

Evaluation of Student Learning Policy

AC-006

Version	Version Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Review Date (MM/DD/YYYY)	Description of Changes
01	04/08/2021	04/08/2023	Changes in evaluation breakdown in exceptional circumstances

Dean, Liberal Arts and Academic Quality	Helen Pearce	
Policy Holder	Print Name	Date (04/08/2021)

Academic Council	
Advising Body	Date Consulted (04/08/2021)

Vice President, Academic Quality	Kevin Weaver	
Approver	Print Name	Date (04/08/2021)

Purpose

Evaluation is the means by which the college measures the success of students in meeting the learning outcomes of courses, and by extension programs. This policy was created to ensure transparency and timeliness in the assessment of student performance, and to ensure that evaluation of student work at Georgian College adheres to the standards laid out by the Ontario Colleges Quality Assurance Service (OCQAS) and by the Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB).

Scope

This policy applies to all Georgian College credit courses.

Definitions

Word/Term	Definition
<i>Assessment – Formative</i>	<i>Formal and informal assessments conducted by faculty throughout the learning process in order to monitor student progress, and to modify teaching and learning activities to improve student success.</i>
<i>Assessment – Summative</i>	<i>Assessments used to evaluate student learning, skill acquisition, and academic achievement at the conclusion of a defined instructional period—typically at the end of a project, unit, course, semester, program, or school year.</i>
<i>Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)</i>	<i>Clear statements that define and clarify the level and quality of performance required by students in a specific course. Learning Outcomes must be specific, attainable, measurable, and learner-centred, and they should identify the knowledge and skills that students are able to demonstrate by the end of a course or program. CLOs are developed from Program Learning Outcomes and appear on course outlines.</i>
<i>Ontario Colleges Quality Assurance Service (OCQAS)</i>	<i>Body established to provide efficient tools that ensure specific quality and consistency standards are met by the Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology (CAAT) in Ontario. The OCQAS is responsible for ensuring quality at both the program level through the Credential Validation Service (CVS), as well as at the institutional level through the College Quality Assurance Audit Process (CQAAP).</i>
<i>Postsecondary Education Quality Assessment Board (PEQAB)</i>	<i>Makes recommendations to the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities (MTCU) on applications for ministerial consent under the terms of the Post-secondary Education Choice and Excellence Act, 2000. All degrees offered at the college must meet PEQAB standards and benchmarks.</i>
<i>Program Renewal</i>	<i>A comprehensive, cyclical program quality review process, typically conducted every five years. At Georgian College, this includes the Five-year Program Renewal for diplomas and certificates, and the Ministry Consent Renewal for degrees.</i>
<i>Student Information System (SIS)</i>	<i>Computer software used by the college to house admission, registration, and graduation records of all students.</i>

Responsibility

- The **Vice President, Academic** is responsible for ensuring that this policy is fully implemented.
- **Faculty** are responsible for
 - reviewing the evaluation component on relevant course outlines as part of the Annual Program Assessment and Program Renewal, and recommending adjustments where necessary;
 - determining and designing appropriate student assessments for courses based on the Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) on the official course outline;
 - collaborating with other faculty teaching the same course to ensure consistency in meeting the learning outcomes across sections;
 - ensuring consistency in rigour of evaluation across multiple sections of the same course;
 - specifying the types and schedule of evaluation within the course syllabus;
 - responding appropriately to documented student accommodation requests;
 - ensuring an appropriate test environment during tests and exams;
 - objectively grading student work based on a clearly articulated grading scheme or rubric;
 - returning graded work promptly in order to provide constructive feedback, and the opportunity for students to progress throughout the semester;
 - retaining unreturned work for a period of one year from the conclusion of the semester; and
 - communicating with students at the initial stages of the academic appeals process, according to [Academic Regulation 9: Appeals, 9.2.](#)
- **Program or College-wide Coordinators** are responsible for
 - participating in the academic appeals process where necessary, according to [Academic Regulation 9: Appeals, 9.2.](#)
- The ***Dean** of the academic area is responsible for
 - reviewing the evaluation component on course outlines, as part of Annual Program Assessment and Program Renewal; and
 - managing steps one through seven of the academic appeals process, according to [Academic Regulation 9: Appeals, 9.2.](#)
 - ***Note:** The Dean may delegate responsibility to the Associate Dean as appropriate.
- The **Registrar** is responsible for managing steps eight through twelve of the academic appeals process, according to [Academic Regulation 9: Appeals, 9.2.](#)

Policy

- 1.1 Evaluation of student learning is designed to assess the capabilities of program graduates consistent with the established Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs).
- 1.2 Faculty may use formative and/or summative evaluation methods that directly measure Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) that are mapped to PLOs. Students are typically given more than one opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the required learning. In most cases, faculty will use several methods of evaluation, spaced at appropriate intervals throughout the semester, the feedback from which will facilitate student progress and success.

- 1.3 Faculty shall make available to students either hard copy or electronic versions of the official course outline and syllabus during the first four hours of scheduled sessions. The course outline will clearly state the CLOs and methods of evaluation (e.g., assignments, tests, projects). The course syllabus will indicate the evaluation criteria, including the weighting of assignments, tests, presentations and other evaluation tools, and the approximate timing of all work.
- 1.4 Typically, a minimum of 30% of the total course evaluation must be graded and returned to students by the midpoint of the course (e.g., for 14-week courses, by week 7), so that students are aware of their progress to date.
- 1.5 Typically, faculty will provide a minimum of two evaluation categories and three evaluation opportunities per course. The weighting in any one category should not exceed 70% of the final grade. Typically, no one instance of evaluation should exceed 40% of the overall course grade. In the case of cumulative final examination, the weighting should be no less than 25% of the total grade. Evaluation categories may include but are not limited to those outlined in Appendix A: Course Evaluation Categories (unless otherwise specified by an external body).
- 1.6 No marks will be assigned for attendance.
- 1.7 The passing grade for most courses is 50%. Exceptions include graduate certificate courses and others as required by external bodies. Academic courses typically have a numeric grade mode, while practical experience courses use pass/fail. If successful completion of a course is dependent on meeting a specific requirement, the course will be evaluated by means of a pass/fail (e.g., 90% requirement on a safety test in order to pass the course). Refer to the official program and course outlines for specific details regarding minimum pass grades for individual courses, for program progression, and for graduation.
- 1.8 For each assessment, faculty will provide outlines detailing the work to be submitted and how it is to be graded (marking scheme or rubric). The course syllabus and assessment outline, where appropriate, will include a list of the course learning outcomes being assessed.
- 1.9 Tests and examinations are conducted in class or online and must be conducted in adherence with [Academic Regulation 10: Tests and Examination Regulations](#).
- 1.10 Evaluation of online degree courses must include a proctored summative assessment.
- 1.11 Faculty will typically return graded student work within 10 working days of submission for evaluation. Any assignments, exams, tests, project work, etc., that are not picked up are kept by the faculty for one year from the end date the course.
- 1.12 Final grades must be entered into the SIS by the End-of-term Grade Submission Deadline, usually the Wednesday following the last week of term. In situations where a student's grade is unresolved by the semester's end, the mark is left blank if resolution will occur within one month, or if not, entered as "incomplete" in the system (Refer to 2.3). Note: If the course is a pre-requisite for a course in the subsequent term, a final passing grade must be entered prior to the last day of Add/Drop or the student will not be allowed to continue in the subsequent course.

- 1.13 Final grades are entered by the faculty responsible for the course.
- 1.14 Students have the right to request a review of a grade, and appeal a grade on an assignment, test, examination or practical experience, or a missing or incorrect assessment information on a grade report and/or transcript (refer to [Academic Regulation 9: Appeals, 9.2](#)).
- 1.15 The evaluation component of each course outline shall be reviewed on an annual basis, as part of the Annual Program Assessment, and approximately every five years as part of the formal Five-year Program Renewal process or Ministry Consent Renewal process (refer to Policy AC-004: Program Renewal). This is to ensure continual reflection upon the appropriateness of the evaluation breakdown for the course, its context within the program, and its consistency with the Program Learning Outcomes.
- 1.16 In exceptional circumstances, (as in the case of the Covid-19 pandemic), it may be necessary for faculty to diverge from the evaluation breakdown on the official course outline in order to facilitate student completion of course. In these cases, faculty make any modifications to the course syllabus with the approval of their Academic Dean and provide the revised syllabus to students. All efforts will be made to ensure that students satisfy a minimum of 80% of the course learning outcomes.

Procedures

Evaluation of Student Learning

- 2.1 Evaluation methods and weightings are determined by the faculty teams in the academic area, approved by the Dean, and documented on the official course outline. The Office of Academic Quality and the Centre for Teaching and Learning are available to support where necessary.
- 2.2 Assessments should be developed by faculty. The Centre for Teaching and Learning is available to support where necessary.
- 2.3 Incomplete grades are handled in one of the following ways:
 - 2.3.1 Where a student has an incomplete grade that will be resolved by the end of the first month in the following semester, faculty should leave the grade blank, and enter it upon resolution. Note: If the course is a pre-requisite for a course in the subsequent term, a final passing grade must be entered prior to the last day of Add/Drop or the student will not be allowed to continue in the subsequent course.
 - 2.3.2 If the incomplete status will continue further into the next semester, faculty must enter an Incomplete Grade (IN) Designation in the Student Information System, and establish a completion contract with the student to be resolved by that semester's end (refer to [Academic Regulation 4: Grade and Record Promotion](#), 4.1.3 for the complete academic regulation and process regarding student completion contracts).

- 2.4 Refer to Georgian College's [Academic Regulation 9: Appeals](#) for the complete academic appeals regulation and process.
- 2.5 Refer to Georgian College's [Academic Regulation 10: Tests and Examination Regulations](#) for the complete regulation and process regarding tests and examinations.

Related Materials

Freedom of Information and Privacy Act
College Quality Assurance Audit Process (CQAAP) Standards
PEQAB Handbook for Ontario Colleges
Georgian College's Academic Regulations
[Policy AC-004: Program Renewal](#)
[Policy AC-007: Course Outline](#)

Appendix A: Evaluation Categories

The following chart is a list of evaluation categories used at Georgian. Other categories not included here may be appropriate for a particular course. In these cases, a discussion should take place between the faculty, Dean/AD, and the Office of Academic Quality.

Note: some categories may overlap to allow flexibility (e.g., tests might include quizzes; assignments may include essays, journals, or blogs)

Evaluation Category	Description	Suggested Weighting per Evaluation
Assignment	Prescribed task or piece of work completed inside or outside of the classroom. Examples include, but are not limited to case studies, lab work, reports, presentations, or online assignments such as blogs, discussion boards, and journals.	10 - 30%
Essay	A written argument, usually in prose, on any subject; includes reviews and critiques.	20 - 35%
Examination	Cumulative evaluation at fixed points (e.g. mid-term, end of term), includes comprehensive final exams which assess the students' understanding of topics covered throughout the full term. Final/comprehensive exams are non-returnable to students (college must keep for at least one year).	25 - 40%
Group project	Project activity assigned to groups of students (generally 2 to 6 students).	15 - 30%
Journal	Reflective written assignment where students explore a topic, often personal; may be included within the assignment category.	10 - 30%
Portfolio	Any portable case, notebook, folder, or report binder that holds a collection of documents, photographs, drawings, or other materials that belong to or represent the work of an individual. Can also be digital portfolios or e-portfolios.	25 - 40%

Practical skill demonstration	Individual demonstration of specific skills or groups of skills that make up a task. Skill demonstrations provide evidence of meeting basic competencies.	5 - 40%
Presentation	Oral and/or visual presentation of report, project, research paper, portfolio or assignment to classmates and/or faculty. Can be individual or group.	10 - 30%
Project	Report with a practical component; detailed study of a particular subject; generally covering about three weeks or the equivalent in duration.	20 - 40%
Quiz	Announced or unannounced short “test,” in or out of class; usually 15 minutes or less.	No more than 5%
Reflective progress notes	Reflective progress notes are similar to writing journal entries and utilized, for example, in health science programs where there is a practicum. Notes should correspond to the learning outcomes of the practicum and focus on continuous improvement of the students’ professional practice.	10 - 30%
Report	Structured, systematic written presentation of informative and/or persuasive material. May include written documents and/or drawings, photographs, and tables.	20 - 35%
Research paper	Systematic exploration (utilizing either primary and/or secondary research) of a problem or question presented in essay form, which may also include such elements as charts, tables, appendices, table of content.	20 - 35%
Seminar	Leadership of discussion amongst a small group of classmates (usually 6 to 12) of a particular topic or subject.	10 - 20%
Test	Planned, periodic assessment; could include multiple choice, short and/or long written answers; commonly set within class periods. This category may also include quizzes (refer to Quiz above).	10 - 25%