Describe the lessons learned as result of your work with the QC project and/or the DQP:

There are a number of lessons learned, both macro-level (i.e., focused on the project’s overarching goals and how they fit into the UW System’s LEAP work, focused as it is on quality educational attainment) and micro-level (lessons learned on the ground, more at the practice level). These lessons include:

Macro:

- Clearly articulated learning outcomes and levels of proficiencies, at both the course-level and program-level, are the essential building blocks that support student and learning-centered transfer evaluations. Without this foundation, the evaluation of transfer is based on inputs, not outputs.
- Despite this critical lesson, we still live in a policy world that—despite claims to the contrary—values outputs which say little about the quality and depth of student learning, i.e., credits, course numbers, and grades. And for all the UW System’s good engagement with student learning outcomes, we still structure learning for our students in ways that uphold these necessary but insufficient measures. The QC project has tried to disrupt this and yet, at the end of the day, it’s difficult to upend the orthodoxy of the credit hour and its stronghold on student transfer as the currency for student learning. Read below for ways in which we are trying!
- Change projects like QC work best when integrated into already existing initiatives taking place systemwide or at the campus level, and when they address existing system or institutional goals.
- Elevator speeches on initiatives like QC and LEAP, in general, remain elusive and this speaks to the problem in explaining the good work that we do to our publics in ways that are clear, digestible, and compelling.

Micro:

- The DQP is not an easy framework with which to engage and more work needs to be done up front to help faculty and staff understand its utility, benefits, and what “problems” it helps resolve. It takes a dedicated group of faculty to own it, apply it to their institutional context in ways that are meaningful and scalable, and to then act as missionaries to spread the word with others on their campuses.

How did your work at the state level connect with or leverage other, similar projects?

- The QC project has taken its place as one of the UW System’s signature LEAP initiatives, and it’s a place of prominence given the System’s ten-year LEAP Wisconsin work. The QC project represents the culmination of work focused on shared learning goals, shared definitions of quality insistently introduced and integrated into the System’s educational attainment goals (More Graduates for Wisconsin), Compass
work on curricular reform, HIPs and underserved student success. In fact, the QC project is a wonderful expansion of the Compass project (even though only one of the four UW campuses involved in QC was part of Compass), and we know other QC participants would agree (CSU most notably). QC has been leveraged as a part of the broader LEAP work and a leverage point for moving the System’s LEAP work in new directions and with some new campus partners, in particular within the policy context we now find ourselves in around transfer (different from where we began three years ago, as described below).

*How have you leveraged work related to student learning outcomes happening at various institutions including public, private, and tribal colleges?*

- The System’s QC project has coincided quite fortuitously with two other systemwide initiatives focused on student learning outcomes and competencies, the UW Flexible Option and the Lumina-funded Prior Learning Assessment. The QC campuses/institutions are involved in both Flex and/or PLA, and the timing of the unfolding curricular development and assessment has overlapped in remarkably productive ways, especially for the UW-Waukesha and UW-Parkside dyad. The exchange and dialogue among the different modalities and delivery models has been extremely productive and QC/DQP has informed and enriched the development of Flex curricula, the BAAS, and PLA, and vice versa.
- In October 2013, we hosted the “UW System Assessment Institute,” intentionally designed to bring together faculty and staff working on Flex, PLA and QC, i.e., programs focused on student learning outcomes and competency-driven modalities. The Institute provided assessment methodology, tools and practices, resulting in a shared sense of purpose and allowing team time for participants to advance project goals. The Institute was open to other UW faculty and staff, beyond those working on QC, Flex and PLA, and thus provided a venue for an even wider sharing of projects and best practices to almost 100 people.
- In Fall 2014, we will host a one-day systemwide transfer symposium (using the remainder of our QC funding), which will focus on helping to make competencies/proficiencies a more accepted currency for student learning and transfer. Speaking to the sustainability of the QC project, we envision this as part one of a two-, perhaps three-part discussion forum on the changing context of transfer in the UW System as we move towards a more competency-based learning environment.
- This work all takes place along a continuum of change efforts and if one looks at these efforts in the aggregate, momentum is gaining, in Wisconsin and across the country.

Additional lessons, articulated as emerging themes towards developing a set of principles and policies, are in the policy section below (p.5).

**Policy-Related Topics:**

**Questions to consider:**

- What policies did you engage with during the project timeframe?
- How did you engage with these policies? Did you adjust, influence, or eliminate any policies, as a result of this process?
- What policies leveraged the work at the campus and/or state level?
- What policies presented barriers?
- What policies (real or imagined) would have helped facilitate the QC work, or could help, going forward—given an ideal scenario?

Student transfer in the UW System is guided by two sets of policies and one statutory requirement. These include the UW System Academic Information Series (ACIS) 6.0: Undergraduate Transfer Policy), 6.2 (Guidelines for Articulation Agreements), and the UW System/Wisconsin Technical College System Universal Credit Transfer Agreement (UCTA) that was established pursuant to section 36.31(2m), Wisconsin Statutes.
The UW System also endorses the Joint Statement on the Transfer and Award of Credit developed by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). This document sets forth a number of basic assumptions regarding the transfer of credit between institutions, whether they are similar or dissimilar. The joint agreement highlights three considerations, relative to transfer:

1. the educational quality of the learning experience which the student transfers
2. the comparability of the nature, content, and level of the learning experience to that offered by the receiving institution; and
3. the appropriateness and applicability of the learning experience to the programs offered by the receiving institution, in light of the student's educational goals.

UW System transfer policy, as articulated in ACIS 6.0 and 6.2, does not necessarily present barriers to the types of transfer frameworks developed in this project; however, it may be useful to demonstrate how institutions may work within the context of these policies to develop alternative transfer agreements for students. As the UW System continues to develop competency-based completion models, we would hope that we can amend our transfer policy language so that it is more inclusive of this practice. Those of us working on QC, Flex and PLA will be watching this and the Transfer Symposium referenced below will allow for some initial discussion of this topic.

ACIS 6.0 articulates a set of principles of accommodation that are intended to ease student transfer. Here are some policy examples and considerations as to how these policies may facilitate or impede the QC work:

- **Institutions are directed to recognize general education/liberal arts requirements in terms of broad academic areas as well of specific courses.**

  As general education programs evolve, this principle provides institutions latitude to articulate transfer of competencies and activities that are not specifically linked to course subject content. An example of this may be the service learning activities and global learning competencies and activities mapped by the UW-Oshkosh and UW-Fox dyad.

- **Institutions may award transfer credit for courses for which they do not have a comparable department or curricular area, or for which they do not have a direct course equivalent.**

  This guideline provides institutions with flexibility to articulate transfer of credit or award credit for prior learning in ways that satisfy broad general education requirements or requirements that seek to attain a specific set of essential learning outcomes.

- **UW baccalaureate-granting institutions must consider transfer students holding a UW Associate Degree to have satisfied the university-wide general education/breadth requirements of the receiving institution. However, institutions may also require transfer students to complete additional GE/breadth requirements; demonstrate stated competency proficiencies, and complete upper-division coursework required in the receiving institution’s GE program, if these requirements are also expected of continuing students.**

  The QC work was particularly successful in demonstrating ways in which a sending and receiving institution can find pathways to support completion of additional GE requirements and proficiencies, as well as gain credit transfer for upper-division coursework. While UW System policy allows this practice, it may be difficult for institutions to operationalize the practice. The outcomes of our QC work do just that. For example, the UW-Oshkosh/UW-Fox dyad mapped the essential learning outcome on
global learning and connected the learning to proficiency requirements within the UW-Oshkosh University Studies Program (USP). The dyad (as well as UW Colleges and UW-Oshkosh as a whole) are considering how the new UW Colleges Service Learning designation, as applied to several courses, may fulfill an upper-level USP course requirement. Furthermore, the UW-Parkside/UW-Waukesha dyad documented in their expansive AAS/BAAS DQP QC project how a range of proficiencies, both at the lower and upper division, map across the two degree programs. Both of these findings can be replicated across other UW College campus and UW comprehensive institution dyads.

ACIS 6.2 primarily discusses practices related to WTCS and UW System institution articulation agreements, though the guidelines may also be applied to the UW Colleges/UW 4-year transfer guides. Articulation agreements are program-to-program agreements that offers credit transfer exceptions to students enrolled in those specific programs. The mapping of learning outcomes is the essential practice that builds these agreements, academic program maps are the means by which the agreements and expectations are articulated to the student. The learning acquired in this project may be applied to the development of new articulation agreements.

For example, the DQP AAS to BAAS mapping exercise completed by the UW-Parkside/UW-Waukesha dyad may be replicated to the other five AAS/BAAS UW College and UW-4 year campus partnerships. Additionally, the UW College campuses authorized to offer the BAAS are currently working with their comprehensive partners to build new articulation agreements and transfer guides that will allow students to take coursework from any BAAS 4-year campus partner, so that the student has more options to identify coursework that is in keeping with his or her academic and career goals. Furthermore, the BAAS partners are currently modifying their agreements to articulate transfer of credits and learning from students with Associate of Applied Sciences from a regional WTCS campus, into the BAAS program. Mapping methodologies and prototypes developed by the UW-Parkside/Waukesha dyad may be applied to develop new and alternative, and proficiency-based articulation agreements and academic maps that facilitate transfer for a new student population.

On July 1, 2013, midway through QC project implementation, Wisconsin Statutes, § 36.31(2m), the State of Wisconsin 30-Credit Transfer Rule, became law. The statutory requirements went into effect on July 1, 2014. Specifically,

The University of Wisconsin (UW) System and Wisconsin Technical College System (WTCS) shall “implement an agreement that identifies core general education courses totaling not fewer than 30 credits” that are “transferable and would satisfy general education requirements at the receiving institution or college, between and within each institution, college campus, and technical college.” [Wisconsin Statutes, § 36.31(2m)(b)]

The statute defines core general education courses to mean,

“Courses generally required for an undergraduate degree that are prerequisite or otherwise in addition to the courses required for an undergraduate degree in a specific course of study.” [Wisconsin Statutes, § 36.31(2m)(a)(1)]

It is worth noting that one-third of new undergraduate degree-seeking students in the University of Wisconsin System enter as transfer students. Of that figure, more than 60% come from the Wisconsin Technical College System or from within the University of Wisconsin System. For details, along with additional information on transfer data in the UW System, go to: http://www.uwsa.edu/opar/orb-im/im/transfer/ts_1213.pdf.

The Universal Credit Transfer Agreement (UCTA) between the University of Wisconsin and Wisconsin Technical College System satisfies the requirement expressed in the statute by establishing 11 course subject sets, totaling between 38-44 credits, that are transferable to any UW or WTCS institution. The agreement is focused exclusively on course-to-course equivalencies and defines general education as a buffet selection of unrelated credits and/or prerequisites, antithetical to how AAC&U and some of our best LEAP campuses view GE.
the development of this policy was unrelated to the QC work, and is—to say the least—old-school in its approach to transfer (i.e., not focused on student learning outcomes or competencies), this legislative requirement did heighten the conversation, even if it felt like a step backward in terms of quality curricular offerings as the pathway to transfer. As a means to establishing the UCTA, UW System Administration pulled together a group of UW Transfer Coordinators and GE directors to develop agreement recommendations. Members of this group will also be engaged to advise UW and WTCS around implementation. We intend to share the lessons learned in the QC project so that they can guide emerging conversations around articulation of course- and program-level learning outcomes, development of transfer pathways, impediments to transfer.

It is worth noting that one-third of new undergraduate degree-seeking students in the University of Wisconsin System enter as transfer students. Of that figure, more than 60% come from the Wisconsin Technical College System or from within the University of Wisconsin System. For details, along with additional information on transfer data in the UW System, go to: [http://www.uwsa.edu/opar/orb-im/im/transfer/ts_1213.pdf](http://www.uwsa.edu/opar/orb-im/im/transfer/ts_1213.pdf).

Several themes of learning emerged as the result of the QC project and we believe learning could/should be integrated into and disseminated as a set of future principles and policies around transfer, at the state, system, and institutional level. Identified themes include:

- There has been a noticeable shift in HLC thinking about the interplay between assessment of prior learning and how it articulates a transfer of learning, rather than a transfer of credit.
- The QC project reveals the need to focus more on student transitions (not just transfer): there is a collective need to shift the paradigm from student and credit transfer, to student and academic program transitions.
- In that same vein, we need to work on shifting transfer advising practices from those that are purely transactional to those that focus on transition and progression of learning toward a student articulated set of educational and career goals.
- We notice in our QC project and those of the other states a shift in thinking that promotes the student experience as the means to unify distinct institutions and program outcomes when students transfer, vs. separation of institutions and two distinct sets of student experiences and outcomes.
- We recognize (even if we aren’t there yet) the need to establish methods to promote, assess, and document a continuum of student learning that spans formal and non-formal academic and career experiences. This plays out in the QC project, as well as Flex and PLA.
- We need to further foster methodologies that enable student to own and value their learning, as the currency of transfer, so that the sending and receiving institutions both recognize the value and exchange the learning into the new academic program.
- What links all of these together is the role that student learning outcomes and competencies (proficiencies) should (but don’t yet) play in determining transfer, i.e., as the operational framework/currency for transfer. We still live in a credit- and course-based world and even the most outcomes-based GE program (like that at UW-Oshkosh’s) must still operate in that world, as the legislatively mandated new transfer policy makes clear. Through its engagement with the DQP, the QC project seeks to upend some of that and if we can keep working as we have been on the QC project strands, intentionally connect them to other allied endeavors like Flex and PLA, then we can keep moving the needle.

*How can we best move the Quality Assurance Framework forward? Can you envision the application of the framework in your state? If so, how?*

Funny you should ask. We had several members of the campus dyads contact us and ask what the framework was, speaking to the fact that there was only superficial engagement with the actual framework throughout the QC project. In fact, I don’t think the UW dyad reports address this because they don’t know what is being asked of them. The state liaisons had to dig in their materials to find the latest draft (at least, we think it’s the latest
As we reviewed it together in preparation for writing this report, it was clear that the three state liaisons for the UW System are not all in agreement as to how it might be used. We appreciate seeing many of the seeds for the framework coming out of Wisconsin’s early adoption of and engagement with LEAP. Shared Learning Goals, Equity, HIPs, are all areas in which we have been strong and received national recognition. At the same time, the framework reveals the places we have not either paid enough attention or been intentional enough: assessment, in particular in the use of student work as evidence. QC and the Flex Quality Profile (a faculty-driven accountability framework for the UW System’s competency-based Flexible Option program) are examples of applying components of the framework in ways meaningful to institutional contexts (student populations, faculty culture, relationships between academic and student affairs, delivery models and modalities, etc.). So on some level, at least for one of us, the framework brings together the critical—and familiar—components of quality, ones we have contributed to and engaged with over the years through LEAP and our partnership with AAC&U.

At the same time, as currently written, we don’t feel its utility is clearly articulated and it may be confusing to others less familiar with the key components. It also privileges traditional-age students and traditional delivery models. We would like to see the framework written to be more inclusive of a range of learners, in particular non-traditional (the new majority), and range of delivery models. This applies to the articulation of HIPs, too, which might focus less on the set of activities and more inclusively on the characteristics and qualities of high-impact practices so that, again, the learning of non-traditional-age students can be included in the proposed assessment model.

We appreciate how the framework seeks to foreground learning outcomes as the currency for student learning (and thereby disrupt the hegemony of the credit hour) although we are all stymied by the fact that—for now—outcomes/competencies/proficiencies aren’t yet acceptable currencies. This kind of framework could help move this paradigm shift forward, especially with policy-makers. To be useful to non-HE audiences, however, it would need to be written in the simplest language possible, with short sentences and probably not too many dimensions included on the framework. The simplification of what is difficult and complex is a problem, both because it’s challenging to pitch it right for the various stakeholders involved (and one would need multiple versions to do that well), and because, in simplifying, we give ground to those who would accuse us of not having rigorous and meaningful ways of defining and demonstrating quality.

The big policy question that the framework seeks to answer is, who gets to define quality? Higher education or external policy-makers? AAC&U and all of its members—us included—obviously want it to be higher educators—guided by the experiences of our students and our experience with students—who answer the question with a clear framework for defining, measuring and providing the evidence for quality. In that respect, the Quality Assurance Framework has a critical role to play. While the current version needs some work, we look forward to seeing future iterations and to engaging with AAC&U on its refinement.


**Cross-Strand Connections:**

*Setting aside the distinctions between the “strands,” what transformational accomplishments or moments have come from your QC project? What have the greatest changes been in terms of practice, function, or culture that will continue to affect your institution or your students?*

**Changes Made (cooked):**

- **Practice:** Led by UW-Fox Valley through the QC, the entire UW Colleges (all 13 two-year campuses) added a Service Learning Designation to their courses and transcripts.
- **Culture:** Joint exploration of and arrival at consensus between UW-Oshkosh and UW-Fox Valley on the meaning and attributes of civic learning.
- **Culture, practice, function:** Understanding that curricular change at the four-year campus will impact students transferring in from the two-years, and that it is the responsibility of both institutions to intentionally address that impact to ensure student success.
- **Culture:** For the two four-year campuses in QC, myths were busted regarding the quality of education in the UW Colleges, including implicit questioning of the quality of the two-year faculty, and the integrity of the Associate’s degree offered at the two-year UW Colleges campuses. The work also demonstrated how upper-level learning is occurring within what we designate as lower level (100 and 200 level coursework).
- **Culture, practice, function:** Robust curriculum mapping, accompanied by a deep understanding of how important this is, has taken place and presumably will continue to take place at the 4 QC campuses.
- **Culture, practice, function:** A strong partnership now exists between UW-Parkside and UW-Waukesha, replete with collaboration around curricular reform, assessment practice, and faculty development where there wasn’t one before. The collaboration between UW-Oshkosh and UW-Fox Valley has also been immeasurably strengthened. The clear winners in these enhanced relationships are the students!

**Emerging Changes (still in the oven):**

- **Potential impact on all transfer students coming from UW College to UW 4-years through better alignment of ELOs and HIPs, embedded within coursework and assessment at each UW College campus, especially as the Colleges associate’s degree undergoes revision in the next year.**
- **Impact on the entire B.A.A.S. program through the inroads made on the degree’s curricular integrity by UW-Waukesha and UW-Parkside.**
- **More integration of student and academic affairs in curricular reform and student success work, critical for transfer conversation and pathways.**
- **Development of institutional policy so that the Service Learning designation at UWC can count toward fulfillment of the UW Oshkosh (Quest III) University Studies Program requirement**
- **At project close, the dyads feel that the QC represents a prototype for other institutions/transfer partners to follow. Need to find ways to allow prototyping to occur.**
- **The big emerging change: A real move away from the courses and credits as the only currency for student learning. QC, in this regard, joins the UW Flexible Option and PLA as potentially transformative players for how student learning is defined and represented by students, institutions and—moving forward—policy-makers and employers.**
Sustainability and Resilience:

What are the greatest challenges that you overcame during the course of this project? How did you overcome these challenges and what assets did you have in doing so (dynamics, communications, team members)? What were you not able to overcome, and why? What aspects (goals, functions, culture) of the QC work do you expect will continue beyond the end of the scope of the grant and why? What aspects will end and why? What have been the most important components (dynamics, communications, team members) to the survival of the project?

Challenges Overcome:

A major challenge was to have the “right” people on the QC project teams, at both the campuses and the System level, who were interested in and willing to spend time on making the project successful. The System liaisons underwent changes over the course of the three years although we finally got the right combination. The campuses also struggled with both turnover and simply identifying those who could put the time in, especially faculty. Faculty are a beleaguered group in the UW System (as they are everywhere). They have had only two 1% raises in the last 6 years, and they have been subjected to public derision by some political factions. Even with stipends for working on the QC project (and these were unevenly distributed, we learned at the end of the project), we are asking them to take on additional work. Having the commitment and support from senior leaders or administrators at the campuses helped this situation.

This was a project that not only took time to gather the right ingredients (people) but also took time to cook. For the project to be successful, the participating campuses had to own and create it. There was not a lot of definition to the project (no recipe) and the System liaisons could have been more involved in pushing the campuses to make progress. This kind of pushing is fraught with political risks for System-level personnel and yet the campus partners at were clear in expressing at the end that the System liaisons could have been more directive. We’ll remember this.

The System liaison organized two all-QC team meetings each year of the project. While we didn’t necessarily get full participation, we always had a critical mass of people and the discussions and sharing of practice and lessons learned were phenomenal. Everyone agreed that these meetings were productive in building ownership of projects, motivation to continue the work, and community.

AAC&U’s requirement of monthly reports from the campuses also helped keep the work moving forward!

Sustainability:

There are many, many components of the QC project that will continue and we believe that the project has been built into the fabric of the four participating institutions, both individually and as transfer partners. This is true for each of the three major strands of the initiative: transfer policy and practice, assessment, and faculty development. Moreover, as we noted in the lessons learned above, change projects like QC work best when integrated into already existing initiatives taking place, and when they address existing system or institutional goals. At this point in time, the QC work is integrated into other change work taking place at the four campuses and we believe that work will continue. This is not to say that there are big challenges to address in moving forward but the foundation is in place to keep going. Below we identify some examples of how the project—or key components of it—will continue (and the campus reports will address this more fully), as well as an additional set of activities and initiatives that we call “unfinished business” that we all want and will work to move forward:

- We anticipate that the curriculum mapping using the DQP for the collaborative Bachelor of Applied Arts
and Sciences (BAAS) between UW-Parkside and UW-Waukesha will apply to the other five BAAS programs and beyond.

- We hope that UW-Oshkosh will move towards development and adoption of an institutional policy allowing the Service Learning designation at UW Colleges to count toward fulfillment of the UW-Oshkosh Quest II University Studies Program requirement. This would help other four-year UWs also accept that SL designation for students who transfer from the Colleges to their institutions.

- The UW Colleges is revising its core degree program, the Associate of Arts & Sciences degree. The QC faculty and deans from the two-years are confident that the revision will incorporate all the good practice and culture change from the QC project, including: better integration of the ELOs and HIPs into the degree, improved curricular mapping and assessment, and improved transfer pathways for students through greater emphasis on student outcomes/competencies and transitions.

- Assessment Work: 1) Using the DQP, UW-Parkside and UW-Waukesha have developed a rigorous assessment plan that they have proposed for adoption and implementation UW Colleges-wide. 2) Assessment for the Civic Learning-designated course transfers between UW-Fox Valley or any other campus at UW Colleges and UW –Oshkosh will continue.

- Given the project timeframe, there has not been sufficient time to assess the impacts on student learning outcomes for either of the dyads. Project personnel fully intend to keep assessing not only to ensure the success of the QC but also, and more importantly, because the data is essential to determining curricular and institutional effectiveness and student success.

- The Mobile Ap under development at UW-Waukesha and UW-Parkside (partially funded through QC money) has the potential to be a truly transformative too, one that will serve as an advising tool for students, faculty, student services personnel like advisors and admissions officers, high school counselors, and employers. Above all, it has the potential to help students more holistically understand, internalize, and influence the purpose, meaning, and pathway of their university experience.

- As noted above, in Fall 2014, we will host a one-day systemwide transfer symposium (using the remainder of our QC funding), which will focus on helping to make competencies/proficiencies a more accepted currency for student learning and transfer. Speaking to the sustainability of the QC project, we envision this as part one of a two-, perhaps three-part discussion forum on the changing context of transfer in the UW System as we move towards a more competency-based learning environment.

- Rebecca Karoff has also been directed by the UW System President to conduct an assessment of LEAP Wisconsin. The QC project has helped identify domains for assessment (ELOs, HIPs, Curricular Reform, etc.) and will serve as a signature project indicative of the transformational impact LEAP has had on the System. This work will get underway this fall and she will reaching out (and already has) to AAC&U for help.

Unfinished Business: Next steps and loose strands identified by QC partners and state liaisons that need to be accomplished to promote and allow for sustainability:

- CREATE METHODS TO VALUE AND EMBED THE KIND OF WORK DONE THROUGH PROJECTS LIKE QC WITHIN MERIT AND PROMOTION PROCESSES AND POLICIES, AS WELL AS THROUGH FACULTY STIPENDS.

- Intentionally think through how to engage other UWs (two- and four-years), as well as tech college transfer partners, in QC now that we have a prototype for how to do this work. This will take resources!

- Find better methods to take inventory of and evaluate HIPs, or, more precisely, the benefits accrued by students in terms of the broad ingredients of key components of HIPs (i.e., the characteristics more than the specific practices).

- Contextualize and increase awareness about the value, purpose and utility of the DQP framework across the UW System, including how to translate it for other projects/units/spaces, including how to break it down and apply it at the classroom level.

- Use and connect common language across institutions to help us arrive at better definitions and
consensus measures for quality.

- Need to use the findings of project as the basis for continued conversations about the meaning and quality of degrees.
- And the bullets above will help us do this: Disseminate our accomplishments in QC and LEAP more broadly to various stakeholders (administrators, Regents, communities, employers).

**Communication by stakeholder group as the means to accomplish much of the above:**

**Employers:**

- Find a better way to articulate what the student can do when he or she graduates (e.g. competency based “smartscript” as opposed to the traditional transcript). The Parkside-Waukesha Mobile Ap under development is one means to do this and, in fact, would apply to all of the groups below, as well.
- Think of more ways to integrate learning into economic development conversations. Example given, there are models around occupation and workforce development (WI Instructional Design System and DACum) that align nicely with this project. We could begin with workforce outcomes (ELOs/so-called “soft” or meta-cognitive skills) and align with the outcomes and proficiencies mapped through the QC and or integrate into academic programs. This will help to communicate the alignment of learning outcomes across the student’s academic and professional career. In other words, the student will know what they will be able to do at the end of their program. This also may be useful to academic program array gap analysis.

**Students:**

- Communicate expectations to students in terms of learning outcomes and proficiency so that they speak the language of QC/LEAP.
- Deliver activities and HIPs that communicate to all that the student’s prior learning is valued, definable, and applicable to BAAS, AAS, Flex, and beyond.
- Empower students to be able to articulate clearly and compellingly what they know and are able to do as they move through their educational programs, and especially upon graduation.

**Faculty:**

- Engage faculty in the prototyping of QC described above. This will entail professional development.
- Engage faculty who have been working on LEAP goals and outcomes for the past 10 years in helping to disseminate consensus language and outcomes within and beyond their classrooms.
- Engage faculty in the assessment of LEAP Wisconsin.

**BOR and UW Leadership and policy-makers:**

- Target presentations that focus on how to provide students with the essential learning outcomes/competencies in terms of student transitions and multiple pathways, and that enable understanding of the continuum of the student learning experience, including transitions through prior learning, prior credit/coursework, credit transfer, and the transfer of learning to settings beyond the classroom and university settings (work environments, careers, graduate programs).
- Provide an impact analysis of LEAP Wisconsin (including QC). To do this we must clearly define what the quality indicators are and how we are measuring them, including the emphasizing appropriate and robust kinds of evidence.

**What practical advice would you offer other states looking to engage in similar work?**

Much of what we’ve written above does double-duty as practical advice. Here are some additional thoughts (some repeated) from our QC team members:

- Seek to embed reform projects like this one in existing institutional initiatives focused on, e.g., educational attainment goals, LEAP, Inclusive Excellence, assessment work.
- Create faculty development workshops and broadly share learning and assessment of project work with faculty groups across the campus.
- Think about how outcomes can be integrated more widely across academic program initiatives (like the BAS, or BAAS, or interdisciplinary studies programs).
- Be open to broadening our interpretation of what is a HIP. Hypothesize about new HIPs (e.g. reflective learning activities, interdisciplinary-based degree programs) and assess all HIPs.
- Right-size your project (i.e. don’t bite off more than you can chew) and be methodical. Start with a single domain (unit) within the DQP and apply it to a single dyad, then go to the next dyad, or the next domain.
- Clearly define faculty and staff roles within the project, and be inclusive of both student and academic affairs.
- Budget planning at institution level should be driven by stakeholders.

What might have helped you do more and better? What tools or resources do you still wish you had? What about support from AAC&U, the project, your system/system?

- More time. The purpose of this project was to pilot the application of the DQP. In order to do that, we needed to build a prototype using the DQP and our existing curricula as the raw materials. It feels like we’re just at the point of putting the prototypes we’ve built into operation and building a model for assessment.
- Our QC teams observed that more intentional “training” around the DQP early in the project would have helped, e.g., a methodology or clear set of best practices and strategies from AAC&U that illustrate the various approaches to implementing the DQP. They also felt more direction—at the outset of the project—on what kinds of institutional roles/key players to engage in the project would have helped. Faculty needed to be engaged earlier in the project, and yet it was difficult to know what we were asking them to do.
- Resources were sufficient to apply this to an existing initiative like the OSH USP.
- We could have been more efficient with resources if there was greater clarity from the start as to expectations, outcomes, budget, and needs.
- Participants loved the dyad structure of the project, which yielded so many benefits and is replicable, especially now that we have an emerging prototype.
- We appreciated all the consultants and their expertise. At the same time, there were maybe too many and we did not “use” people as we probably should and could have.