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):**

   [Provide a paragraph explaining the assessment method(s) used, including the rationale and process.]

   The assessment of this course comes under the purview of the 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 Hina, 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 tests/exams as the mode of assessment. This is one of the methods accepted by the department for learning assessment. Data were collected for 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 Spring 2012: 76% This score was higher than typical test scores (~60%) in Introductory Physics in the Physics Department.

5. **How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?**

   [Provide a paragraph explaining how the findings were used to improve teaching or course development.] Instructor’s Verbatim Comments: I notice that students perform poorly on questions related to measure 2 and 3. This is expected as their preparation (most students are non-science majors) is poor in math and science compared with other basics. It is not the lack of intelligence, as they can understand the contents of algebraic relations if you express them in English. This is no big problem, if your thought process involves one or two steps, but it becomes a huge disadvantage if the number of logical steps increases. So, as is always the case, our objective is to challenge the students to read and interpret graphs and diagrams in addition to interpreting what algebraic relations mean, without discouraging them to the point they give up.

6. **Additional Comments:**

   [Provide a paragraph with any additional comments or suggestions regarding the assessment or the course.] The instructor has done a better job in this year’s assessment by using more questions. The instructor commented during the assessment meeting that he has problems identifying proper questions for some of the
7. **Committee Comments**

Mean of rubric score = 2.67 (out of 4) Questions allegedly assessing Measures 1 and 2 have nothing to do with measures 1 and 2, hard to see some of the correlations between the questions and measures. Since questions don't relate to Measures, then no findings can logically emerge. No discussion evident, did increase number of questions and has a committee oversight.