Degree Qualifications Profile Conference
SESSION DESCRIPTIONS

October 25-26, 2012
Lane Community College

The Degree Profile describes student performance appropriate
for each degree level through clear reference points that indicate the incremental and cumulative nature of learning.
Focusing on conceptual knowledge and essential competencies and their applications, the Degree Profile illustrates
how students should be expected to perform at progressively more challenging levels.

Day 1: October 25, 2012

Lunch Plenary Panel II: 12:15-1:00

Lunch Plenary Panel II	Why the Oregon DQP Matters: Institutional and Statewide Perspectives *Moderated by Ron Baker* *Mark Williams, Sarah Witte, Larry Cheyne, Karen Marrongelle*	CML 220
Description: The Bologna Project, in general, and the Degree Qualifications Profile Project, in particular, are attempts to articulate greater clarity on the meaning of student knowledge, skills, and abilities inherent in collegiate-level degrees. Why does this work matter to Oregon? What opportunities does it offer institutions—individually and collectively—to foster student success, goal achievement, and degree completion? This session will present local and global perspectives on the benefits and challenges of individual and collective institutional conversations on the meaning of Oregon degrees. **Outcomes:** Participants will have a context for the relevance of the DQP to Oregon institutions. Participants will also have a framework for the institutional conversations on project work plans.		

Breakout Sessions 1:10-2:10 p.m.

Breakout 1	**Creative Commons, DQP and being open** *Cable Green*	**CML 102**
Description: This session is for those who are interested in learning more about open educational resources and specifically about creative commons. "Creative Commons develops, supports, and stewards legal and technical infrastructure that maximizes digital creativity, sharing, and innovation." [http://creativecommons.org/] **Outcomes:** At the end of the session participants will (1) identify strategies for using open educational resources (2) assess the relevance of "openness" for the DQP work		
Breakout 2	DQP Spider-web Mapping the Curriculum *Mark William, Kyle Schmidt, Christina Howard*	**CML 105**
Description: This session is for both faculty and instructional administrators who want to see how to work with the DQP mapping in a practical way, whether at the course- or program-level, for program design or as a system for use in accreditation. The presenters from UCC and LCC will share their experiences with using the DQP mapping at both the course and program level, followed by time for group discussion of issues, ideas and questions. Participants will have the opportunity to try it out for themselves, and are encouraged to bring examples of course- and program-level outcomes from their institutions for this hands-on work. **Outcomes:** At the end of the session participants will: (1) identify methods to create DQP course- and program-level mapping, and (2) identify strategies for how they might engage in this mapping at their schools		
Breakout 3	**Working Institutionally: Modeling a Process for Faulty Ownership Across Degree Programs** *Sarah Witte, Cori Brewster, Donna Evans, Karen Marongelle*	**CML 220**
Description: The Degree Qualification Profile work involves design, scale, and purposeful direction that arises out of an institution's existing needs and plans. In this session, OUS will give a system-wide perspective for engaging OUS universities in the work of the DQP. EOU will provide a sample institutional DQP work plan predicated on the following strategic principles to maximize success: 1) an administrative sense of the DQP framework as a whole to give direction and momentum through several phases of work, 2) scaling the whole to serve an immediate institutional *and* degree program need across the curriculum, and 3) selecting pilot programs to implement a well-designed process for faculty engagement. EOU faculty will offer interactive perspective on the challenges to faculty engagement followed by a process-oriented model that initiates conversations that result in faculty ownership of valued learning outcomes that frame a bachelor's degree. **Outcomes:** Participants will be given a sense of perspective and scale at the system and institutional levels, along with a sample institutional work plan that documents the DQP initiative. Participants will also leave with a model for engaging faculty in conversation about the value of writing, for example.		

Breakout 4	ePortfolios and Engaging Community in DQP *Gary Brown*	CML 225

Description: This session will share a strategy for using ePortfolios to span classroom and institutional boundaries to engage faculty, students, and the broader community in the work of the DQP. The rationale for this strategy will be presented in light of current teaching and assessment practice and emerging trends, particularly MOOCs and prior learning assessment that appear to be altering the landscape of higher education. Real writing and critical thinking assessment results will be shared to illustrate challenges that underscore the implications of the DQP. Participants will be invited to join in one or more of PSU's current initiatives in ways that value and even integrate their own campus initiatives in order to help shape the future of the DQP.

Outcomes: Participants in this session will be invited to join us in the pilot assessment as it unfolds this fall and winter. They will be invited to review alignment of activities with the outcomes, the criteria used to assess outcomes, and to apply DQP criteria to assess student work. Participants in this session will understand what the invitation entails, including how ePortfolios can be used to extend and deepen our work. Participants will be invited to help articulate a working hypothesis or two for this experiment. For instance, Oregon institutions of higher education will establish a vital and new approach to collaboration.

Breakout 5	Information Technology/Institutional Research (IT/IR) Considerations for the DQP, Part I *Pat Griffin, Tim Wilson, Larry Cheyne*	CML 205

Description: Participants will engage in a dialogue with DQP IT/IR team members. The session will explore the infrastructure needed for the project, what has been developed preliminarily, and what should be kept in mind as the team explores IT/IR to support the overall DQP effort. The session will be an opportunity for participants to learn about the current status of DQP development and provide input directly to team members.

Outomes: Participants will gain understanding of the role of IT/IR in the project. Participants will be able to recognize some of the initial tools and resources that are under consideration. The IT/IR team will come away with ideas from participants.

Breakout Sessions 2:20-3:20 p.m.

Breakout 6	Connecting the DQP to Current Work at your Institution *Carol Schaafsma, Co-coordinator of DQP Project*	CML 220

Description: Don't want to do yet another initiative? Afraid to add one more thing to your work load? Come to this session to figure out how the DQP can enhance work you are already involved in, rather than add another thing to your to-do list. Whether you are working on assessing student outcomes, going through a program review process, developing a new program, or getting ready for accreditation reports, the DQP can add to your conversations and insights about your degrees and certificates.

Outcomes: Participants will develop a strategy for aligning the deliverables for the DQP grant with their own institution's work.

Breakout 7	**Information Technology/Institutional Research (IT/IR) Considerations for the DQP, Part II** *Pat Griffin, Time Wilson and Larry Cheyne*	**CML 205**

Description: Participants will brainstorm next steps that may be appropriate based on the discussion from part 1. The approach will be an interactive "what-if" design session.
Outcomes: Participants will gain understanding of the role of IT/IR in the project. Participants will be able to recognize some of the initial tools and resources that are under consideration. The IT/IR team will come away with ideas from participants.

Breakout 8	**Principles of a Backward Designed DQP Assessment Process** *Peggy Maki*	**CML 102**

Description: This session focuses on principles of a backward designed DQP assessment process that chronologically monitors student progress towards collaboratively agreed upon outcomes and the exit level work that demonstrates or represents the integration of DQP outcomes. More than an act of accountability, assessment becomes a means of learning about how well students progress towards agreed upon final assignments and your standards and criteria of judgment.
Outcomes: participants will learn about and discuss ways to: (1) Scaffold assignments that provide students with chronological practice towards achieving DQP outcomes, (2) Use chronologically situated muddy problems, critical incidents, case studies, team-based problem solving, scenarios, simulations or media based projects that position students to integrate their learning, and (3) Collaboratively and chronologically monitor students' achievement of desired outcomes to identify barriers or obstacles they encounter that--if not addressed—predict lower than expected performance.

Breakout 9	DQP Spider-web Mapping the Curriculum *Mark Williams and Kyle Schmidt and Christina Howard*	**CML 105**

Description: This session is for both faculty and instructional administrators who want to see how to work with the DQP mapping in a practical way, whether at the course- or program-level, for program design or as a system for use in accreditation. The presenters from UCC and LCC will share their experiences with using the DQP mapping at both the course and program level, followed by time for group discussion of issues, ideas and questions. Participants will have the opportunity to try it out for themselves, and are encouraged to bring examples of course- and program-level outcomes from their institutions for this hands-on work.
Outcomes: At the end of the session participants will: (1) identify methods to create DQP course- and program-level mapping, and (2) identify strategies for how they might engage in this mapping at their schools

Breakout 10	**What is the Bologna Process? What is it not? What can we learn?** *Johannes De Gruyter*	**CML 225**

Description: Since May of 1999, 46 European countries have been engaged in reforming their higher education systems to create a European Higher Education Area where academic degree standards and quality assurance standards are more compatible and comparable. This voluntary undertaking, known as the Bologna Process, is evidently a major inspiration behind the efforts of the Lumina Foundation. Lumina has sponsored major studies of the process and started its pilots of what a system would look like across several American states. The DQP project is one of these pilot studies.

This presentation takes a closer look at what Europe has achieved and learned in the last 10 years particularly in terms of working with student learning outcomes within 'qualification frameworks'. What is the European Qualification framework and how does it relate to the Degree Qualification Profile? How was it implemented? Were there (common) obstacles and how were they solved? What can we learn from this process for this project in Oregon? The session will have plenty of practical examples from various institutions in Europe, especially the university-colleges and the University of Leuven in Flanders, Belgium where I was personally involved in aspects of its implementation.

Outcomes: By the end of this session participants will be able to: (1) Define and discuss the key drivers and main components of the Bologna Process, (2) Interpret the DQP project with reference to those key components, and (3) Reflect on their own DQP planning and implementation processes based on the various illustrations and examples.

Day 2: October 26, 2012

Breakout Sessions 1:00-2:00 p.m.

Horizontal Alignment OUS	Working Horizontally: Integrating Content Tuning and Liberal Education into the DQP *Ron Baker, Karen Marrongelle, Sarah Witte, Gary Brown*	CML 220

Description: In this session, we will lead OUS faculty and administrators in a discussion of mapping bachelors degrees to the DQP framework across OUS institutions. We will discuss examples (e.g., history, chemistry) from the tuning work done in other states. Tuning is a faculty-driven process that identifies what a student should know and be able to do in a chosen discipline when a degree has been earned. However, we will discuss extending the tuning work to incorporate Oregon's liberal education learning outcomes in order to create a more complete picture of the skills associated with a degree earned. We will incorporate campus-based Learning Outcomes & Assessment work in writing and discuss how writing can be used as a prototype for other liberal education requirements.

Outcomes:
Participants will understand how work with other campus initiatives can be leveraged in conducting work on the DQP. Participants will distinguish differences between a DQP mapping and distribution/degree requirements. And, Participants will leave with frameworks to prototype mappings of a major to the DQP, with an emphasis on discriminating between the liberal arts contributions to the liberal education component of a baccalaureate degree and the contributions of the major to a baccalaureate degree.

MM Cart, 2 wall sized post it pads, 15 markers, work in groups

Horizontal Alignment Community Colleges *Carol Schaafsma, Larry Cheyne, Mark Williams, Elizabeth Lundy*	CML 102

In this session Community College faculty and administrators will discuss mapping the associate's degrees to the DQP framework across the Oregon community colleges. Specifically the AAOT and AAS will be used as case studies of understand issues related to horizontal alignment of a degree.

Outcomes: Participants will: (1) understand the factors to be considered at defining degree level outcomes, and (2) how work with other campus initiatives can be leveraged in conducting work on the DQP (3) distinguish differences between a DQP mapping and distribution/degree requirement.