

MPHEC

Maritime Provinces
Higher Education
Commission

CESPM

Commission de
l'enseignement supérieur
des Provinces maritimes



**Preliminary Assessment of
the Effectiveness and Benefits
of Articulated Programs**

March 2003

**PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND
BENEFITS OF ARTICULATED PROGRAMMES DELIVERED IN THE MARITIMES**

PREPARED BY THE
AAU-MPHEC ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FOR THE
MARITIME PROVINCES HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

March 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Articulated Programmes - Definition and Key Dimensions	2
III.	The Assessment Process	4
IV.	Preliminary Assessment of the Effectiveness and Benefits of Articulated Programmes	5
	1. Overview	5
	2. Institutional Responses	5
	2.1 Student success/satisfaction	5
	2.2 Programme design and administration	6
	2.3 Programme review and quality assurance	6
	3. Preliminary Findings	7
V.	Recommendations	7
Appendices		
	1. List and Status of Articulated Programmes	9
	2. Assessment Questionnaire and Time Frame	11

I. INTRODUCTION

With the release of the Landry-Downey Report, *To Live and Learn: The Challenge of Education and Training for the Commission on Excellence in Education*, in 1993, a framework for inter-institutional education opportunities and for enhanced links to the labour market was developed within the context of a lifelong learning directive. The next decade concentrated on linking the different types of educational and training institutions and their programmes to make an inter-institutional education system, guided by increased opportunities to flow from one institution to another, and to link education to work and job/career opportunities.

The intention of the Landry-Downey Report was to identify directions for a renewed investment of time, attention, and resources to achieve the goal of creating what is sometimes referred to as a learning culture. "Implicit in a learning culture are such ideas as equity of access to education and training for all who demonstrate the ability and desire to succeed; hospitable institutions and flexible curricula to foster lifelong learning; a financial incentive system that encourages individuals and employers to invest in education and training; and active partnerships among all of the significant players, including business, labour, governments, and the educational and training institutions themselves" (Landry-Downey Report, p. 8).

In the mid- to late-1990s, provincial governments in the Maritimes designed a number of educational initiatives to provide greater opportunities for students to experience more job/career related activities. Universities responded by exploring alternative ways to provide students, who were not enrolled in professional, semi-professional or co-op education programmes or other similar programmes designed with built-in work experiences, with work experience. In 1995-1996, St. Thomas University submitted the first proposal for an articulated

programme for consideration and approval by the Commission.

Upon receipt of this first proposal for an articulated programme, the Commission, through its AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee, defined, in conjunction with external readers and input from its stakeholders, an articulated programme as a substantively new programme articulating components of a post-secondary programme delivered by one institution with components of the programme delivered by another. The general aim of such programmes is to expand the opportunities for graduates to acquire both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies.

The Commission's "Guidelines for the Preparation of Proposals for Articulated Programmes" were published in its Policy on Quality Assurance in 1999. At that time, the Commission announced its intent to carry out an assessment of the effectiveness and benefits of articulated programmes once a significant number of approved articulated programmes had graduated their first cohort of students.

The Commission approved its first articulated programme in September 1996. As of 2002, the Commission has received proposals for 21 articulated programmes. Universities within the Commission's mandate offering articulated programmes, at this time, include: St. Thomas University, Dalhousie University, Université de Moncton, University College of Cape Breton¹,

¹The University College of Cape Breton received its degree granting status in 1982 and represents the only university college on the Commission's schedule. The combination and blending of Liberal Arts and Sciences with technology and trade programmes have a long-standing history at the University College of Cape Breton. For UCCB, bridging and/or articulated arrangements between these two levels of programmes is not a new addition to its programme mix or a new experience, as is the case for articulated programmes developed at other universities on the Commission's schedule since 1996. The definition of an articulated programme, as defined in 1996, is a substantively new programme articulating components of a post-secondary programme delivered by one institution with components of a programme delivered by another. The long standing programmes at UCCB do not at this time

University of New Brunswick, and University of Prince Edward Island. Fourteen of the 21 articulated programmes approved by the Commission since 1996 have been implemented, eight of which have reported their first cohort of recent graduates (see Appendix 1).

In June 2001, the Commission began its assessment of articulated programmes; however, the timing of the assessment proved to be premature. In the interim, the Commission agreed to conduct a preliminary assessment and a more comprehensive assessment of these programmes would be conducted in three years time.

This report begins by defining the articulated programme structure. This is followed by a description of the assessment process conducted to date by the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee. Next, the report describes the information collected from universities to date, including a preliminary assessment of the challenges identified by these universities. The report concludes with recommendations to universities on ways to strengthen and sustain this programme structure as well as recommendations for procedural and data collection improvements which will help institutions prepare for a more comprehensive assessment at a later date.

II. ARTICULATED PROGRAMMES - DEFINITION AND KEY DIMENSIONS

According to the MPHEC's Quality Assurance Policy, an articulated programme is defined as a substantively new programme articulating components of a post-secondary programme delivered by one institution with components of a programme delivered by another.

involve a separate institution delivering part of its programme. Therefore for the purpose of this preliminary review, only new articulated programmes involving more than one institution are included, and UCCB's internal articulation programmes have not been included at this time.

From a policy perspective its objectives are to provide graduates with a more timely access to significant jobs or earnings and ensure that they have indeed acquired both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies. To ensure the breadth and depth of knowledge in a practical, applied environment, articulated programmes are designed to integrate: 1) the application of skills; 2) critical thinking and communication skills; and 3) the ability to transfer and articulate knowledge.

Articulated programmes are between institutions who generally grant two different types (levels) of credentials. The institutions will generally be a community college and a university. However, other education providers (publicly or privately funded) could also be involved. An articulated programme can have one or more exit points at varying levels. When there is only one level, the programme is delivered by two institutions but its completion leads to only one credential. When there are two (or more) levels, the programme is delivered by two (or more) institutions and its completion leads to two recognized credentials, generally at two different levels. One credential may be earned as a requirement to earn the other, or they may be earned concurrently or independently.

While the design of articulated programmes is not limited to credit transfers, it likely includes credit transfer agreements. Articulated programmes are more than the juxtaposition of existing programmes, and can lead to credentials in applied arts, applied sciences, applied social sciences, technology, etc. or they could lead to more traditional designations (Arts, Science, etc.).

Four key dimensions distinguish articulated programmes from a programme consisting only of credit transfer or a block of transfer credits. These dimensions include: programme content, inter-institutional coordinating mechanisms, labour market linkages, and programme evaluation.

(1) Programme content

The structure and content of an articulated programme should address the following three components:

- a. *Occupational content*, i.e., course content directly related to the practice of an occupation in the field;
- b. *Occupationally related content*, i.e., courses usually delivered, especially at the upper level, by a university (English, Political Science, History, Psychology, Management, etc.), where the content has been tailored to the clientele of the programme (for example, English or Political Science for journalists or business courses for students in tourism and hospitality); and
- c. *Other academic content*, i.e., courses in other fields that contribute to the education of the student.

(2) Inter-institutional coordinating mechanism(s)

This mechanism bridges the two or more partners in the delivery of an articulated programme and can be represented by one or more individuals (for example, a programme coordinator or a coordinating committee). This mechanism is responsible for: 1) establishing the roles and responsibilities of the two or more partners delivering the programme; 2) setting and maintaining common standards in relation to programme design and admission requirements; 3) setting standards for progression through, and graduation from, the programme; 4) clarifying cost and revenue-sharing; 5) evaluating the programme; and 6) advising students and providing other student services. This coordinating mechanism is a key player in facilitating student transfer from one institution to the other, especially in the early implementation period of the programme.

(3) Labour market linkages

Labour market linkages are established through an industry advisory group or by members of the inter-institutional group, which include industry partners.

These linkages ensure that the need for the programme exists and that its relevancy is maintained. This is especially pertinent in cases where a subset of courses within an articulated programme must meet accreditation requirements or standards for a licence to practice (i.e., health-related programmes, trades and technology programmes, etc.). Labour linkages also facilitate opportunities for student placements.

(4) Programme evaluation

Given the unique dimensions of an articulated programme and its recent introduction to the universities' programme mix, clearly defined programme evaluation policies and procedures are imperative. The policy must clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each partner, including the designated partner (the partner granting the degree for the articulated programme) who will be responsible for the overall management of the assessment process. The coordinating unit responsible for the review of articulated programmes must be able to mesh each partner's policies and procedures, frequency of reviews, standards, and scope of programme review. The policy should include a graduate follow-up process to measure the success of the programme in meeting its major objectives (to provide graduates with a more timely access to significant jobs or earnings and to ensure that they have acquired both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies). The evaluation process, as well as programme delivery, should be integrated and cooperative.

All articulated programme proposals submitted to the Commission, with the exception of the first one, have followed the guidelines for the preparation of proposals for articulated programmes included in the Commission's Policy on Quality Assurance. These guidelines have two objectives: programme quality and suitability of services for the students involved. The guidelines require that universities interested in developing and implementing articulated programmes provide the Commission

evidence that with: 1) the programme structure and content are consistent with the definition of an articulated programme; 2) an inter-institutional mechanism has been established, and that the responsibility for the programme's delivery and administration, as well as the roles and responsibilities of the partners, is well defined; 3) linkages to the labour market are in place to ensure that the programme has a close connection to the practical requirements of the labour market and that the inter-institutional coordinating mechanism benefits from this connection (either through an industry advisory group or through appropriate membership on its coordinating committee); and 4) the evaluation procedures and cycle include a procedure for graduate follow-ups.

III. THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS

In June 2001, the Commission agreed to the process established by the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee to carry out its assessment of articulated programmes.

The Commission agreed that the assessment should examine:

- Student outcomes and success, graduate employment rates, student satisfaction, attrition rates, etc.
- The types of recruitment activities developed by the participating institutions.
- The inter-institutional arrangements in terms of barriers and challenges, as well as lessons learned.
- How successful the concept of articulated programmes has been, including input from the senior administration levels, as well as joint committees charged with liaison between the two different types of institutions.
- The extent the objectives of articulated programmes have been met.
- Upcoming articulated programme developments, as well as possible modification or termination of existing programmes.

A questionnaire was designed by the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee to collect information on four key elements: 1) student success and satisfaction; 2) programme design and administration; 3) programme review and quality assurance; and (4) additional comments - to give universities an opportunity to provide information which they considered relevant but was not covered in the other sections of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed in November 2001 to all universities² on the Commission's schedule delivering articulated programmes, with a deadline for response of February 1, 2002. Each university was also given a list of all its approved articulated programme codes to verify programme implementation status. (Appendix 2 contains a copy of the questionnaire as well as the time-frame for the assessment.)

The Academic Advisory Committee believed that the questionnaire would collect adequate information to allow the Committee to assess the following:

- The success of articulated programmes in terms of establishing themselves as a significant and accepted programme structure in the context of established programme patterns in the Maritime university system.
- The success of articulated programmes in adding value and/or contributing to their field of study or discipline.
- The success and satisfaction of students who are enrolled in and who have graduated from articulated programmes.
- The extent to which the objectives of articulated programmes were realized.
- The ease with which students flowed between the two types of institutions.
- The extent to which appropriate quality assurance review procedures and mechanisms

²The Commission approves programmes only for universities. The partner institutions participating in the delivery of articulated programmes are not within the Commission's mandate. This is why the questionnaire was addressed solely to the universities, who could, at their discretion, choose to involve their partners. This is also why this report is directed primarily at universities.

have been developed by the universities in questions.

- The success of the development of internal mechanisms designed to facilitate programme reviews and continuous programme improvements.
- The intention of the universities to continue their commitment to preserve and expand their offerings of articulated programmes.

The responses to the Articulated Programme Review Questionnaire were received by the Commission in early February 2002.

IV. PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND BENEFITS OF ARTICULATED PROGRAMMES

1. Overview

The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee recognizes that all participating universities readily accepted the opportunity to respond to the questionnaire and to engage in this assessment process. Overall, the process was revealing, and the Committee did not anticipate that the timing of its assessment would prove to be premature. At the outset, the Committee believed that five years beyond the approval of the first set of articulated programmes would be adequate time for participating universities to:

- 1) Collect relevant data for the purpose of setting benchmarks relating to programmes and graduates outcomes.
- 2) Develop an integrated programme approach to articulated programmes.
- 3) Complete an adequate number of reviews of articulated programmes.

However, these programmes have not been in operation long enough, relevant data has not been collected in an integrated and consistent matter, nor have any formal reviews of articulated programmes

been completed by the participating universities. This makes it challenging, and in some cases impossible, to measure such aspects as student success and satisfaction, the effectiveness of programme structure and design, or to learn from the reviews of articulated programmes what is working and what is not. Notwithstanding, participating universities are strongly committed to this type of programme structure and most have indicated their intention to develop additional articulated programmes in response to a clearly defined student demand.

Given the seemingly premature timing of the Commission's assessment, the AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee agreed that it could not make an assessment on the effectiveness and benefits of articulated programmes at this time. Nonetheless, participating universities did provide enough information for the Committee to begin identifying a number of challenges and issues faced by participating universities as well as to establish measures that would facilitate a more comprehensive assessment of articulated programmes at a later date.

2. Institutional Responses

The following are highlights of the responses and findings organized along the three key areas in the questionnaire.

2.1 Student success/satisfaction

In general, students have successfully progressed through articulated programmes and have indicated they were satisfied with the programme and that it met their expectations.

The universities appear to have responded to feedback from students in terms of programme and administrative changes, although, they did not provide detailed information regarding the specific changes made.

Due to small sample size or missing data, retention and attrition rates could not be calculated or were not useful. However, the universities did provide a range of responses to explain attrition in the programmes. Explanations included financial restrictions, personal issues, transfer to another programme, change of geographic location during the programme, lack of portability of scholarships, lack of access to university facilities and services while not on campus, limited seats and capacity of participating partners, pre-graduation employment opportunities, and a lack of preparedness for academic study.

The universities do not appear to be tracking graduates. This seems to have been left to the partner institution who generally already has a mechanism in place to track its graduates.

2.2 Programme design and administration

The flow of students between the two types of institutions has presented numerous challenges in the early implementation years. The responses indicated that most of these issues have been addressed with improved recruitment practices involving assistance from students already in the programme, as well as increasing the students' understanding of the content and outcomes of the programmes. In addition, the universities stressed the importance of both the coordinating committee and the industry advisory group working together to address student concerns and issues identified in the implementation stage of these programmes. The universities provided little information about the effectiveness of the coordinating committees.

The majority of the universities indicated that the concept of articulated programmes has been successfully applied in that their respective programmes have combined occupational content, occupationally related content and academic content from more than one type of institution. No details of how this was measured were provided by the universities.

Due to the lack of programme history, very few of the universities were able to provide any actual evidence that the primary objectives of an articulated programme were achieved. Health-related articulated programmes did provide some evidence of this, however to date only a few graduates have been reported in this type of programme.

Of the eight articulated programmes with graduates, little or no follow-up by the universities has occurred. Articulated programmes need to be in operation a few more years before a valid assessment of value-added through quicker employment and easier transition between learning and work can be done. In fact, one of the weaknesses identified at this point is that the universities, in most cases, do not appear to take the responsibility for follow-up of their articulated programme graduates. In some cases, this has been left to their community college partners and, for some programmes, follow-ups have not yet been done.

2.3 Programme review and quality assurance

Neither the universities nor their partners have assumed the responsibility to review articulated programmes as a whole. To date no articulated programme has undergone a full programme review.

The bifurcation design of articulated programmes has led to both partner institutions contributing separately to the content, design, delivery, student recruiting, student flow, student supervision, student advising, etc. This is also evidenced in the evaluation policies of the universities offering an articulated programme where each partner appears to evaluate their respective component. There appears to be no singular process in place to evaluate an articulated programme as a whole or as a stand-alone programme. From the documentation provided by the universities, it appears that no one has assumed the responsibility of reviewing articulated programmes.

3. Preliminary Findings

Based on the universities' responses, it is apparent that little has been done in terms of data collection and benchmarking. This includes collecting specific data to calculate student attrition and retention rates, tracking graduates, and monitoring the flow of students between the two types of institutions.

The responses of participating universities suggest that universities have not yet fully developed a data collection mechanism to track graduates of articulated programmes.

Without this information, it is difficult to assess whether or not the primary objectives of an articulated programme have been met, including: to provide graduates with more timely access to significant jobs or earnings, and to ensure that graduates have indeed acquired both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies.

This information would also allow the Committee to determine if, for example, an articulated programme structure is more effective than just credit transfers, block credit transfers, or advanced standing in a programme through prior learning assessment and recognition (PLAR). Benchmarks are required to make these comparisons and to measure the effectiveness of the articulated programme structure and to determine if this structure has actually expanded opportunities for learners, presented ease of movement through its design structure, and shortened the time between successfully completing a programme to relevant employment in the graduates' areas of study.

Although participating universities have not yet carried out a review of their respective articulated programmes, some have reached the point of exploring how these reviews could be accommodated within their existing programme review schedules. In addition, some are beginning to explore how modifications to their existing mechanisms for programme reviews may be

adapted for the review of articulated programmes. What appears to be occurring, based on the information provided, is that both partners have developed separate approaches to the delivery and review of articulated programmes.

Based on the responses of participating universities, these programmes could benefit from an inter-institutional coordinating mechanism with essentially the same responsibilities associated with a department in a university. This mechanism would oversee the following: clarifying the roles and responsibilities of the two or more partners delivering the programme; setting and maintaining common standards in regards to programme design and admission requirements; setting standards for progression through, and graduation from, the programme; advising students and the provision of other student services. This mechanism could also have the responsibility of data collection pertaining to student success and satisfaction, and would be the key player in the review of these programmes. The coordination of these reviews is crucial in that they must recognize the need to mesh each provider's policies and approaches, frequency of reviews, standards, and scope of programme review, and include a graduate follow-up process.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee has formulated a number of recommendations based on its preliminary assessment of articulated programmes. The Commission approved these recommendations at its June 25, 2001 meeting.

Recommendation 1

A more comprehensive and conclusive assessment of the effectiveness and benefits of articulated programmes should be conducted by the Commission through its AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee by 2006. This delay will give participating universities adequate time to develop

mechanisms to collect and evaluate pertinent data, to establish benchmarks and to complete an adequate number of reviews of articulated programmes.

Recommendation 2

Universities should immediately begin collecting data on the following dimensions: attrition and retention rates, graduation rates, student satisfaction while in the programme and after graduation, and graduate outcomes such as time to employment in area of study, employment rate, average or range of earnings, relatedness of employment, local and regional employment opportunities for graduates, success rates of graduates in obtaining their license for practice when required, etc.

Recommendation 3

Since participating universities appear to not have tracked graduates of articulated programmes, they should establish a tracking mechanism, perhaps through their alumni offices or associations, and begin collecting data as early as possible.

Recommendation 4

The degree granting institution and its partner(s) should assume shared responsibilities and develop an integrated approach to delivering and evaluating articulated programmes.

Recommendation 5

By early 2004, universities delivering articulated programmes should provide evidence to the Commission that an inter-institutional coordinating mechanism has been established. This inter-institutional structure should operate with the authority and autonomy similar to that of a university department and should be adequately staffed, effectively deliver, and review articulated programmes. This mechanism should be responsible for departmental type functions including student

services, programme review, data collections, programme coordination, programme delivery, etc.

Participating institutions should provide evidence to the Commission that this mechanism is meeting a few times per year or at least one time per semester to coordinate and assess, among other things, data collection as per Recommendations 2 and 3 of this document.

Recommendation 6

Appropriate linkages to projected career and job placements should be established and maintained to ensure relevancy of content.

The Committee would like to thank the universities who participated in this preliminary assessment. The Committee is pleased with the system's commitment to developing articulated programmes that respond to the needs of students and employers.

University Name	Programme Name	Total number of programmes		Number of programmes implemented	Number of programmes which have reported graduates
		Date of approval	Date of implementation		
Dalhousie University	1. Master of Business Administration (Information Technology)	6/28/99	1999-00	1	0 ¹
St. Thomas University	1. Bachelor of Applied Arts in Journalism 2. Bachelor of Applied Arts in Gerontology 3. Bachelor of Applied Arts in Criminal Justice	9/16/96 6/2/97 9/8/97	1996-97 1997-98 1999-00	3	2 (Gerontology and Journalism)
University College of Cape Breton	1. B Tech. (Information) specialization in Information Management 2. B Tech. (Information) Networking Systems 3. B Tech. (Information) Computer System Development 4. B Tech. (Information) Geographical Information Systems	All four programmes approved 8/6/98		N/A - UCCB has not submitted their response to date.	N/A - UCCB has not submitted their response to date.
Université de Moncton	1. Baccalauréat ès sciences en techniques radiologiques 2. Baccalauréat ès sciences en techniques de laboratoire médical 3. Baccalauréat en intervention touristique appliquée	6/28/99 5/2/01 7/2/00	1998 2000 2001	3	1 (Techniques radiologiques)

¹Planned discontinuation of programme.

University Name	Programme Name	Total number of programmes		Number of programmes implemented	Number of programmes which have reported graduates
		Date of approval	Date of implementation		
University of New Brunswick - Fredericton	1. Bachelor of Applied Arts in Craft and Design 2. Bachelor of Medical Laboratory Science	6/28/99	1999-00	1	0
		6/2/97	1997	1	1
University of New Brunswick - Saint John	1. Bachelor of Applied Management in Hospitality and Tourism 2. Bachelor of Health Science in Radiation Therapy 3. Bachelor of Health Science in Nuclear Medicine 4. Bachelor of Health Science in Radiography 5. Bachelor of Health Science in Respiratory Therapy ²	6/2/97	1998-99	4	4 - as listed from 1 through 4.
		4/12/99	1999		
		4/12/99	1999		
		4/12/99	1999		
		No record of submission			
University of Prince Edward Island	1. Bachelor of Business in Tourism and Hospitality 2. Bachelor of Applied Science in Radiography 3. Bachelor of Applied Science in Print Journalism	8/6/98	1998	2	1 (Tourism and Hospitality)
		4/12/99	2000		
		11/26/2001	No record		
TOTALS 6 Universities		21		14	8

²No record of Respiratory Therapy programme being approved. UNB asked to clarify.

Appendix 2**ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS AND BENEFITS OF ARTICULATED PROGRAMMES****QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. How many articulated programmes has your university implemented as of September 2001? Please list them by date of implementation and/or planned implementation. (Defined as first year of reported enrolment.)

Based on the first three to five years of programme operation, would the university provide the Commission with its opinions and findings for each of the above listed articulated programmes, on the following items:

A. Student success/satisfaction:

2. Enrolment trend for years of programme operation (include actual enrolment numbers).
3. Attrition rate by year of study.
4. Identified reason(s) given for leaving the programme.
5. How do these attrition rates compare with those in traditional programmes in similar fields of study? To traditional programmes generally? Are they higher or lower? If there is a difference, what factors are involved?
6. Retention rate (defined as the proportion of students entering year one of the programme and remaining in the programme until completion).
7. Have students indicated whether the programme met their expectations, based on programme advertising and the recruitment process?
8. Have programme graduates been tracked? If so, what proportion have found employment in their area of study and at their level of acquired occupationally related skills?
9. How does the post-graduation rate of employment of programme graduates compare to those students who graduated from more traditional programmes? Comparing the same two groups of graduates, is there a difference in the duration between programme completion and obtaining the first job?

B. Programme design and administration:

10. In your opinion, did the transfer from one institution to the other work well for the duration of the programme? If so why? If not, why not? Have modifications been made to address this issue?
11. Do the participating institutions find that their recruiting practices are successful in terms of attracting students who are academically ready and whose expectations are in line with programme objectives? If not, have changes been made to the recruitment process? Have the participating institutions changed the way they advertise the programme and/or what is written in the academic calendars and other promotional materials? If so, what was the purpose of the change(s)?
12. In your opinion, has the concept of articulated programmes been successfully applied, that is the combining of occupational content, occupationally related content and academic content from more than one type of institution, at your university?

13. Describe how the primary objectives of an articulated programme, which are to provide graduates with more timely access to significant jobs or earnings and to ensure that they acquire both occupation-specific and general post-secondary education competencies, have been met/achieved.
14. How important is the continuation of articulated programmes to the participating institutions? Have they added value and/or contributed to the field of study or discipline?

C. Programme review and quality assurance:

15. Has your institution developed, either individually or jointly with your partner(s), an evaluation policy for articulated programmes? If so, what are its main components? (Provide copy.)
16. How many articulated programmes at your institution have undergone monitoring during their evolution? Have any of the articulated programmes at your institution undergone a programme review, either internal or external to the university?
17. Have any of your articulated programmes undergone significant modifications, i.e. programme design, curriculum, administration, physical and human resources, etc., during the first five years of programme operation? If so, please describe any modifications. If modifications are planned, can you provide a time line?

D. Additional comments:

18. Is your university planning to develop more articulated programmes? If so, can you provide details (field of study, partner institution, etc.). And in what areas of study?
19. Please feel free to provide any additional comments judged important or useful by your university.

TIME-FRAME AND PROCEDURES

- September 7, 2001*
- The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee to sign off on the Questionnaire.
 - Staff follow-up will include:
 - Completing final modifications to questionnaire;
 - Preparing accompanying cover letter to identified universities; and
 - Preparing and releasing documents for translation.
- Late October 2001*
- Deadline for receipt of translated questionnaire and cover letter.
- Early November 2001*
- Distribute letter and questionnaire to identified universities with a deadline for answer of February 1, 2002.
- January 15, 2002*
- Distribute reminder to universities of the February 1, 2002 deadline for receipt of response to questionnaire.
- February 1, 2002*
- Deadline for receipt of information from the universities.
- March-April 2002*
- Staff preparation of summary report of documentation received from the universities.
- May 2002*
- The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee reviews documentation and decides whether it can conclude its assessment of the effectiveness and benefits of articulated programmes, or whether additional steps are required (such as hiring a consultant).
- June 2002*
- The AAU-MPHEC Academic Advisory Committee files a status report and/or its findings to the Commission at its June 2002 meeting.