



MARIANOPOLIS
COLLEGE

Program Management Policy (PMP)

Adopted by the Board of Governors
February 12, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. POLICY STATEMENT	3
2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES	3
3. DEFINITIONS	4
4. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	6
4.1 Ongoing Program Improvement Approach	6
4.2 Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Ongoing Program Improvement	7
4.3 Program Revision and Program Development	9
4.4 In-Depth Program Evaluation	9
4.5 Directory of Information on Programs (DIP)	10
5. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	10
5.1 Program Committees	10
5.2 Program Revision and Program Development Committees	11
5.3 General Education Committee	12
5.4 Program Coordinators	13
5.5 Program Coordination Committee (PCC)	13
5.6 Permanent Program Management Policy Committee (PPMPC)	13
5.7 Academic Departments	13
5.8 Academic Advisors	14
5.9 Pedagogical Counsellors	14
5.10 Associate Dean, Programs	14
5.11 Academic Dean	14
5.12 Academic Council	15
5.13 Board of Governors	15
6. EVALUATION AND REVISION OF THE POLICY	15
6.1 Evaluation of the Policy	15
6.2 Revision of the Policy	15
7. RELATED POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS	16

1. POLICY STATEMENT

The Program Management Policy (PMP) provides the framework for the management of all programs at Marianopolis College and identifies areas of responsibility for the various College bodies. The PMP takes as its premise that a program is the foundation of college education.

The PMP defines a collaborative ongoing program improvement approach, which will ensure the quality and proper functioning of programs at Marianopolis College and support students as they pursue academic excellence.

2. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

As a general principle, the management of programs at Marianopolis must be aligned with the Mission, Vision and Values of the College, and with the implementation of the Strategic Plan and the Student Success Plan.

Specifically, the PMP is guided by the following principles:

- Having the student at the centre of program management decisions;
- Emphasizing excellence and rigorous university preparation in all programs;
- Striving to position each program at Marianopolis College as a first-choice program in the college network;
- Supporting a distinct Marianopolis identity for each program;
- Framing decision-making within participatory structures in the spirit of collaboration and consensus-building between members of the community, while recognizing the key role of faculty in the delivery of programs;
- Allowing for flexibility in the composition and mandate of Program Committees, Program Development Committees, and Program Revision Committees to reflect the specific realities and needs of programs;
- Fostering participation of General Education disciplines in program decision-making;
- Privileging an ongoing improvement approach to program management driven by the active participation of faculty;
- Promoting the interdisciplinary nature of programs by following the principles of the program approach and competency-based education;
- Making evidence-based decisions for the continuous improvement of programs;
- Respecting ethical best practices in the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data and information related to program management with a view to protecting confidentiality and maintaining transparency in the data collection process.

The procedures and tools to support the implementation of the PMP are housed in the Directory of Information on Programs (DIP; see section 4.5).

3. DEFINITIONS

Competency framework: A tool that provides a local interpretation of the objectives and standards set by the *devis*. It defines common elements for all sections of a course. It also locates the competency within specific courses and in relation to other program courses.

Competency map: A document that describes the logical progression of competencies of a program and how they are distributed within and across courses. A program competency can be met by a single course or by multiple courses. Similarly, a course can meet one or more program competencies.

Comprehensive assessment: An academic activity that allows the students in a given program to demonstrate achievement of program competencies, the ability to make appropriate connections among program disciplines, and attainment of the program exit profile. Students must successfully complete the comprehensive assessment in order to graduate with a diploma in their program.

Data: Quantitative and qualitative information gathered through College quality assurance mechanisms.

Devis: Ministerial document that describes the objectives, standards, and competencies of the Specific Education component for a given program, or for the General Education component for all programs, which are to be interpreted locally by colleges.

Exit profile: A tool that defines the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that all students must develop upon successful completion of the program.

Local program development: Refers to two possible processes. Regarding a program currently offered at the College, local program development is the process of implementing a substantial addition to the existing program, which involves developing new or significantly revised program portfolio documents. Local program development also refers to the process of implementing a *devis* for a program that is being added to the College's offering, which involves defining a local interpretation of the new competencies and developing new program portfolio documents.

Local program revision: Regarding a program currently offered at the College, local program revision is the process of implementing an existing *devis* in a substantially different way such that the local version of the program ceases to be offered and is replaced with an updated version. A local program revision includes the development of new program portfolio documents.

Ministerial program revision: The process of implementing an updated ministerial *devis* for a program currently offered at the College, which involves defining a local interpretation of the new competencies and developing new program portfolio documents.

Program: An integrated set of courses offered by various disciplines, including General Education, that together help students develop the competencies set by the Ministry of Higher Education, as well as those defined locally in the program's exit profile.

Program annual plan: An annual proposal submitted by the Program Committee to the Associate Dean, Programs, describing its goals for program monitoring and improvement in the upcoming academic year.

Program approach: An approach to program management that prioritizes the program experience as a

whole. This approach highlights the students' needs for meaningful skill development, coherent progression of knowledge, and ongoing synthesis of their learning across semesters, disciplines, and courses in their program. While acknowledging the subject-specific expertise of faculty who design individual courses, the program approach emphasizes program coherence and competency-based learning, as reflected in the program vision.

Program dashboard: A tool that provides an overview of a program's key performance indicators (KPIs), based on data from a variety of external and internal sources.

Program dissolution: The permanent closure of a program.

Program grid: A document that lists, by semester, the sequence of all the courses in a given program, their competencies, ponderation, and pre-requisites. A single program may include several program grids to account for varying courses and course sequences.

Program portfolio: A collection of all the documents that locally define a given program, including the program vision, exit profile, competency map, program grid(s), and comprehensive assessment.


Program suspension: As a result of concerning trends in program quality indicators or external factors, the temporary cessation of recruitment for and admission to a program pending a decision on further action.

Quality assurance criteria for programs: There are six criteria that provide the framework for ensuring the continuous improvement of programs through ongoing program monitoring. The six criteria are: (1) program relevance; (2) program coherence; (3) program effectiveness; (4) quality of teaching methods and student supervision; (5) alignment of human, financial, and material resources; and (6) quality of program management.

Year-end report: An annual report submitted by the Program Committee to the Associate Dean, Programs, describing the progress made on the program annual plan goals in the preceding academic year.

4. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The heart of the program management system is a commitment to making data-driven decisions in the pursuit of ongoing program improvement. The graphic below schematizes this approach. Further details on the individual components of the system follow.



Legend




Figure 1. Marianopolis College Program Management System

4.1 Ongoing Program Improvement Approach

Program management is characterized by an ongoing improvement approach. This is an iterative, cyclical process of monitoring and evaluating programs according to the six quality assurance criteria. This approach involves making adjustments to the program, as needed, based on the program information generated through different quality assurance mechanisms, to ensure that the program remains of the highest quality.

4.2 Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Ongoing Program Improvement

The table below outlines the mechanisms used to inform ongoing program improvement.¹ It includes the frequency at which the mechanisms are run, the individuals or groups involved in their implementation and follow-up, and the corresponding quality assurance criteria for programs. Data generated through the mechanisms listed below is added to the Directory of Information on Programs (see section 4.5) and shared with Program Coordinators to guide the work of Program Committees.

Data collection and reporting tools: prepared and validated by the Office of the Academic Dean in consultation with the Program Coordination Committee.			
Quality Assurance Mechanism	Criteria Covered	Roles and Actions	Frequency
Program Exit Survey	Program effectiveness Program relevance Program coherence Quality of teaching methods and student supervision	Office of the Academic Dean collects data and reports on results; Program Committees analyze results and propose actions in annual plan	Once a semester to capture Fall and Winter graduates
Alumni consultation	Program effectiveness Program relevance Program coherence Quality of teaching methods and student supervision		As needed, but at least every 5 years per program
Program dashboards	Program effectiveness Program relevance		Annual
University pathways data	Program effectiveness Program relevance		Annual
Program Synthesis Report (salient findings from data obtained by the quality assurance system)	Program effectiveness Program relevance Program coherence Quality of teaching methods and student supervision		Annual

¹ Certain mechanisms may support other components of the quality assurance system, such as the IPESA or the Student Success Plan. Only the components of the mechanisms that relate to program management are described here.

Annual plans and regular review processes for program components			
Quality Assurance Mechanism	Criteria Covered	Roles and Actions	Frequency
Program annual plans and year-end reports	All 6 criteria, as relevant	Program Committees produce annual plans and year-end reports; Associate Dean, Programs presents plans and reports to Academic Council. Program plans may reference or incorporate elements of department plans, particularly in relation to capital budgets	Annual
Regular review processes for competency frameworks	Program coherence Program effectiveness Quality of teaching methods and student supervision Other quality assurance criteria, as relevant	Program Committees and Academic Departments review competency frameworks and make adjustments; Office of the Academic Dean reviews frameworks and provides feedback	As needed, but at least every 5 years
Regular review process for course outlines	Program coherence Program effectiveness Quality of teaching methods and student supervision	Academic Departments verify course outlines; Office of the Academic Dean spot checks to validate Departmental review, reviews report, and provides feedback	Every semester
Regular review process for final evaluations	Program coherence Program effectiveness	Academic Departments report on final evaluations; Office of the Academic Dean reviews reports and provides feedback	Annually
Review of program portfolio materials	All 6 criteria	Program Committees review materials and propose actions in annual plan; Office of the Academic Dean ensures that the Directory of Information on Programs is up to date	Ongoing, as needed
Evaluation of program resources and processes	Alignment of human, material and financial resources with education needs	Program Committees propose actions in annual plan; Director General assesses recommendations with the Academic Dean	Annually, or as part of program revision, program development, or in-depth evaluation

4.3 Program Revision and Program Development

The program management system is also designed to respond to the following situations:

- The Academic Dean issues a mandate for a local program development (see section 3, Definitions).
- The Academic Dean issues a mandate for a local program revision (see section 3, Definitions) as a result of a Ministerial program revision (see section 3, Definitions) or an in-depth program evaluation (see section 4.4).

Once a new *devis* has been issued, or once a decision has been made to revise or develop a program locally, the Office of the Academic Dean creates a framework for the revision or development, which must include the following components:

- A rationale for the program revision or development, including key questions to be addressed;
- The mandate and composition of the Program Revision or Program Development Committee;
- A definition of roles and responsibilities;
- A timeline for the major phases of the program revision or development.

The framework must be adopted by Academic Council. Once adopted, the Program Revision or Program Development Committee is struck and proceeds with the program revision or development. A final report is presented to Academic Council, and the revised or new program grid is recommended to the Board of Governors for approval.

Once approved, the revised or developed program is implemented and enters the ongoing program improvement process.

4.4 In-Depth Program Evaluation

As part of ongoing program improvement, the Academic Dean can request an in-depth evaluation when there are concerning trends in key performance indicators (KPIs) (e.g., drop in enrolment; drop in graduation rates) or when external factors have an important impact on a program (e.g., legislative changes). The evaluation must address all six quality assurance criteria.

Once a decision has been made to conduct an in-depth program evaluation, the Office of the Academic Dean develops a framework for the evaluation, which must include the following components:

- A rationale for the evaluation;
- A description of the methodology that will be used to evaluate the program according to the six quality assurance criteria for programs;
- A definition of roles and responsibilities; and
- A timeline for the evaluation.

The framework must be adopted by Academic Council. The result of an in-depth program evaluation is a report developed by the Office of the Academic Dean, in collaboration with the Program Committee, detailing the findings of the evaluation and recommendations for any future actions, such as a local program revision or the dissolution of the program. A final report is presented to Academic Council and its

conclusions are shared with the Board of Governors, either for information (in the case of a local program revision) or approval (in the case of a dissolution).

4.5 Directory of Information on Programs (DIP)

The Directory of Information on Programs is a core quality assurance mechanism that supports ongoing program improvement in several ways:

- It houses information that serves key stakeholders in the Marianopolis community in making evidence-based decisions about program management, including program evaluation, revision, and development;
- It acts as a unique, centralized repository for program-related procedures, policies, templates, and guidelines;
- It serves as a repository for the plans, procedures, and policies that support quality assurance as it relates to programs;
- It constitutes an archive of program-related information.

The DIP includes:

- Program *devis* and objectives;
- Program portfolio materials;
- Competency frameworks;
- Final versions of reports on program dashboards, student surveys, student success indicators, and university admissions;
- Annual plans and year-end reports produced by the Program Committees;
- Procedures, templates, and forms related to program management;
- Frameworks for in-depth program evaluations, program revisions, and program development;
- Records of program management decisions and activities.

The DIP is updated on a continual basis throughout the year by the Office of the Academic Dean.

5. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following is a description of the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the ongoing improvement and management of programs.

5.1 Program Committees

Program Committees are responsible for:

- Fostering the quality of the program through ongoing program improvement;
- Participating in all aspects of program management and regular program operations;
- Determining internal regulations for the functioning of the Program Committee and creating sub-committees and taskforces on specific issues, as necessary;
- Establishing program improvement objectives on an annual basis (annual plan) and reporting on

- their progress at the end of the year (year-end report);
- Contributing to the development and updating of program portfolio documents in collaboration with Academic Departments;
- Recommending updated program portfolio materials to the Associate Dean, Programs;
- Developing and proposing revisions to competency frameworks, in collaboration with Academic Departments, as relevant;
- Reviewing competency frameworks for coherence and alignment with program aims (as per the Exit Profile) in collaboration with Academic Departments;
- Recommending competency frameworks to the Associate Dean, Programs, in collaboration with Academic Departments, as relevant;
- Collaborating with the General Education Committee, as necessary.

The composition of Program Committees takes into account the size of the program and must minimally include the following members:

- Program Coordinator (Chair);
- At least 2 other faculty members from contributing Specific Education disciplines;
- At least 1 member of the General Education Committee, or a General Education faculty member delegated by the General Education Committee.

Program Committees may also include other members, such as additional faculty members from contributing Specific Education disciplines and General Education, and up to two staff members. Members of Program Committees have a term of two years.

The composition and membership of Program Committees is determined by the Academic Dean, in consultation with the Program Coordinator and the Associate Dean, Programs.

5.2 Program Revision and Program Development Committees

Consensus-based Program Revision and Program Development Committees have the mandate to drive the local program revision or development process with the support of the Office of the Associate Dean, Programs. More specifically, these committees are responsible for:

- Establishing a critical path and detailed timeline for the program revision or development;
- Creating a vision for the new program or new component of the program;
- Analyzing the aims, competencies and objectives and standards of the *devis*, and defining a local understanding of the main program components;
- Ensuring the pedagogical harmonization and interdisciplinary nature of the program;
- Consulting on a regular basis with Academic Departments on key issues;
- Consulting with other members of the community as it deems necessary;
- Recommending the Program Portfolio to Academic Council;
- Reviewing frameworks for program-specific competencies prepared by Academic Departments and recommending such frameworks to the Associate Dean, Programs;
- Providing feedback to the Ministry during the ministerial revision of the program (for program

revisions only).

Program Revision and Program Development Committees will be composed of the following:

- Associate Dean, Programs (Chair);
- Program Coordinator (Vice-Chair);
- Up to 5 faculty members from contributing Specific Education disciplines, appointed by the Academic Dean on the basis of departmental recommendation;
- 1 faculty member from each of the General Education disciplines, appointed by the Academic Dean on the basis of departmental recommendation;
- One Pedagogical Counsellor, appointed by the Associate Dean, Programs;
- One Academic Advisor, appointed by the Associate Dean, Student Success.

One faculty member on the Committee will receive release time to be the Faculty Lead. The Faculty Lead could be the Program Coordinator, or another faculty on the committee. The Academic Dean designates the Faculty Lead following a call. Generally speaking, the Faculty Lead will be responsible for:

- Assisting the Office of the Associate Dean, Programs in the production of the materials which will constitute the program portfolio (vision statement, exit profile, program comprehensive assessment, competency map and program grid(s));
- Providing feedback to Curriculum Committees on the production of frameworks for all program-specific competencies.

The precise responsibilities of the Faculty Lead will be specified in the program revision or program development framework (see section 4.3). Program Revision and Program Development Committees retain their mandate until the implementation of the revised or developed program.

5.3 General Education Committee

The General Education Committee is responsible for:

- Responding to any mandate relevant to General Education, such as a ministerial revision of General Education competencies or a local policy change;
- Reviewing competency frameworks for coherence and alignment with program aims for all specific to program General Education competencies;
- Participating in Program Committees, as required.

The General Education Committee will be composed of the following:

- Associate Dean, Programs (Chair);
- The Chairs of the Departments that include General Education disciplines, or delegates from their curriculum committees.
- Members of the General Education Committee have a term of two years, so long as they remain Department Chair or a member of the curriculum committee.

5.4 Program Coordinators

Reporting to the Associate Dean, Programs, the Program Coordinator is responsible for:

- Ensuring all functions of the Program Committee, as listed in 5.1, are fulfilled;
- Actively supporting all aspects of the management of the program;
- Chairing and facilitating Program Committee meetings;
- Following up on work done by the Program Committee and related sub-committees and taskforces;
- Acting as a liaison between the Program Committee and Chairs of Academic Departments that offer courses in the program.

Program Coordinators have a term of three years.

5.5 Program Coordination Committee (PCC)

The Program Coordination Committee is responsible for:

- Advising the Associate Dean, Programs on matters related to program management;
- Sharing program materials and program development initiatives to foster a College-wide perspective on the learning experience of students.

The Program Coordination Committee is composed of the following members:

- Associate Dean, Programs (Chair);
- Program Coordinators;
- One staff member, appointed by the Academic Dean.

5.6 Permanent Program Management Policy Committee (PPMPC)

PPMPC is a subcommittee of Academic Council and is responsible for:

- Supporting the implementation of the Program Management Policy (PMP);
- Supporting the development of procedures and tools supporting the PMP;
- Compiling a list of issues or possible edits related to the PMP as part of an ongoing evaluation process and in preparation for its next revision;
- Reporting at least once a year to Academic Council on the implementation and application of the PMP and any related issues;
- Providing a recommendation to Academic Council, when appropriate, to initiate a revision of the PMP;
- Supporting the ongoing evaluation and the revision of the PMP.

5.7 Academic Departments

Academic Departments are responsible for:

- Ensuring the course offering meets the needs of the different programs;
- Proposing new courses to the Office of the Academic Dean;
- Developing and proposing revisions to competency frameworks for their respective disciplines, in collaboration with Program Committees, as relevant;

- Recommending competency frameworks to the Associate Dean, Programs, in collaboration with Program Committees, as relevant;
- Ensuring that course outlines accurately reflect competency frameworks.

5.8 Academic Advisors

Academic Advisors are responsible for:

- Supporting Program Committees, Program Revision Committees, and Program Development Committees by providing expertise on university admission requirements, course progression, student registration, and program-related decisions faced by students.

5.9 Pedagogical Counsellors

Pedagogical Counsellors are responsible for:

- Providing expertise, tools, information and support to Program Committees, Program Revision Committees, and Program Development Committees in the development of program portfolio materials; and to Program Coordinators in ongoing program monitoring and improvement;
- Supporting the Associate Dean, Programs with the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the Program Management Policy.

5.10 Associate Dean, Programs

The Associate Dean, Programs is the delegate of the Academic Dean on all matters related to the application of the Program Management Policy, as listed in section 5.11. Additionally, the Associate Dean, Programs is responsible for:

- Ensuring the alignment of processes and documentation related to program management;
- Implementing updates following Ministerial directives and other regulatory changes;
- Producing an annual summary of Program Committee reports to be presented at Academic Council;
- Overseeing the activities of Program Committees and the General Education Committee, and implementing appropriate measures, as needed, to ensure the proper functioning of these committees.

5.11 Academic Dean

The Academic Dean is responsible for all academic matters at the College and oversees all aspects of program management, under the direct authority of the Director General. More specifically, the Academic Dean is responsible for:

- Ensuring that program management is aligned with the Mission, Vision and Values of Marianopolis College and supports the achievement of the Strategic Plan and the Student Success Plan;
- Overseeing the application, evaluation, and revision of the Program Management Policy;
- Ensuring the proper implementation of the Program Management Policy;
- Ensuring that adequate resources are made available to support the implementation of the policy;
- Resolving issues resulting from contradictory recommendations when consensus cannot be

reached:

- within a Program (Revision, Development) Committee, or
- between a Program (Revision, Development) Committee and an Academic Department;
- Initiating an in-depth program evaluation;
- Suspending admission into a program for the upcoming academic year, as determined by the Director General, and informing Academic Council of the rationale for the decision.
- Coordinating the actions of the Office of the Academic Dean to support faculty in program management.

5.12 Academic Council

Academic Council advises the Board of Governors and the Office of the Academic Dean on all questions concerning programs of study, evaluation of learning, and program management. Academic Council is responsible for:

- Recommending the Program Management Policy to the Board of Governors;
- Recommending major changes to existing academic programs to the Board of Governors;
- Recommending a program that has undergone a revision or development to the Board of Governors;
- Recommending program portfolio materials to the Academic Dean;
- Responding to recommendations in an in-depth evaluation report presented by the Academic Dean's Office.

5.13 Board of Governors

The Board of Governors is responsible for:

- Approving the Program Management Policy;
- Approving major changes to existing academic programs mandated by the Ministry of Higher Education or as a result of local program revision and/or development;
- Approving the dissolution of existing programs.

6. EVALUATION AND REVISION OF THE POLICY

6.1 Evaluation of the Policy

An evaluation of the Program Management Policy, addressing the content and effectiveness of the policy, will be conducted on an ongoing basis under the responsibility of PPMPC.

6.2 Revision of the Policy

A revision of the policy is to be initiated once every five years, based on the data collected through the ongoing evaluation of the policy and in consultation with key stakeholders. A revision can also be initiated at the request of the Board of Governors, Academic Council, or the Academic Dean. The Board of Governors formally approves any revision to the policy, upon a recommendation by Academic Council.

7. RELATED POLICIES AND DOCUMENTS

The following policies and documents may be useful in the application of the PMP.

- Admissions Policy
- Collective Agreement between Marianopolis College and the Marianopolis College Teachers' Union
- *Évaluation des politiques institutionnelles d'évaluation des programmes d'études : Cadre de référence, troisième édition* (CEEC, 2020)
- Institutional Policy on the Evaluation of Student Achievement (IPESA)
- *Règlement sur le régime des études collégiales* (RREC)
- Strategic Plan
- Student Success Plan