



Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) Report for **Non-Accredited Programs**

(updated 9/19/25)

Program Type: **Non-Accredited Program**

Program Name: **B.A. Mathematics w/ Teacher Licensure**

Submitted By: **Andrew Mertz**

Email: **aemertz@eiu.edu**

Submission Date: **10/21/2025**

Review Cycle: **EVEN YEAR CYCLE**

ODD YEAR CYCLE

Review Round and Instructions

- **Round A** (Associate Dean review): Submit this cover sheet and the review sheets below to your Associate Dean by October 15th.
- **Round B** (Associate Dean + VPAA review): The Associate Dean will send the report to the VPAA Office for further review.

All SLO reports are archived here: <https://www.eiu.edu/assess/majorassessment.php>

DUE: **October 15th** to your Associate Dean or designee

Each academic program is expected to prepare a Summary of the Assessment Data by Student Learning Outcome. This summary may take the form of a chart or other means of presentation that describes the annual data collected, when it is collected, in which course(s), through which assignment or activity, and by whom. This summary should clearly indicate what the program seeks to discover in its students' learning. The summary should correspond to the record-keeping documents maintained by the academic program. While this is a biennial report, a program's assessment should be ongoing, throughout every academic year.

Program Name: B.A. Mathematics w/ Teacher Licensure

PART 1. OVERVIEW OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND MEASURES

Student Learning Outcome (SLO)

Demonstrate appropriate knowledge of core mathematical content.

What measures and instruments are you using?

This could be an oral or written exam, a regularly assigned paper, a portfolio—administered early and later in coursework.

How are you using this info to improve student learning? What are you hoping to learn from your data? Include **target score(s) and results**, and specify whether these were met, not met, or partially met for each instrument.

Does your SLO correspond to an **undergraduate learning goal (ULG)**: writing, speaking, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, responsible citizenship?

Critical Thinking, Quantitative Reasoning

Course Grades: Grades from all required mathematics courses completed at Eastern are used as one measure of core content knowledge. Coursework is completed throughout the degree program.

State Licensure Content Test: The state licensure content test provides an external measure across several content categories of student knowledge of core mathematical content. The state content test is usually completed prior to student teaching. The test must be

Course Grades

2023-24

	A	B	C
MAT 1441	1		
MAT 2442	1		
MAT 2443	1		
MAT 2550	1		1
MAT 2800	2	1	
MAT 3271	1	2	
MAT 3272	1	1	1
MAT 3530	3		
MAT 3701	1	1	1
MAT 4900	1	1	1
MAT 2270	2		1
MAT 2400	2	1	
MAT 3400	1	2	
CSM 2170	1		

2024-25

passed to obtain a teaching license.

	A	B	C
MAT 1441			
MAT 2442	1		
MAT 2443		1	
MAT 2550	1	1	
MAT 2800	2		
MAT 3271	2	1	
MAT 3272	1	1	
MAT 3530	2		
MAT 3701	1	1	
MAT 4900	3		
MAT 2270	1	2	
MAT 2400	1	1	
MAT 3400	1	1	
CSM 1000/2170	3		

Content Test

2023-24

2 passed on 1st attempt
1 passed on 2nd attempt

2024-25

1 passed on 1st attempt
1 passed on 2nd attempt
1 did not attempt the test

The majority of students had A and B grades indicating knowledge of the required content.

Many students transfer in one or more calculus classes causing incomplete data for those courses.

Demonstrate the ability to plan for mathematical learning.

Peer Teaching Experience in MAT 3400 – Teaching Secondary Mathematics:
Students are required to create a detailed lesson plan that they teach to the class and then reflect upon the experience. Part of the lesson planning process includes the completion of the Thinking

The foundations class (MAT 2800) shows students are ready to transition to upper-division mathematics.

The linear algebra through geometry sequence (MAT 2550, MAT 3271, MAT 3272) shows that students learn the required content.

The mathematics education classes (MAT 2270, 2400, and 3400) show students are prepared to provide their students with effective learning experiences and are proficient at using technology in both teaching and learning mathematics.

The remaining coursework (MAT 3530, MAT 3701, MAT 4900) show similar trends.

Students appear to be prepared to pass the state content test when attempted. If a student does not pass, the Secondary Education coordinator contacts the student to make sure they are aware of the available free study materials.

Peer Teaching Experience in MAT 3400 – Teaching Secondary Mathematics:

2023-24
2/3 students earned ‘Basic’ or better in all assessed categories
1/3 student earned below ‘Basic’ in no more than three categories

Critical Thinking, Writing and Critical Reading, Speaking and Listening

Demonstrate the ability to teach meaningful mathematics

Through a Lesson Protocol. This protocol is divided into pieces that are directly related to the lesson plan and implementation. The protocol contains questions that students must produce written answers to and then must share during a meeting with the instructor. The actual lesson plan written is assessed using a rubric and the actual implementation of the lesson has its own rubric. This assessment is evaluated and revised every semester in order to address emerging needs and better focus in on needed ideas. The ratings indicators have remained the same. A rating of 'Basic' is the minimum rating to show that you have passed an observed or assessed criteria.

2024-25

2/2 students earned 'Basic' or better in all assessed categories

The process of peer teaching is detailed and involved. The assessment shows students are able to write and implement a lesson. Only one student had any categories below 'Basic'.

Student Teaching

This assessment was not used for this assessment time frame. The department believes the Impact on Secondary Math Student Learning Assessment along with the Cooperating Teacher Assessment provide evidence needed to assess the program and address the SLO - Demonstrate the ability to plan for mathematical learning.

Moving forward as the state changes assessment needs and standards for teaching, the department may consider adding this assessment back to the portfolio of data used for the program.

Cooperating Teacher Evaluation

Note the rating system (across 21 items) is now (from lowest to highest): beginning, developing, and competent.

2023-24

1 student earned developing in 5 categories and competent in 16 categories.

Critical Thinking, Writing and Critical Reading, Speaking and Listening

Demonstrate the ability to meaningfully impact the learning of students at the secondary level.

address various teaching and pedagogical elements. This survey allows the department to gather granular level data on how the candidate met or did not meet these criteria. A rating of ‘competent’ or higher is the goal on the three-scale rating system. The survey was revised once during this assessment time frame.

1 student earned developing in 4 categories and competent in 17 categories.

1 student earned beginning in 1 category, developing in 15 categories and competent in 4 categories.

2024-25

1 student earned developing in 4 categories and competent in 17 categories.

1 student earned developing in 11 categories and competent in 10 categories.

1 student earned beginning in 3 categories, developing in 6 categories and competent in 12 categories.

Candidates seem to be able to implement effective lessons and do well working with the cooperating teacher and others in the building/district in planning learning experiences.

Impact on Secondary Math Student Learning Assessment

2023-24

2/3 students earned emerging or better in all categories.

1/3 students earned under developed in 1 category.

2024-25

Critical Thinking, Writing and Critical Reading, Quantitative Reasoning

implementation, and assessment measures for that unit. Candidates have flexibility as to how they want to measure learning, but any measure must show gains in knowledge beyond memorization. The learning segment is also supported via video segments or direct observation by the secondary mathematics education coordinator in the department. As part of the submission, students submit a narrative describing the central focus of the learning segment and how they have planned this segment taking into account the needs of their students (both math and non-math specific). Students also must justify that they are implementing high cognitive demand tasks in the unit and are attempting to promote reasoning and sense making. Finally, students are required to use math specific tools and discuss how they used representations to further learning. Regarding the measures of assessment, candidates are asked to provide details on how they designed their assessment plan, collected data and then ultimately analyzed that data to determine

2/3 students earned emerging or better in all category.

1/3 students earned under developed in 1 category.

The assessment shows that most candidates are prepared to engage in student teaching, but also gives information to us to assist individual candidates.

the outcomes of the learning segment. Details regarding types of assessment and reflections are also required. A rubric is used to assess each aspect of the narrative and provided evidence. A rating of ‘emerging’ or higher is the goal for the three scale rating system.

PART 2. IMPROVEMENTS AND CHANGES BASED ON ASSESSMENT

A. Provide a short summary (1-2 paragraphs) or bulleted list of any **curricular actions** (revisions or additions) that were approved over the past two years as a result of reflecting on the student learning outcomes data. Are there any additional future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or still pending?

Departmental controlled assessments and rubrics are reviewed every academic year and revised as needed.

We eliminated the “Student Teaching Assessment” as a measure of outcomes as we found the “Cooperating Teacher Candidate Evaluation” and the “Impact on Secondary Math Student Learning Assessment” provide more relevant information for us.

We changed the prerequisite for MAT 3400 to require SED 2000. SED 2000 is an introductory course for secondary education majors. Requiring SED 2000 better prepares students for MAT 3400.

B. Provide a brief description or bulleted list of **any improvements (or declines)** observed/measured in student learning. Be sure to mention any intervention made that has not yet resulted in student improvement (if applicable).

The Impact on Secondary Math Student Learning Assessment and Cooperating Teacher Candidate Evaluation may show some declines, but the small sample size is not yet conclusive. They will be watched for any continuing trends. However, these instruments also give faculty actionable information to assist individual students.

C. HISTORY OF DATA REVIEW OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS

Please document annual faculty and committee engagement with the assessment process (such as the review of outcomes data, revisions/updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs).

Date of annual (or periodic) review	Individuals or groups who reviewed the assessment plan	Results of the review (i.e., reference proposed changes from any revised SLOs or from point 2.A. curricular actions)
Fall 2024	Andrew Mertz, Marshall Lassak	Added SED 2000 prerequisite to MAT 3400.
Fall 2025	Andrew Mertz, Marshall Lassak	No revisions.

Dean Review and Feedback

Dean or Designee Signature and Date: Michael Cornebise, Associate Dean

11/25/2025

The BA in Mathematics Teacher Licensure was previously accredited by the NCTM and also met all SPA standards. During the review period, the department eliminated the Student Teaching Assessment used in the previous report in favor of the Cooperating Teacher Candidate Evaluation and the Impact on Secondary Math Student Learning Assessment measures. The assessment review committee met annually and added SED 2000 as a prerequisite to MAT 3400 in an effort to improve student learning outcomes. The report notes that the new instruments may show some declines, but the small sample size is inconclusive. However, the results do provide faculty with information to assist individual students.

VPAA Office Review and Feedback
(for "Round B" SLO report only)

VPAA Signature and Date:

Type Electronic Signature and Date

Type here