**Student Learning Assessment Program**

## Response to Summary Form

**Graduate Program 2018**

Department: Mathematics and Computer Science

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Level[[1]](#footnote-1)\*** | Comments |
| Learning Objectives | Level 2-3, M.A., Mathematics | Objectives 1-3 are clear and measurable. Objective 4 is not really written in language conducive to measurement; it is more of a topic than a learning objective, so you might want to look at that one. You are missing the action verb of what you want students to learn. All of the goals established by CGS have been adopted by this program. |
| **How, Where, and When Assessed** | Level 2, M.A., Mathematics | You have identified the courses where assessment will take place, which is a good start, but you could use more detail here to flesh out your instruments and assessment methods taking place in those courses. Uniform exams are a good direct measure of knowledge for objective one, but then in objective 2, how do you determine what assignments are used? Are students preparing a portfolio of some kind or are faculty collecting samples? Then, how do you assure that your data is comparable across time and cohorts? Objective 3 combines oral and written communication, which is fine, but the measures only indicate assessment of presentations, so how will you assess written skills? Do all of your students do a thesis? If not, you may need additional assessment for the research objective. If so, then how do you assess that thesis? |
| **Expectations** | Level 2, M.A., Mathematics | Some expectations established. The best plans will have multiple measures for each objective that include direct and indirect tools to provide the fullest possible picture of student learning. I would caution you about using student evaluations for assessing objective 2; you might find it more pertinent to evaluate your teaching assistants and SI leaders yourself using a form or rubric that speaks to the teaching skills you seek to assess. You indicate wanting students at the “basic level” or higher for presentations, so that sounds like you have a rubric that is being used (of which you gave me a copy), so include the presentation rubric in your instruments to clarify how you are assessing presentations. |
| **Results** | Level 2, M.A., Mathematics | Results are collected for most instruments. What do these results tell you about your students’ achievement of your learning objectives? You seem to be making changes, so analysis appears to be occurring, but it is not clear what the data have told you to instigate any changes to the curriculum or assignments. |
| **How Results Will be Used** | Level 2, M.A., Mathematics | A feedback loop appears to be in place. You describe some presentations given in the one credit hour seminar. Have these changes improved student learning? What is the connection between these presentations and preparing students to be community college instructors? There seems to be some missing information in Parts 2 and 3. |

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)