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DEGREE
The emphasis is on demonstrating learning appropriate for the award of a degree—regardless of discipline.

QUALIFICATIONS
It is organized according to domains of learning through which students qualify to demonstrate proficiencies developed through study.

PROFILE
It offers standards that colleges may use as a template for developing their learning outcomes. It does not “standardize” outcomes.
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- The *Profile* should “describe *concretely* what is meant by each of the degrees addressed.”
- The *Profile* should “illustrate how students should be expected to perform *at progressively more challenging levels*.”
- The outcomes expressed in the *Profile* should be *summative*—and should be approachable by multiple paths.
- The outcomes should be *illustrative*, as no profile can be comprehensive.
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Five areas of learning

- Integrative Knowledge
- Specialized Knowledge
- Intellectual Skills
- Applied Learning
- Civic Learning

Interrelated, not discrete
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- Offer reference points for students, faculty, advisors, accreditation
- Create expectation for a curriculum that is clearly intentional, coherent, cumulative
- Encourage assessment
- Support institutional alignment with accreditors’ expectations
- Provide a baseline for institutions seeking to clarify their distinctiveness
- Clarify the incremental nature of degree levels, thereby encouraging progression
What a Profile

Is **NOT** Intended To Do
What a Profile
Is *NOT* Intended To Do

➡️ Standardize degrees
What a Profile Is NOT Intended To Do

- Standardize degrees
- Define what should be taught
What a Profile
Is NOT Intended To Do

→ Standardize degrees
→ Define what should be taught
→ Prescribe pedagogy
What a Profile Is *NOT* Intended To Do

- Standardize degrees
- Define what should be taught
- Prescribe pedagogy
- Encourage rankings, internally or externally
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Release of *The Degree Qualifications Profile* in October 2014 following three years trial use of Beta version by 400+ colleges and universities
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Release of *The Degree Qualifications Profile* in October 2014 following three years trial use of Beta version by 400+ colleges and universities

Commitment to merge DQP and Tuning as alternate strategies for developing disciplinary and institutional learning outcomes
Why a DQP “second edition”?

• As users have reported on their experience, the authors, NILOA, and Lumina have listened

• The DQP now reflects the thoughtful input of hundreds of individuals and organizations who have reviewed and used it
Is the “new DQP” a *radical* revision?
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• Short answer:
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• Short answer: NO.
A radical revision?

Longer answer:
A radical revision?

Longer answer: Those engaged in implementation or adaptation of the DQP may be confident that its structure and contents have not been substantially altered. But there are significant enhancements that respond to advice and experience.
What are some noticeable changes?

- New proficiency statements concerning ethical reasoning
- Greater emphasis on global learning
- Stronger and more descriptive statements concerning quantitative reasoning
- Lexicon for terms used in the DQP
And . . .

Greater emphasis on

- Independent investigation at all degree levels
- Analytical, cooperative approaches to learning that transcend fields of study
- Integration of intellectual skills with broad, specialized, applied, and civic learning
And, finally . . .

Acknowledgement of credentials not (yet) defined at this stage of the qualifications profile work

• Certificates
• Other short-cycle credentials
• Professional practice doctorates
• The Ph.D.
More “user friendly”?  

DQP now responds to requests by directing users to resources that support the assessment of DQP proficiencies.
More “user friendly”? 

DQP now proposes a preliminary lexicon that defines higher education terms *as used in* the DQP
More “user friendly”?

DQP now clarifies “family resemblances” between the DQP and the Tuning Process
More “user friendly”?  

DQP 2.0 responds to recurring questions and issues concerning the DQP
More “user friendly”?

DQP now includes examples of institutional and organizational experience in using the DQP
TUNING?
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TUNING?
Developed in Europe in association with the Bologna Process, “Tuning” convenes faculty members in particular disciplines—often from multiple institutions—to develop learning outcomes for that discipline at each stage of the program.
Tuning and the DQP
ONCE ON PARALLEL TRACKS

DQP Limited

TUNING EXPRESS
NOW ON THE SAME TRACK

DQP Tuning
A learning-centered framework for what college graduates should know and be able to do to earn the associate, bachelor’s or master’s degree.

A process by which faculty in different fields of study determine discipline-specific desired learning outcomes for their subject area through consultations with one another, colleagues on other campuses, students, alumni, and employers.
“It takes two . . . To make a thing go right”  
APOLOGIES TO MARVIN GAYE

The DQP

- Offers a degree qualifications profile—exclusive of discipline-by-discipline qualifications
- Describes a product (the degree) but implies a process (general education → a major)
- An institutional process across disciplines

Tuning

- Invites disciplinary qualifications profiles—consistent with degree-level qualifications
- Describes a process (general education → a major) but implies a product (the degree)
- A discipline-by-discipline process across institutions
Different strokes for different folks
APOLOGIES TO SLY AND THE FAMILY STONE

Begin with Tuning
Some colleges may find it more practical to ask disciplines to clarify their incremental outcomes—then derive institutional degree qualifications from the result.

Begin with the DQP
Some institutions may find it more practical to define degree-level outcomes—then ask disciplines to frame incremental outcomes consistent with them.
Prompts for Tuning . . .

- Increased emphasis on accountability
- Corresponding emphasis on assessment
- Focus on achievement of credentials
- Critical scrutiny by policy makers
- Concerns about student persistence
- Employer dissatisfaction
- Faculty interest in disciplinary-level consensus
are prompts for the DQP as well
Tuning and the DQP: 3 Principles

1. Higher education must tell its story more effectively—or others may write it.

2. Increasing the number of credentials awarded is meaningless unless there is a guarantee of quality.

3. Both Tuning and the DQP should address these concerns in ways that institutions, faculty members, students, and many others can USE.
The Town Hall
How suitable are Tuning materials and the DQP for use by assessment leaders? What might be done to make them more useful? What related resources (e.g., the NILOA Assignments Library) might assist leaders in strengthening assessment planning, implementation, and management?
What strategies might lead to a broader and more consistent commitment within the academy to explicit, assessable learning outcomes? Does it make sense first to stress the importance of explicit and assessable outcomes and, second, to emphasize the usefulness in this regard of Tuning, the DQP, and other resources such as the Essential Learning Outcomes and the VALUE rubrics?
Too often, it appears, institutions and programs commit to robust assessment without first reaching consensus on explicit, assessable learning outcomes. What are the likely consequences of such a misstep—and how can they be ameliorated after the fact?
Although clear statements of learning outcomes and related assessment strategies express a fundamental faculty value, both often emerge within an institution as administrative exercises. How might we emphasize more effectively the faculty role and responsibility?
Are there success stories concerning the alignment of clear statements of learning outcomes with effective assessment? About applications of Tuning and/or the DQP?
What advice would you have concerning the communication of expectations regarding clear, assessable learning outcomes—by accreditors, by administrators, by faculty members?
What advice would you have concerning future iterations of the DQP and Tuning?
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