frameworks;
- b) defining the learning objectives for each course and seeing to it that relevant pedagogical methods are applied in each of the courses for which they are responsible;
- c) making certain that proper evaluation procedures are implemented in each course, that they specify the passing thresholds and the objectives to attain which, if not attained to the required level, lead to a failing grade;
- d) ascertaining the equity of course summative assessments and of the Integrative Projects;
- e) for a same course taught by more than one teacher, establishing a context promoting teacher consultation and ensuring equality in evaluation; informing the Academic Dean of the rules they establish to that effect;
- f) implementing Integrative Projects when applicable;
- g) defining their regulations with regards to learning assessment in compliance with the present policy; determining sanctions for late submission of work and non compliance to formatting standards. Also, determining the procedures for evaluating French proficiency in compliance with article 5.3.1.;**
- h) when necessary, and with the approval of the Academic Dean, establishing procedures for suspending repeatedly absent students;
- i) every semester, approving course outlines with respect to the standards established in the course specifications and, when applicable, in the course curriculum framework, and according to the various policies, rules or regulations which apply to said plan, in compliance with the provisions of article 5.1.; forwarding an electronic copy of each approved course outline to the Academic Dean;
- j) carrying out grade reviews in compliance with article 5.6.2 of the present policy;
- k) when mandated by the Academic Dean, evaluating requests for course equivalencies or substitutions;
- l) answering to the Academic Dean for the carrying out of their responsibilities with regards to learning assessment through their annual report.

** All provisions relative to the French language will be adapted to the specific context of English language programs.

6.4 Program Committees

The program committees set the orientation for the Integrative Projects in accordance with the Academic Dean's guiding principles and other official documents pertaining to the Integrative Projects. It is their responsibility to submit to the Academic Dean a curriculum framework proposition for the Integrative Projects in compliance with the provisions of article 5.4.5.

6.5 Academic Dean⁸

The Academic Dean is responsible for the application of the IPESA / PIÉA and makes sure it is implemented. Therefore, it:

- a) receives exemption requests, grants approval when criteria are met and announces its decisions;
- b) discloses this Policy to those concerned and publishes an abridged version for students to consult;
- c) ensures that all teachers have created a detailed course outline for each course, in conformity with the educational plan;
- d) makes certain approval mechanisms for course outlines are implemented by departments;
- e) approves the Integrative Projects submitted by program committees. For each program, it also makes a summary of the most important information contained in the curriculum framework available to students;
- f) approves departmental regulations regarding learning assessment;
- g) authorizes, when necessary, exclusion procedures to be implemented by departments in case of repeat absenteeism, and makes these procedures public;
- h) implements the mechanisms teachers need to ensure the confidentiality of the material being used for summative evaluations;
- i) promotes common examinations for multiple classes/groups;
- j) receives, processes and communicates to students, within prescribed deadlines, their final results for each of their courses and for Integrative Projects;

- k) receives grade review requests, forwards them to departments, approves results and communicates them to students;
- l) recommends certification of studies;
- m) offers consultation and analysis services to teachers and to departments on the subject of learning assessment;
- n) makes sure that relevant documentation concerning learning assessment is available to teachers through Cegep libraries, and provides consultation and further training to teachers on this matter;
- o) establishes and makes the IPESA / PIÉA evaluation process public. It also plans and coordinates the evaluation and the updating of the IPESA / PIÉA, making certain that necessary corrections are applied.

6.6 Academic Council

The Academic Council relays its opinions to the Board of Governors, especially in the matter of learning assessment:

- a) relays its opinion to the Board of Governors on any project concerning the IPESA / PIÉA or concerning modifications brought to it;
- b) relays its opinion on the evaluation of the current policy's application to the Board of Governors, in compliance with article 7.

6.7 Board of Governors

The Board of Governors, on Academic Council recommendation:

- a) adopts the IPESA / PIÉA;
- b) recommends to the Minister the granting of a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) to those students who have met the conditions for the certification of studies, as established in article 5.5.3.1 of the present policy;
- c) grants an AEC (*Attestation d'études collégiales*) to those students who have met the conditions for the certification of studies, as established in article 5.5.3.2 of the present policy;

⁸ The Academic Dean may delegate some of its mandates to other Departments and to the ÉNA directors.

7. POLICY EVALUATION AND REVISION

7.1 Frequency of evaluation

Five years after the enactment of the IPESA / *PIÉA*, the Academic Dean will evaluate its implementation and will revise the policy if needed.

7.2 Purpose of evaluation

This evaluation will mainly verify that:

- its principles and orientations have been respected;
- its norms and regulations have been applied;
- its responsibilities have been carried out.

7.3 Evaluation criteria

The Academic Dean will apply the following criteria:

- application of the policy in compliance with its text;
- effectiveness of its application to guarantee quality of assessment;
- equivalence and equity in learning assessment.

7.4 Evaluation process

The Academic Dean will specify the evaluation process of the present policy and will make it public.

7.5 Policy update

The Academic Dean may recommend to the Board of Governors to update the policy in light of the modification propositions that may be brought to its attention.

8. IMPLEMENTATION

8.1 Date of enactment

The current version of the IPESA / *PIÉA* comes into effect starting in the Fall of 2016.

The Academic Dean is responsible for implementing the policy.

8.2 Policy disclosure

The policy is disclosed to all teachers and to all members of personnel as well as among pedagogical services and student services staff during the semester of Winter 2016. An abridged version is available to students as of the Winter 2016 semester.

A full version of the current policy is always available for consultation at the office of the Cegep's Director General.

GLOSSARY

Learning activity	Activities undertaken by students, in or out of the classroom, promoting learning, i.e. acquiring new knowledge and developing abilities and attitudes. All learning activities pursue objectives and, ultimately, the development of a specific behavior with respect to program competencies.
Competency	The capacity to perform a set of tasks or of intellectual activities within complex situations relevant to the field of studies, or representing the reality of the workplace, by using one's knowledge and abilities and by adopting appropriate attitudes. It is the ultimate academic goal.
Course	An integrated set of teaching and learning activities comprising at least 45 teaching hours or, as in the case of physical education, comprising 30 teaching hours, to which credits are attributed.
Learning assessment	A process which leads to a judgement passed on learning, based on data that is collected, analyzed and interpreted, in order to render a pedagogical decision.
– Evaluation criteria	[Translation] "Clear points of reference from which to sustain the development of competencies and from which to judge this development". (Legendre, 2005)
– Evaluation tools	Tools used by teachers to render judgement on the quality of student work (evaluation grid, observation grid, interview chart, etc.).
– Evaluation procedures	Tests, exams, assignments, homework, laboratory experiments, investigations, oral presentations, practical experience reports, etc. are examples of evaluation procedures which teachers may use. The choice of a procedure is always contingent on the objectives whose attainment must be assessed or on the competencies whose development must be demonstrated.
– Types of evaluations	The function of assessing learning is done by observing and interpreting student results to learning activities in relation to the achievement of course or program objectives. This function is carried out through one and/or the other of the following means of evaluating:
♦ <i>Formative</i>	During an instructional unit, provide feedback on student work to encourage them to persevere and to immediately address and correct problems through exercises or further explanations, etc.
♦ <i>Summative</i>	At the end of an instructional unit, evaluate student learning in relation to course learning objectives. Observation is factual and objective. Assessment procedures are quantitative and graded.
Learning objectives	Objectives determined by teachers for their students in order to guide them and direct their learning activities. Learning objectives are based on Ministerial program objectives. Addressed to students, they define student achievement. They describe students' expected behavior, i.e. the results which prove they have developed the required knowledge, abilities and attitudes during a study program. This behavior must be clearly observable and measurable at the end of an instructional unit.

Ministerial objectives	Objectives defined by the <i>ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche, de la Science (MESRS)</i> when formulating or reviewing study programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) ⁹ . Ministerial objectives for technical programs represent the tasks which graduating students will be asked to perform when entering the job market. For pre-university programs, they evidence the abilities and knowledge students are required to possess in order to pursue advanced education. For general education, they also specify each discipline's contribution to the achievement of competencies by graduating students, whether it be academic rigor, general culture, logic in speech and thought, or self-awareness through the embracing of a healthy lifestyle.
Final course objective	An academic objective for students to reach which specifies the results expected from them at the end of a course. It addresses a wide scope of knowledge acquired through previous learning activities and is the integrative task or activity which enables teachers to appreciate student performance and their capacity for resolving problems, and for which the latter must mobilize all of the resources (knowledge, abilities, and tools) they acquired during the course.
Learning plan	A set of institutional documents elaborated during the revision or the development of study programs. An end-product of these operations, the learning plan is a coherent set of tools to plan courses and implement a local program in line with Ministerial specifications. Among other things, it specifies the contribution of each course within the process of competency development and in regards to the relationships between courses, and between courses and Ministerial objectives.
Program	An integrated set of courses aiming to develop competencies through the attainment of objectives, themselves determined by specified standards. All programs leading to a Diploma of College Studies (DEC) are in part general education and in part specific training. An institutional program leading to an <i>Attestation d'études collégiales</i> (AEC) addresses only specific training.
Standard	The threshold level of performance at which the attainment of an objective is recognized.
Standard components	<p>The context for carrying out tasks for technical programs corresponds to a profession's practice conditions when entering the job market. It does not specify learning or assessment situations.</p> <p>Performance criteria specify the requirements which will verify the attainment of all Ministerial objectives. Performance criteria are not evaluation tools, but may be referred to when developing such tools.</p>
Credit	A credit corresponds to 45 hours of teaching and learning activities. ¹⁰

⁹ When developing or revising an AEC (*Attestation d'études collégiales*), the Cegep may define its own institutional objectives.

¹⁰ To calculate the number of credits attached to a course, add the three numbers of a course's weighting and divide by three (3).