1. **AGSC Content Area of Alignment:** Area III: Science and Math

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...
   
   SLO 4: Students will be able to apply simple mathematical methods to the solution of real-world problems.

3. **Assessment Method(s):**
   
   [Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method.]
   
   We did the statistical comparison between pre- and pro-test scores, and the statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses for each question of the pre- and pro-tests.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   Based on the analysis of assessment data from various assessment methods, we obtained the histograms, curves, and pie charts. The hypotheses tests show that the score of the pro-test was higher than the pre-test with a 95% significant level. Statistical comparison between the percentage of the right responses (PRR) of each question show that the PRR of the pro-test was higher than pre-test for many of the questions. See attached file for details.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**
   
   [What questions / issues / concerns did 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?]

   Although we have seen improvement on student learning, but based on the discussion with the Chair, we decided to start the process of updating the tests and to plan having separate tests for this course. Also, whenever possible, we will put more experienced and seasoned instructors to teach this course besides having more close supervision of the instructors by more experienced faculty.

6. **Additional Comments:**
   
   [What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]
   
   NIL

7. **Committee Comments**
   
   Mean rubric score = 2.22Report indicates that there is evaluation of the learning outcome across the math courses and that revision of the test items needs to occur, report suggest to have more seasoned faculty teaching courses and closer supervision of instruction by more experienced faculty. The writer indicates that separate tests for each course are needed.; seeing the test questions, especially as they pertain to each measure, would really help the evaluation process.