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INTRODUCTION

• Recently, the University of Colorado at Boulder (CU) developed the Colorado Upper-Division Electrostatics (CUE) Diagnostic to assess student conceptual learning of upper-division electricity and magnetism (E&M) [1–3].

• Using the CUE, we have been documenting students’ understanding of E&M at Oregon State University (OSU) over a period of 5 years (from 2009 to 2013).

• Our analysis indicates that the CUE identifies concepts that are generally difficult for students, regardless of the curriculum.

• Using student data from both OSU and CU, we discuss similarities in the overall pattern of scores and possible causes for differences on selected questions, as well as steps that may rectify the situation.

WHAT ARE PARADIGMS?

• Paradigms revolve around concepts underlying different fields of physics: energy, symmetry, forces, wave motion, etc.

• The content is arranged differently: more time spent on direct integration and curvilinear coordinates, less time devoted to separation of variables (SofV), covering potentials before electric fields, covering magnetostatics in vacuum before electrostatics in matter.

• Large variety of active engagement strategies:
  - individual small white board questions,
  - small group problem-solving,
  - computer visualizations, simulations and animations,
  - kinesthetic activities.

THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE ON EACH QUESTION AT OSU & CU

• The post-test was administered at OSU three times: in the Fall terms of 2010, 2011 and 2013 to a total of N = 39 students.

• With the exception of two questions (Q1 and Q15), the averages agree to within 10% on the first 12 questions and to within 20% thereafter.

OSU students’ scores differ by over 50% on question Q1 and by almost 40% on question Q15, which test whether students can set up the solution to a problem involving partial differential equations:
  - recognizing SofV as an appropriate problem-solving technique and/or
  - defining boundary conditions (BCs).

At OSU students are exposed to the SofV mainly in the context of the Schrödinger equation:
  - 1-D Waves and Central Forces (Junior year),
  - Math Methods (Senior year).

There is only one day spent on Laplace’s equation in the E&M Capstone, followed by 2 or 3 homework problems.

It was assumed that — once exposed to certain problem-solving technique in one context — students will be able to transfer knowledge of its applicability from one field of physics to another.

Low scores on two other questions involving SofV and BCs: Q11 (finding BCs in a specific scenario) and Q13 (recognizing the form of solutions that match given BCs) support our suspicion that students are not getting enough exposure to these topics in the context of E&M.
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OSU students’ scores differ by over 50% on question Q1 and by almost 40% on question Q15, which test whether students can set up the solution to a problem involving partial differential equations:
  - recognizing SofV as an appropriate problem-solving technique and/or
  - defining boundary conditions (BCs).

At OSU students are exposed to the SofV mainly in the context of the Schrödinger equation:
  - 1-D Waves and Central Forces (Junior year),
  - Math Methods (Senior year).

There is only one day spent on Laplace’s equation in the E&M Capstone, followed by 2 or 3 homework problems.

It was assumed that — once exposed to certain problem-solving technique in one context — students will be able to transfer knowledge of its applicability from one field of physics to another.

Low scores on two other questions involving SofV and BCs: Q11 (finding BCs in a specific scenario) and Q13 (recognizing the form of solutions that match given BCs) support our suspicion that students are not getting enough exposure to these topics in the context of E&M.

CONCLUSIONS

• Due to the significantly restructured curriculum at OSU, our findings provide valuable data for comparison with reported results from CU’s more moderately reformed curriculum and from institutions with a more traditional (lecture) format.

• Despite the different sample of students, the difficulty pattern for most questions is preserved, regardless of the curriculum.

• Students at OSU on average scored about 11% lower, yet they showed learning gains of 33%, which is similar to students from other institutions taught in PER-based courses and higher than gains observed in standard lecture-based courses.

• Strong differences in scores on a few specific questions revealed gaps in our curriculum.