## Core Curriculum Assessment Annual Report

### General Information

1. **Name / Number of Course / Sequence:**
   MATH 1680

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:**
   Student will be able to apply simple methods to real-world problems and be able to select and use techniques and methods to solve open-ended, ill-defined or multi-step problems.

3. **Department:**
   Mathematics and Statistics

4. **Department Representative:**
   Michel Smith

5. **AGSC Content Alignment:**
   AREA III: Science and Math

### Assessment Information

6. **Assessment Method:** [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO – not grading for the course as a whole was conducted.]
   A sample of final exams was selected and from this sample specific problems were selected whose solutions required an understanding of the SLOs 4 and 5.

7. **Findings:** [What assessment data did each assessment method produce?]
   Average grade on selected problems from final exam = 73.7 %
Percent of students with greater than 60% correct on the selected questions on the final exam = 82.4%

Sample size = 57

8. How did you or will you use the findings for improvement: [What questions / issues / concerns do your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

The department assessment committee recommended that larger samples be obtained and that GTA and Faculty taught classes be separately assessed.

9. Additional comments: [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
None

10. Core Curriculum General Education Committee Comments:

The Committee hopes that in the next round of reporting the Math Department will do more to “connect the dots” for these as well as all the core courses it offers. It was also unclear from the report what kind of discussion about the results occurred in the Math Department or how the data and the departmental discussion would logically lead to the information describing how the results will be used to promote improvement: why focus on teaching or teaching method differences between faculty and GTAs? Why is the department not suggesting any curricular revision? Members of the CCGEC are willing to meet with the Math Department’s Assessment Committee to discuss these reports and general education assessment in more detail.