**Student Learning Assessment Program**

## Response to Summary Form

**Undergraduate Program 2017**

Department: Mathematics and Computer Science

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Level[[1]](#footnote-1)\*** | Comments |
| Learning Objectives | Level 2, B.A., Mathematics | Objectives are programmatic. This program has adopted quantitative reasoning, critical thinking, speaking, and writing of the undergraduate learning goals. Given the content of this program, I am assuming that quantitative reasoning is embedded in objective 1. There’s a bit of overlap between objectives 2, 3, and 4. |
| **How, Where, and When Assessed** | Level 2, B.A., Mathematics | Your plans to include edTPA assessment in your report is a good one and should provide excellent direct assessment of student learning. AY17 was the last year for which Watson-Glaser data will be available, so you will need to consider a new measure for critical thinking this coming year. Some programs may be looking at the AAC&U rubric that CASL has adapted for EIU use. Incorporating an exit survey is another good idea; Qualtrics can make it pretty easy to keep sending it out and tabulating results once you have the questions established and in the system as you want. That would give you indirect assessment as well. I remain hesitant about course grades for assessment although they make sense for content objectives like objective 1, but just be aware of their limitations in telling you specifics about particular knowledge and skills. |
| **Expectations** | Level 2, B.A., Mathematics | Expectations are given for the measures established. |
| **Results** | Level 2, B.A., Mathematics | Results are given for each objective. Congratulations on your “nationally recognized” status from CAEP. You mention some concern about the calculus sequence. Would it make sense to add these courses into your plan as formative assessment since they set the basis for later learning in MAT 2443? |
| **How Results Will be Used** | Level 2, B.A., Mathematics | Results are being used with changes having been made to MAT 2400 and MAT 3400 and the purchase of study guides for the state content exam. These changes appear to have had a positive impact for students, so that’s great. It isn’t clear how much involvement there is from the faculty in the feedback loop. Do the faculty as a whole see the data and the committee’s analysis? How is it shared and discussed? |

1. \* Levels should not be interpreted as grades or scores; they are stages of implementation based on patterns of characteristics described by North Central Association. These levels are approximations based on the information provided in the summaries. Please refer to the checklist for the Primary Traits listed for each level on the assessment web site at www.eiu.edu/~assess. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)