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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed?  | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| 1. Students will demonstrate appropriate knowledge of core mathematical content. | a) All three options: course grades from MAT 2443, MAT 3271, MAT 3530, MAT 3701b) Pure option: course grades from MAT 4760 and MAT 4860c) Applied option: course grades from MAT 3501 and CSM 3570d) Teacher licensure option: course grades from MAT 2550, MAT 2270, MAT 4900e) Teacher licensure option: ISBE Mathematics Area Content Test | Students in all options should obtain at least a “C” (2.00 out of a 4.00 scale) in the identified coursework. The state of Illinois requires that teacher licensure students obtain a “C” or better in all coursework. Teacher licensure students should pass the ISBE Mathematics Area Content Test after no more than two attempts. | a) FA 16-MAT 2443: 6 of 6 students met or exceeded expectations.MAT 3271: 5 of 5 students exceeded expectations.MAT 3530: 3 of 4 students exceeded expectations.MAT 3701: 8 of 8 students met or exceeded expectations.SP 17-MAT 2443: 3 of 3 students met or exceeded expectations.MAT 3530: 7 of 7 students met or exceeded expectations.b) FA 16-MAT 4760: 2 of 2 students met or exceeded expectations.MAT 4860: 2 of 2 students met or exceeded expectations.c) SP17-MAT 3501: 6 of 6 students met or exceeded expectations.CSM 3570: 3 of 3 students met or exceeded expectations. d) FA16-MAT 2550: 9 of 9 students met or exceeded expectations.MAT 4900: 6 of 6 students exceeded expectations.SP17-MAT 2550: 1 of 1 student met or exceeded expectations.MAT 2270: 6 of 6 students exceeded expectations.e) 5 of 5 students passed the test in one attempt. | This data are collected by the course faculty and the department chair.Course grade data are shared informally among course instructors and the department chair. Students who earn a “C” or lower typically are required to meet with their advisor to discuss potential issues and deficiencies that may be present moving forward.ISBE Mathematics Area Content Test data are shared with the departmental secondary education coordinator; these results are also shared on the annual ISBE report. If a student does not pass after two attempts, the student is contacted for a conference. |
| 2. Students will be able to communicate mathematics appropriate to the degree option in both oral and written forms. | a) All three options:Written work from MAT 2800.b) Pure and Applied option: Presentations in MAT 3800.c) Teacher licensure option: Successful implementation of the second peer teaching experience during MAT 3400.d) Teacher licensure option: Successful implementation of a peer teaching experience in MAT 2400. | a) Performance in MAT 2800 should be at the “Fair” or higher category. Opportunities for rewrites are provided. Overall performance is reported as an aggregate score.b) Performance in MAT 3800 should be at the “Fair” or higher category. Overall performance is reported as an aggregate score.c) Peer Teaching performance should be at the “Basic” or higher rating for each individually assessed category. This assessment takes place in class and is assessed by the course instructor and students in the class.d) Peer Teaching performance should be at the “Basic” or higher rating for each individually assessed category. This assessment takes place in class and is assessed by the course instructor and students in the class. | a) FA16-MAT 2800: 5 of 7 students achieved a rating above “Fair” on written assignments. SP17-MAT 2800: 3 of 4 students achieved a rating above “Fair” on written assignments.b) SP 17-MAT 3800: 3 of 3 students achieved the highest rating of “Excellent.”c) FA16-Peer Teaching II (n=5): 1 student rated below Basic in the Accommodations category on the lesson plan; 2 students rated below Basic in the “After” category lesson implementation.SP17-Peer Teaching II (n=1): The student rated Basic or higher in all assessed categories for both the lesson plan and lesson implementation.d) Peer Teaching (n=5): 1 student rated below Basic in the “Assessment” category on the lesson plan. For the lesson implementation, 3 students had ratings that were below Basic (all 3 in the “SMP” category, 1 in the “Organization” category and the “After” category, and 1 in the “Launch” category). | The data are collected by the course faculty and the department chair.Results from MAT 2800 are shared among relevant faculty, especially the instructor of MAT 3271 (MAT 2800 is a prerequisite for this course).Results from MAT 3800 are shared among relevant faculty and are used to help determine implementation of the next MAT 3800.Results of the peer teaching labs (both MAT 2400 and MAT 3400 are shared with the departmental secondary education coordinator; these results are also shared on the annual ISBE report. |
| 3. MATT students will successfully demonstrate the ability to meaningfully impact the learning of students at the secondary level. | This objective is assessed during STG 4001 through edTPA.  | edTPA sets the passing score at an aggregate of 35. The aggregate score is generated across 3 tasks using several rubrics. Students are given an opportunity to revise/resubmit on this assessment.Students are prepared for this assessment in both their education courses and mathematics methods course (MAT 2400 and MAT 3400). | 2016-2017 (n=9):6 students passed on their first attempt; 2 students passed after two attempts; 1 student remained incomplete.The average pass score was 38.1 for the initial 6 students and was 39.1 for the set of 8 passing students.  | This data are reported to the departmental secondary education coordinator.Data are shared with the department chair and the mathematics education faculty.  |
| 3. Students will demonstrate speaking proficiency. | This objective is assessed at the University level in both CMN 1310G and Senior Seminar | Students will score at or above 3.0 for each individual rating category and score an average of at least 3.0. | FA16:MAT (n=1) 1 student met scoring expectations for CMN 1310G.MAT (n=3) 3 students met the scoring expectations for Senior Seminar. MATT (n=1) 1 student met average but not individual scoring expectations for CMN 1310G.SP17:MAT (n=1) 1 student met average but not individual scoring expectations for CMN 1310G.MATT (n=3) 3 students met the scoring expectations for Senior Seminar.  | Data is reported by CASA. Data are shared informally with faculty. |
| 4. Students will demonstrate proficiency in writing.  | This objective is assessed at the university level through the EWP. The three EWP submissions are collected at various times during the degree program. | Students will score at or above 3.0.  | FA16:All MAT (n=3) and 9 of 10 MATT (n=8) submissions were scored at the 3.0 or higher level.SP17:All MAT (n=3) and 7 of 9 MATT (n=7) submissions were scored at the 3.0 or higher level. | Data is reported by CASA. Data are shared informally with faculty. |
| 5. Students will demonstrate critical thinking skills. | This objective is measured at the university level by the Watson Glazer exam given to students during senior seminar. | Students will score at the University average or higher. | AY 17 (n = 6): 2 students scored below the University average of 25.40. | Data is reported by CASA. Data are shared informally with faculty. |

**PART TWO**

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

Since the last report, the MATT program has undergone two evaluations.

* Annual ISBE program review: This review has become much more perfunctory over the last couple of years, with a focus on brief justifications of any programmatic changes. Our program received continued approval.
* NCTM/CAEP SPA Review: The MATT program was initially reviewed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) CAEP SPA standards in 2014. Our program has been “Nationally Recognized with Conditions” twice since that time. As reported on the last assessment report, we resubmitted in March 2016 and we heard in September of 2016 that we are now “Nationally Recognized.”

The MATT program added and offered for the first time a new introductory methods course (MAT 2400) which has an assessment featured in Objective #2. Coursework changes are still ongoing to meet new CAEP SPA requirements and the University teacher education program as a whole is undergoing an external assessment review by CAEP in the coming year.

The MAT programs continue to remain relatively static as indicated in the previous report. While a small group of faculty worked on potentially realigning some courses in the sequence, nothing actionable took place. Instead there are changes being made to the content of some courses (most notably MAT 3701 which is part of an assessment for Objective #1). Content changes are being made in order to make courses more relevant and applicable to both the field and other coursework. A secondary point of emphasis remains on the calculus sequence. While MAT 1441G and MAT 2442 are not part of our assessment plan, we continue to be concerned about student success in these courses. It is important to us as MAT 2443 is the capstone of this sequence and poor performance in the previous two courses does not usually make for a successful MAT 2443 experience.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

The MATT program continues to refine both its Peer Teaching assessment (which is part of this assessment report in Objective #2) and edTPA assessment (which is not yet part of the assessment report). The edTPA Unit Plan assessment has students create a unit plan using various resources including both traditional and integrated textbooks and using online resources. The unit plan also uses materials from the ISBE Model Math Curriculum website. This assessment is assessed using rubrics from the edTPA assessment that students will encounter during student teaching. It will be part of the assessment plan (either Objective #4 or #5) by next assessment cycle. The pass rate for the edTPA remains near 100%. However, it is unclear what we can do to assist those students (1 for this year) who remain as an “incomplete” finisher.

The MATT program added a new methods course (MAT 2400) which changed some sequencing of when students take MAT 3400. Additionally, MAT 3400 used to be a 4-credit course and is now 3-credits, with MAT 2400 being 1-credit. Some content and pedagogical ideas are now first experienced in MAT 2400 much earlier in a student’s degree program. Ideally, we will develop an assessment that takes place across both courses that will allow us to measure growth in lesson planning and lesson implementation. The results of the Peer Teaching performance in MAT 2400 for this year were not at the level expected or needed. However, the performance level for Peer Teaching in MAT 3400 continues to be at an appropriate level.

While the numbers have dropped significantly, all MATT students passed the state content test in one attempt (as opposed to last year). The department purchased (for student use) study guides for the test. All students reported that the study guides were quite helpful in preparing fort he exam. Additionally, the secondary mathematics education coordinator purposely met with students regarding plans for taking the state test.

The MAT program is moving slowly toward some curricular changes and there is much interest from students in independent study and research experiences. These individual experiences yield great results and excellent student work, but are not part of a comprehensive assessment plan as neither type of experience is required. There is still interest in paring MAT 2800 with MAT 1441G or MAT 2442 for our majors, but that proposal has yet to be written.

It is clear that some sort of exit survey is still needed for our graduating students. This does not seem to be something that should be difficult to implement, but still has yet to done. I will attempt to make it a priority for the coming year.