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

2. **SLO(s) being assessed:** Student will...
   
   SLO 10: Students will understand and appreciate methods and issues of science and technology.

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]. The assessment of this course comes under the purview of the Department of Physics’ Learning Improvement Committee for Introductory Physics and Astronomy, chaired by Dr. Chin-Che Tin. The committee believes that learning assessment should not be viewed as a measure of the teaching effectiveness of the instructors. To discourage such unwarranted association and to encourage participation in the assessment efforts, the committee has decided not to identify the instructors. However, during the committee meetings to discuss assessment data, the instructors may choose to identify themselves to aid in the discussion, and many instructors did. Members of the Learning Improvement Committee for Introductory Physics and Astronomy were: Dr. Chin-Che Tin (Chair) Dr. Satoshi Hinata Dr. Stephen Knowlton Dr. Stuart Loch Dr. Joseph Perez The Chair of the committee has the prerogative to invite other instructors teaching those courses under the purview of this committee but who are not members of the committee, to the meetings. The instructor in this course has chosen homework assignments as the mode of assessment. This is one of the methods accepted by the department for learning assessment. The questions shown in the attached file under each measure are homework assignments from the text - Conceptual Physics, 11th Edition, Paul G. Hewitt, Addison Wesley, 2010. There is one problem from each chapter covered in both semesters. Data were collected for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012. The SLO data were submitted to the Chair of the Learning Improvement Committee for Introductory Physics and Astronomy, Dr. Chin-Che Tin, after the end of Spring semester 2012. The committee met on Sept 27, 2012, to discuss the assessment data for this course.

4. **Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?**
   
   Average score for Fall 2011: 71%
   Average score for Spring 2012: 79%
   
   In 12 out of the 15 questions, there was improvement in the average score from Fall 2011 to Spring 2012. These scores were lower than those of other instructors using MasteringPhysics assignment.

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?]
   
   Instructor’s Verbatim Comments: Of the 15 questions, improvement from Fall to Spring was made on 12. Does this mean I was a much better teacher in the Spring than in the Fall? I doubt that this data warrants any such conclusion. I do think, however, that learning in the Spring semester improved. Aside from that, I must admit that I am not smart enough to extract any great significance from such data. I will have to leave that to the folks from the College of Education. While I am not teaching this class in the coming semesters, I will do what I have always done in the past 24 years, i.e., try to do better each semester. I am hard pressed to find appropriate words for the members of the assessment community who contend that wasting time collecting this data and typing this report is going to help me improve and, that on the other hand if I do not follow such a
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shallow procedure, I am not trying to improve.

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

Finding appropriate problems suitable for Measures 1 and 4 continues to be a problem in our assessment efforts.

7. Committee Comments
   Mean of rubric score: 2.5 (out of 4)Questions allegedly assessing Measures 2 and 3 have nothing to do with Measures 2 and 3. Since questions don't relate to Measures, then no findings can logically emerge, comments don't explain this at all. Little revision suggested, except search for some better questions for measures 1 and 4, where the weakness is in measure 2 and 3.