



**ANTELOPE VALLEY COLLEGE
OUTCOMES COMMITTEE MEETING
March 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 OC COMMITTEE CHAIR**
3. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. March 10, 2014
5. **REPORTS**
 - a. FPD: Learning Outcomes: General Pedagogical Strategies (3/17 /14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151)
 - b. Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning – Dr. Meeta Goel
6. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. Revised SLOs: **HIST 107, HIST 108, PHTC 205, PHTC 205L**
 - b. New course SLOs: **ESL 099, ESL 101**
7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**
 - a. President Knudsen
 - b. The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) (attachment)
 - c. Good PLOs based on DPQ
 - d. GEOs based on DQP
8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**
 - a. SLO-Related Events –
 - i. FPD:
 1. Why Grades are Not enough (4/21/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151),
 - ii. ACCJC Conferences on Degree Qualification Profile Project (4/4, 5/1-5/3 in San Diego)
9. **OTHER**
 - a. OC Meeting dates for Spring 2014: 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**

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
Dr. Fredy Aviles, SLO Faculty Co-Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:08 p.m.
2. **OPENING COMMENTS FROM THE OC COMMITTEE CHAIR**
Dr. Fredy Aviles welcomed the representatives to the third meeting of the spring semester.
3. **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC**
No comments from the public were made.
4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - a. **February 24, 2014**
A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 24, 2014 Outcomes Committee meeting. Dr. Aviles requested clarification on whether SLO/PLOs can still be approved past the AP&P deadline. Mrs. Melissa Jauregui stated that SLO/PLOs can be approved at any time regardless of the deadline but if the course/program should be implemented in the coming catalog then faculty should attempt to receive approval by the deadline. Motion carried with one abstention.
5. **REPORTS**
 - a. **FPD: PLO Assessment**
Dr. Fredy Aviles indicated that there was no report for this item as he was not feeling well and cancelled the meeting.
 - b. **Updates from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning – Dr. Meeta Goel**
Dr. Meeta Goel stated that she will report at the next meeting on this item.
6. **ACTION ITEMS**
 - a. **Revised SLOs: CIS 101, ELTE 135, ESL 099, ESL 101, HIST 107, HIST 108, Math 102B**
Dr. Fredy Aviles requested a motion to amend the agenda to add item 6b, new SLOs and move ESL 099 and ESL 101 to that item.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda as requested. Motion carried.

A motion was made and seconded to approve CIS 101, ELTE 135, and MATH 102B. After a brief review of each course SLOs, the committee requested a motion to approve CIS 101, ELTE 135, and MATH 102B. Motion carried.

A motion was made and seconded to approve HIST 107 and HIST 108. The committee requested faculty to revise the SLO assessment methods for HIST 107 and HIST 108. It was noted that too many

assessment methods would make it difficult for faculty to aggregate the data once collected and suggested faculty decide on one to three assessment methods that will be common to all. Motion failed.

b. New SLOs: ESL 099 and ESL 101

A motion was made and seconded to approve ESL 099 and ESL 101. After a brief review of each SLO, the committee felt for ESL 099 SLO 1 and 2 the language which referenced total words minus errors to assess students critical thinking skills may not be the best form of assessment. Since this language is simply an example, some members asked if that language be removed and would it be sufficient for approval. Unfortunately the answer was no because the SLO calls out the ability to demonstrate critical thinking skills and writing accuracy rate did not seem to be an appropriate form of measurement. It was noted however that ESL 099 SLO 3 was fine as is.

As for ESL 101 SLO 1 and 2 the committee noted the same comments as above. Concern was also expressed for the following statement noted in ESL 101 SLO 1, 2 and 3:

"ESL and/or English faculty-development rubrics can also be used."

The committee had concerns with this statement because it seemed like it was optional and should be a requirement if the statement is used. The use of the word "can" did not agree with many members and it seemed they were in favor of changing this word to "will". Motion failed.

7. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

a. Minor vs. major SLO/PLO revisions (attachment)

Dr. Fredy Aviles requested the committee to review the document in the agenda packet, which had previously been reviewed, discussed, and revised. Dr. Aviles expressed his concerns with the language for minor and major SLO revisions. Since the committee currently does not differentiate between minor and major but rather reviews all SLOs fully, is it appropriate for this language to still be listed on this document. Mr. Glenn Haller indicated in the most recent revision of this document, this language was removed per discussions that occurred in this meeting. Dr. Aviles seemed surprised but still requested the committee to consider whether it is appropriate to review all SLOs fully as if new. It was noted that unfortunately a mass approval of SLOs without that review potentially puts poorly written SLOs into place. Mrs. Stacey Adams noted that while some representatives are fully reviewing SLOs some are not giving a thorough review but this seems to be more of a process issue.

Ms. Melanie Parker indicated that at the last SLO meeting Dr. Scott Lee expressed his concerns with this committee over stepping bounds and not trusting discipline faculty. At the time Ms. Parker did not agree but after giving it more thought, she feels that he is correct and perhaps this committee should not be reviewing each SLO with such a critical eye. Mrs. Adams indicated that the committee has not established what a non-substantial revision is and cannot determine what type of review is needed. While it was brought up that the AP&P committee has a technical review level, the Outcomes Committee felt that one more committee would not be appropriate. Ms. Melanie Parker reminded the committee of a rubric that was used in past years but representatives when reviewing SLOs/PLOs and suggested that rubric be used again to ensure a thorough review is done by each representative.

Dr. Aviles did not feel this was necessary but rather wanted to remove the notation of minor vs. major and in the future make the review of SLOs and PLOs so automated that the review and approval can be done by the AP&P committee. He indicated that if the representatives felt a process needs developing then bring concrete examples to a future meeting for discussion and implementation. Dr. Meeta Goel recommended that the committee continue to review and revise the current process so to simplify the SLO/PLO link. Perhaps in 2016 the committee should revisit this suggestion and determine whether the approval of the SLO/PLO can be done through the AP&P process. Dr. Goel also asked about the goals that were rewritten last fall, perhaps those should come forward for review and approval so they can be measured.

b. The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) (attachment)

Dr. Aviles attempted to introduce the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) as a topic for discussion in the last 15 minutes of the meeting. He stated that the DQP is a tool that should be used by faculty to determine if the degrees offered by their program, meet certain established criteria. The DQP states that students that receive an AA, BA, or MA should have achieved 5 proficiencies: 1) Specialized knowledge (Knowledge acquired in a specialized field of study to attain "depth of learning/mastery")

competencies), 2) Broad, integrative knowledge (Knowledge acquired in general education fields to attain “breadth of learning/liberal education” competencies), 3) Intellectual skills (analytic inquiry; use of information resources; engaging diverse perspectives; quantitative fluency; communication fluency), 4) Applied learning (Experience from outside the class is brought to bear on classroom material; classroom material is brought to bear on outside the class experiences); and 5) Civic learning (Developing a readiness and acceptance of each person’s understanding of and obligation to contribute to their community). These proficiencies are addressed at higher levels of complexity at the BA and MA levels. Dr. Aviles mentioned that the discussion at hand will only apply to the DQP at the AA level.

Mrs. Stacey Adams asked where this is coming from and who requires us to revise our PLOs. Dr. Aviles stated that he has been attending a series of 7 conferences hosted by ACCJC on this topic. The training on the DQP has been conducted by the Lumina Foundation. Dr. Aviles thus believes that ACCJC is requiring that we revisit how we have defined our degrees and the program learning outcomes for such degree, particularly the transfer model curriculum degrees. The DQP should be used as a guide to make sure students who receive an AA degree are proficient in the 5 established areas. He noted that it has been mentioned at the conferences that this is not an attempt to standardize degrees because department faculty determined how these are defined and assessed for their particular degrees. The 5 areas are written very broadly to allow for the flexibility different degrees would need in different areas of emphasis. Mrs. Stacey Adams asked what all this has to do with the Outcomes committee. Dr. Aviles noted that it is the job of the committee to approve program learning outcomes and we need to find a way to get faculty to revise them so that they address the 5 proficiencies established by the DQP.

Ms. Kimberly Covell asked if this was mandatory and whether a timeline of expected implementation has been developed. Dr. Aviles commented that if it is coming from ACCJC we should do it, however, currently there is no mandate that requires that programs be revised. Dr. Scott Lee mentioned that ACCJC is currently revising its standards and this may be part of the new guidelines. Dr. Glenn Haller asked why we should do this before the new standards are established. He also mentioned that they (his area) already do what the DQP requires.

Dr. Aviles mentioned that we will have to continue this discussion at the next meeting due to lack of time. To prepare for that meeting, Dr. Aviles requested the committee members to review the document in totality and bring discussion points and comments to the next meeting.

8. **ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS**

a. **SLO-Related Events –**

i. FPD:

1. General Pedagogical Strategies (3/17/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151)
2. Why Grades are Not enough (4/21/14, 7-10 pm in SSV 151),

ii. ACCJC Conferences on Degree Qualification Profile Project (3/21, 4/4, 5/1-5/3 in CSUSB)

Tabled due to lack of time.

9. **OTHER**

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

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the March 10, 2014 Outcomes Committee meeting at 4:42p.m. 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.

Degree Specification

[A description of the degree that can be placed in a college catalog or accompany a student's transcript and that explains to students, employers and interested others the nature of the competencies and learning achieved in the program of study.]

Degree Name:

Purpose Statement:

[Provide a succinct statement of the program philosophy as it relates to the specific degree.]

Characteristics:

[Highlight the distinctive elements of this degree track, including disciplines and featured subject areas.]

Career Pathways:

[Describe the possible kinds of work and careers for graduates of this degree (focus on the learning and competencies acquired).]

Education style:

[Identify learning and teaching approaches (like seminar, labs, projects) and describe assessment methods used to record student learning. Be sure to note unique or distinctive approaches or elements within this program of study.]

Core learning and competencies:

LEARNING SKILLS ACQUIRED

Skill and competency:

- To further one's educational development by exercising core intellectual skills (communication, analytic inquiry, information resource skills, engaging diverse perspectives, quantitative-technical)
- To understanding the ways in which disciplines create and apply knowledge to solve problems
- To achieve mastery
- To increase competency by application of learning to real world experiences
- To responsibly contribute to civic society through work, service, or community activity

Continued on reverse

Core learning and competencies:	Continued from previous page
<p>SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE (Knowledge acquired in a specialized field of study to attain “depth of learning/mastery” competencies).</p>	<p>Describe specific student learning and competencies for students who complete this degree program of study (both discipline major and general education):</p>
<p>BROAD, INTEGRATIVE KNOWLEDGE (Knowledge acquired in general education fields to attain “breadth of learning/liberal education” competencies).</p>	
<p>INTELLECTUAL SKILLS: analytic inquiry; use of information resources; engaging diverse perspectives; quantitative fluency; communication fluency (All of which facilitate attainment of learning outcomes across the other categories).</p>	
<p>APPLIED LEARNING (Experience from outside the class is brought to bear on classroom material; classroom material is brought to bear on outside the class experiences).</p>	
<p>CIVIC LEARNING (Developing a readiness and acceptance of each person’s understanding of and obligation to contribute to their community).</p>	
<p>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC AREAS (As appropriate, that unique aspect of learning all degree earners attain by studying at your particular institution).</p>	

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 20th 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 21st 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.