



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
OUTCOMES COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 24, 2014  
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
L 201**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR**
3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. February 10, 2014
5. **REPORTS**
  - a. Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning – Dr. Meeta Goel
6. **ACTION ITEMS**
  - a. Revised SLOs: **BUS 201, ELTE 125, ELTE 130, ELTE 135, ELTE 180, ELTE 235, KIN 102, KIN 190, KIN 196, PHTC 205L, THA 130**
  - b. Revised PLOs: **International Business**
  - c. SLO/PLO assessment section in CurricUNET
  - d. SLO/PLO revision of assessment criteria and achievement targets
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
  - a. Minor vs. Major SLO/PLO revisions
  - b. The Degree Qualifications Profile
8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
  - a. **SLO-Related Events** –
    1. FPD: PLO Assessment (2/24/14 7-10 pm in SSV 151)  
General Pedagogical Strategies (3/17 /14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151)  
Why Grades are Not enough (4/21/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151),
    2. ACCJC Conferences on Degree Qualification Profile Project (2/21, 3/21, 4/4, 5/2 in CSUSB)
9. **OTHER**
  - a. SLO Meeting dates for Spring 2014: 3/10, 3/24, 4/14, 4/28, 5/12
10. **ADJOURNMENT**

**NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY**

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE  
OUTCOMES COMMITTEE MEETING  
February 10, 2014  
3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
L 201**

To conform to the open meeting act, the public may attend open sessions

MEMBERS PRESENT			
Dr. Fredy Aviles, Chair	Jessica Eaton	Dr. Glenn Haller	Wendy Stout
Stacey Adams	Luis Enriquez, proxy	Dr. Scott Lee	LaDonna Trimble
Leslie Baker	Dr. Irit Gat	Dr. Tom O’Neil	William Vaughn
David Durost	Dr. Meeta Goel	Melanie Parker	
MEMBERS ABSENT		GUESTS PRESENT/EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS	
Carla Corona	Diana Keelan		
Kimberly Covell			

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**  
A motion was made and seconded to call the February 10, 2014 SLO Committee Meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. Dr. Fredy Aviles, SLO Faculty Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m. Motion carried.
  
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE SLO COMMITTEE CHAIR**  
Dr. Fredy Aviles welcomed the representatives back and hoped they had a nice long break.
  
3. **OPEN COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**  
No comments from the public were made.
  
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. **November 25, 2013**  
A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the November 25, 2013 Student Learning Outcomes Committee meeting. After a brief moment, it was determined that discussion was not needed. Motion carried.
  
5. **REPORTS**
  - a. **FDP: Spring Welcome Back (1/31)**  
Dr. Aviles requested each representative to report on the welcome back presentations and begin by listing the disciplines that were present.
    - Melanie Parker announced that no faculty showed to her presentation so she joined Irit’s presentation, which went well. Dr. Gat stated social and behavioral science faculty were present.
    - Wendy Stout presented to Nursing, Rad. Tech and Medical Office faculty. The disciplines have decided to enter the data gathered per term into the Weave for fall and again for spring. Another person will compile the data from both terms to determine the action plan.
    - Stacey presented a good session to the BCSED adjunct faculty. The group discussed and developed common assessment tools. She also emphasized that all data needs to be entered in Weave even though entries are once a year.
    - Bill Vaughn presented to the language arts faculty and had over 20 people show. He reviewed the presentation and explained the importance of tangible and measureable student learning outcomes. A discussion occurred on how the faculty know that students learn the information provided in the class of attendance rather than from previous experiences. It was recommended that students be assessed at the start and end of the class.
    - Glenn Haller presented to the kinesiology, athletics and dance faculty but only three people showed. After the PowerPoint, significant time was spent on the CurricUNET entry process.
    - Leslie Baker presented a good session to the technical education division where two-thirds of the faculty was adjunct.

- Jessica Eaton presented to ten counseling and library faculty. The presentation went well but she had difficulty logging on to CurricUNET.
  - Fredy Aviles reported for Carla Corona, who was absent. She said the presentation went well but unfortunately they had trouble logging on to the computer. Luckily Carla had copies of the presentation so she could continue without the computer.
  - Fredy Aviles reported for Luis Enriquez, who was absent. Dr. Aviles attended this presentation as Mr. Enriquez is the newest SLO representative. He felt the presentation was a little chaotic but provided useful information. The presentation did not go smoothly due in part to the number of questions.
- b. Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning – Dr. Meeta Goel  
Dr. Meeta Goel informed the committee that the cycle has been changed in Weave. She found some issues when identifying the dates of the annual cycle since the semesters previously overlapped and overlapping is not allowed in the annual cycle. All issues have been resolved and the new cycle is fully implemented.

6. **ACTION ITEMS**

a. **Revised SLOs: CFE 101, CIS 159, THA 103, VN 109, VN 112, THA 102**

A motion was made and seconded to approve action item 6a Revised SLOs. Dr. Aviles requested a motion to amend the agenda to include an additional SLO that was recently reviewed and meet all the requirements of a properly written SLO.

*A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda to add THA 102. Motion carried.*

Dr. Aviles also communicated to the committee that the paper SLO revision forms continue to be submitted to the committee and are attached for all to review. Additional discussion was not necessary. Motion carried to approve item 6a as amended with one abstention.

b. **Revised PLOs: none**

None to approve at this time.

c. **New PLOs: English-Transfer**

Dr. Aviles requested a motion to approve the PLOs for the English-Transfer degree, which was originally submitted last academic year. These PLOs are properly written and should be approved. A motion was made and seconded to approve item 6c, English-Transfer PLOs. Motion carried.

7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

a. **Weave training**

Dr. Fredy Aviles indicated that Weave training would be done early this semester since it did not take place last semester. He showed the committee the different types of reports available and the fact that they can be extracted into excel.

A question was asked whether degrees with complementary certificates have separate findings entered in Weave. It was also asked whether programs with multiple degrees like digital media have separate findings entered. Dr. Aviles indicated that the certificates and degrees are linked so the data is entered once for both. Another question was asked as to whether the programs are approved separately at the state level, to which the answer is yes, the certificate receives a separate entry and approval from the degree. Dr. Aviles feels that the new TMC degrees should absolutely be separate from any other degree in the same discipline. Dr. Goel said that if the PLOs are the same with the same core skills then we should be ok to enter the findings once. Dean Trimble referenced language from educational master plan, which may have a say as to how the information is entered. This language should be reviewed before a decision is made. Stacey Adams said it would be difficult to know which students in her classes are there for the certificate versus the degree and did not think it would be possible to separate out the data. Additional research may be needed to determine the requirements from ACCJC.

c. **SLO/PLO assessment section in CurricUNET**

Dr. Aviles requested the committee members to consider whether a revision to the form in CurricUNET is necessary since a past discussion took place and a recommendation was made to make

the assessment methods section multiple-choice. A brief discussion occurred and the committee agreed that perhaps changes to the SLO form in CurricUNET would be necessary so to reduce the confusion on what is needed in each section. It was also asked whether more language could be added to the page to give better direction to faculty when completing the form. Melissa Jauregui indicated that anything was possible and perhaps the representative should send a list of those items that would be multiple-choice for the assessment methods and any explanatory language that would make the form seem simpler. This language would then be compiled and brought back to the next committee meeting for review.

**d. SLO/PLO revision of assessment criteria and achievement targets**

Dr. Aviles requested comments from the committee members on whether it is appropriate for a faculty member to initiate an SLO revision to update the assessment methods, assessment criteria or the achievement target. The committee agreed that of course it would be necessary to review the SLO if the actual SLO language were changing but what about the other components of the document. A brief discussion occurred and the committee agreed that perhaps changes to the assessment criteria and achievement targets would not necessarily require the review and approval of this committee. Once the changes discussed in item 7c are implemented in CurricUNET perhaps those fields that the committee feels can be changed without a re-approval of the SLO can be left open for editing.

**e. FPD proposals for Fall 2014-Spring 2015**

Dr. Aviles announced the deadline to submit FPD proposals is February 28<sup>th</sup>.

**f. Minor vs. Major SLO/PLO revisions**

A motion was made and seconded to table item 7f, Minor vs. Major SLO/PLO revisions. Motion carried.

**8. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

**a. SLO-Related Events –**

- 1) FPD: PLO Assessment (2/24/14 7-10 pm in SSV 151)  
General Pedagogical Strategies (3/17 /14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151)  
Why Grades are Not enough (4/21/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151),
- 2) ACCJC Conferences on Degree Qualification Profile Project (2/21, 3/21, 4/4, 5/2 in CSUSB)

**9. OTHER**

- a. SLO Meeting dates for Spring 2014: 2/10, 2/24, 3/10, 3/24, 4/14, 4/28, 5/12

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the February 10, 2014 Student Learning Outcomes Committee meeting at 4:33p.m. Dr. Aviles asked the committee members to check their emails in the weeks leading up to Welcome Back as the presentation and instructions will be sent. Motion carried.

**NON-DISCRIMINATION POLICY**

Antelope Valley College prohibits discrimination and harassment based on sex, gender, race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, cancer-related medical condition, or genetic predisposition. Upon request, we will consider reasonable accommodation to permit individuals with protected disabilities to (1) complete the employment or admission process, (b) perform essential job functions, (c) enjoy benefits and privileges of similarly-situated individuals without disabilities, and (d) participate in instruction, programs, services, activities, or events.

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REVISION



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

**COURSE SUBJECT & NUMBER:** ELTE 130

**COURSE TITLE:** DIGITAL CIRCUIT ANALYSIS

### Institutional Learning Outcomes

1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) and Program Learning Outcome(s) each revised Student Learning Outcome will support. Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome. Document the dialogue that prompted this revision along with the rationale for the revision. Post a copy of this form, with any additional supporting information, in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course. Revisions should also be reflected in the course Action Plan. *Please submit an electronic copy of this form to mparker@avc.edu.*

ILO	PLO	STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS	REVISION DIALOGUE
4	2	Students will analyze, troubleshoot, and repair various digital electronics circuit.	Troubleshooting technique will be graded and assessed by industry standards utilizing a standardized project rubric that is used by all instructors in all sections.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
3	4	Students will read and properly interpret industry standard electronics schematics and technical manuals to assess, maintain, and repair digital electronics systems.	Standardized questions on exam that are used by all instructors in all sections.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
5	3	Student will identify and demonstrate safe shop practices, soldering and components handling, and hand tool, shop equipment, and test equipment operation.	Standardized safety exam that is used by all instructors in all sections.	

SLO Committee Acknowledgement \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REVISION**



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

**COURSE SUBJECT & NUMBER:** ELTE 135

**COURSE TITLE:** Direct Current and Alternating Current Principles

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) and Program Learning Outcome(s) each revised Student Learning Outcome will support. Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome. Document the dialogue that prompted this revision along with the rationale for the revision. Post a copy of this form, with any additional supporting information, in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course. Revisions should also be reflected in the course Action Plan. *Please submit an electronic copy of this form to mparker@avc.edu.*

ILO	PLO	STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS	REVISION DIALOGUE
4	2	Students will analyze, troubleshoot, and repair various electronics circuit. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Troubleshooting technique will be graded and assessed by industry standards utilizing a standardized project rubric that is used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 85% of all students assessed will score 75% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
3	4	Students will read and properly interpret industry standard electronics schematics and technical manuals to assess, maintain, and repair electronics systems.	Standardized questions on exam that are used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will score 75% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
5	3	Student will identify and demonstrate safe shop practices, soldering and components handling, and hand tool use, and test equipment operation. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Standardized safety exam that is used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will score 75% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	

SLO Committee Acknowledgement \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REVISION**



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

**COURSE SUBJECT & NUMBER:** ELTE 125

**COURSE TITLE:** Direct Current and Alternating Current Principles

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) and Program Learning Outcome(s) each revised Student Learning Outcome will support. Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome. Document the dialogue that prompted this revision along with the rationale for the revision. Post a copy of this form, with any additional supporting information, in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course. Revisions should also be reflected in the course Action Plan. *Please submit an electronic copy of this form to mparker@avc.edu.*

ILO	PLO	STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS	REVISION DIALOGUE
4	2	Students will analyze, troubleshoot, and repair various electronics circuit.	Troubleshooting technique will be graded and assessed by industry standards utilizing a standardized project rubric that is used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 85% of all students assessed will score 75% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
3	4	Students will read and properly interpret industry standard electronics schematics and technical manuals to assess, maintain, and repair electronics systems.	Standardized questions on specific exam that are used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will score 75% or higher.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
5	3	Student will identify and demonstrate safe shop practices, soldering and components handling, and hand tool, shop equipment, and test equipment operation. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Standardized safety exam that is used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 80% of all students assessed will score 75% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	

SLO Committee Acknowledgement \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REVISION**



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

**COURSE SUBJECT & NUMBER:** ELTE 235

**COURSE TITLE:** Electronic Communications I

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) and Program Learning Outcome(s) each revised Student Learning Outcome will support. Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome. Document the dialogue that prompted this revision along with the rationale for the revision. Post a copy of this form, with any additional supporting information, in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course. Revisions should also be reflected in the course Action Plan. *Please submit an electronic copy of this form to mparker@avc.edu.*

ILO	PLO	STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS	REVISION DIALOGUE
4	2	Students will analyze, troubleshoot, and repair various electronics communication circuit, and perform AM transmitter measurements using meters, oscilloscopes, and spectrum analyzers. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Troubleshooting technique will be graded and assessed by industry standards utilizing a standardized project rubric that is used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 85% of all students assessed will score 70% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
3	4	Students will read and properly interpret industry standard electronics schematics and technical manuals to assess, maintain, and repair digital electronics systems.	Standardized questions on specific exam that are used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 85% of all students assessed will score 70% or higher.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
5	3	Student will identify and demonstrate safe shop practices, soldering and components handling, and hand tool, shop equipment, and test equipment operation.	Standardized safety exam that is used by all instructors in all sections. Achievement target is that 85% of all students assessed will score 70% or higher. <span style="float: right;">+</span>	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO  Updating COR and reviewing the SLO

SLO Committee Acknowledgement \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REVISION**



ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE

**COURSE SUBJECT & NUMBER:** ELTE 180

**COURSE TITLE:** Microprocessor System

- Institutional Learning Outcomes**
1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
  2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
  3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
  4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
  5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
  6. Identifv career opporunities that contribute to the economic well beind of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) and Program Learning Outcome(s) each revised Student Learning Outcome will support. Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome. Document the dialogue that prompted this revision along with the rationale for the revision. Post a copy of this form, with any additional supporting information, in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course. Revisions should also be reflected in the course Action Plan. *Please submit an electronic copy of this form to mparker@avc.edu.*

ILO	PLO	STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS	REVISION DIALOGUE
4	2	Students will analyze and flowchart a process of moderate complexity of microprocessor.	Flow charting, will be graded and assessed by industry standards utilizing a standardized project rubric that is used by all instructors in all sections.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
3	4	Students will diagram the internal function of each blocks of the microprocessor.	Standardized questions on specific exam that are used by all instructors in all sections.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
5	3	Student will demonstrate proper operation of a standard microprocessor trainer.	Execution of a lab assignment graded on a standardized rubric.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO
3	4	Students will read, interpret, and apply text material in the creation of memory-mapped, and mastery of bus structure of a microprocessor system, internal structure and operation of an 8085 processor	Bus structure of a microprocessor system, internal structure and operation of an 8085 processor will be graded and assessed by industry standards utilizing a standardized project rubric that is used by all instructors in all sections.	Updating COR and reviewing the SLO

SLO Committee Acknowledgement \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES REVISION**



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE**

**COURSE SUBJECT & NUMBER:** KIN 102

**COURSE TITLE:** Water Aerobics

**Institutional Learning Outcomes**

1. Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
2. Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
3. Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts, Natural Sciences, and Mathematics.
4. Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and variety of technologies.
5. Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
6. Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well being of the community.

Indicate, by number, the Institutional Learning Outcome(s) and Program Learning Outcome(s) each revised Student Learning Outcome will support. Specifically describe the assessment method(s) used to measure each outcome and the achievement target that will determine successful completion of the outcome. Document the dialogue that prompted this revision along with the rationale for the revision. Post a copy of this form, with any additional supporting information, in the WEAVE Document Repository for the course. Revisions should also be reflected in the course Action Plan. *Please submit an electronic copy of this form to mparker@avc.edu.*

ILO	PLO	STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES	ASSESSMENT METHODS and ACHIEVEMENT TARGETS	REVISION DIALOGUE
2,3,5,6		1. Assess and implement the various techniques of water aerobics conditioning to increase cardiovascular fitness through different types of aerobic training principles and exercises in the water.	Performance, Demonstration. 70% of students will achieve a 70% level of skill using instructor designed rubric.	
2,5,6		2. Understand and apply proper progression of skills used to develop flexibility, strength, coordination, aerobic capacity and reach target heart rate/Borg scale.	Performance, Demonstration. 70% of students will achieve a 70% level of skill using instructor designed rubric.	

SLO Committee Acknowledgement \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Assessment

**Assessment Method:** activity or assignment students undertake that can be used to determine whether learning has occurred. Examples below.

- True false
- Survey
- Essay
- Paper
- Research Paper
- Project
- Portfolio
- Exhibit
- Performance
- Demonstration
- Simulation
- Interview
- Focus group
- Licensure exam
- Exit exam
- Standardized test

**CurricUNET:** *changed to allow users to check all the boxes that apply to the SLO. Is it necessary to also have an open entry box called "other"?*

**Assessment Criteria:** how well a student must score on the activity or assignment to be considered successful. Examples below.

- Percentage score: \_\_\_\_%
- Ratio score (ex. 3/5) \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_
- Rubric score \_\_\_\_\_
- Checklist score \_\_\_\_\_
- Pass/Fail
- Participation

**CurricUNET:** *changed to allow users to select only ONE of the above options and provide the value as it applies to the SLO. Is it necessary to also have an open entry box called "other"?*

**Achievement Target:** the percentage of students that must be successful on the activity or assignment. Example: 80%

\_\_\_\_%

**CurricUNET:** *changed to allow users to only enter a percent value up to 3 digits as it applies to the SLO.*

**Below are discussion items that were also emailed:**

**Assessment Method:** activity or assignment students undertake that can be used to determine whether learning has occurred.

- Because I am representing the Visual and Performing Arts division, naturally, I'm thinking broadly for the creative and artistic fields. I'm wondering if the "Performance" listed under

this field means "to perform a piece or work", "attend a performance", or "evaluate or critique a performance (whether theatre, music, dance, etc)?"

- Can you add "Matching or Identification"? I'm specifically thinking of techniques and/or methods covered in courses as part of the process to creating artistic pieces or works.
- What will be the difference between "paper" and "research paper"? Can there be certain criteria distinguishing the two?
- I'm a little unclear on "focus group". Is this to lead one or participate in one?
- Should "multiple choice" be added or is that assumed with the "Standardized test"?

**Assessment Criteria:** how well a student must score on the activity or assignment to be considered successful. Examples below.

- This looks good to me.
- For VAPA, I think it will be imperative that faculty are "buying in" to an assessment criteria. We need to get on the same page for assessment criteria since everyone (saying "everyone" very loosely) that assess in creative fields are most likely to assess "subjectively" because it's art and how can you "limit" art. Did that even make sense? ⇒)
- Side note--- I need to do some research on what best practices are out there in the field for arts assessment in higher education.

**Achievement Target:** the percentage of students that must be successful on the activity or assignment.

Example: 80%

- This may open a whole can of worms, but will there be a minimum value for this entry? For example, can a class be successful at 50% or less? This may be something for the bigger picture, but it just seems that if SLOs can be approved by having 50,60, even 70% "achieving" than we may be setting up our students to struggle in the "real world".

# The Degree Qualifications Profile

## Defining U.S. Degrees through Demonstration and Documentation of College Learning

By Cliff Adelman, Peter Ewell, Paul Gaston and Carol Geary Schneider  
January 2014

### The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)

#### **DQP: Value, uses and contexts**

Through this document, Lumina Foundation offers a second iteration of the *Degree Qualifications Profile*, a tool meant to help transform U.S. higher education. The *DQP* illustrates clearly what students should know and be able to do once they earn their degrees – at any level, in any field of study. As a profile that invites institutions to fill in the details, the *DQP* thus proposes proficiencies that benchmark the associate, bachelor's, and master's degrees – which constitute the great majority of postsecondary degrees awarded by U.S. colleges and universities – regardless of a student's field of specialization. The proficiencies specified in the *DQP* are not without precedent. In fact, the *DQP* draws on more than a decade of widespread debate and effort, across all levels of U.S. higher education and in countries throughout the world, to define expected learning outcomes that graduates should fulfill in preparation for work, citizenship, global participation and life. But the *DQP* represents a significant advance beyond such efforts by describing in concrete terms how students *demonstrate* expected proficiencies across different degree levels and across the different elements of any degree.

#### **The need for a DQP**

Higher learning has become especially critical in today's knowledge society. To succeed in the workplace, students must prepare for jobs that are rapidly changing, use technologies that are still emerging, and work with colleagues from (and often in) all parts of the globe. Moreover, many of the complex challenges that graduates must address as citizens are global.

Recognizing the economic and societal importance of higher levels of learning, national leaders, policymakers, analysts and major

philanthropies have called for a dramatic increase in the number of degrees awarded in the U.S. But the press toward increased degree production has not been grounded in any consistent public understanding of what these degrees ought to demand and mean. Even as colleges and universities have defined their own expected student learning outcomes – typically to meet accreditation requirements – what they have done has been largely invisible to policy leaders, the public and many students. Similarly, while higher education institutions have been under increasing pressure to “be accountable” for the quality of their degrees, colleges and universities have frequently responded by assessing samples of students in ways that say too little about learning and even less about what *all* students should know and be able to do. The *DQP* responds to these concerns by describing concretely what is meant by each of the degrees addressed. Focusing on broad areas of conceptual knowledge and essential proficiencies and their applications, the *DQP* illustrates how students should be expected to perform at progressively more challenging levels. Demonstrated performance at these ascending levels becomes the basis on which students are awarded degrees.

While clarity and consensus are certainly goals of the *DQP* process, the *DQP* does not attempt to “standardize” U.S. degrees. The *DQP* recognizes that it is the role and responsibility of faculty to determine both the content appropriate to different areas of study and the best ways to teach that content. Instead, the *DQP* describes generic forms of student performance appropriate for each degree level through clear reference points that indicate the incremental, integrative and cumulative nature of learning.

The *DQP* offers reference points in five broad areas of learning for all associate, bachelor’ s and master’ s degrees. But no outcomes framework can or should attempt to address every element of a college education. Acknowledging and seeking to protect the rich diversity of U.S. higher education, the *DQP* thus invites adaptation within the context of varied institutional missions – for example, those that emphasize religious exploration or proficiency in the performing arts.

Every institution may expand the *DQP* by adding outcomes that are specific to its mission and by documenting student attainment of such outcomes.

In addition, the *DQP* embodies an appreciation for the commitment of many colleges and universities to foster students’ personal growth and help them examine their values and commitments. Indeed, these principles are inherent in many of the proficiencies that the *DQP* defines. But

because such elements of institutional mission rarely are specified as criteria for awarding degrees, they are not explicitly referenced in the *DQP* proficiencies.

Sustained use of the *DQP* over time should continue to yield several positive results, including:

- An emerging common vocabulary for sharing good practice.
- A foundation for better public understanding of what institutions of higher education actually do.
- Reference points for accountability far stronger than test scores or tallies of graduates, research dollars, student satisfaction ratings, or job placements and average salaries.

Further, because the *DQP* defines proficiencies in ways that emphasize both the cumulative *integration* of learning from many sources and the *application* of

learning in a variety of settings, it offers benchmarks for improving the *quality* of learning.

**Proficiency:** A label for a set of demonstrations of knowledge and skill consistent with the higher levels of mastery that justify the award of an academic degree. The term “proficiency” is preferred because the *DQP* addresses the degree as a whole, and the continuum of learning across increasingly higher degree levels. In contrast, while the term “competence” is frequently used to address objectives within a specific course or learning experience, none of the proficiencies addressed in the *DQP* can be developed in a single learning experience. Rather, the *DQP* describes broad or crosscutting areas of college- level accomplishment and the interrelationships among them.

Moreover, because every learning outcome should lead to and support a provider’ s capacity to gather evidence that stated proficiencies are achieved, the *DQP* also is designed to encourage colleges and universities to enhance their assessment practices and resources. While some institutions have developed impressive approaches to documenting what students achieve, all should find in the *DQP* a helpful prompt to improve on those efforts.

## **Uses of the *DQP***

Beyond encouraging thoughtful discussion and evolution of reference points for students’ progressive and cumulative education, the *DQP* can serve other purposes largely missing from U.S. higher education. While it is difficult to anticipate all the purposes that the *DQP* can serve, there are several obvious applications that deserve mention. The nearly 400 colleges and universities that have experimented with the *DQP* have already taken action on many of these applications.

At the institutional level, the *DQP* provides reference points that allow faculty members to articulate and better align institutional student learning outcomes with departmental objectives. Instructors and students can then refer to the *DQP* as a common source of understanding and as a point of departure for agreement on more detailed and specific expectations about programs, courses, assignments and assessments. For those engaged in educational innovations and experimentations, the *DQP* provides a framework for describing the multiple kinds of learning that students need to accomplish and demonstrate.

In guiding students, advisers can use the *DQP* as a framework to explain the structure and coherence of the curriculum with a particular emphasis on the interdependence of general education and the major. In such a context, students will be able to make better informed choices as to courses to take and will better understand how the parts of their education add up to a whole.

**Assignment:** Any problem, task, or creative undertaking designed by faculty that students within a course or program of study must address in order to develop, advance, and document their proficiency. Assignments are the principal vehicle for certifying *DQP* proficiencies.

Recognizing that many students attend a community college intending to transfer to a four year institution and that others may attend several institutions before completing their degrees, the *DQP* provides a framework useful for aligning degree requirements across institutions. This gives prospective students a clear statement of the proficiencies they will be expected to achieve wherever they enroll while also providing a platform for both vertical (two-year to four-year institution) and horizontal (between similar institutions) transfer.

The *DQP* also provides resources for strengthening accreditation. Regional accreditors should find that the *DQP* prompts them to reach the consensus on learning outcomes that is being sought by many leaders and opinion makers. And specialized accreditors can use the *DQP* to relate disciplinary expectations to broad institutional goals for student learning outcomes.

In addition, the focus on student learning embodied in the *DQP* and its clear demarcation of increasing levels of challenge as a student progresses from one degree level to the next should enable:



- A continuing and sustainable emphasis on learning as the proper determinant for the quality and value of degrees. This will help correct the tendency to view the credential as an end in itself, independent of the learning it is meant to represent.
- Refinement and further elaboration of points of alignment between and among secondary schools and postsecondary institutions regarding achievement levels in specific knowledge, skill and application areas.
- Guidance (a) for students on the degree ladder in terms of what to expect at the next degree level, (b) for students who intend to transfer from one institution to another, and (c) for students returning to higher education after a period of absence.
- Expansion and elaboration of connections between school-based learning and out-of-school learning, including prior learning (e.g., from employment, military service, volunteer activity, etc.).
- Development of reference points to assess students' progress and levels of achievement in relation to specific proficiencies.

### **The value of the DQP for faculty members**

There are five principal values of the *DQP* for faculty. First, it draws them into active clarification of the reasons they teach in relation to what their students learn. Second, it encourages them to examine more fully the content and methods of their fields of study in relation to priorities that span departmental and school boundaries. That is, the *DQP* can prompt a shift of perspective from “my courses” to “our curriculum.” Third, it can help foster purposeful and sustained interactions with colleagues concerning the very purpose of colleges and universities: that is, to generate, preserve, evaluate and disseminate knowledge. Fourth, the *DQP* compels faculty to closely examine the assignments they give to students to ensure that these assignments truly foster and properly assess the desired learning and proficiencies. Fifth, and most importantly, faculty members' collaborative engagement with the *DQP* reinforces the value of their intentionality for both teaching and learning.

### **The value of the DQP for the public**

Although the public values higher education, many do not understand it – how it is organized, how it operates, and what it accomplishes. Higher education is in part responsible for this dilemma because colleges and universities have never expressed a clear and straightforward consensus as to what degrees should mean in terms of student proficiencies. The

*DQP* offers an important step toward such a consensus by proposing in direct, simple language what a degree recipient should know and be able to do, regardless of the field of study. When such a consensus can be expressed “at scale,” so that it speaks broadly for the great majority of colleges and universities, the public will be able to make better-informed decisions about higher education. To which colleges and universities should a prospective student apply? Does a community college bond issue deserve support? Should media reports on higher education be taken at face value? What, after all, do academic degrees *mean*?

Early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, educators decided that the college degree should be organized in terms of depth and breadth, or “concentration” and “distribution.” Depth and breadth, which are terms applicable to the way students approach their studies in specific knowledge areas, became, over time, organizing principles for the college degree throughout the United States. Yet, as educators and employers have worked on hundreds of campuses and in every part of the U.S. to articulate the learning outcomes students need to succeed in 21<sup>st</sup> century contexts, they have gone significantly beyond the twin pillars of breadth and depth. In particular, they have specified essential intellectual skills in seeking to ensure that students are well prepared to apply their learning beyond the classroom and to contribute to the life and vitality of the U.S. as a globally engaged democracy. Educators also have expanded the contexts for learning so that students now have many opportunities to develop and apply their learning in field-based settings.

*DQP 2.0* builds from and further develops insights about higher learning articulated through these reconsiderations. While “depth” and “breadth” remain component elements of all postsecondary study, the *DQP* describes explicitly five basic areas of learning, each of which should be included in the associate degree, the bachelor’s degree and the master’s degree. They are as follows:

### **Specialized Knowledge**

Independent of the vocabularies, theories and skills of particular fields of study, the *DQP* outlines what students in any specialization should demonstrate with respect to the specialization, often called a major field. The *DQP*’s “profile” description of specialized knowledge in any field of study will be – in practice – filled out in much greater detail than the *DQP* provides. Tuning (see Page 38) and

other field-specific efforts describe the concepts, knowledge areas, methods and accomplishments basic to particular fields of study.

### **Broad and Integrative Knowledge**

This category asks students at all degree levels covered in the *DQP* to develop and consolidate broad knowledge across multiple areas of learning, and to discover and explore concepts and questions that bridge multiple fields of study. The *DQP* recommends that broad and integrative learning should involve students across all degree levels in the inquiry practices of core fields

ranging from the sciences and social sciences to the humanities and arts. By exploring global, intercultural, scientific and economic topics, students pursue questions that both prepare them for civic participation and create a larger context for their specialized interests.

### **Intellectual Skills**

The *DQP* describes a set of proficiencies that are basic to evidence-based reasoning across fields of study, including: analytic inquiry and operations, use of information resources, engaging diverse perspectives, ethical reasoning, quantitative fluency, and communicative fluency. There is an emphasis throughout on the capacity to engage, make and interpret ideas and arguments from different points of reference (cultural, technological, political, etc.)

### **Applied and Collaborative Learning**

This area focuses on what students can do with what they know, demonstrated by innovation and fluency in addressing both conventional and unscripted problems in the classroom, beyond the classroom, and at work. This category includes both undergraduate research and creative activities involving individual and group effort.

### **Civic and Global Learning**

This area of learning fosters students' integration of knowledge and skills in applications that prepare them for citizenship through engagement with and response to political, social, environmental and economic challenges at local, national and global levels.

### **Guidelines for interpreting the DQP proficiencies**

Proficiencies are organized in the *DQP* within the five broad areas of learning outlined above. For the sake of clarity, the *DQP* describes the

proficiencies for each area independently. Yet, as will become clear, specific proficiencies typically integrate knowledge, one or more intellectual skills, and some form of demonstration. The same point applies to students' actual development of the expected proficiencies. Students will learn what they practice and they should frequently encounter assignments that charge them to integrate knowledge, specific skills and applications.

A few pointers may be helpful in understanding the proficiencies presented in the *DQP*:

□ The proficiencies are intended to be summative for each degree level. Thus, the proficiencies identified “at the associate level,” which are also descriptive of work assigned during the first two years of a four-year curriculum, are assumed for the baccalaureate level. In turn, outcomes stated specifically for the master's degree include those for the associate and bachelor's degrees. Each section of the *DQP* thus demonstrates the principle of incremental challenge and cumulative accomplishment from one degree level to the next.

□ Students can attain these proficiencies through many paths and at any point in the course of their academic journeys. Just as learning is cumulative but rarely follows a rigid sequence, evidence for learning is cumulative and reflects programmatic and individual differences.

□ The ways of demonstrating the proficiencies that are frequently included in these statements are illustrations. When they indicate a range of performance, the implied forms of demonstration (e.g., an essay, oral presentation, or project) are suggestive rather than exhaustive.

□ The proficiencies are presented through active verbs that declare what students should do to demonstrate proficiency. These active verbs are deliberately cast at different levels of sophistication as the *DQP* moves up the degree ladder. The *DQP* avoids terms such as “appreciation,” “awareness,” and “ability” because these cannot be demonstrated through specific assignments.

□ The proficiency statements do not prescribe *how well* a student must demonstrate proficiency; they are intended to invite demonstration that learning outcomes have been achieved.

This section outlines the five component areas of learning for each degree level, the proficiencies basic to each area of learning, and their relationship to one another. These proficiencies appear also in a summary chart or grid on Pages 33–36.

## **KNOWLEDGE**

The *DQP* offers a significant modification of the traditional distinction between the broad knowledge acquired through the entire course of one's education and that gleaned through pursuit of a specialized field of study. It emphasizes the *integration* of ideas, methods, practice, and theory across *both* broad and specialized realms.

## 1. Specialized knowledge

Most who receive degrees pursue specialized areas of study and are expected to meet knowledge and skill requirements of those areas. Specialized accrediting associations and licensure bodies have developed standards for many such fields of study and the "Tuning" process is doing so for some of these and others. (See Appendix B, Page 38.) But all fields call more or less explicitly for proficiencies involving terminology, theory, methods, tools, literature, complex problems or applications, and cognizance of limits. These reference points for student achievement of specialized knowledge are addressed in the proficiencies presented below.

**At the associate level** the student pursuing a specialized degree such as an Associate of Applied Science

- Describes the scope of the field of study, its core theories and practices, using field-related terminology, and offers a similar explication of at least one related field.
- Applies tools, technologies and methods common to the field of study to selected questions or problems.
- Generates substantially error-free products, reconstructions, data, juried exhibits or performances appropriate to the field of study.

## 2. Broad and integrative knowledge

U.S. higher education is distinctive in its emphasis on students' broad learning across the humanities, arts, sciences and social sciences, and the *DQP* builds on that commitment to liberal and general education in postsecondary learning. However, the *DQP* further invites students to *integrate* their broad learning by exploring, connecting and applying concepts and methods across *multiple fields of study* to complex questions – in the student's areas of specialization, in work or other field-based settings, and in the wider society. While many institutions of higher education and most state requirements relegate general knowledge to the first two years of undergraduate work and present it in isolated blocks, the *DQP* takes the position that broad and integrative knowledge,

at all degree levels, should build larger, cumulative contexts for students' specialized and applied learning and for their engagement with civic, intercultural, global, and scientific issues as well.

**At the associate level,** the student

- Describes how existing knowledge or practice is advanced, tested and revised in each core field studied – e.g., disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses in the sciences, social sciences, humanities and arts.
- Describes a key debate or problem relevant to *each* core field studied, explains the significance of the debate or problem to the wider society, and shows how concepts from the core field can be used to address the selected debates or problems.
- Uses recognized methods of each core field studied, including the gathering and evaluation of evidence, in the execution of analytical, practical or creative tasks.
- Describes and evaluates the ways in which at least two fields of study define, address, and interpret the importance for society of a problem in science, the arts, society, human services, economic life or technology.

### **3. INTELLECTUAL SKILLS**

The six crosscutting Intellectual Skills presented below define proficiencies that transcend the boundaries of particular fields of study. They overlap, interact with, and enable the other major areas of learning described in the *DQP*.

#### **Analytic inquiry**

Because the synthesizing cognitive operations of assembling, combining, formulating, evaluating and reconstructing information are foundational to all learning, they are addressed throughout the *DQP*. But analytic inquiry, though it is involved in such synthesis, requires separate treatment as the core intellectual skill that enables a student to examine, probe and grasp the assumptions and conventions of different areas of study.

**At the associate level,** the student

- Identifies and frames a problem or question in selected areas of study and distinguishes among elements of ideas, concepts, theories or practical approaches to the problem or question.

#### **Use of information resources**

There is no learning without information, and students must learn how to find, organize, and evaluate it. At each degree level, these tasks become more complicated – by language, by media, by ambiguity and

contradictions – and the proficiencies offered below reflect that ladder of challenge.

**At the associate level,** the student

Identifies, categorizes, evaluates and cites multiple information resources so as to create projects, papers or performances in either a specialized field of study or with respect to a general theme within the arts and sciences.

### **Engaging diverse perspectives**

Every student should develop the intellectual flexibility and broad knowledge that enables perception of the world through the eyes of others, i. e., from the perspectives of diverse cultures, personalities, places, times and technologies. This proficiency is essential to intellectual development and to both Applied and Collaborative Learning and Civic and Global Learning.

**At the associate level,** the student

Describes how knowledge from different cultural perspectives might affect interpretations of prominent problems in politics, society, the arts and/or global relations.

Describes, explains and evaluates the sources of his or her own perspective on selected issues in culture, society, politics, the arts or global relations and compares that perspective with other views.

### **Ethical reasoning**

Analytic reasoning, the use of information resources, communication, and diverse perspectives must inevitably be brought to bear on situations, both clear and indeterminate, where tensions and conflicts, disparities and harms emerge, and where a particular set of intellectual skills is necessary to identify, elaborate and resolve these cases. Ethical reasoning thus refers to the judicious and self-reflective application of ethical principles and codes of conduct resident in cultures, professions, occupations, economic behavior and social relationships to making decisions and taking action.

**At the associate level,** the student

Describes the ethical issues present in prominent problems in politics, economics, health care, technology or the arts and shows how ethical principles or frameworks help to inform decision making with respect to such problems.

### **Quantitative fluency**

Quantitative expressions and the issues they raise inform many tasks. In addition to essential arithmetic skills, the use of visualization, symbolic translation and algorithms has become critically important.

**At the associate level,** the student

- Presents accurate interpretations of quantitative information on political, economic, health-related or technological topics and explains how both calculations and symbolic operations are used in those offerings.
- Creates and explains graphs or other visual depictions of trends, relationships or changes in status.

### **Communicative fluency**

The use of messages to achieve shared understanding of meaning depends on effective use of language, intentional engagement of audience, cogent and coherent iteration and negotiation with others, and skillful translation across multiple expressive modes and formulations, including digital strategies and platforms.

**At the associate level,** the student

- Develops and presents cogent, coherent, and substantially error-free writing for communication to general and specialized audiences.
- Communicates effectively to general and specialized audiences through structured oral presentations.
- Negotiates with peers an action plan for a practical task, and communicates the results of the negotiation either orally or in writing.

## **4. APPLIED AND COLLABORATIVE LEARNING**

An emphasis on applied learning suggests that what graduates can *do* with what they know is the most critical outcome of higher education. The proficiencies described in this section focus on the interaction of academic and non-academic settings and the corresponding integration of theory and practice, along with the ideal of learning with others in the course of application projects.

Research of different kinds and intensities, on and off campus, on and off the Internet, and formal field-based experiences (internships, practicums, community and other service-learning) all are cases of applied learning.

**At the associate level,** the student

- Describes in writing at least one case in which knowledge and skills acquired in academic settings may be applied to a field-based challenge, and evaluates the learning gained from the application using evidence and examples.
- Analyzes at least one significant concept or method in light of learning outside the classroom.



□ Locates, gathers and organizes evidence regarding a question in a field-based venue beyond formal academic study and offers alternate approaches to answering it.

## **5. CIVIC AND GLOBAL LEARNING**

U.S. higher education acknowledges an explicit obligation to prepare graduates for knowledgeable and responsible participation in democratic society. The *DQP* reaffirms and updates that commitment. But the *DQP* further recognizes that graduates face a social, economic and information world that knows no borders, that is buffeted by environmental changes, and that requires both the knowledge and the experiences that will enable them to become genuinely interactive and productive. The *DQP* therefore envisions both global and local settings for civic engagement and outlines proficiencies needed for both civic and global inquiry and interaction.

Civic and Global Learning proficiencies rely principally on the types of cognitive activities (describing, examining, elucidating, justifying) that are within the direct purview of institutions of higher education, but they also include evidence of civic activities and learning beyond collegiate settings. These proficiencies also reflect the need for analytic inquiry and engagement with diverse perspectives. Together, they underscore the interplay of proficiencies from the major components of higher learning presented in the *DQP*.

**At the associate level,** the student

- Describes his or her own civic and cultural background, including its origins and development, assumptions and predispositions.
- Describes diverse positions, historical and contemporary, on selected democratic values or practices, and presents his or her own position on a specific problem where one or more of these values or practices are involved.
- Provides evidence of participation in a community project through either a spoken or written narrative that identifies the civic issues encountered and personal insights gained from this experience.
- Identifies an economic, environmental, or public health challenge affecting at least two continents, presents evidence for that challenge, and takes a position on the challenge.