

Participants were divided amongst five tables. Each table had outcomes from one Oregon university or community college and the DQP. One table included outcomes for Oregon's main associate transfer degree, the AAOT. Participants were asked to compare and contrast the two sets of outcomes looking for differences, similarities, missing components, and overall impressions. Participants moved around, having a chance to participate in three conversations about three different institutions. Each table had a "host" who stayed at the table and took notes. Here are the results of the conversations.

Comparison of Oregon State University liberal arts learning outcomes and DQP Bachelor's outcomes:

There is a different organization and different categories between the two.

OSU has specific disciplines and specific classes; the DQP is generalized across programs

OSU has applied their learning outcomes to classes: DPD (Difference, Power and Discrimination which is a curricular requirement of OSU liberal arts core) and WR more generalized, skills which characterizes the institution (and also aligns with DQP applied learning)

The DPD requirement at OSU is broad, integrated knowledge on the DQP

DPD might also involved civic learning from the DQP

OSU could map to the DQP, even though its categories are different than DQP

OSU gives a "how" application.

OSU's criteria articulate increasing levels of cognition

OSU clearer about the importance of liberal education through DPD

DQP operates at the 30,000 foot level and OSU outcomes are earthbound

The DQP doesn't include anything about fitness and nothing about evidence-based decision-making

OSU's headings are more compelling, where the DQP headings are more neutral descriptors

OSU outcomes synthesize multi-discipline approach; DQP seems to integrate two disciplines

OSU's outcomes are student friendly and the DQP is more abstract.

OSU singles out the importance of writing as a critical feature of thinking

Comparison of Lane Community College outcomes with DQP Associate's outcomes

Questions about mastery level: Implied or expressed in LCC outcomes and DQP

DQP uses Bloom's taxonomy levels but then seems more flat on that metric (confined to lower levels)

Lane targets the transfer to 4 year institution better than DQP.

Some LCC outcomes are intentionally aligned with DQP pieces (this shouts in category titles , some of language in Applied Learning

DQP seems more like "terminal" outcomes, rather than transfer-oriented.

DQP does better job of attempting to describe target level/depth for AA degree

"Terminal is ok, meaning even non-transfer degrees are important to consider but the concern of missing higher-order outcomes is necessary.

DQP seems more task/proof oriented.

Lane is beautifully broad, can be interpreted differently

DQP needs something in line with "creative process/thinking" which is central to Lane's outcomes

Lane's outcomes seem holistic, focused on communication, etc. (not on subject) – dispositional

DQP seems more specific, more tied to specific skills you could demonstrate – to the point of being too prescriptive.

Are either of these "measurable" enough?

Mathematics-related in DQP should be tied to reasoning-related areas.

Comparison of Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer outcomes and DQP Associate's outcomes

AAOT is skills and discipline thematic

Discipline thinking easier to concretize

DQP category differentiation is artificial or at least uncomfortable.

More integration with LEAP

AAOT development highly political

AAOT developed through inclusive faculty process

Advantage to broad perspective of DQP

DQP lacks emphasis on creative processes

What is the significance of place in the DQP

Explicit civic learning emphasis lacking in AAOT

Could Oregon change the DQP?

AAOT are requirements, DQP is non-normative feedback.

Comparison of Oregon Tech (OIT) outcomes and DQP Bachelor's outcomes

Needs to be more of a “sliding scale” between Associate and Bachelor's instead of a step/level

In the DQP, community service doesn't show up in bachelor's degree after its at Associate level (civic learning)

DQP doesn't specify working together/working in teams/ collaboration

Dqp idea that absolute threshold doesn't match student learning – doesn't acknowledge wholeness of student)

Comes across as tracking, rather than discussion about teaching and learning, not presented as informing teaching and learning but rather as tracking

DQP is broad enough that institutions have flexibility. Faculty need help “seeing” how and what they do fits in this structure.

Would like to see terms like quantitative reasoning brought into DQP. Students need help to understand how these are relevant to later professional life/role. Quantitative reasoning as opposed to math discipline.

We don't know how to measure adequately. Faculty lack the time.

DQP not well understood – “dirty word” to applied learning

DQP doesn't have recursive learning but implies scaffolding in learning.

L.O. can fit in multiple outcomes of DQP.

OIT outcomes are higher than DQP on Bloom's taxonomy.

OIT has specificity due to its mission (stem related)

Oregon Associate level is higher synthesis and thinking than DQP suggests. DQP seems prescriptive.

OIT Learning outcomes are about abilities, DQP is about outcomes. Mapping between the two is possible.

Degrees from institutions vary, thus mapping will vary.

DQP is missing ethics and ethical reasoning frameworks are not called out specifically

Outcomes in DQP don't evidence Higher Order thinking required to be ready for work or 4 year university.

Things missing in DQP: Creative process, fitness, evidence-based decision-making, collaboration skills

Valuse is in asking people to “be more intentional in assessing learning

How DQP is organized – is there an inherent hierarchy to some areas? Are these areas truly linear or could always abstract “up”

Should collaboration, working well, emotional intelligence skills be more specific in DQP?

DQP is another way, another model, it is helpful.

Faculty lack understanding of LO which may make it harder for institution to map to DQP. But could give details under a DQP area and ask faculty how could this help you frame learning outcomes?

Learning outcomes without verbs make it challenging perhaps to map to DQP but def. to assess (OIT specific_

With these learning outcomes, how would you map to DQP?

Comparison of Southwestern Oregon Community College outcomes to DQP Associate's outcomes

The college's outcomes are more specific

Distribution outcomes more closely align

DQP making assumptions about skill level of community college students, e.g. lower-order verbs

Evidence-based decision-making missing in DQP

Expectations for CTE students may not align

DQP is broad and generic

Is this just shuffling categories?

DQP is missing visibility of some of its pretexts, namely the financial motivation to measuring/establishing outcomes

Increase the visibility of teaching and learning.

At the end of the comparisons and conversations, each person was asked to reflect on the three conversations they had and talk at their tables about their observations and take-aways. Here are the comments and questions that arose at the end of the conversation:

If the institutional outcomes available at the tables are representative of all of Oregon's higher education institutions, the DQP outcomes fall short of the levels of student learning Oregon currently strives to attain.

Each conversation became more specific of differences. The DQP falls short of Bachelor's degree level.

DQP – good starting point, recognition that a broader range of outcomes is pursued/contained within our AAS degrees.

DQP language – too general, wordy, not student friendly. Outcomes need verbs. DQP levels are not a good match to the arc of learning and the transition 2 year to 4 year.

Are the DQP outcomes too low?

Are we just reshuffling outcomes into categories for the DQP?

The DQP just articulates differently what we are already doing within our curriculum. Are we protecting traditional, silo type viewpoint rather than integrating knowledge and skills?

Each conversation this morning seemed to involve some clarification of DQP. It's still an elusive concept.

The DQP doesn't guide toward learning outcomes, needs to come back to earth or how do those of us on earth make direct links to DQP and classroom

The DQP is broad open-ended learning, others are skill oriented

DQP is missing creativity and environment. Need a 6th category – creativity

Are skills acquired at the Associate level assumed they will be acquired at Bachelor level? How does this effect students who go to university without an associates?

DQP – absence of creativity?

DQP not specific enough in writing – more of an option vs. requirement.

Structures of institutions limit or discourage discussions about teaching and learning – no attention to instruction, competition for Professional Development funds. It happens in the department or not happening.

DQP is missing key elements e.g. writing

DQP uses too low language/expectations in Bloom's taxonomy.

Level of mastery described by outcomes

DQP is a reshuffling into categories that do not make curricular sense in terms of courses, sequencing, scaffolding