NILOA’s mission is to discover and disseminate effective use of assessment data to strengthen undergraduate education and support institutions in their assessment efforts.

- **Surveys** • **Web Scans** • **Case Studies** • **Focus Groups**
- **Occasional Papers** • **Website** • **Resources** • **Newsletter**
- **Listserv** • **Presentations** • **Transparency Framework**
- **Featured Websites** • **Accreditation Resources** • **Assessment Event Calendar** • **Assessment News** • **Measuring Quality Inventory** • **Policy Analysis** • **Environmental Scan**
- **Degree Qualifications Profile**

[www.learningoutcomesassessment.org](http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org)
NILOA’s role with the DQP

NILOA is “harvesting” (collecting, analyzing, summarizing, synthesizing) what can be learned from all of the funded and unfunded work

- Web scans
- Project meetings
- Institutional Activity Report
- Case studies (see DQP Corner)
400 institutions are using or have used the DQP, 165 funded by Lumina.
Regional Accreditors
• ACCJC (15)
• HLC (23)
• SACS (22)
• WASC (28)

Organizations
• AASCU (6 in 3 state systems)
• AAC&U (21)
• CIC (25)

States
• Oregon (24)

http://www.learningoutcomesassessment.org/DQPNew.html#Funded
Institutional Control

Number of institutions

- Public: 230
- Private: 150
- Private For-Profit: 20
- N/A: 5
The bar chart illustrates the use of DQP (Data Quality Project) across various institutional processes and activities. The activities are ranked by the number of institutions using them:

1. Discussion of DQP (200 institutions)
2. Outcome Review (190 institutions)
3. Curriculum Mapping (140 institutions)
4. Transfer (110 institutions)
5. Program Development (105 institutions)
6. Accreditation (95 institutions)
7. Strategic Planning (75 institutions)
8. Assessment (65 institutions)
9. Other (30 institutions)
10. Missing Data (20 institutions)
Who Is Involved?

- Faculty: 120
- Administration: 200
- Student: 30
- Contingent Faculty: 30
- Student Affairs: 20
- Employer: 10
- Missing data: 180
74% of Provosts Are Aware of the DQP
2013 Provost Survey
DQP Awareness and Use by Institutional Type

![Graph showing the number of institutions with awareness and use of DQP by institutional type.](image-url)
Awareness of DQP by Selectivity

Provost Survey 2013

Percentage of Institutions

Special or Not Identified
Less Competitive and...
Competitive and...
Very Competitive and...
Highly Competitive and...
Most Competitive
What We’re Learning

- 90% of early users found DQP 1.0 “dense”
- DQP is a conversation starter: offers a common vocabulary for talking about outcomes
- Spider web viewed by some as helpful (SACS), by others as confusing
- Curricular mapping: Where are students mastering these proficiencies, especially re: gen ed? Where are the gaps?
- Certify transfers, align and “streamline” systems
What We’re Learning

- Initiative fatigue
- Faculty engagement and ownership are essential, which take time
- Doing assessment right is a continuing, perennial challenge.
Cliff’s 12-minute work-out

• How and why did I get into this?
• Version 1 and Version 2: what’s different?
• Competence versus Proficiency
• Intertwining with the disciplines: the Tuning dimension
• Language rules, virtues, and their logical extensions, leading to . . .
Peter’s 12-minute work-out

• How and why did I get into this?
• Assessment implications of the DQP
  – *All* students must demonstrate proficiency
  – So assessment must be *embedded* in the curriculum
  – *Assignments* that can do this must be carefully designed to ensure that the resulting student work can be consistently scored
  – And a *record keeping* system must be in place to aggregate, analyze, and report data on student performance
  – All of this will require a good deal of *faculty development*