

Complementary documents

Complementary document 1

Student perceptions and expectations¹¹²

Summary

Initially, we discuss how students experience learning evaluations, then we examine the impact that the evaluation of learning is likely to have on student life: at school (their perception of school and evaluations as well as their study habits) and on their future (aspirations, plans for higher studies and career). Finally, we look at student expectations regarding evaluations and this in turn tells us something about their concepts.

In drafting its opinion for the ministère de l'Éducation titled *Des conditions de réussite pour le collégial*, the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation met with students in their immediate environment. During the interviews, the Conseil spoke with students enrolled in one of three pre-university or twelve technical programs, from 19 public colleges and 4 private institutions throughout the region. Under the heading "Conditions for success in college", we asked students what they thought of learning evaluations and teacher-student relationships.

The document produced by the CSE (Conseil supérieur de l'éducation) as a result of these meetings became our main source of information on student perceptions and expectations (for this section and section B.3).

Perceptions and feelings with regard to the evaluation of learning

The CSE reports that students expressed "critical points of view" on the way the evaluation of learning is carried out (CSE, 1995, p. 59).

In section C.4 we present the teaching practices that students are most critical of.

Let us keep in mind that students feel that certain aspects of current evaluations, due to their nature, can result in **serious prejudices to them**. In this respect, what the students dislike about evaluations is that their purpose is to "select and control above all, and control badly, which results in a serious bias toward students" (CSE, 1995, p. 59) as well as "the loss of a meaningful evaluation as it rests too heavily on the subjectivity of individuals [...] a source of serious prejudice against students" (*ibid.*, p. 60). (Refer also to Wiggins, 1993)

The likely impact of the evaluation of learning on students

Impact of evaluation methods on concepts, attitudes, study habits and performance

Many studies tend to show that summative evaluation methods (content, tools, criteria, requirements) have a **major impact on student learning strategies and study habits** (*cf.* Howe et Ménard, 1993, p. 65-67; Roy, 1991, p. 121-125).

Evaluation methods also **impact student conceptions**: they convey messages on school, training, evaluations, etc. When there is no consistency between the implicit message conveyed by the methods and the teacher's message, the latter "shoots himself in the foot", say Howe and Ménard (1993, p. 66).

¹¹² Translated from Cécile D'Amour and Groupe de travail at Performa, *L'évaluation des apprentissages au collégial : du cours au programme*, [s. l.]. Booklet I. La problématique, April 1996, p. 11-17.

In fact, it seems that the message, which carries the greatest weight and influence on student concepts, arises from evaluations methods. This message is counterproductive if it does not support the efforts of teaching personnel i.e., training that is in-depth, long-lasting and that leads to change in a student; and student commitment to his studies and a serious belief in evaluation of learning activities. Some of the evaluation methods and attitudes of evaluators that transmit **counterproductive messages** are: (and the list is not exhaustive)

- continuous summative evaluation practices, such as: many juxtaposed stages of summative evaluations, each dealing with small sections of the whole — not to mention the practice of giving points for attendance to courses, a practice strongly denounced by students (CSE, 1995, p. 59);

(These practices result in the standardization of summative evaluations; and as such, encourage the student to be content with short-term surface learning.)

- comments and behaviour that give the impression that the goal of an academic activity is evaluation rather than learning;

(It appears that students who think the teacher is pursuing evaluation goals believe the latter is simply trying to validate learning results rather than develop student knowledge, deepen understanding and develop competency [cf. Dweck, 1989, cited by Tardif, 1995, p. 187].)

- forecast of poor student evaluation results (weak, average, or strong chances of failure) mentioned by the teacher;

(Students say that attitudes like these can make them “hate the content and even the total academic experience.” [CSE, 1995, p. 88].)

- evaluation tools and remedial requirements that do not correspond to training objectives, for example, the practice of “exams packed with difficult questions” or using a conformist approach, that is devoid of critical meaning, just to get “good grades” (CSE, 1995, p. 59);

(Students have reported the de-motivating effect that evaluations of this nature have on them.)

- a wide variation in concepts and methods of evaluation, such as “contradictory approaches from one teacher to another”, and evaluations “that depend too much on a person’s subjectivity”. (CSE, 1995, p. 59 and 60).

(These characteristics result in a “loss of meaning for the evaluation” which in turn can lead to student de-motivation and an increase in misunderstanding [*ibid.*, p. 60].)

To avoid such counterproductive effects, we must ensure that evaluation methods transmit messages that are consistent with educational objectives. This presupposes that the goals are clearly established and transmitted to students. Cégep science professors Dedic and Rosenfield (1994) studied this question and came up with interesting results.

Impact of evaluation results on personal aspirations, higher studies and career plans

One of the main messages conveyed by students in the CSE meeting, focused on the **power of “grades”** and the **distinction** between evaluation of learning at college level and selection for entry into university programs.

“Considering the power that grades have, we (the students) believe that measures have to be taken to grade more accurately and ensure equity in evaluations. Also, with regard to the validation of studies, colleges should not be concerned with university quotas during the evaluation and should focus strictly on the attainment of established objectives.” (CSE, 1995, p. 60)

Based on the use that **universities and/or employers make of grades**, they will have an impact on both study and career paths.

They can also impact any **aspirations** students may have (or had) relative to a specific discipline or a particular field of activity. Studies on career advancement (particularly in mathematics and science) show that students limit future opportunities because they believe, in light of poor evaluation results (not necessarily failures), that a certain discipline or field of activity is “not for them”. Given this impact — that influences the student from within and without — we can understand how a “poorly managed” evaluation can “cause serious damage” to a student” (CSE, 1995, p. 60).

Voicing expectations

Comments made during CSE meetings held in the student environment provide information on student concepts and expectations relative to teachers’ competence and attitude, their interventions and the evaluation of learning. According to the CSE, these **expectations** are for the most part, **justified**.

Relative to the evaluation of learning, **students want** “an evaluation that helps them understand the subject matter rather than one limited to the purposes of controlling and sanctioning” (CSE, 1995, p. 86); they list their expectations as follows (*ibid.*, p. 59 and 60):

- an evaluation that grades fairly, that is equitable;
- an evaluation that provides information on personal strengths and weaknesses;
- an evaluation that includes the integration of various knowledge;
- an evaluation that facilitates progress, that is part of the learning process and encourages growth;
- rather than an evaluation that selects and controls above all, and exercises bad control at that.

As we can see from the evaluation practices brought to our attention by students (*cf.* section C.4), there is a convergence between student perspective and what we read in current literature on the evaluation of learning. In both cases, great importance is given to the support of learning and the requirements for a quality evaluation that is accurate and fair (*cf.* section C.2).

Finally, students expressed their expectations and concepts regarding other teaching practices – the evaluation of learning cannot be disconnected, either for the student or the teacher, from the whole of teaching practices. In the following section, B.3, we will review expectations with respect to teacher attitudes and student-teacher relationships. Expectations relative to teaching practices are covered in section C.1 (p. 27 and 28).

Relational and affective dimensions

Summary

Initially, we look at the teacher-student relationship within learning evaluation situations. We examine how students see this relationship and how important it is for them. We then take a quick look at the factors to be considered for three delicate affective issues involving both the teacher and the student, where they come face to face, experience shared ideas and opposing views: topics of fairness, self-assertion and the cohabitation of guide and judge within the teacher.

Comment — In this section and the preceding one, our principal source of information on the expectations and perceptions of cégep students is the *Avis sur les conditions de réussite au collégial*, which was produced by the CSE subsequent to meetings held with the student body.

The teacher-student relationship as seen by the student

It is interesting to note, that a teacher's ability to enter in a relationship with students, is one of the three elements students use to **gauge competency** in teachers (CSE, 1995, p. 84).

We see that the teacher-student relationship is at the heart of student **concerns**. Indeed, in addition to disciplinary competency, three of the five major concerns that students have with teaching personnel touch upon this relationship: teacher availability and personal contact with students (*ibid.*, p. 84), a teacher-student relationship marked by respect (*ibid.*, p. 85 et 86), and student-teacher reciprocity with regard to self-discipline and demands (*ibid.*, p. 86 et 87).

In the field of evaluation of learning, these required qualities are of prime importance because the evaluation is an act of **communication** (refer to Hadji, 1990, who refers in turn to Watzlawick).

In dealing with **respect** in the teacher-student relationship, students who took part in the CSE consultation would particularly like to see:

“the presence of an assistant rather than a judge, a guide rather than a boss, a person who controls the course and not his students, who treats them as adults not children, who demonstrates a respectful attitude and is not arrogant or scornful [...]” (CSE, 1995, p. 85).

With regard to **self-discipline and demands**, students appreciate teachers who are demanding, but want it to be reciprocal:

“To demand yes, but under the following conditions: to be as demanding of themselves; to demand development and not control; to show reasonable limits and exert reasonable pressures; within the overall perspective of requirements imposed on students; remembering to give clear instructions; showing the usefulness and providing feedback on the results in an atmosphere of confidence, complicity and negotiation.” (CSE, 1995, p. 87)

In connection with another student concern — teaching approaches that allow the greatest number of students to grasp the subject matter — we find more comments on the teacher-student relationship in the evaluation of learning.

Students have:

“asserted, on many occasions, the right to make mistakes [...], and also the right to benefit from the mistakes, to receive feedback on examinations and work, that is timely and thorough” (*ibid.*, p. 86)

Moreover, students value ...:

“When the teacher’s behaviour motivates them not “to give up”; also teachers who share in the pride of student success or progress, however slight that progress may be.” (*ibid.*, p. 86)

Students also express their appreciation for teachers who display openness. It is seen as a “sign of respect for their right to be treated as “individuals” involved in a learning process.” (*ibid.*, p. 86)

The following thoughts concern, either directly or indirectly, the evaluation of learning. We note that **students wish for:**

- Teachers who display thoroughness, who are as demanding of themselves as they are of their students;
- Teachers who are accomplices more than judges;
- Teachers who treat them like adults and not children;
- A climate of confidence and mutual respect;
- Reasonable requirements;
- Requirements related to development rather than control;
- Clear instructions, explicit meaning and usefulness;
- Recognition that learning is a process, the right of students to make mistakes and to learn from these mistakes;
- Thorough and timely feedback on work and exams.

Three delicate affective issues

The teacher-student relationship has an affective dimension. In matters relating to the evaluation of learning, the emotional stakes are generally even higher than in the other aspects of the relationship. There are indeed few **relationships that are more delicate** than those that require the giving or receiving of criticism.

We identify three delicate affective “areas” for the teacher and the students, where they come face to face, where they share experiences with common and opposing facets – like both sides of a coin. These three areas are: fairness, self-assertion, and the cohabitation of guide and judge within the teacher.

What follows is only a sample of writings on these questions. We have limited ourselves to formulating certain perceptions and indicating certain references **for the purpose of drawing attention to questions that we consider important.**

Fairness

Students expect the evaluation of learning process to be fair and equitable (CSE, 1995, p. 59).

Teachers are responsible for the process and must therefore ensure it is fair for the student. This is a heavy burden of responsibility that could become confusing (*cf.* Howe et Ménard, 1993, p. 62). A large part of the difficulty resides in the exercise of judgment: how does one make a valid judgment, ensuring treatment that is fair and equitable for students, while dealing with the subjectivity that is necessarily present?

Self-assertion

In a learning process, the student's self-esteem is often shaken up. He achieves mastery of a concept, a principle, a theory or method, develops a certain amount of self-confidence and feels personal pride. He must then turn around and immediately master another subject or a more complex task through training that includes mistakes or errors, which results in fear and self-doubts with regard to his ability to learn and succeed.

The students hope that the following attitudes will be present in their teachers. They want to be treated in a "respectful manner" and not in an "arrogant and disdainful" manner (CSE, 1995, p. 85); they want the right to make mistakes and to learn from feedback resulting from these mistakes (*ibid.*, p. 86); they want teachers who can share in their pride for progress achieved (*ibid.*).

The formative evaluation is a situation where we should see complicity between students and teachers.

The evaluation of learning is also a situation where the teachers can assert themselves. They are the ones who make judgments, who render *their* judgment. This is a type of power. The wording of the evaluation judgment touches upon teachers' concepts relative to the extent and exercise of their authority (*cf.* Morissette, 1993).

The reconciliation of the roles of guide and judge

In college instruction, excluding standard ministerial examinations, the teachers in charge of student training almost always carry out the evaluation of learning. The role of guide and judge are now the responsibility of one and the same person. This situation can have its advantages but it can also cause difficulties. We have identified two such difficulties:

- How can the student feel confident in sharing his difficulties with the teacher, without fearing that revelations made during the course of learning will impact the summative evaluation judgment?
- How can the teacher be close to the student, to support him in his learning (not only from a cognitive perspective but also an affective level) and yet be sufficiently "distant" to judge student learning accurately? (*cf.* Mc Donald, 1993 et Wiggins, 1993)

Complementary document 2

Alternate ways of designing and evaluating learning

Lecture notes by:

Jacques Laliberté, member of the Groupe de recherche-action PERFORMA, Université de Sherbrooke, *Pédagogie collégiale*, vol. 8, n° 3, March 1995.

In the United States, limitations in the extremely widespread use of standardized tests have led specialists and teachers to seek other ways of evaluating¹¹³ student learning. Another reason is the growing influence of cognitivist and constructivist concepts of learning and the influence of a curriculum based on competency development (*Competence-based education*) or, in broader terms, education based on targeted results (*Outcome-based education*). This has had a major effect on our neighbours to the South, impacting the way they view and implement evaluations of learning.

In February 1991, in an article entitled “Évaluation, dites-vous? Non, {*assessment*}...” and published in *Pédagogie collégiale* (vol. 4, n° 3, p. 36-39), Paul Forcier analyzed the essential characteristics of the reform of evaluation of learning practices in the United States. This article is still relevant today and remains current; what started as an incipient trend has now grown into a widespread movement.

It is useful to keep in mind the American terminology found in the documentation. In much of the current writing, the term *assessment* has a generic meaning and is used to describe all types of evaluations. Some authors use the term to refer to the “new ways of evaluating” learning that we have just mentioned.

Underlying these “new ways” are concerns about evaluating what students can do with their knowledge, skills and abilities, their attitudes and mindset (preoccupation with integration and transfer of learning); evaluating their capacity to demonstrate mastery of a competency, to resolve a difficult problem and carry out a complex task; evaluating their capacity for higher thought; evaluating their degree of achievement as regards precise and known standards; and to make the evaluation as authentic as possible through the contextualization of the tests, tasks and problems used for evaluation purposes.

The three descriptive documents presented here, including one recently published in the United States, relate to this trend and identify new forms of evaluation that should inspire us and cause us to reflect on our actions. All this is happening at a time when a climate of renewal is prevalent in colleges and when many are questioning the way we currently design and perform evaluations of learning.

Catherine Taylor, (“Assessment for Measurement or Standards: The Peril and Promise of Large-Scale Assessment Reform”, *American Educational Research Journal*, vol. 31, n° 2, summer 1994, p. 231-262.

¹¹³ In the American documentation, the expression “*alternative assessment*” is used to describe practices which are not invariably new but which seem new relative to very widespread conventional practices. It is in this context that I speak about “new ways to evaluate”.

In a recent article with a weighty title that implies a very technical perspective, Catherine Taylor challenges us to make an in-depth reflection on the purpose of the evaluation of learning and in, the final analysis, on the philosophy of education that underlies evaluation practices and instructional rating systems currently used in academic institutions. Towards the end of the article, the author gets to the heart of the matter by asking if we are going to continue to design tools to classify and compare students, or will we develop and implement an evaluation system to help us determine if students are reaching complex learning objectives. (Refers to p. 254) Further on, she adds that: “We must begin to believe that the *majority of* students are fully capable of learning and succeeding and that the “*dramatic differences*” we observe in student performances result from conditions that have no relationship to the student’s ability to learn” (refers to p. 255). These conditions and differences must be taken into account.

This statement is another way of presenting the concept of ‘educability’ proposed by Meirieu as the driving force behind professional activity of the teacher. A natural corollary being: the appropriate design and implementation of differentiated instruction, if we are serious about respecting the heterogeneity of classroom groups.

The article by Catherine Taylor focuses on the evaluation of learning and relates primarily to considerations of a far-reaching methodological nature: requirements for the validity and reliability of tool design and the interpretation of results; the choice and use of criteria and standards; the nature and connotations of the professional judgment to be exercised.

Taylor begins with the premise that in the United States, teachers and legislators are looking for systems of assessment that require students to participate in problem solving and complex tasks. The tasks require the recourse to higher thought, rather than the simple demonstration of *discrete knowledge* and the skill to apply this knowledge (p. 232). The evaluation approaches, means and methods, which are being used more and more frequently, are the *authentic, performance and portfolio assisted* evaluations.

According to the author, we must become aware that when it comes to large scale implementation of evaluations, teachers and legislators ask that we design tests or tools that will provide two incompatible end results:

- a) Identify if students master the standards and desired performances; or are at least show progress in this direction;
- b) Provide *relative measurements* of students, schools and school districts or States in relation to an output scale (p. 232). On this subject, Taylor fears that applying a model based on measurement to performance assessment development on a large scale will ultimately undermine the efforts made on a national scale to improve the quality of education for all students (p. 233).

In her article, Taylor compares the essential characteristics, major goals, practical and pedagogical consequences of two models of evaluation of learning: *the made-to-measure model* (the primary model in the United States for over sixty years) and *the model based on standards* (currently building strength in the United States).

In the first model, we seek to identify observable differences in people. We postulate that we can situate an individual, relative to a given characteristic or feature, and relative to the “normal” distribution curve. This famous curve that gave birth to psychometric procedures used to establish the reliability of tests and to ensure stringency and validity in the interpretation of results. (p. 236-242). In *the made-to-measure model*, it is the individual differentiation and classification that take precedence over the identification of precise student expectations. Taylor describes excellence by saying: “it is determined by the fact that someone has a higher grade or score than all others who took the same exam”, or passed the same test, we could add ...

The *model based on standard* rests on four concepts:

- we can identify general public standards and work toward reaching them;
- the majority of students can assimilate and meet the standards;
- very different student performances and demonstrations can reflect the same standards;
- teachers can be trained to assimilate the standards and become reliable judges and consistent observers of a variety of student performances (p. 243).

We see how these two models differ significantly from one another. The author, recalling and underlining the limitations of traditional testing, also underlines the challenges facing theorists and experts in performance-based evaluations: to ensure the reliability and accuracy similar types of evaluations; to identify essential performances for specific disciplines; to establish standards and criteria relative to these performances; to obtain sample performances that reflect these standards and criteria; to communicate the whole experience to the general public; ... (p. 247-253). This will naturally entail several consequences and requirements on a pedagogical level (p. 254-259).

There seems to be a two-fold lesson in Taylor's writings.

- On the one hand, the type of evaluation we recommend and use must correspond to the educational goals targeted;
- On the other hand, a performance-based evaluation that is credible and provides results, must not only relate to authentic (real life) situations and the fundamentals of a discipline; it must also contain demanding criteria and high standards. In addition, it must take place in an educational environment where everything is done to help students reach these standards and meet the criteria in their productions or demonstrations that may vary from one student to another, yet remain intrinsically adequate.

We are far from behaving automatically, or lowering standards...

Jean (Ed) MacGregor, "Student Self-Evaluation: Fostering Reflective Learning", *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, n° 56, winter 1993, 123 p.

Several commentators emphasize that through the judicious use of criteria and standards, a competency-based approach could contribute to developing students' ability to self-evaluate (with thoroughness, precision and without indulgence) their learning and behaviour. Those interested in self-evaluation will benefit from the article on this question in the periodical *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*. The article presents elements to justify this teaching practice, including possible implementation methods, and also creates an awareness of potential benefits for both students and teachers. The entire issue is a worthwhile read. In addition to the preliminary note, it brings together seven different authors. Each one's contribution is worth reading and commenting on, however, we will limit ourselves to highlighting only certain aspects of this collection of texts.

For Edith Kusnic and Mary Lou Finley, "the expression *student self-evaluation* refers to written productions that come in many forms, and to the process that leads to this type of production by students. As a process, self-assessment demands that students reflect on what they have learned and produce a written work on the subject. Student self-evaluation is a powerful learning tool. Students' written self-assessment provides a description and analysis for them and for us". (p. 8).

Two fundamental characteristics stand out from this quotation: the importance of writing in student self-assessments and the relationship between the assessment and the quality of student learning. Throughout the issue, these two facets are found in various forms.

In their article (p. 5-14), Kusnic and Finley point out, or let us infer some of the positive benefits of exercises and tasks relating to students writing self-evaluations of their learning. This can:

- help students use their knowledge;
- help students develop the capacity for *self-reflection* and establish an active and meaningful rapport with the subject matter in question;
- help students strengthen their analytical abilities, their ability to summarize and evaluate; to find meaning in what they have learned and to explore the connection between this knowledge and previously acquired knowledge and ideas; to become more aware of their values and ways in which they are developed; to provide in depth learning and establish links between students and the content of their studies; to develop the capacity, competency and self-assurance necessary for effective learning throughout their life;
- provide students with a new form of feedback on learning and useful data for evaluating the results of education and instruction;
- teach students to be at the centre and in control of their learning experience (refer to p. 5 to 9).

For his part, Carl J. Waluconis (p. 15-33) describes various contexts for student self-evaluations. Self-evaluations can be designed to:

- cover a short period of time;
- refer to work that is spread out over several weeks;
- relate to the entire course;
- cover more than one course.

The author supplements the article with excerpts of texts written by students.

To conclude this rather quick presentation, I would like to draw the reader's attention to the appendix (p. 101-117), which contains:

- examples of tasks, advice and directives for student self-evaluation exercises;
- examples of wide-ranging student self-evaluations;
- lists of additional resources of theoretical works on student development and the value of self-reflection; practical approaches and studies that refer specifically to student self-evaluations.

It should be noted that the examples provided in this appendix are taken from the post secondary level, with the majority, if not all, referring to the first years of university studies.

Grant P. Wiggins, *Assessing Student Performance. Exploring the Purpose and Limits of Testing*, San Francisco (CA), Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993, XX and p. 316

In response to the question: "In the American documentation that you have read recently, is there is *one* book in particular that you would recommend for the evaluation of learning of students in a competency-based approach?", my reply would be to read the work of Grant P. Wiggins, *Assessing Student Performance...*. I suspect that this book can, in many ways, help deepen our understanding of what American specialists call an *assessment* when they refer to new trends in the conception and implementation of evaluations of student learning. Moreover, *Assessing Student Performance...* can provide a very rich source of inspiration for the professional practice of teachers and educational advisors working with them.

We cannot do justice to the contents of the work here. However, to provide as tangible an outline as possible, I would like to draw attention to certain topics selected by Wiggins from which every reader can benefit depending on his personal level of interest, concerns and beliefs.

1. We find a critique on the traditional testing that is widely used in the United States. Standardized tests do have value but they are limited in the following ways: an unjustified focus on simple factual knowledge; the simplification and removal of tasks from their contexts in order to ensure greater precision in rating; a creationist concept of intelligence that translates into evaluation practices where it is more important to classify students in relation to each other rather than the quality of the performance relative to clearly identified standards; ... (refers mainly to chapters 1, 3, 4 and 5).
2. We promote a broad and exacting concept of *assessment* defined as “a complete analysis of a performance, a personal analysis based on a judgment and comprising several aspects.” As expressed over thirty years ago by Lee Cronbach, professor at Stanford University and dean of American psychometrics: an *assessment* requires the use of a variety of procedures, relies mainly on observation (of the performance) and requires the integration of diverse information in a *summary judgment*.” (p. 13)
3. From the point of view of *assessment*, the professor becomes more of an ally to the student than a judge (p. 14). Wiggins states that “justifiable *assessments* do not differ from tests simply because they are more complex. Questions relative to rights and accountability are crucial: in an adequate *assessment*, student rights come first” (p. 22). What is the nature of these rights? Wiggins helps us understand this through the help of two documents: the first is a set of principles adopted by the New Zealand Ministry of Education that puts *assessment* at the service of better learning (p. 26 et 27); the second is a Declaration of the rights of students with regard to *assessments* that Wiggins himself wrote (p. 28) and presented to several teachers in workshops, but regretfully, was not well-received...
4. When we want to evaluate a student’s intellectual progress, we are stymied by eight dilemmas that Wiggins summarizes (p. 37-45). For example:
 - we must be concerned with what the students know, but we must also assess if the knowledge has meaning for them;
 - we must establish a balance between an evaluation of the mastery students have over ideas and projects of others and an assessment of their mastery over their own ideas and projects.
5. Wiggins identifies nine concepts that should be considered if we wish to implement *assessment* systems; among these:
 - an authentic system of evaluation must rest on criteria and known standards that are clear, public and not arbitrary;
 - the degree of student comprehension is better evaluated by following up on the questions they ask rather than limiting ourselves to rating their answers;
 - we should evaluate the intellectual integrity of students and other mindsets they might have; beyond cases of cheating, we should also take into account student capacity to recognize the gaps in their knowledge and to express their perplexity with regard to a particular question or problem.

6. To ensure the evaluation has a positive effect on the student's motivation to learn, Wiggins makes several recommendations. Among these:
 - evaluate student progress and achievements; for this, you should base your ratings on models of exemplary performance that students are pursuing, each on his own path (p. 171 et 172);
 - design an evaluation system in which the proportional weighting can vary: at the beginning, we can give greater preponderance to effort and progress; then subsequently, focus more keenly on performance and achievement (p. 172 and 173).
7. The author attaches a great importance to student feedback. He compares the characteristics of effective feedback to ineffective feedback (p. 198 et 199). He reminds us of the requirements that any information system, designed to provide maximum support for performance, must have. Eight requirements are proposed by T. F. Gilbert in his work entitled *Human Competence* (New York, McGraw Hill, 1978, p. 178 and 179). They are presented in the form of eight stages going from the identification of expected achievements (n° 1), to an activity designed to bring specific corrective measures to poor performance (n° 8), while describing the manner in which the performance will be evaluated and reasons for the procedure (n° 3) and the identification of people with exemplary performances and the available resources to be used so we can become exemplary in our own performances (n° 5).
8. The last point I would like to highlight: the work is interesting and useful based on the examples and tools it features:
 - examples of complex tasks;
 - a list of criteria formulated by Lauren Resnick and that we can connect to higher order thinking, p. 215);
 - a list of criteria to judge the authenticity of tests and exams that target the evaluation of student intellectual abilities (p. 239 et 240);
 - a list of performance standards (p. 286-288).

After reading this work, it is not surprising that Grant Wiggins wrote a widely distributed article entitled: "Creating Tests Worth Taking" (*Educational Leadership*, vol. 49, n° 8, May 1992, p. 26-33) and has since become a figurehead within the movement actively promoting "authentic" evaluations.

Source : *Le Relais. Journal pédagogique de l'Assemblée générale*, Performa collégial, Université de Sherbrooke, vol. 4, n° 1, January 1995, p. 37-49.

Complementary document 3

The principles of evaluation in competency-based learning (CBL) linked to the principles of CBL¹¹⁵

The preceding sections allowed us to analyze certain aspects of the formative evaluation and the certification (summative) evaluation. In this section, you will find a synthesis of certain principles of evaluation in competency-based learning. Some principles refer specifically to the formative evaluation, others the summative evaluation, and some are applicable to both types. The principles are presented in order to establish a link between the principles of evaluation in competency-based learning [CBL] and the CBL principles discussed in Chapter 6. In the table, the last principles of evaluation are not placed against the CBL principles because they are of a general nature.

Coherence	<p>We cannot separate evaluations from learning. Evaluations, just like teaching, exist to support learning.</p> <p>We should be able to observe a similarity between the integrating tasks used for learning and those used for formative evaluations in the preparation stage for the end of the cycle and in the summative evaluation at the end of the cycle.</p>
Global Application	<p>The evaluation of a competency is achieved through integrating tasks that involve all the components (abilities) of the competency.</p>
Global Integration	<p>To evaluate the integration of a competency, we should use the evaluation criteria defined in the specifications for that competency. Contrary to a widespread misconception in competency-based learning, evaluations do present a greater degree of subjectivity than purely objective evaluations, such as multiple choice questions or short replies. This explains why integrating evaluation tasks are more inclusive. Performing more subjective evaluations will add to the stress levels for both the teacher and the student. Educators will have to adjust to these new forms of evaluation.</p>

¹¹⁵ Translated from François Lasnier, *Réussir la formation par compétences*, Guérin, 2000, p. 229-232.

<p>Construction</p>	<p>One cannot dissociate the formative evaluation during the course of learning and the summative evaluation at end of cycle. There must be a <i>continuum</i>. The formative evaluation, even though it often relates to aspects of the competency (developmental stage), must also include formal formative evaluation aspects relating to the integration of the components of the competency (integration stage).</p> <p>In formative evaluations, we should evaluate a component or a competency using more than one criterion. The judgment on competency development is rendered when the evaluation criteria are applied. A judgment on the development of the components of the competency (abilities) is based on the component evaluation criteria resulting from the demonstrations connected to each component of the competency. We should also evaluate the learning strategies associated with a component or a competency.</p> <p>In order to respect the spirit of the formative evaluation in competency-based learning, the learner must clearly understand the evaluation criteria prior to the actual evaluation, so that he may prepare for the accomplishment of the evaluation task or learning task. Ideally, in formal evaluations, the learner must have on hand, the descriptive evaluation grid to be used for the summative evaluation at the end of the cycle or any other grid used for formative evaluations.</p>
<p>Meaning</p>	<p>The evaluation of a competency is done by placing the student in circumstances that conform to the realization context and asking him to carry out meaningful tasks.</p> <p>The student must feel responsible for his own evaluation; he must be involved in self-evaluation exercises.</p>
<p>Rotation</p>	<p>As an evaluator, we make a judgment on the degree of development of the components of a competency and on the competency as a whole.</p> <p>Although the evaluation must be complete, in a formative evaluation, all components of a competency must be evaluated by integrating tasks in order to facilitate their integration. This does not exclude occasionally carrying out evaluations, based on learning activities that focus on only one component, to correct errors and improve its utilization.</p>

<p>Integration</p>	<p>The evaluation in competency-based learning requires that we focus mainly on the evaluation of the competency and its components and not on declarative knowledge used to activate the competency. This knowledge will generally be evaluated indirectly, because it is integrated in the components (a competency does not work in a vacuum, i.e. it manifests itself in a specific context associated with a family of situations and the totality of knowledge linked to a given disciplinary content). Thus, the evaluator does not simply want to know if the student has appropriated some declaratory knowledge, but if he knows how to apply this knowledge. (This principle does not exclude the possibility of evaluating disciplinary content on occasion within a formative evaluation.)</p> <p>In competency-based learning, the complexity of evaluating comes from the fact that we must evaluate a complex situation linked to a competency that combines components of an intellectual, emotional, social and sometimes psychomotor nature. However, the use of precise criteria and appropriate grids greatly facilitates the task.</p> <p>The principal danger is to evaluate a series of criteria without taking into account the integrating aspect of the components of a competency (possible solution: to take both the process and the product into account and include criteria relative to integration). To evaluate the acquisition of a competency through the use of an integrating task does not consist in designing an examination that covers the totality of the disciplinary content (as was done in the 1940's), but rather developing an evaluation that validates the integration of the components of a competency. This principle requires the choice of a disciplinary content to develop an integrating task.</p>
<p>Distinction</p>	<p>The evaluation in competency-based learning should relate to the process (how the evaluated person carries out the task while calling upon the components of a competency) and to the finished product (qualitative results of the task). Thus, we require evaluation criteria that allow for a judgment on both these facets of the evaluation.</p>
<p>Iteration</p>	<p>A competency must be evaluated several times to allow the student to correct his errors and acquire stability in its acquisition.</p>
<p>General comments</p>	<p>Competency-based learning requires a criteria-based evaluation, i.e. one that uses criteria that specify the expected results. We recognize that a criteria-based evaluation and normative evaluation are not in direct opposition, except in their underlying principles. As a result, a criteria-based evaluation could very well be transposed into a normative evaluation, if we use a numerical scale corresponding to the various levels of the criteria-based grid. In fact, what distinguishes these types of evaluation is more the goal of the evaluator than the procedure used to develop the measurement tools. In a criteria-based evaluation, we want the learner to be able to compare his degree of mastery of a competency based on a description of the various levels of a precise criterion, i.e. an expected result. These criteria constitute a reference for the learner relative to what he must master and improve upon, whereas in a normative evaluation, regardless of the measurement procedure used, we want to be able to classify those being evaluated from the strongest to the weakest, or by intervals. In this case, the results for the person evaluated are interpreted according to standards (table of standards, usually detailed by means of percentiles) that compare them to others who were evaluated, rather than rate them on their level of mastery. The interpretation of student results based on a comparison with the class average is also a good example of</p>

	<p>a normative evaluation. The normative evaluation does not harmonize with the concept of competency-based learning.</p> <p>Criteria used to evaluate a competency in the summative evaluation and with certain formal formative evaluations are more or less derived from evaluation criteria linked to components found in demonstrations. Criteria for the evaluation of a competency are more global than evaluation criteria for the components. They are the result of a selection of a group of evaluation criteria used for the components. They can also be designed to allow for a global judgment on the degree of acquisition of the competency. It is difficult to incorporate more than 7 criteria (± 2), unless the evaluator can make several observations successively, as with interactive tasks or training in the workplace. If the task is evaluated through direct observation (in real time), it is difficult to effectively observe more than 5 criteria at the same time (even if the number of subjects being observed is very small).</p>
<p>General comments (cont'd)</p>	<p>Given that learning is gradual (we learn through successive layering), the evaluation of a competency should not to be seen as a dichotomy (success-failure), but should be able to describe the mastery of a competency or a component in varying degrees. A 'dichotomy-based' vision of evaluation could negatively impact the learner's motivation (you are a good student or you are not). If used, rating is done through the use of descriptive grids, qualitative or qualitative-quantitative, depending on the rating system appropriate for the environment. We are currently seeing a move towards the abolition of rating. It is often replaced by criteria-based grids with descriptive scales identifying the varying degrees of acquisition relative to each criterion used in the evaluation of the competency.</p> <p>A descriptive evaluation grid can clearly identify the expected threshold of success. Contrary to what has been said and written, an evaluation criterion does not represent a minimal threshold of success. The threshold of success is set according to the levels in the evaluation grid and, therefore, according to the levels of mastery of a given criterion. We must however be very careful relative to the setting of the expected threshold of success. It is practically impossible to set a threshold with certainty without having personally experienced the instruction, training and the evaluation of a competency. Consequently, it is strongly recommended to validate the use of a descriptive grid and to set the threshold of success for a criterion only after a good experience of it. As for the weighting of the criteria to guide the validation, the trend is to not assign weight to them because it interferes with the global judgment regarding the degree of mastery of the competency. However, not weighting the criteria increases the subjectivity of the evaluation.</p> <p>During the evaluation of a competency or of a component of an affective nature, we must consider ethical constraints. Given that commitment to an attitude or a behaviour rests on a system of personal values, we can only require evaluation activities from the learner that correspond to the primary levels of the affective domain (receipt of information, response or discussion on the attitude or behaviour, evaluation of the impact of the attitude, identification of the advantages and disadvantages for oneself and others, recognition of desired behaviours, choice of immediate action).</p> <p>All things considered, we can select affective abilities from high taxonomic levels for learning activities, but to evaluate them would be highly debatable, except on rare occasions, as in the case of professional competencies and in certain technical or university programs connected to the profession.</p>

Basic definition of principles relating to competency-based learning¹¹⁶

Global:	analysis of elements starting from a complete situation (complex situation, overall picture, global approach).
Construction:	actualization of previously acquired knowledge, development of links between prior knowledge and new learning, organization of information.
Rotation:	global —specific — global; competency — abilities— competency; integrating task —specific learning activity — integrating task.
Application:	learning by doing.
Distinction:	between the content and the process for a competency.
Meaning:	meaningful and motivating situations for the learner.
Coherence:	coherent relationship between teaching activities, learning activities, evaluation activities and the competency.
Integration:	components under study are connected to each other and to the competency; the learner develops a competency by using the components of the competency in an integrated manner.
Iteration :	the learner is subjected on many occasions to the same type of integrating tasks connected to the competency or the same disciplinary content.

¹¹⁶ Translated from François Lasnier, “Un modèle intégré pour l’apprentissage d’une compétence”, *Pédagogie collégiale*, vol. 15, n° 1, October 2001, p. 28-33.

Complementary document 4

From planning stages to the evaluation plan for the final course test

When the time comes for preparing the evaluation plan for final course test, many decisions have already been made in the first stages of the program development process. Choices to be made for the evaluation of learning rely on this previous information.

To clarify the context of decisions relative to determining the final course test, it is wise to keep in mind the whole development process with regard to the program as well as the course. The information collected in these stages has a cumulative effect that impacts both the context and the content of the evaluation plan for the final course test.

We will outline the development process, first for the program and then for the course. After this, a clarification of each stage is provided, followed by a realization context (contextual tools for assistance purposes) and accompanied by examples in the last column of the table below.

To draft the evaluation plan for the final course test, the teacher must have on hand all the relevant documents or refer to the stages of the development process to validate his choices in the evaluation of learning.

Development process	Explanation	Realization context
<p>1. With regard to the program</p> <p><i>Analysis of the totality of the competencies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Analysis using one of the competencies — Overall picture of the competencies 	<p>Local interpretation of competencies in order to ensure a univocal reading</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Based on ministerial specifications — With the help of tools to analyze a competency — With the help of the competency matrix
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Choice of essential contents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Local development of the third column of the ministerial specifications — “Recall” also applies to essential contents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — When one competency requires the review of another competency, it should be labelled as “improvement, enrichment or recall”
<p>Definition of the training axes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Learning axes — Grouping of competencies around the axes 		
<p><i>Distribution of the competencies over time</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Distribution of the competencies into six program trimesters — Identification of the number of hours by competency, by course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Tool: program matrix — Logical diagram of the competencies — Logical diagram of the course
<p><i>Relationship objective / course</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Shows how competencies will be developed in the courses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Using the table provided by the ministère

<p>2. With regard to the course <i>Analysis of the training objective</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — For one competency in the course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Clarification of the competency — Meaning and range of the competency — Univocal interpretation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Integrating diagram
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — For several competencies in the course 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Overall picture of the competencies introduced in the course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Establish links between the competencies or components of the competencies and justify them (in order to ensure integration) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — To illustrate graphically (overall picture) interrelation of the competencies by identifying the links between them
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Determine a final integrating objective 	<p>Corresponds to the competency in the case of a course/a competency</p> <p>If a competency is spread out over more than one course or if one course contributes to the development of more than one competency, we must ensure that the desired integrating objective corresponds to the meaningful portion of the competency and respects its nature</p>	<p>An objective is considered an “integrating objective” when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — it coordinates achievements, contexts and practical applications, processing behaviours that seem to be the most determining and characteristic. — it reveals what is essentially at stake in the training — it develops a dynamic, stable and durable system of knowledge (what, how and when).

<p><i>Choice of learning objects</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Identify essential learning that must be mastered in order to achieve the integrating objective — Learning objects are drawn from the essential content (identified at the time of the study of each competency) — When there are several competencies in a course, the student must retain the essential content for each part of the competency that will become learning objects during a given course. — The “improvement, enrichment or recall activities” are also essential content. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Please refer to I.A and I.B — Integrating diagram of the course
<p><i>Unfolding of the learning</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Establish the progression of learning targeting the mastery of learning defined in II.B — The last sequence provides unquestionable clues regarding the content of the final course test 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Choice of course section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Holistic approach ○ Analytical approach
<p><i>General evaluation of learning strategy for a course</i></p>	<p>A general evaluation strategy identifies for each learning sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The final integrating objective for each section of the course — The list of evaluation activities — The objects of evaluation — The means of evaluating — The types of evaluation — Weighting 	

<p><i>Evaluation plan for the final course test</i></p> <p>A. Analyze the training objective</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Characterize the training objective 2. Identify the true nature of this objective 	<p>The evaluation plan is based on the choices made in the activity planning stages developed earlier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — How are the various components of the competency integrated — What competency are we referring to? — Which type of production derives from this objective? 	
<p>B. Select and render operational the objects to be evaluated</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify essential objects and learning for evaluation 2. Select indicators that allow for the observation of demonstrations of this learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Link to the integrating objective that defines the expected result at the end of the course — Link to essential content of each training sequence — Not all objects of learning are objects of evaluation. Do not evaluate what has been previously evaluated. — Nature of the indicators: process, product, speech — The indicators are actions that demonstrate mastery of the competency. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Analysis of the components of the competency and the performance criteria — See the progression of learning in the course sections — To ensure students are guided towards the action, use verbs in the present tense.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Identify the evaluation criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Expected quality is directly linked to indicators 	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Specify the realization context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Specifies circumstances when the competency should be used, for what purpose and in what environment 	

<p>C. Select evaluation methods or the type of test and design the evaluation tools</p> <p>1. Determine the most appropriate means of evaluation for the type of training objective</p> <p>2. Develop the tools which will be used for the evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Identify the evaluation task or choose the methods that conform to the criteria of integration, authenticity and focus on the competency as much as possible. — Corresponds to the all documentation and activities relating to the evaluation methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The methods used must allow for the evaluation of integrated learning. — Concept to keep in mind: the authentic evaluation — Select a problem situation
<p>D. Develop tools to assist in the evaluation judgment</p> <p>1. Design the necessary tools: observation and correction grid</p> <p>2. Develop a rating scale relative to the evaluation criteria</p>	<p>The observation grid is made up indicators, criteria and a rating scale that makes it possible to carry out an analytical correction by examining the product, the process, the speech and the attitude according to each criteria of evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> — The observation grid is a formative evaluation tool and the correction grid is a summative evaluation tool.

Complementary document 5

The evaluation of learning at college level: from course to program¹¹⁷

This text is an excerpt of a research file that is impossible to overlook. A product of Performa, it is available at every college and at Université de Sherbrooke's website.

A Performa college file containing the following documents:

- *Présentation du dossier*, [s. l.], [s. l.], April 1996, Presentation, Table of contents, iii and 16 p.
- *Fascicule I. La problématique*, [s. l.], avril 1996, Présentation, Table des matières, ii et 66 p.
- *Fascicule II. Cadre de référence. Première partie : Les questions préalables*. Première édition, [s. l.], April 1996, Presentation, Table of contents, List of tables, ii and 85 p.
- *Fascicule III-IV – 1^{er} volet. Avenues quant au comment faire. Comment faire l'évaluation des apprentissages. Comment faire l'animation pédagogique sur ce thème*. [s. l.], January 1997, Presentation, Table of contents, vi and multiple pagination.
- *Fascicule III-IV – 2^e volet. Avenues quant au comment faire. Comment faire l'évaluation des apprentissages. Comment faire l'animation pédagogique sur ce thème*. [s. l.], January 1997, Presentation, Table of contents and multiple pagination.
- *Appendices*, [s. l.], January 1997, Table of contents and multiple pagination.

Notes on the authors of the texts

Content description

- Information on the file: its origin, recipients, content, format, usefulness and limitations, p. 1-7;
- Work perspectives that are used to study the question of evaluation of learning with teaching personnel: A systematic approach p. 8-11, an approach of “research-action”, p. 12-16.
 - *The evaluation of learning as a component of teaching* that is linked to other components such as: a) the orientation of the training and the course; b) planning relative to the course and relative to the program; c) the pedagogical and didactic interventions and d) a critical review of practices, p. 3-5;
 - *Principal participants in the evaluation of learning* :
 - **The teachers:** perceptions and feelings that a number of them share in evaluating learning; concepts, beliefs and values on which their practices rest; the impact that the evaluation of learning can have on their professional activity, p. 6-10;
 - **the students:** their perceptions and feelings on the evaluation of learning; the impact the evaluation is likely to have on them and their expectations, which were discussed during a consultation held by the Conseil supérieur de l'éducation on this subject, p. 11-14;
 - The relational and affective dimensions that characterize the evaluation of learning are two-fold: how students perceive the teacher-student relationship and three delicate affective issues to be taken into account: the fairness of the evaluation process, the self-assertion of the two groups of participants and the cohabitation of the guide and the judge within the role of teacher, p. 15-18;

- The practical context for the evaluation of learning marked by :
 - *The evolution of the teaching profession, p. 23-29;*
 - *The paradigm shift in the world of evaluation of learning, p. 30-43;*
 - *Certain outstanding features of college instruction in Québec, p. 44-47;*
 - *The evaluation of learning in college instruction in Québec, p. 48-55;*
- The problem divided into two segments:
 - *What is the problem and how to resolve it, p. 56-60;*
 - *How does research provide elements for the solution to the problem, p. 61-66.*
- The concepts and beliefs affect the frame of reference relative to the evaluation of learning: an evaluation of learning marked by the new paradigm, p. 15-17; an evaluation carried out in a professional manner, p. 17; an evaluation carried out from a program perspective, p. 17-18.

Comment : The page numbering in this booklet jumps from page 5 to page 15 as this space had been reserved for other concepts and beliefs listed in the table of contents. However, on page 5 it is noted that the drafting of sections A. 1 and A. 2 were not yet complete and will be “distributed at a later date”;

- The nature, function and follow-up to the evaluation of learning are detailed in the 2nd portion of this booklet under three main headings: a) what is evaluation of learning, p. 21-36; b) for whom and for what purpose should the evaluation of learning be used (and not used), p. 37-42; c) where does the evaluation of learning lead, p. 43-44;
- The units of training (course and program) and the objects of evaluation are the focus of the third section, p. 45-64. The objects of evaluation are extensively analyzed in this section, p. 47-64.
- Distinctions are established between objects of the formative evaluation and those of the summative evaluation. The author states that “these two types of objects of evaluation are included within a network of components relative to what the training must contain (goals, learning objectives, minimum requirements), what the training is (training effectively presented learning effectively achieved) and the ways in which these results can be evaluated (indicators and demonstrations of the learning acquired by the student)” p. 47;
- Six general principles were retained as guiding principles “to guide all evaluations of learning: Two general perspectives (professionalism and collective responsibility); the assertion of the two-fold purpose of the evaluation of learning (support and certification); two principles referring to ethical requirements of summative evaluations and formative evaluations; and a last principle relating to the methodological requirements of the operation”. p. 66 The first part of section p. 66-69 is devoted to listing the six general principles, the connection between these principles and their origin. The second part p. 70-85 deals with the use of the general principles. This use is summarized as: “Each individual general principle is used with a certain number of precise principles. In this way, the system comprises 37 principles in all: 6 general principles and 31 secondary principles that further explain the meaning of the first 6. It is the fourth general principle relating to the ethical requirements of the summative evaluation that produces the greatest number secondary principles, a total of 12, grouped around four topics: fairness, accuracy, equity and the appearance of these qualities” p. 70;
- General suggestions [N = 5] on teaching activities for the evaluation of learning and the comprehensive program assessment (CPA);
- Integrated learning: A series of documents on teaching activities for this theme and a second series on means of intervention and components of reflection relative to the problem of integrating the learning and/or relative to the frame of reference for this concept;

- The evaluation of learning: Tools for teaching activities; a document dealing with the planning activities for the whole of the evaluation of learning and a series of documents suggesting alternate venues for the formative evaluation;
- The development of a summative evaluation tool: Tools for teaching activities that facilitate reflection on the relative importance of criteria and their use; and other material to help develop and draft a summative evaluation tool; a series of documents recommending components for a frame of reference on the methodological aspects of the evaluation of learning, particularly from a summative perspective;
- The CPA merits elaborate handling: a) tools for teaching activities; b) information concerning the official guidelines for a CPA; c) focus on the dynamics and results of work carried out within the college network on the CPA; d) components for a frame of reference on the CPA; e) documents concerning the “exit profile” as a reference for selecting CPA objects; f) materials that could prove useful when it comes to developing a CPA or performing a critical review.

Descriptors

Comprehensive program assessment / evaluation of learning/ formative evaluation / summative evaluation / teacher training / integrated learning / teacher improvement / teaching profession / exit profile / research-action

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

- Given that the title of the file is “The evaluation of learning at college level: from course to program”, we should not be surprised to see that the comprehensive program assessment (CPA) is a subject developed at length. Approximately two thirds of Booklet III-IV – 2nd section is devoted exclusively to this topic. It is also discussed, directly and indirectly in the 1st section of the Booklet. Two others sections recommend “paths” on the road to evaluation of learning.
- In addition, all thoughts on the subject of the CPA, all recommendations and practical suggestions must relate to the frame of reference for evaluations presented in Booklet II. The authors develop their thoughts based on “prerequisite questions” dealing with certain realities or aspects such as: nature, role and follow-up of learning evaluations; the units of training and objects of evaluation; the guiding principles in administering evaluations. All things considered, Booklet II allows for an even greater clarification of the theoretical foundation of actions relative to the CPA.
- The official guidelines for a CPA [*cf.* Booklet III-IV – 2nd portion, Doc. E.2.1, 4 p.], in section E.4 of the 2nd section of Booklet III-IV identify components for a frame of reference relative to the CPA. Three documents, respectively dated March, June and September 1996, facilitate conceptualization and are recommended by the authors of file # 4. Two definitions of a CPA are suggested, then developed further in the June and September 1996 documents:
 - “The CPA is a summative evaluation activity whose objective is to attest to the integration of essential learning by the student at the end of a study program”. *id.*, “One step closer towards a frame of reference on the CPA”, Doc. E.4.2].
 - “The comprehensive program assessment” within a program is a summative evaluation activity whose goal is to attest the level of development of the competencies of graduates at the end of the study program — development of competencies resulting from the integration by the student of the learning acquired in the program”. [*id.*, “an operational definition of the CPA”, Doc E.4.3]. Let us note that in the presentation of this second definition, Cécile D’Amour states she is hoping “to establish a junction between two types of CPA formulation: One based on integrated learning and the other based on competencies [*ibid.*]

- In addition and in keeping with this definition the authors propose elements for reflection and make suggestions:
 - general work prospects in the CPA file [*id.*, Doc. E.4.1, p. 3];
 - the concept of the evaluation of learning that must be present for the development and implementation of a CPA [*id.*, Doc. E.4.1, p. 1-3 et p. 10 et 11; Doc. E.4.2, p. 6-10];
 - the relationship between a CPA and integrated learning [*id.*, Doc. E.4.1, p. 6-7];
 - the development of comprehensive program assessments, their validation, testing and evaluation [*id.*, Doc. E.4.1, p. 8 and 9 and all of document E.4.2, 11 p.]

- The CPA made its appearance in college instruction in 1993, without any kind of groundwork and without any precise details other than those that could be found analyzing College Education Regulations (CER, 1993). Participants in the college network, particularly educational advisors and academic deans had to gradually provide learning models of a CPA or what they thought a CPA should be. The file includes background on the initial arduous progression of this question. Education historians would be very interested and could benefit from an analysis of the documentary sections collected by the authors that validate certain theoretical advances but also from the variegated portrait (no negative connotation intended) of concrete initiatives taken in a number of colleges relative to the CPA. The principal texts and documents are:
 - two working papers reflecting current thinking and concerns of the Groupe de travail PERFORMA [*cf.* Appendices 6.2 a et b];
 - a presentation of the main trends and characteristics brought to light in college institutions on the CPA according to three axes: regulatory, conceptual and procedural [*cf.* Booklet III-IV, 2nd portion, Doc. E.3.1, June 1996, 14 p.];
 - the draft of a typology of practices and documented work relative to the development of the CPA, April 1996 [*id.*, Doc. E.3.2, 2 p.];

 - a list of works undertaken outside the college framework, dated February 1996: at Fédération des cégeps, at Performa and Délégation collégiale (Regroupement des colleges Performa) as well as the Association québécoise de pédagogie collégiale, AQPC [*id.*, Doc. E.3.3, 2 p.];
 - an analysis of the current status relative to the CPA dated February 1996 [*id.*, Doc. E.3.4, 7 p.];
 - a synthesis of material coming from the college network and used for case studies on CPA within the framework of professional development courses on CPA by Performa in 1996 [*id.*, Doc. E.3.5, 4 p.]. Concerning this improvement session, the following information is also provided in the booklet that contains the Appendix:
 - outlines of the September 1996 seminars on CPA [Appendix 4.1, 3 p.]; Evaluation of the seminars [Appendix 4.2, 7 p.].

- For those who would like to organize information sessions, teaching and professional development on the CPA, the following material is available:
- suggestions by the members of the Performa work group on the evaluation of learning with suggestions on improving sessions offered to teaching personnel on the evaluation of learning [*cf.* Booklet III-IV, 1st section, Doc. A.1 a, 3 p.];
 - two types of practical exercises to facilitate sensitization and teaching professional development [*id.*, Doc. A.1 b, 4 p.];
 - “problem-based learning” and “cooperative learning” as pertinent educational strategies for teaching professional development of [*id.*, Doc. A.1 c et d];
 - “case studies: inductive and deductive approach” excerpt from participation booklet at Performa seminars on the CPA, September 1996 [*id.*, Doc. A.1 e];
 - “educational goals of general training” [*cf.* Booklet III-IV, 2nd section, Doc. E.2.2, 7 p.];
 - “overall picture: training-learning activities with integrated results”: two diagrams developed during Performa seminars on CPA September 1996 [*cf.* Booklet III-IV, 1st section, Doc. B.2.3, 3 p.];
 - *continuum* and categorization of integrating objectives [*id.*, B.2.4a, 3 p.];
 - “key competencies in designing exit profiles that lead to the development of a CPA in an economic and equivalent fashion “ [*id.*, Doc. B.2.4 b, 2 p.];
 - “to plan learning evaluations within a course or program” [*id.*, Doc. C.2.1 a, 2 p.].