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Introduction

Because of their commitment to the voluntary measurement and improvement of student learning outcomes, colleges and universities that are members of the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) have been at the forefront of the national shift from teacher-centered to student-centered learning. The institutions participating in the CIC Degree Qualifications Profile Consortium in 2012 and 2013 contributed significantly to this pattern by exploring various ways in which the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) can be used to facilitate student learning. Supported by a generous grant from the Lumina Foundation, CIC established a network of 25 colleges and universities committed to working together to find ways in which the DQP could help develop new or strengthen existing efforts to improve academic programs on their campuses (see page 27). The 25 institutions were selected from 81 applicants that had expressed interest in participating in the CIC/DQP Consortium.

The Lumina Foundation commissioned four individuals to create “a framework for defining the learning and quality that college degrees should signify” (www.luminafoundation.org). Inspired by the Bologna Process, which created common standards for European degrees, the Lumina profile reflects distinctive characteristics of American higher education. The DQP identifies five areas of student learning that can be assessed: Applied Learning; Intellectual Skills; Specialized Knowledge; Broad, Integrative Knowledge; and Civic Learning. Applied Learning “is used by students to demonstrate what they can do with what they know.” Intellectual Skills “are used by students to think critically and analytically about what they learn….” Specialized Knowledge “is the knowledge students demonstrate about their individual fields of study.” Broad, Integrative Knowledge “…encompasses all learning in broad areas through multiple degree levels.” Civic Learning “…enables students to respond to social, economic, and environmental challenges at local, national, and global levels” (Adelman, Ewell, Gaston, and Schneider 2011). Foundational to the DQP is the assumption that a college education should progress “vertically” rather than “horizontally” so that a student’s skills and understanding should increase at each stage of learning. To this end, the document provides general student learning outcomes at the associate’s, baccalaureate, and master’s levels for each of the five areas of learning. These outcomes are described in narrative form, in chart form, and in graphic form in the Lumina DQP document and referred to as the “spiderweb” (see image on following page).
The Lumina Foundation seeks to improve the nation's higher education attainment rate by increasing the proportion of Americans with high-quality degrees and credentials to 60 percent by the year 2025. Lumina leaders believe that assuring the quality of academic programs in American colleges and universities is essential to successful achievement of this ambitious goal. Because a major goal of CIC is to help member colleges and universities improve student learning and maintain academic quality, CIC saw the potential of the Degree Qualifications Profile to further its own goals and was one of the first three groups to receive pilot grants from the Lumina Foundation. A challenge to contemporary American higher education is the need to prepare college graduates for a changing workplace in an increasingly global economy. The grant provided an excellent opportunity to demonstrate how small and mid-sized private institutions can be leaders in educational improvement.

Notification that CIC had received the grant from the Lumina Foundation came in May 2011. Two of the four authors of the Lumina DQP document, Peter Ewell and Paul Gaston, were assigned to work with the project from the beginning, and Terry Grimes, retired chief academic officer (CAO) of Barton College, was hired by CIC as senior advisor and project director.
The announcement of the application process for the consortium included two main requirements: The proposed project had to focus on improving the academic quality of an initiative or plan that was already in place; and the institution needed to demonstrate that there was sufficient time to implement the project within the two-year time frame of the CIC Consortium. Institutional representation in the consortium would consist of teams of three people from each institution: the CAO, a faculty leader committed to improving academic quality, and a faculty or staff member with expertise in the assessment of student learning. Participating institutions were given the option of adding a fourth team member at their expense, which many did.

Because the DQP was fairly new, CIC staff members were not convinced that 25 institutions would be willing to make the significant commitment in time and resources that participation in the consortium would demand. CIC, however, received 81 applications representing a wide variety of proposals and a range of motivations for applying. As might be expected, a large number of applicants wanted to develop further or evaluate their general education programs. Several wanted to explore new areas, such as establishing standards for co-curricular or non-traditional learning or creating new academic programs. Some focused on specific majors or departments, while others saw the DQP as a possible way to prepare for regional reaffirmation of accreditation. The DQP model seemed to evoke genuine interest, and the hard work that would obviously be involved in testing the DQP model did not dampen that interest. The rewards of involvement in the CIC/DQP Consortium consisted of participating with institutional colleagues in three national meetings and working directly with two of the DQP’s authors. There was no financial incentive; in fact, participation in the Consortium would require some financial investment as well as the commitment of human resources by participating institutions.
Consortium Activities

The first CIC/DQP Consortium meeting was held March 8–10, 2012, in Indianapolis, Indiana. This location allowed for the participation of several key members of the Lumina staff, notably Jamie Merisotis, president and CEO, who delivered a plenary address; Holiday Hart McKiernan, chief of staff and general counsel; and Marcus Kolb, at that time program officer. In planning for the meeting, CIC used two strategies to foster collaboration among consortium members. The first approach was to have each institution prepare a poster illustrating its goals and action plans for the project that would be reviewed by other consortium members. The second was to divide the 25 participating institutions into five “cluster groups” to facilitate more effective discussion. The cluster groups consisted of teams that had similar projects. The institutions placed in Cluster Group One addressed assessment issues: Bay Path College, Holy Names University, McKendree University, Point Loma Nazarene University, and Wofford College. Cluster Group Two consisted of institutions focused on business programs: Concordia University Wisconsin, Golden Gate University, Southern New Hampshire University, and Tiffin University. Those in Cluster Group Three examined general education programs: Berry College, Chatham University, Daemen College, Marymount California University, and Westminster College (UT). Cluster Group Four institutions were grouped together because of an interest in broad institutional change: University of Charleston (WV), Nebraska Methodist College, Baldwin-Wallace University, DePauw University, and Franklin College (IN). Cluster Group Five consisted of institutions that wanted to improve services to transfer students and prepare graduates for the workforce: Bethel University (MN), Davis & Elkins College, D’Youville College, Juniata College, Saint Augustine’s University, and Virginia Wesleyan College. Over the course of the two years, members of the cluster groups bonded together and functioned effectively as a means to share data and receive advice from each other about the projects.

The first consortium meeting included observers from the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA): George Kuh, director and co-principal investigator, Indiana University; Jillian Kinzie, senior scholar and associate director, Indiana University; and Natasha Jankowski, assistant director and research assistant professor, University of Illinois. In a special session, each institutional team reviewed all of the posters and provided feedback to the other teams about the scope of the projects and the action items planned. Participants found the feedback to be very useful, and some teams later announced that they had narrowed or shifted the focus of their projects based on frank suggestions from the reviewers.
At the beginning of the meeting there was some healthy and constructive skepticism about the DQP and its usefulness for bringing about change in higher education. Much of the concern involved perceptions that the profile was too prescriptive in its five categories of learning, that the language was too abstract, and that no specific models for measuring student learning were provided. But the two major objectives for the meeting—to give participants a deeper understanding of the Degree Qualifications Profile and to create opportunities for communication among participants, with CIC staff, and with consultants Ewell and Gaston—were met. Although skepticism about the ability of the DQP to cause change never completely disappeared, it decreased significantly as the Consortium evolved.

On the final day of the first meeting, CIC President Richard Ekman proposed an additional strategy for the consortium. He suggested holding a series of regional meetings, during which institutions could benefit from exchanges with their colleagues at other institutions that were not necessarily in their cluster group. The regional meetings allowed participants to share stories about the challenges they faced implementing their action plans and to give each other advice on various topics, including appropriate methods for assessing student learning and for using assessment data to plan improvements. CIC staff facilitators also received valuable advice about planning the second consortium meeting, and the consultants heard useful suggestions for revising the Lumina DQP document.

Equipped with additional information about the purposes and usefulness of the DQP, institutional teams returned to their home campuses to begin the work of implementing their respective projects. Over the next few months, regional meetings were held to offer support and guidance to institutional teams as they sought to garner support on their campuses, adjust their approach in light of new information, and achieve their initial project objectives. In addition, CIC conducted three webinars to share resources with consortium participants and provide a means of interaction among the teams between meetings. In April 2012, a webinar reviewed features of the online community site and resource library, which were used to provide announcements and reminders and served as an online space for participants to ask questions and share information. In May 2012, Gaston conducted an interactive workshop on how to create a campus action plan, which became a key component of the institutions’ interim reports and was useful in preparing for the second consortium meeting in late October. In early October, Ewell, assisted by Grimes, facilitated a discussion of progress on meeting campus project objectives for those participants who were unable to attend a regional meeting.
The second CIC/DQP Consortium meeting was held October 18–20, 2012, in Washington, DC. The first plenary address by Kuh provided an update on the work of NILOA to harvest data from the more than 100 DQP projects that had been identified at that point. In the second plenary address Sylvia Manning, president of the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association (HLC), reflected on the role of the DQP in regional accreditation, particularly as it might relate to the U.S. Department of Education. In another plenary session, Ewell discussed some of the issues involved in the collection and use of assessment data for institutional planning and suggested that participants take advantage of electronic methods. The final plenary session featured Kolb and Gaston, who provided an update on the status of revisions to the DQP and possible future directions for the document.

Nearly a year elapsed between the second and third consortium meetings, during which time campus teams from the participating institutions sought to execute refined action plans for accomplishing their campus project goals. Although the project types varied from institution to institution (see the detailed descriptions in the following section), every campus team diligently strived to apply the DQP to its particular context during this period. In addition, the CIC/DQP Consortium online community site and resource library continued to support participants between the second and third consortium meetings.

At the third and final consortium meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana, on August 8–10, 2013, Jamie Merisotis provided an overview of Lumina’s involvement with the DQP, including the foundation’s continued commitment to its support and development. Sessions at this third meeting included a panel discussion by CAOs Timothy O’Rourke of Virginia Wesleyan College, Kerry Fulcher of Point Loma Nazarene University, and Elizabeth Martin of Holy Names University, who addressed the potential of the DQP to improve student learning outcomes. In a second panel discussion, led by Kinzie, assessment officers Donna Lewis of the University of Charleston, Elizabeth Evans of Concordia University Wisconsin, and Salvatore D’Amato of D’Youville College detailed the benefits and challenges of using the DQP to assess student learning. This meeting also featured an open forum moderated by Holly Zanville, strategy director at the Lumina Foundation, during which consortium participants were asked to provide suggestions for revisions to the DQP document. Ekman moderated the final panel session, which featured Ewell, Gaston, and Kuh; the panel participants summarized the achievements of the consortium and examined the future of the DQP.
A survey of the final reports from participating institutions revealed that the 25 projects included several overlapping objectives: reforming general education, enhancing business programs, assessing co-curricular programs, improving the process of transfer from two-year to four-year programs, creating new undergraduate programs, improving study abroad programs, creating common standards for capstone courses, clarifying and enhancing student learning outcomes, improving writing and communication skills, evaluating specialized knowledge in the major, improving the first-year experience, improving the senior-year experience, and assessing the effectiveness of the language of the DQP. The institutions also used various methods to initiate and document results of their projects. Many teams used curriculum mapping as a first step. Several either began their projects with the intention of using electronic programs to document student learning or came to the conclusion later that these programs were essential to effective tracking of student outcomes. Several teams used surveys, faculty workshops, and focus group meetings to identify campus perceptions.

**General Education**

**Bethel University** (MN) began its project of evaluating the recently adopted general education program for traditional undergraduates, “Pillars of Learning,” to create broader and more manageable learning outcomes. It also began the project to use “signature assignments” to assess these outcomes by collecting artifacts as evidence that students had achieved targeted learning outcomes. Faculty members who taught general education courses were then invited to join a “scoring workshop” to assess the level of student achievement. Finally, participating faculty members were asked to develop at least two changes to the general education courses they taught based on what they had learned during the workshop.

The Bethel team credits consortium colleagues with helping them realize that the curricular goals were satisfactory, thus freeing them to pursue the more important second goal of developing a process for using signature assignments to assess student learning. They collected 25 student artifacts for each of five general education categories: Freshman College Writing, World Cultures, Interpreting Biblical Themes, Comparative Systems, and Contemporary Christian Issues. They also collected ten artifacts in mathematics. Five to ten faculty members were involved in scoring the artifacts in each category. Importantly, faculty members from different academic departments discussed the strengths and weaknesses they found in the students’ work and subsequently recommended
changes to the curriculum. Project coordinators report an unparalleled degree of collaboration among faculty to use assessment results to improve the general education program. Bethel will continue to improve this process while sharing the DQP with faculty members in their other schools.

Another institution that had recently adopted a new general education program and was in the process of developing a new institutional strategic plan that would include review of general education was Westminster College (UT). Because faculty members were reluctant to use the DQP to reexamine the learning goals they had adopted so recently, the team chose to use the developmental model of the DQP to address two related questions: What does student learning look like at the end of the sophomore year when most students are completing general education requirements? What does student learning look like at the end of the senior year when they are completing major requirements? Faculty members have made considerable progress specifying the level of learning expected at these two critical times in a student’s college experience for each college-wide learning outcome. For example, associate's level DQP outcomes were used to gauge student proficiency at the end of the sophomore year. Participants in the Westminster project are now planning to use e-portfolios of student work to document learning at both sophomore and senior years.

Working with a recently revised general education program that needed fine tuning, Chatham University used the DQP to identify areas of improvement in general education and academic support services by clarifying learning expectations; improving communication and analytical skills; strengthening faculty members’ teaching effectiveness in writing, oral communication, and information literacy; improving the integration of content and skills; improving the content of senior tutorials; and enhancing retention and graduation rates. This ambitious list of goals was grounded in the fundamental purpose of improving students’ basic skills. Tasks completed by the Chatham team included articulating criteria for designating courses as writing intensive, then testing, revising, and implementing the criteria; revising writing-intensive courses to address the criteria; developing rubrics to evaluate writing, oral communication, and information literacy; and providing training to help faculty members use rubrics effectively. Chatham plans to use the DQP to assess other learning outcomes of the general education program and to examine the structure of academic majors.

Established in 1904, Davis & Elkins College (West Virginia) is a private, liberal arts college known for its nurturing environment and small classes. The college offers associate's and bachelor's degrees to more than 800 students. www.dewv.edu
The DQP project at **Davis & Elkins College** sought to develop a first-year seminar to include a three-week winter term symposium for first-year students focusing on a current issue, to develop a college-wide senior capstone requirement, to review and reform general education, and to measure the contribution of the co-curriculum to student learning. The team recognized that these goals were broad and ambitious, but team members believed that making progress on all of these goals at the same time was necessary for the coherence of the academic program, particularly given substantial changes in academic affairs in the past several years. The college has made significant progress toward realizing all project goals and, having achieved success with the co-curriculum, is now focused on general education.

Like many other consortium members, the Davis & Elkins team was concerned about sustaining the campus energy necessary to complete its ambitious plans. A positive sign of the continued utility of the DQP on the Davis & Elkins campus is the encouragement of the Higher Learning Commission to build on the assessment plan that has emerged from the DQP project to develop its report for reaccreditation. The plan embeds core general education learning outcomes within academic programs and assesses student performance on those outcomes at the end of the sophomore and senior levels.

The **Holy Names University** project had two major goals. One was to evaluate its traditional general education program, which identifies 60 student learning outcomes in 14 different areas in relation to the DQP’s Intellectual Skills and Broad, Integrative Knowledge goals. The other goal was to assess the nascent community-based learning program in relation to the DQP goals of Applied and Civic Learning. In order to track students for four years by archiving performance using campus rubrics, the college purchased an electronic portfolio system and hired a new assistant academic dean to lead the shift from a discipline-based general education program to a skill-based program that reflects the development of Broad, Integrative Knowledge learning outcomes.

Faculty members at **D’Youville College** uncovered “an inconvenient truth” during their use of the DQP. The campus team initially planned for faculty members in the arts and sciences and mathematics to map the five DQP areas to their general education core courses. Once the project was initiated, however, the team realized that student learning outcomes of the core curriculum were inadequate and readjusted their project goals to include creating clearer and measurable institutional learning outcomes. After clarifying the learning outcomes, the team went on to compare these outcomes to the five DQP areas of learning. D’Youville’s ultimate goal is to align student learning outcomes with each course, academic program, and the DQP.
Curriculum mapping was a strategy crucial to the project at Nebraska Methodist College, which aligned two associate’s degree programs in health care and the general education core with the DQP and then aligned the DQP with degree completion courses. The results of these exercises were discussed by cross-disciplinary teams, which reviewed both gaps and areas of richness that were revealed by applying DQP standards to the associate’s programs. These discussions led to revisions in expected learning competencies and eventually to course revisions. The process also increased communication between arts and science and professional programs. The team focused on the associate’s programs as models for future use of the DQP, but the new application of the DQP will be developing a capstone experience in the healthcare operations management master’s degree program based on the Civic Learning; Applied Learning; and Broad, Integrative Knowledge learning objectives.

The purpose of the DQP project at Marymount California University was to strengthen its undergraduate program as it shifted from a two-year to a four-year degree-granting institution. The campus team used the DQP to assess student learning through rubrics and used the results of the assessments to improve general education learning outcomes. Scoring workshops revealed that senior capstone courses were strongest in the DQP areas of Applied Learning and Civic Engagement. In addition, the campus team identified a need to integrate content with skills in courses and to emphasize writing and research skills. A first step in meeting these challenges was to lead the faculty to go beyond content in creating student learning outcomes statements. The next step was to identify reasons for the learning gaps in the DQP area of Intellectual Skills, especially critical thinking and quantitative skills. These gaps were addressed by creating a series of aligned assignments, clear rubrics, and an institutional assessment system. One of the important lessons learned by the Marymount California team was that “it is easier to build outcomes and assessment into a curriculum from the beginning than it is to retro-fit competency structures….” Even more importantly, the DQP “clarified for the faculty at large…the importance of a coherent two- and four-year curriculum that would produce students who possessed these and other major academic skills and broad educational outcomes.”
The project at Saint Augustine’s University was an ambitious plan to transform the entire institution. The main effect on general education was to move from a two-year core of general education requirements to a four-year competency-based curriculum. A large number of courses were revised to meet the standards of its new Transformative Education Program (TEP). Every syllabus for the revised courses included an assessment tool. Using input from faculty focus groups and departmental meetings, the TEP committee identified ten core competencies to form the basis of the new curriculum. In addition to the five domains of the DQP, the Saint Augustine’s team developed “identity” as a sixth institution-specific outcome, which included requirements in African-American history. The DQP served as a useful model to ensure the cumulative development of skills designed to foster higher levels of attainment during students’ education at Saint Augustine’s University.

Business Programs

The projects involving business programs tended to be more narrowly focused than others, but they resulted in many of the same outcomes. The campus team from Concordia University Wisconsin planned to assess learning outcomes at all levels (the major, the business core, general education, and university-wide) by mapping the first and fourth year of the accounting majors to the DQP. Faculty members created student learning outcomes for first- and fourth-year business courses, revised the curriculum, and created exit tests for the financial and managerial accounting courses. Recognizing the need to include more people and campus groups in discussions about assessment, the university appointed a new project coordinator to lead the orientation of new faculty members and collection of data on student learning in business. The university plans to turn their attention next to mapping the DQP to learning outcomes in the major, in the business core, and in the university-wide core curriculum.

For some time, Southern New Hampshire University has offered a three-year business degree program for highly qualified students. The Southern New Hampshire team set out to develop a “Degree in Three” program that would be open to students of all academic levels. The new program began in fall 2013 with 60 first-year students in three majors: business administration, marketing, and sports management. Reflective of the programs’ focus on student learning outcomes, both the business core and major course requirements include credit for “non-seat time learning,” that is, credits for achieving learning goals drawn explicitly from the DQP that are assessed through a weekly “huddle” meeting.
with a teacher/mentor. Borrowing directly from the DQP, the Degree in Three program has a different theme each year: (1) Broad, Integrative Knowledge, (2) Civic Engagement and Citizenship, and (3) Intellectual and Interpersonal Skills (which focuses on team membership and cooperation). The success thus far of this “move to three years” has led to a general reevaluation of the way the university teaches in the school of business. Faculty members are considering a major change that would introduce certain annual shared experiences for all students and thread certain competencies and credits in the experiences rather than embed all of them in specific courses.

The project team from Tiffin University applied the DQP in a unique way by recreating the “spiderweb” graphic from the Lumina DQP document to illustrate the varying emphases of the college’s business programs. Although the initial goal was to use the DQP to develop marketing materials for their business program to be used for student recruitment and appeals to external organizations and stakeholders, program evaluation revealed that general education courses promoted civic learning to a greater degree than the business program. The university adjusted its marketing materials accordingly. The Tiffin team plans to evaluate the project’s success before applying the DQP to other academic programs. The project team plans to work with enrollment management and university development staff members to promote use of the DQP.

Golden Gate University sought to use the DQP to redesign its undergraduate curriculum in business by integrating key liberal arts outcomes into the undergraduate major and by distinguishing undergraduate from graduate programs. The project increased cross-disciplinary communication and collaboration and helped solidify the institution’s commitment to lifelong learning. Further positive outcomes of these campus discussions include attention to online best practices, increased knowledge about competency-based education, interest in expanding the role of the capstone course, a commitment to providing better training for part-time faculty members, and interest in launching an associate’s degree program. After the new undergraduate program is launched in fall 2014, the Golden Gate team anticipates that the graduate faculty will be encouraged to apply the DQP to its programs. According to the team’s final report, “The DQP has opened our eyes to many more opportunities to improve the student learning experience…. It has become the guidepost by which the undergraduate faculty has made some critical decisions for the undergraduate curriculum.”
Co-Curricular Programs

Cooperation between academic affairs and student affairs is an important strength of many institutions, but the question of how to award credit for co-curricular student work is difficult to address. Many of the CIC/DQP Consortium projects involved co-curricular issues, including those of Davis and Elkins College, which examined the co-curricular contribution to student learning; Holy Names University, which compared the DQP Applied Learning and Civic Learning outcomes to the community-based learning program; and Saint Augustine’s University, which added non-academic credit to student transcripts.

McKendree University selected one of its seven undergraduate student learning outcomes, “appreciation of diversity,” as the focus of a systematic, comprehensive, and sustainable assessment system linked to faculty professional development activities. McKendree faculty and staff first used the DQP to further articulate the outcome of appreciation of diversity and to develop measureable performance indicators. They then “cross walked” the DQP areas of learning with McKendree’s student learning outcomes, the Association of American Colleges and Universities’ (AAC&U) Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) Essential Learning Outcomes, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association’s (NCAA) Division II Life in the Balance attributes. Results of this exercise enabled the team to define what students should know and be able to do to demonstrate their appreciation of diversity, identify the courses that helped students meet the learning goal, and develop assessment tools to measure student mastery of the learning outcome. Importantly, this exercise also has led to consideration of requiring a capstone experience in every academic program and expansion of faculty professional development programs related to capstone experiences. In addition, the McKendree team completed a curricular map of its undergraduate student learning outcomes, required general education courses, and AAC&U High Impact Practices.

The project team at Berry College mapped the DQP onto one outcome from the Applied Learning area and one outcome from the Civic Learning area to student research programs in several disciplines, the student work program, student activities, and the Bonner Center for Student Engagement. Faculty and staff members then created signature assignments that could measure student learning in each of these curricular and co-curricular programs. Despite the difficulty inherent in adapting academic assessment language to non-academic activities, the Berry team found success by adopting two strategies: creation and use

Holy Names University (California) is located in the Oakland Hills. Founded by the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary in 1868, the university offers 19 bachelor’s degrees, five degree completion programs for adults, seven master’s degrees, and various certificates and credentials. www.hnu.edu
of a common rubric across programs; and development of “crosswalks” among the AAC&U guidelines for Civic Engagement, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the DQP. Berry College’s work with the DQP continues in the student work program and with all faculty members in two disciplines. Interestingly, while some in the higher education community fear that the DQP could lead to standardization of the undergraduate curriculum, the Berry team has found that, “the [DQP] work . . . serves as an excellent starting point and scaffold for encouraging more faculty and staff to search for ways to capitalize on Berry’s unique strengths and assets to deepen students’ education experiences.”

Perhaps the most ambitious of the consortium projects involving the co-curriculum was that of DePauw University. The DePauw project team created a co-curricular inventory of student activities designed to function as an objective account of non-classroom activities that contribute to student learning. This effort involved creating a website, testing the usefulness of the inventory for research questions, and recruiting faculty and students to participate in populating the new system with co-curricular learning activities. After categorizing a wide range of co-curricular activities, the project team decided against including one-time activities or organizations independent enough to resist academic control (such as Greek organizations) in the inventory. The initial data system has proven useful not only for recording student activities but also as a stimulus for student reflection on personal learning experiences. The project team expanded the online system to include a section for comments by students and activity sponsors.

Study Abroad Programs

Wofford College used the DQP to examine two areas of institutional distinction—study abroad and academic credit for work completed off campus. Team members wanted to understand the changes in cross-cultural competency that result from study abroad. They administered the Global Perspective Inventory (GPI) to measure changes in students’ cross-cultural competencies after studying abroad and compared GPI results to the DQP standards for Applied Learning and Civic Learning. The college’s commitment to integrated learning led the project team to examine learning outcomes in career services programs as well. A tangible result of this assessment is a formal proposal to the college administration for a program designed to enhance student learning outcomes through employment, an initiative that will involve staff from several administrative offices.
 Consortia projects demonstrated that the DQP could provide helpful—though at times sobering—insights into the student experience. The campus team at Bay Path College included the DQP’s Applied Learning and Civic Learning outcomes in an assessment instrument designed to evaluate the level of learning students achieved through participation in the college’s travel courses. Assessment results revealed that there was little difference between student’s pre- and post-travel responses, suggesting a general lack of student reflection on and understanding of other cultures. These results indicated that students needed more direction in “reading” other cultures and that they would benefit from more cultural “cueing and reviewing” during the travel experience.

The Bay Path team also learned a number of important operational lessons regarding survey administration, namely that surveys should be administered to study abroad students immediately upon their return home, online delivery can provide valid survey results, and surveys that measure overlapping phenomena should be consolidated. A number of practical outcomes resulted from the Bay Path project, including the creation of an ad hoc group to discuss student travel experiences, development of new and clearer procedures for creating travel courses, new institutional efforts toward refining learning objectives for travel courses, and establishment of the Office of International and Domestic Learning charged with assessment of the college’s travel programs.

New Undergraduate Programs

Three of the CIC/DQP Consortium projects resulted in the creation of new undergraduate programs. In the process of applying the DQP to capstone experiences in two academic programs, faculty members in journalism at Franklin College (IN) were inspired to create a separate major in public relations. As discussed earlier, Southern New Hampshire University expanded its “Degree in Three” program offerings, and Golden Gate University launched a new associate’s degree program.

Associate’s Degrees and Transfer Programs

A number of participating institutions applied the DQP to associate’s degree programs. As noted earlier, the project team at Marymount California University laid a solid academic grounding for the institution’s mission change from being a two-year college to becoming a four-year baccalaureate university by using the DQP to develop outcomes and standards appropriate for four-year degree programs. Also, Nebraska Methodist College explored appropriate standards for learning outcomes across levels of instruction by mapping the curriculum of its associate’s degree and general education programs onto the DQP categories.
The University of Charleston (WV), which recently acquired a nearby institution and its associate's degree programs, also used the DQP to distinguish between appropriate standards for learning at the associate's and baccalaureate levels. As reported by the team, “Serendipitously, [the DQP project] prepared UC for sudden and massive institutional change. Over a six-month period, UC took responsibility for three associate's, five baccalaureate, and two graduate programs in two new locations…” Consequently, “The DQP project has affected every academic program at every level within the institution. It is also causing faculty and staff to rethink some aspects of the co-curricular program.”

The project team from Baldwin Wallace University focused on creating performance measures for adult students in order to improve the transfer process from affiliated community college programs. After employing various measures of adult learning, including national surveys (NSSE and GPI), curriculum mapping, and the use of rubrics, the Baldwin Wallace team examined assessment results to identify differences between the prior preparation and academic performance of students transferring into the baccalaureate program. Interestingly, the traditional undergraduate student population has been socialized into a culture of assessment in which they understand that they are required to participate in annual assessments. Both students and faculty take this participation very seriously. This same process has never been applied to non-traditional students, however. Therefore, team members had to institute new procedures to provide the necessary incentives for adults to participate in assessment activities. Eventually, the project resulted in an effective feedback loop with two local community colleges, and the project team continues to collect data whose analysis will support the academic success of transfer students.

Capstone Courses

CIC/DQP Consortium projects undertaken by teams from Franklin College (IN) and Point Loma Nazarene University focused mainly on capstone courses. The Franklin team used the DQP to develop student learning outcomes for the senior-year experience in two departments—journalism and biology and chemistry—then collected student artifacts from academic year 2012–2013 to assess the senior-year experience. In one example of institutional collaboration fostered by the CIC/DQP Consortium, at one of the summer 2012 regional meetings the Franklin team invited a faculty member from an institution in its cluster group, Tami Eggleston, associate dean and professor of psychology at McKendree University, to visit the Franklin College campus to conduct a workshop designed to identify assessment tools appropriate for Franklin’s DQP project.
The Point Loma Nazarene team used a pilot group of seven program areas—business administration; visual art; liberal studies; literature and English education; Spanish; philosophy; and mathematics, computer science, and computer information systems—to create university-wide standards for capstone experiences. An inventory of these seven program areas revealed significant variation in the standards and teaching methods used in capstone experiences. Departments most successful in the pilot project tended to be those that already had a strong culture of assessment and strong leadership. Student learning outcomes data from the seven areas were presented to the faculty. This presentation facilitated consideration of developing a capstone experience in all programs and energized the campus to reframe the Point Loma Nazarene University vision to improve the institution's curriculum and co-curriculum. Finally, the university plans to rewrite its student learning outcomes for general education to align with AAC&U's LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, which will provide standardization in the general education program.

Writing and Communication Skills

CIC/DQP Consortium projects at several institutions addressed student outcomes related to writing and communication skills, including two institutions mentioned earlier (Chatham University and Marymount California University) and another institution described below (Virginia Wesleyan College). At Daemen College, the campus team worked with three academic departments to map student learning outcomes to the DQP; the team then helped four additional departments connect course content to core competencies. Twenty-five faculty members completed an assessment framework for one course assignment and identified changes to improve teaching and learning in that course. In the process of implementation, the campus team discovered the need to redefine two core competencies—contextual integration and affective awareness—as faculty members have been unable to reach consensus on definitions of learning objectives for these competencies. The team took particular note of the importance of helping adjunct faculty members understand the core curriculum and their role in teaching and assessing both program and institutional learning goals. Future plans at Daemen include extending the assignment design project to other departments and using the DQP to help address the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools requirement for global competency.
Specialized Knowledge

As noted earlier, projects undertaken by Saint Augustine’s University (workforce and graduate school preparation), Southern New Hampshire University (business), and Nebraska Methodist College (health professions) examined some type of specialized knowledge. In a similar vein, the project team at Juniata College sought to use the DQP to assess the quality of three majors: communications, business, and environmental sciences. Using a series of surveys of students and faculty members, the Juniata team tested the degree to which the language of the DQP was understood across campus. Findings indicated that faculty and students in the three pilot departments had a good grasp of the DQP concepts, although the Civic Learning and Broad, Integrative Knowledge outcomes were perceived as less important than the other three outcomes. A criticism shared by faculty and students was that the DQP lacked measures for “immersive learning, creativity, and digital literacy skills” and that Civic Learning was focused too narrowly on politics and public policy rather than on community outreach and civic engagement “as social capital.” That said, commitment remains strong within the three pilot departments at Juniata to continue using the DQP.

First-Year Experience

Virginia Wesleyan College’s project team examined the college’s first-year experience, among other programs. The Virginia Wesleyan team administered pilot programs for three DQP areas (Broad, Integrative Knowledge; Intellectual Skills; and Specialized Knowledge) in general education courses and in the teacher education program using e-Portfolios of student learning artifacts at the first-year and senior levels. The data collected were reported to the faculty and became the basis for the design of faculty development programs. Specifically, Intellectual Skills, especially communication, were assessed in first-year composition classes; Broad, Integrative Knowledge was assessed in the first-year experience course and in a pilot senior-level capstone course; and Specialized Knowledge was assessed in the introductory teacher education course. The campus team quickly discovered the need for a rubric that measures the complexity of learning and distinguishes different levels of understanding. Virginia Wesleyan plans to continue to use the DQP to assess general education, to create signature assignments, and to help prepare for regional reaccreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
Lessons Learned

Common Strategies Used by the Projects

Three strategies were used by a number of campus teams participating in the CIC/DQP Consortium. Curriculum mapping played an especially important role at Concordia University Wisconsin, Nebraska Methodist College, Bethel University (MN), Westminster College (UT), Chatham University, D’Youville College, Juniata College, and Saint Augustine’s University. Many of the projects set out to define and articulate desired student learning outcomes. This was the case at Saint Augustine’s University, D’Youville College, the University of Charleston (WV), Chatham University, McKendree University, Marymount California University, and Daemen College. Finally, several institutions identified elements common to the DQP, their own academic programs, and other frameworks for learning outcomes, such as the AAC&U LEAP Essential Learning Outcomes, NSSE, the GPI, and the NCAA Division II Life in the Balance attributes.

Challenges Shared in the Projects

Although each campus team in the CIC/DQP Consortium dealt with issues specific to their institutions, several common challenges emerged during the course of the project. All teams faced a greater or lesser amount of resistance to use of the DQP, particularly among faculty members. Fortunately, the consortial format served to prepare project teams for any resistance they might face on their campuses. At the first consortium meeting, some participants articulated concerns about the DQP’s usefulness, providing a preview of potential reactions to the DQP they might find on their home campuses. Many of the CIC/DQP Consortium projects were undertaken on campuses that had experienced “initiative overload,” or a sense of fatigue from involvement in previous initiatives. In many cases, campus teams experienced unanticipated barriers to progress when members of the campus community perceived an effort to transform institutional practice without adequately consulting faculty members. One extreme example of this response came in the form of faculty accusations that the campus team was jeopardizing academic freedom. Several campuses reported faculty resistance because the DQP seemed to be an external imposition, and many teams learned the important lesson that communication across campus is essential to the success of any academic initiative. Although timing and effective strategies for communication varied from campus to campus, most teams found that involving key faculty leaders in systematic exploration of the DQP early in the process proved beneficial.
Most of the institutional teams faced a challenge because of the perception that the DQP framework would add yet another responsibility to faculty members who already felt overworked. One successful strategy for securing faculty engagement was to demonstrate how participation in the DQP project would result in more efficient use of time in the long run. Project teams often explained that the DQP could be a valuable tool to seek reaffirmation of accreditation, that it provided a coherent system for dealing with the need for colleges and universities to demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving student learning outcomes, and that it had the potential to foster a shared national language for assessment and accountability discussions. In addition, a few projects revealed that the DQP could be used as a marketing tool for a department or the entire institution. Finally, CIC/DQP Consortium participants made the case that the DQP could empower the higher education community to agree on standards for assessing quality in academic programs.

Despite the persuasiveness of these arguments, one looming challenge for CIC institutions is the extent to which additional financial and personnel resources are required to create and sustain a viable and successful campus assessment system. The DQP articulates what already has become an obvious truth within the assessment movement: Average scores are no longer sufficient evidence of student learning. If a college or university takes seriously its promise to provide a high-quality education for all its students, it must be able to utilize learning outcomes data for every student. This will require an expansion of data collection processes for many institutions, as well as additional resources to support this expansion.

Participants in the CIC/DQP Consortium recognized that use of the DQP to improve student learning significantly affects how faculty members plan and teach their courses. Consequently, several of the participating institutions already have put in place extensive faculty development programs to cultivate consensus on expected student learning outcomes and standards for measuring students’ achievement of those outcomes. In an academic community oriented around student learning, grading workshops and other venues that engender common standards are essential. Faculty members can benefit from discussions of strategies for creating effective syllabi and assignments with their peers. Although individual teaching styles should be encouraged and nurtured, it is critical that common standards for student learning be developed at the institutional, programmatic, and departmental levels.
Signature Assignments

One of the major outcomes of the CIC/DQP Consortium has been a heightened interest in “signature assignments” designed to provide clear evidence of students’ achievement of desired learning outcomes. Although grounded in a particular subject, signature assignments can serve as models for faculty members who teach in other disciplines and for all faculty members who teach sections of the same course. Members of the CIC/DQP Consortium have pointed to the creation of signature assignments as the crucial next step toward achieving that transformation.

NILOA, in partnership with Lumina, has provided a platform for meeting this need by assembling a library of DQP assignments on its website for each of the five DQP areas of learning as well as resources for designing effective assignments (www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/assignmentlibrary). NILOA also has featured a number of articles about projects using the DQP, including separate articles on several CIC/DQP Consortium institutions: DePauw University, McKendree University, Point Loma Nazarene University, Saint Augustine’s University, the University of Charleston (WV), and Westminster College (UT). In addition, NILOA has begun to bring together faculty members to demonstrate successful signature assignments and will conduct a series of assignment-design charrettes beginning in spring 2014.
Evaluating the Degree Qualifications Profile

In its grant application to Lumina, CIC pledged to help answer the important question of the usefulness of the DQP in fostering improvement in student learning on college campuses. The 25 institutional teams that were chosen for the consortium were charged with making a good faith effort to answer this question. Despite some initial reservations, most participants came to recognize the value of the DQP to provide a comprehensive model for evaluating the five identified areas of learning at the associate's, baccalaureate, and master's levels. In short, the DQP provides a kind of checklist for evaluating student learning. One of the most valuable results of the CIC/DQP Consortium is that several institutions found inadequacies, inaccuracies, or lack of clarity in their published statements of student learning outcomes as a result of comparing them with the DQP guidelines. Such use of the DQP can raise awareness regarding fundamental gaps between theory and practice, a necessary step toward clearer articulation and demonstration of student learning outcomes.

Several institutions that applied to join the CIC/DQP Consortium were motivated by the possibility of using the DQP to prepare for reaffirmation of regional accreditation. In fact, many expressed the belief that regional accreditors were likely to require use of the DQP in the reaffirmation process. HLC President Sylvia Manning assured institutional participants at the second meeting of the Consortium that HLC has no intention of requiring use of the DQP and has simply identified it as one of several pathways to achieving accreditation. Manning noted that regional accrediting agencies share the concern that the U.S. Department of Education might dictate use of the DQP in accreditation. The DQP has great potential to transform student learning, yet any externally imposed framework is likely to compromise its flexibility. Moreover, many DQP projects experienced negative reactions by faculty members to the perception of external imposition, reducing the DQP's efficacy in achieving positive change. While some of the consortium institutions plan to use the DQP voluntarily to prepare for reaffirmation of accreditation, nearly all participants cautioned against its use as a federal or state mandate.
Every institution participating in the CIC/DQP Consortium concluded that working with the DQP had been valuable and useful on their campuses. There were important caveats, however. The language of the DQP was a problem for many. Even in cases where students and faculty members achieved a good understanding of the language of the DQP, team members often pointed to redundancies or instances of lack of clarity. At times, participants also complained that the DQP language was confusing and too abstract. Others believed that the applicability of the DQP was compromised by the number of possible learning outcomes listed. Participants wondered whether the multiplicity of outcomes was intended to suggest a range of possibilities or, instead, a list of learning outcomes that should be accomplished at every institution. Perhaps the most common frustration with the DQP was insufficient use of examples or models for measuring student learning outcomes. It may have been unreasonable to expect that the document in its beta version would have included examples of specific indicators of student achievement; regardless, it is now evident that an important next step in the development of the DQP is to assemble a library of models for assessment tied to the DQP. As mentioned above, NILOA, with support from Lumina, is well on its way to providing this valuable service.

One of the controversial aspects of the DQP is the question of exactly what it represents. Should it be an aspirational model for American colleges and universities—a position held by many of the CIC/DQP Consortium participants—or should it be a declaration of minimal standards? The conflict is highlighted by the DQP’s requirement for proficiency in a second language, which many consortium institutions viewed as an unreasonable expectation of students. The issue is not what American students ought to know in order to become well educated; rather, it is what they can reasonably be expected to learn in the course of an undergraduate degree program. If the DQP is intended to articulate a competency-based set of requirements or essential expectations, then its acceptance as a working model for assessing student learning achievement in higher education is unlikely. A related, emergent question is whether all five areas of learning are relevant to all institutions. For example, should Civic Learning be expected at all types of institutions? The four authors of the DQP carefully avoided language that would portray the document as a set of standards that can and should be applied to every single college or university. Paradoxically, for the DQP to be useful, it must ultimately function as a set of expectations that is shared across higher education. CIC/DQP Consortium participants pointed out how unworkable it would be for each institution to create its own version of the DQP, leaving out items that did not seem relevant or possible for them. Achieving some level of agreement regarding standards for student learning while avoiding the complete standardization of American higher education remains a difficult dilemma to negotiate.
Contributions of the CIC/DQP Consortium

The CIC/DQP Consortium brought to light the persistent question of how common standards can be balanced with the threat of standardization. The focus on the language of the DQP in the CIC projects in discussions at consortium meetings and during the summer regional meetings helped Lumina focus on the audience for the document and influenced the production of future versions of the DQP aimed at faculty members, students, and external constituencies. One of the DQP’s strengths is its potential to provide a common language for discussions of student learning, though consortium members have suggested that the initial document be revised to include a media literacy competency and to provide a broader definition of Civic Learning. Finally, although the DQP has been vetted with employers, consortium members cautioned that the DQP should not reflect only what the business community currently seeks from graduates but should be grounded in extensive higher education research concerning the requirements for educational attainment.

The projects undertaken by the institutional participants in the CIC/DQP Consortium were creative, ambitious, and thorough, demonstrating how extensively the DQP can be used. The projects clearly show that independent small and medium-sized institutions, with all their financial and personnel limitations, can make significant contributions to an understanding of how academic programs can be improved through hard work and focus.

The most important contribution of the CIC/DQP Consortium was to reveal the profound impact the DQP can have in focusing attention on improvement in teaching and student learning. The DQP can serve as a powerful catalyst for campus conversations about the core institutional mission—teaching and learning. Indeed, without a functional and thorough system of assessment of student learning that includes periodic examination of the data by engaged faculty members, student outcomes cannot be improved. The time and energy required to create a vital and responsive system for assessing student learning will be wise investments if they lead to greater levels of student success.

Westminster College (Utah) is a comprehensive liberal arts college with 38 undergraduate majors and 14 graduate programs. Founded in 1875, the college currently enrolls 3,100 students (2,300 undergraduates and 800 graduate students). www.westminstercollege.edu
Almost 300 DQP projects are underway now across the country, suggesting that the DQP has the potential to make a powerful impact on American higher education. The pioneering work of the CIC/DQP Consortium contributed significantly to an understanding of the potential of the Degree Qualifications Profile to improve student learning and to the ability of higher education to demonstrate that learning achievement to itself and to the world.
## CIC Degree Qualifications Profile Consortium Participating Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Wallace University (OH)</td>
<td>Juniata College (PA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Path College (MA)</td>
<td>Marymount California University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry College (GA)</td>
<td>McKendree University (IL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel University (MN)</td>
<td>Nebraska Methodist College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham University (PA)</td>
<td>Point Loma Nazarene University (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University Wisconsin</td>
<td>Saint Augustine’s University (NC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daemen College (NY)</td>
<td>Southern New Hampshire University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis &amp; Elkins College (WV)</td>
<td>Tiffin University (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw University (IN)</td>
<td>University of Charleston (WV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Youville College (NY)</td>
<td>Virginia Wesleyan College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin College (IN)</td>
<td>Westminster College (UT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate University (CA)</td>
<td>Wofford College (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Names University (CA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>