Degree Program Student Learning Report

Revised August 2017

Department of Mathematics & Physical Sciences

AS in Physical Science

For 2018-2019 Academic Year

PART 1

Degree Program Mission and Student Learning Outcomes

A. State the school, department, and degree program missions.

University Mission	School Mission	Department Mission	Degree Program Mission
Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.	Central to the mission of the School is the preparation of students to achieve professional and personal goals in their respective disciplines and to enable their success in dynamic local and global communities. Our strategy is to foster an academic setting of diverse curricula that inherently incorporates an environment of service and collegiality.	The mission of the Department of Mathematics and Physical Sciences at Rogers State University is to support students in their pursuit of knowledge in mathematics and physical science.	The Associate of Science in Physical Science consists of general education curriculum and courses supporting other departmental programs. In support of the mission of the university, the school, and the department, the degree seeks to provide a solid general education component for all university students, provide curriculum in the physical sciences for students who are preparing for a baccalaureate-granting program, and provide programs of study to students presently in the work force, allowing them the opportunity to continue their education.

B. Align school purposes, department purposes, and program student learning outcomes with their appropriate University commitments.

University Commitments	School Purposes	Department Purposes	Student Learning Outcomes
To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning and critical and creative thinking.	The School offers innovative degrees, which focus upon developing skills in oral and written communication, critical thinking, creativity, empirical and evidenced-based inquiry, experimental investigation and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena, and innovative technology.	1. To increase the student's critical thinking and reasoning abilities.	1a. Demonstrate a thorough knowledge and understanding of basic physical science principles and their applications (outcome meets in two different department purposes – 1a and 5a). 1b. Apply problem solving skills through critical thinking and scientific methods (meets in 1b and 2b).
		2. To increase the student's understanding and appreciation of the physical world, and the ability to apply this understanding in his/her personal and professional life.	2a. Demonstrate an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data (meets in 2a, 3b, and 4a). 2b. Apply problem solving skills through critical thinking and scientific methods (meets in 1b and 2b).
		3. To increase the student's awareness of the benefits of incorporation of technology into Science and Math studies.	3a. Demonstrate an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data (meets in 2a, 3a, and 4b).
		4. To increase the student's ability to interpret and understand his/her world mathematically.	4a. Explain and predict quantitative, analytical and graphical situations 4b. Demonstrate an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data (meets in 2a, 3a, and 4b).

To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.	The School educates its majors to think independently and have the knowledge, skills and vision to work in all types of situations and careers and communicate with all types of people.		
To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.	The School offers general education courses of high quality and purpose that provide a foundation for life-long learning.	5. To prepare a student to matriculate into a four-year degree program in math or science-related fields or graduate.	5a. Demonstrate a thorough knowledge and understanding of basic physical science principles and their applications (meets in 1a and 5a).
To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits and continuous improvement of programs.	The School fosters a community of scholars among the faculty and students of the institution.		
To provide university-wide student services, activities and resources that complement academic programs.			
To support and strengthen student, faculty and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.			
To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves.	The School will offer and promote artistic, scientific, cultural, and public affairs events on the campus and in the region.	6. To serve as a resource for the community, utilizing the expertise of the faculty.	

PART 2

Revisit Proposed Changes Made in Previous Assessment Cycle

Revisit each instructional/assessment change proposed in Part 5 of the degree program SLR for the preceding year. Indicate whether the proposed change was implemented and comment accordingly. Any changes the department implemented for this academic year, but which were not specifically proposed in the preceding report, should also be reported and discussed here. Please note if no changes were either proposed or implemented for this academic year.

Proposed Change	Implemented? (Y/N)	Comments
Department was planning to incorporate Graduating Student Survey results about overall department experience for this assessment cycle. No changes were implemented for this academic year	N	It was debatable to include these survey results as an SLO and as a result it is under revision.

PART 3

Response to University Assessment Committee Peer Review

The University Assessment Committee provides written feedback on departmental assessment plans through a regular peer review process. This faculty-led oversight is integral to RSU's commitment to the continuous improvement of student learning and institutional effectiveness. UAC recommendations are not compulsory and departments may implement them at their discretion. Nevertheless, respond below to each UAC recommendations from last year's peer review report. Indicate whether the recommendation was implemented and comment accordingly. Please indicate either if the UAC had no recommendations or if the program was not subject to review in the previous cycle.

Peer Review Feedback	Implemented (Y/N)	Comment
The program was not subject to review in the previous cycle.		

PART 4
Evidence of Student Learning

Evidence and analyze student progress for each of the student learning outcomes (same as listed in Part I B above) for the degree program. See the *Appendix* for a detailed description of each component. Note: The table below is for the first program learning outcome. Copy the table and insert it below for each additional outcome. SLO numbers should be updated accordingly.

A. Student Learning Outcome					
SLO #1: Demonstrate a thorough knowledge and understanding of basic physical science principles and their applications.					
B. Assessment Measure	**C. Performance Standard**	**D. Sampling Method**	**E. Sample Size (n)**	**F. Results**	**G. Standard Met (Y/N)**
1A. **Direct Measure:** American Chemical Society (ACS) academic assessment exam.	1A. At least 50% of majors who take the American Chemical Society (ACS) standardized exam will score in the 36th percentile or higher.	1A. All Physical Science Major Students taking CHEM 1415, General Chemistry II.	1A. 3 (2018-19) 2 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 5 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 1 (2013-14) 3 (2012-13) 3 (2011-12) 5 (2010-11) 2 (2009-10) 29 Total	1A. 33% (1/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2018-19; 50% (1/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2017-18; 67% (2/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2016-17; 60% (3/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2015-16; 50% (1/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2014-15; 100% (1/1) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2013-14; 0% (0/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2012-13; 66.7% (2/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2011-12; 60% (3/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2010-11; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2009-10. A 10-year "average" showed that 16/29 (55%, N = 29) majors met the assessment performance standard.	1A. N (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) Y (2013-14) N (2012-13) Y (2011-12) Y (2010-11) Y (2009-10) Y: Ten-year average

1B. **Direct Measure**: Four hourly exams in MATH 1613, Trigonometry.	1B. At least 70% of majors will earn a grade of 70% or better on the four hourly exams in Math 1613, Trigonometry.	1B. All available Physical Science Major Students taking Math 1613.	1B. 6 (2018-19) On-ground (OG)-6 Blended (B)-N/A 7 (2017-18) On-ground (OG)-7 Blended (B)-N/A 6 (2016-17) On-ground (OG)-2 Blended (B)-4 - (2015-16) 6 (2014-15) 3 (2013-14) 6 (2012-13) 12 (2011-12) 46 Total	1B. 5 of 6 (83%) [OG-5/6 and B-N/A] scored 70% or better on the hourly exams in 2018-19; 1 of 7 (14%) [OG-1/7 and B-N/A] scored 70% or better on the hourly exams in 2017-18; 5 of 6 (83%) [OG-2/2 and B-3/4] scored 70% or better on the hourly exams in 2016-17; No data were available during 2015-16; 4 of 6 (67%) scored 70% or better on the hourly exams in 2014-15; 3 of 3 (100%) in 2013-14; 6 of 6 (100%) in 2012-13; 10 of 12 (83%) in 2011-12.	1B. Y (2018-19) N (2017-18) Y (2016-17) - (2015-16) N (2014-15) Y (2013-14) Y (2012-13) Y (2011-12)
1C. **Direct Measure**: Four lecture exams in PHYS 2015, Engineering Physics I (if offered) and PHYS 1114, General Physics I. Note: Both are first semester introductory level physics courses with the same focus. PHYS 2015 is calculus based, intended for students majoring in physics, mathematics or engineering.	1C. At least 50% of the Majors will score 70% or greater on four lecture exams in PHYS 2015 and/or PHYS 1114.	1C. All Physical Science Major Students taking PHYS 2015 and/or PHYS 1114.	1C. 5 (2018-19) 5 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 2 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 9 (2013–14) 15 (2012-13) 4 (2011-12) 45 Total	1C. MPS majors all failed to meet the expectations in 2018-19. In 2017-18, 60% (3/5) scored 70% or better, 67% (2/3) in 2016-17; 50% (1/2) in 2015-16; 100% (2/2) in 2014-15; 22% (2/9) in 2013-14; 47% (7/15) in 2012-13, and 75% (3/4) in 2011-12.	1C. N (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) N (2013-14) N (2012-13) Y (2011-12)
1D. **Direct Measure:** Written paper of a field study of interpretation of	1D. 70% of all majors will score 70% or greater on the final field analysis paper.	1D. All Physical Science Major Students taking GEOL 1224.	1D. 5 (2017-18) - (2016-17) 5 (2015-16)	1D. 100% (5/5) of geology majors scored 70% or greater on their term paper in 2017-18 academic year.	1D. Y (2017-18) - (2016-17) Y (2015-16)

geological processes and geological formations in GEOL 1224, Historical Geology.			6 (2014-15)	No data were available for 2016-17 as the course was not offered. 100% of majors scored 70% or greater on their paper in 2015-16 and in 2014-15 academic years.	Y (2014-15)

H.
Conclusions

1A. This year the standards were not met. However, in overall average during the last ten years, a majority of majors (more than 50%) in CHEM 1415 were able to possess basic knowledge of chemistry, and have an understanding of its principles and their applications and thus met the standards. With small N (number of majoring students in CHEM 1415), annual fluctuations are to be expected. Keeping an average of the data reveals any on-going trends.

1B. The expected standards were met. The results were above or very close to the performance target in five of the last seven years where data were available, suggesting students (majors) understand the basic trigonometric concepts to the standards expected by the department.

1C. Standards were met for 5 times in last 8 academic years.

1D. All geology majors in GEOL 1224 Historical Geology, scored 70% or greater on their comprehensive term project. In fact, the geology majors in this course this year scored 85% or greater on this assessment which consisted of the development of a Geological Time Scale of the History of the Earth in regards to evolution of major biotic groups on Earth, major extinction events, the evolution of surface climates and topography and the examination of major extinction events and their causes. The project required students to determine major climate changes, tectonic plate locations, sea level rises/falls, and atmospheric evolution through time. These events/biota were placed within a time scale that was accurately divided into the standard geologic Periods and Epochs.

A.
Student Learning Outcome

SLO #2: Apply problem solving skills through critical thinking and the scientific methods.

B. Assessment Measure	C. Performance Standard	D. Sampling Method	E. Sample Size (n)	F. Results	G. Standard Met (Y/N)
2A. **Direct Measure**:	2A. At least 50% of	2A. All Physical	2A.	2A. 60% (3/5) of majors met the	2A.

Titration lab reports and Beers Law lab reports in CHEM 1415, General Chemistry II.	majors will earn a grade of 70% or higher for lab reports.	Science Major Students taking CHEM 1415, General Chemistry II.	5 (2018-19) 2 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 5 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 1 (2013-14) 3 (2012-13) 3 (2011-12) 5 (2010-11) 2 (2009-10) 31 Total	assessment performance standard in 2018-19; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2017-18; 100% (3/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2016-17; 80% (4/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2015-16; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2014-15; 0% (0/1) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2013-14; 100% (3/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2012-13; 100% (3/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2011-12; 40% (2/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2010-11; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2009-10. A 10-year "average" showed that 24/31 (77%, N = 31) majors met the assessment performance standard.	Y (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) N (2013-14) Y (2012-13) Y (2011-12) N (2010-11) Y (2010-09) Y: Ten-year average
2B. **Direct Measure:** Three assignments in MyMathLab in MATH 1613, Trigonometry. These topics were trigonometric functions, inverse trigonometric functions, and complex numbers.	2B. At least 70% of majors will earn a grade of 70% or better on the three assignments in MATH 1613.	2B. All available Physical Science Major Students taking MATH 1613, Trigonometry.	2B. 6 (2018-19) On-Ground (OG)-6 Blended (B)- N/A 7 (2017-18) On-Ground (OG)-7 Blended (B)- N/A 6 (2016-17) On-Ground (OG)-2 Blended (B)-4 - (2015-16) 6 (2014-15) 3 (2013-14) 6 (2012-13) 12 (2011-12)	2B. In 2018-19, 6 of 6 (100%) [OG-6/6 and B-N/A] of the majors scored 70% or better on the homework assignment "trigonometric functions"; 6 of 6 (100%) [OG-6/6 and B-N/A] of the majors scored 70% or better on the homework assignment "inverse trigonometric functions"; 5 of 6 (83%) [OG-5/6, and B-N/A] of the majors scored 70% or better on the homework assignment "complex numbers". Please note no data were available for 2015-16.	2B. Y (2018-19) Y/N (2017-18) Y (2016-17) - (2015-16) Y (2014-15) Y (2013-14) Y (2012-13) Y (2011-12)

2C. **Direct Measure**: Four lecture exams in PHYS 2015, Engineering Physics I (if offered) and PHYS 1114, General Physics I. Note: Both are first semester introductory level physics courses with the same focus. PHYS 2015 is calculus based, intended for students majoring in physics, mathematics or engineering.	2C. At least 50% of the Majors will score 70% or greater on four lecture exams.	2C. All Physical Science Major Students taking PHYS 2015 and PHYS 1114.	2C. 5 (2018-19) 5 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 2 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 9 (2013–14) 15 (2012-13) 4 (2011-12) 45 Total	2C. MPS majors all failed to meet the expectations in 2018-19. In 2017-18, 60% (3/5) scored 70% or better, 67% (2/3) in 2016-17; 50% (1/2) in 2015-16; 100% (2/2) in 2014-15; 22% (2/9) in 2013-14; 47% (7/15) in 2012-13, and 75% (3/4) in 2011-12.	2C. N (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) N (2013-14) N (2012-13) Y (2011-12)
2D. **Direct Measure**: Term project in GEOL 1224, Historical Geology: a geologic model of the Earth through time. Includes: evolutionary and extinction events, tectonic plate locations, atmospheric conditions, sea level changes, major orogenic locations, events, climatic changes, etc.	2D. 70% of majors will score 70% or greater on their comprehensive geologic model term project.	2D. All Physical Science Major Students taking GEOL 1224, Historical Geology.	2D. 5 (2017 –18) - (2016-17) 6 (2015-16) 5 (2014-15)	2D. All geology majors enrolled in GEOL 1224 scored 70% or higher on their term project in 2017-18. In fact, 4/5 geology majors scored 85% or higher. No data were available for 2016-17 as the course was not offered. 100% geology majors scored 70% or higher on their term project in 2015-16 and in 2014-15 academic years.	2D. Y (2017-18) - (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15)

H.
Conclusions

2A. This measure was met in last five years continuously (eight of the past ten years). With small N (number of majoring students in CHEM 1415), annual fluctuations are to be expected. Keeping an average of the data reveals any on-going trends.

2B. Performance standards were met seven out of last eight years (data were not available for one year). Majority of Math. and Physical Science (MPS) majoring students taking MATH 1613, Trigonometry, demonstrate required skills in problem solving (related to topics trigonometric functions, inverse trigonometric functions, and complex numbers) through critical thinking and by applying trigonometric concepts.

2C. Performance standards were met five times in past eight years.

2D. Expectations have been continuously met during the semesters this course has been taught. In the past 4 years the course has been taught 3 times and each of those times the geology majors' scores exceeded the 70% suggested average. These students demonstrated knowledge of deep geological time, the fundamentals of evolutionary processes of ocean basins, continental plates, climates, atmospheric gases and composition as well as all life on Earth. During the semester, all of the geology majors were able to develop an accurate geological time scale ***to scale*** and incorporate ***all major evolutionary changes*** (both abiotic and biotic) throughout deep geological time.

A. Student Learning Outcome					
SLO #3: Explain and predict quantitative, analytical and graphical situations.					
B. Assessment Measure	**C. Performance Standard**	**D. Sampling Method**	**E. Sample Size (n)**	**F. Results**	**G. Standard Met (Y/N)**
3A. **Direct measure**: Ten unit-laboratory reports in PHYS 1114, General Physics and PHYS 2015, Engineering Physics I (if offered). Note: Both are first semester introductory level physics courses with the same focus. PHYS 2015 is calculus based, intended for students majoring in	3A. At least 70% of majors will average 70% or better on ten unit-laboratory reports in PHYS 1114 and PHYS 2015.	3A. All Physical Science Major Students taking PHYS 1114, General Physics and PHYS 2015, Engineering Physics I.	3A. 5 (2018-19) 5 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 2 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 9 (2013–14) 15 (2012-13) 4 (2011 -12) 45 Total	3A. 80% (4/5) of MPS majors met the performance standard in 2018-19; 80% (4/5) in 2017-18; 100% (3/3) in 2016-17; 100% (2/2) in 2015-16; 100% (2/2) in 2014-15; 100% (9/9) in 2013-14; 87% (13/15) in 2012-13; 100% (4/4) in 2011-12.	3A. Y (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) Y (2013-14) Y (2012-13) Y (2011-12) Y: Eight-year average

physics, mathematics or engineering.					

H. Conclusions
3A. All MPS majors in PHYS 1114 & PHYS 2015 were able to conduct the basic experiments and analyze and interpret the data using mathematical and/or graphical tools. (Standards were met continuously for eight academic years).

A. Student Learning Outcome					
SLO #4: Demonstrate an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data.					
B. Assessment Measure	**C. Performance Standard**	**D. Sampling Method**	**E. Sample Size (n)**	**F. Results**	**G. Standard Met (Y/N)**
4A. **Direct Measures** Composite lab grade in CHEM 1415, General Chemistry II.	4A. At least 50% of majors will earn a lab grade of 70% or higher on laboratory reports in CHEM 1415, General Chemistry II.	4A. All Physical Science Major Students taking CHEM 1415, General Chemistry II.	4A. 5 (2018-19) 2 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 5 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 1 (2013-14) 3 (2012-13) 3 (2011-12) 5 (2010-11) 2 (2009-10) 31 Total	4A. 100% (5/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2018-19; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2017-18; 100% (3/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2016-17; 80% (4/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2015-16; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2014-15; 100% (1/1) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2013-14; 100% (3/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2012-13; 100% (3/3) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2011-12; 60% (3/5) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2010-11; 100% (2/2) of majors met the assessment performance standard in 2009-	4A. Y (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) Y (2013-14) Y (2012-13) Y (2011-12) Y (2010-11) Y (2009-10) Y: Ten-year average

				10. A 10-year "average" showed that 28/31 (90%, N = 31) majors met the assessment performance standard.	
4B. **Direct measure**: Ten unit-laboratory reports in PHYS 1114, General Physics and PHYS 2015, Engineering Physics I (if offered). Note: Both are first semester introductory level physics courses with the same focus. PHYS 2015 is calculus based, intended for students majoring in physics, mathematics or engineering.	4B. At least 70% of majors will average 70% or better on ten unit-laboratory reports in PHYS 1114 and PHYS 2015.	4B. All Physical Science Major Students taking PHYS 1114, General Physics and PHYS 2015, Engineering Physics I.	4B. 5 (2018-19) 5 (2017-18) 3 (2016-17) 2 (2015-16) 2 (2014-15) 9 (2013–14) 15 (2012-13) 4 (2011 -12) 45 Total	4B. 80% (4/5) of MPS majors met the performance standard in 2018-19; 80% (4/5) in 2017-18; 100% (3/3) in 2016-17; 100% (2/2) in 2015-16; 100% (2/2) in 2014-15; 100% (9/9) in 2013-14; 87% (13/15) in 2012-13; 100% (4/4) in 2011-12.	4B. Y (2018-19) Y (2017-18) Y (2016-17) Y (2015-16) Y (2014-15) Y (2013-14) Y (2012-13) Y (2011-12) Y: Eight-year average.

H.
Conclusions

4A. Standards were met for the last ten academic years continuously. A majority of majors in CHEM 1415 were able to design and conduct experiments, and successfully analyze and interpret the data gathered from them. With small N (number of MPS majoring students in CHEM 1415), annual fluctuations are to be expected. Keeping a moving average of the data reveals any on-going trends.

4B. MPS majors in PHYS 1114 & PHYS 2015 were able to conduct the experiments and analyze and interpret the data using mathematical and/or graphical tools. Standards were met for eight academic years consistently.

PART 5
Proposed Instructional or Assessment Changes

Learning outcomes assessment can generate actionable evidence of student performance that can be used to improve student success and institutional effectiveness. Knowledge of student strengths and weakness gained through assessment can inform faculty efforts to improve course instruction and program curriculum. Below discuss potential changes the department is considering which are aimed at improving student learning or the assessment process. Indicate which student learning outcome(s) will be affected and provide a rationale for each proposed change. These proposals will be revisited in next assessment cycle.

Proposed Change	Applicable Learning Outcomes	Rationale and Impact
Department's plan to incorporate Graduating Student Survey results about overall department experience for the next assessment cycle is under revision.	Graduating students will indicate (rate) their satisfaction about overall department experience.	Department purpose 6 has no student learning outcome aligned with it, and addition of this new student learning outcome will help to assess and improve department services.

PART 6
Summary of Assessment Measures

A. How many different assessment measures were used?
Nine different assessment measures were used.

B. List the direct measures (see appendix):
Nine direct measures:
[1] Gen. Chemistry II: The American Chemical Society (ACS) Academic Assessment Exam (1A); [2] Trigonometry: Exams (1B); [3] Physics: Exams (1C, 2C); [4] Geology: Written Paper (1D); [5] Gen. Chemistry II: Lab Reports (2A); [6] Trigonometry: Class Assignments (2B); [7] Geology: Term Project (2D); [8] Physics: Laboratory Reports (3A, 4B); [9] Gen. Chemistry II: Laboratory Reports-Grades (4A)

C. List the indirect measures (see appendix):
No indirect measures were used.

PART 7
Faculty Participation and Signatures

A. Provide the names and signatures of all full time and adjunct faculty who contributed to this report.

Faculty Name	Assessment Role	Signature
Dr. Jamie Graham	Prepared the report, reviewed, and approved final draft.	Jamie M. Graham
Dr. Doug Grenier	Reviewed and approved final draft.	
Dr. Min Soe	Collected and analyzed Physics and Trigonometry data; reviewed and approved final draft.	
Dr. Kirk Voska	Collected and analyzed Chemistry data; reviewed and approved final draft.	Kirk Voska
Dr. Kasia Roberts	Collected Chemistry data; reviewed and approved final draft.	Kasia Roberts
Dr. Ram Adhikari	Collected and analyzed Trigonometry data; reviewed and approved final draft.	
Dr. Suhkitha Vidurupola	Prepared the report, reviewed, and approved final draft.	Suhkitha Vidurupola

B. Reviewed by:

Titles	Name	Signature	Date
Department Head	Dr. Jamie Graham	Jamie M. Graham	5/28/19
Dean	Dr. Keith Martin	Keith W. Mark	5/28/19