**GENERAL EDUCATION QUANTITATIVE LITERACY ASSESSMENT TEMPLATE**

**Course (Please Identify the course): e.g. HUMN 1100**

**I. Assessment Methods (Examples only provided for SLO 1)**

Complete a table for each general education SLO. If SLOs are assessed by more than one measure, complete tables for each measure used to assess the SLO.

|  |
| --- |
| **GEN ED SLO #1: Solve real-world problems** |
| 1. Title of Measure
 | *e.g. Term Paper* |
| 1. Alignment of Measure

*Describe how measure aligns to the SLO* | *e.g. This paper requires students to explain how socio-cultural, psycho-social, and philosophical perspectives account for the formation and development of their character and personality.*  |
| 1. Domain of Measure

*Check all that apply* | [ ]  Exam [x]  Product [ ]  Performance |
| 1. Type of Measure

*Check all that apply* | [x]  Direct (e.g. exam, presentation) [ ]  Indirect (e.g. self-assessment,  course evaluation) |
| 1. Measurement Tool

*Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate* | [ ]  Subset of questions on exam [ ]  Exam [x]  Product evaluated w/rubric[ ]  Product evaluated w/o rubric [ ]  Performance evaluated w/rubric[ ]  Performance evaluated w/o rubric [ ]  Other (please describe): |
| 1. Population of Students Assessed
 | [x]  All students in a course [ ]  Sample of students – Describe below |
| 1. Frequency of Data Collection
 | [ ]  Every semester [x]  Every academic year[ ]  Other – Describe below: |
| 1. Proficiency threshold (e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome)
 | Describe: *e.g. Student must achieve a 3 or a 4 on the assignment based on a faculty developed rubric*  |
| 1. SLO Proficiency Target (e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO)
 | Describe: *e.g., at least 80% of all students assessed will meet or exceed the proficiency threshold noted above.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **GEN ED SLO #2: Draw inferences based on a set of data or quantitative information** |
| 1. Title of Measure
 |  |
| 1. Alignment of Measure

*Describe how measure aligns to the SLO* |  |
| 1. Domain of Measure

*Check all that apply* | [ ]  Exam [ ]  Product [ ]  Performance |
| 1. Type of Measure

*Check all that apply* | [ ]  Direct [ ]  Indirect |
| 1. Measurement Tool

*Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate* | [ ]  Subset of questions on exam [ ]  Exam [ ]  Product evaluated w/rubric[ ]  Product evaluated w/o rubric [ ]  Performance evaluated w/rubric[ ]  Performance evaluated w/o rubric [ ]  Other (please describe): |
| 1. Population of Students Assessed

  | [ ]  All students in a course [ ]  Sample of students – Describe below |
| 1. Frequency of Data Collection
 | [ ]  Every semester [ ]  Every academic year[ ]  Other – Describe below:  |
| 1. Proficiency Threshold (e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome)
 | Describe:  |
| 1. SLO Proficiency Target (e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO)
 | Describe: |

|  |
| --- |
| **GEN ED SLO #3: Justify conclusions derived from quantitative information** |
| 1. Title of Measure
 |  |
| 1. Alignment of Measure

*Describe how measure aligns to the SLO* |  |
| 1. Domain of Measure

*Check all that apply* | [ ]  Exam [ ]  Product [ ]  Performance |
| 1. Type of Measure

*Check all that apply* | [ ]  Direct [ ]  Indirect |
| 1. Measurement Tool

*Check all that apply and attach rubrics where appropriate* | [ ]  Subset of questions on exam [ ]  Exam [ ]  Product evaluated w/rubric[ ]  Product evaluated w/o rubric [ ]  Performance evaluated w/rubric[ ]  Performance evaluated w/o rubric [ ]  Other (please describe): |
| 1. Population of Students Assessed

  | [ ]  All students in a course [ ]  Sample of students – Describe below |
| 1. Frequency of Data Collection
 | [ ]  Every semester [ ]  Every academic year[ ]  Other – Describe below:  |
| 1. Proficiency Threshold (e.g. the score which determines if an individual student has met the outcome)
 | Describe:  |
| 1. SLO Proficiency Target (e.g. percentage of students who must meet/exceed proficiency target for the course to meet the SLO)
 | Describe: |

## II. Data Collection and Analysis (Samples only provided for SLO 1)

A: Results Table – Report results for each SLO. If an SLO was assessed by multiple measures, report data for each measure. Add rows as needed to accommodate the number of SLOs and measures.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data Collection Date Range** | **Number of Students Assessed** | **Percentage of Students who Met/Exceeded Threshold Proficiency** |
| **SLO 1 – Measure one** | Fall 2015 – Fall 2017 | 120 | 86% |
| **SLO 1 – Measure two***(if applicable)* |  |  |  |
| **SLO 2 – Measure one** |  |  |  |
| **SLO 2 – Measure two***(if applicable)* |  |  |  |
| **SLO 3 – Measure one** |  |  |  |
| ***SLO 3 – Measure two****(if applicable)* |  |  |  |

B: SLO Status Table

Based on the results reported in the above table, indicate the status of Gen Ed SLOs as Met, Partially Met, Not Met, or Unknown for your course.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SLO 1 |  [x]  Met [ ]  Partially Met [ ]  Not Met [ ]  Unknown |
| SLO 2 |  [ ]  Met [ ]  Partially Met [ ]  Not Met [ ]  Unknown |
| SLO 3 |  [ ]  Met [ ]  Partially Met [ ]  Not Met [ ]  Unknown |

C: Describe how results are communicated within the unit.

|  |
| --- |
| *SLO 1: Research paper grades (rubric scores) are routinely shared between faculty members who teach the course. These faculty members meet at the end of each academic year to review the data and summarize their discussion at a committee meeting.* |

## Decisions and Actions

Briefly describe decisions and actions related to these SLOs. Include the decision making process to include who made the decision, when was the decision made, what data informed the decision, and a timeline for actions taken or to be taken.

|  |
| --- |
| *SLO 1: At the May 2016 department retreat, faculty discussed the results of the term paper. Based on overall results, the SLO was met by the majority of students. However, faculty indicated that students failed to fully incorporate appropriate philosophical perspectives in their papers. A small committee was subsequently formed to develop strategies to address this shortfall. The team’s recommendations will be presented at the 2017 department retreat.*  |

***APPENDIX 1****: Sample of worksheet used by Gen Ed Assessment Committee members to provide feedback to units.*
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