

Mathematics Assessment Report

2019-20

Learning Outcomes for Mathematics:

1. Students will be able to demonstrate facility with analytical concepts.
2. Students will be able to write proofs.
3. Students will be able to demonstrate facility with algebraic structures.
4. Students will be able to apply their mathematical knowledge and critical thinking to solve problems.
5. Students will be able to use technology to solve problems.
6. Students will be able to speak about their work with precision, clarity and organization.
7. Students will be able to write about their work with precision, clarity and organization.
8. Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand.
9. Students will collaborate effectively in teams.
10. Students will be able to understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence.
11. Graduates will be prepared for careers that use mathematics in business, industry, government and the non-profit sector; graduate study in fields related to mathematics; and teaching mathematics and computer science at the secondary level.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to demonstrate facility with analytical concepts.

Outcome Measure: Annual - ETS Major Field Test in Mathematics: Calculus subscore

Criteria for Success: The department subscore will be at the 50th percentile or higher

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

This is the most recent 10 years of data.

Year	Percentile
2009-10	90
2010-11	70
2011-12	99
2012-13	38
2013-14	72
2014-15	*
2015-16	16
2016-17	13
2017-18	*
2018-19	57
2019-20	N/A

* Insufficient students for score to be calculated

Note the ETS changed the Mathematics test in 2012-13.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Before the change in the exam in 2013, the students were meeting our expectations, since the exam changed they have not. We need to look at the questions that make up this subscore to see if we need to make curricular adjustments or if the questions being asked mean that this tool is no longer measuring what we want to measure.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We made curricular adjustments in about 2008-09 to reduce the amount of Real Analysis (two semesters to one) in order to create space for additional course work. It does not appear that these changes had a negative impact on student scores. However, it appears that the questions in this section are mostly focused on calculus-related concepts.

Because of the change in 2013, we need to further analyze the questions as part of our program review to determine if this remains a valid measure for this learning outcome in our program. Digging into this issue will be part of our upcoming program review.

The department has decided to discontinue using the ETS MFT. We are in the process of aligning this learning outcome with a signature assignment in a class.

Rubric Used

None. The scores are computed by ETS.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to write proofs.

Outcome Measure:

Annual - MTH242/MTH3012 Signature Assignment

Alternating Years - MTH424/MTH4024 and MTH444/MTH4044 Signature Assignment

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students to score a 2.5 or higher (on a scale of 1-4) in each of the four areas:

- Statement of the problem
- Logic
- Symbolism
- Justification

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	MTH242/3012 Percentage of Class at 2.5 or Higher								
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Statement of Problem	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Logic	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Symbolism	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Justification	75%	100%	83%	88%	100%	78%	100%	100%	100%

*Note that MTH242 was renamed MTH3012 in institutional catalog changes.

	MTH4024 Percentage at 2.5 or higher			
	Fall 2013	Fall 2015	Fall 2017	Fall 2019
Statement of Problem	92%	100%	90%	83%
Logic	92%	89%	90%	83%
Symbolism	100%	100%	90%	100%
Justification	77%	67%	60%	100%

	MTH4044 Percentage at 2.5 or higher			
	Fall 2012	Fall 2014	Fall 2016	Fall 2018
Statement of Problem	92%	100%	83%	100%
Logic	92%	100%	0%	100%
Symbolism	100%	100%	67%	100%
Justification	77%	100%	67%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The place where the students continue to struggle the most is in the area of justification in their proofs. These classes are small so the difference between meeting or not meeting the benchmark may be the performance of single student. The 2016-17 data in MTH444/MTH4044 is somewhat surprising – the low scores are primarily due to the particular problem chosen and the instructions given. If the criteria for success is lowered to “percentage at 2 or higher” then the scores become Statement of Problem (100%), Logic (67%), Symbolism (100%) and Justification (83%). So this group of students was just below the benchmark.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We continue to emphasize the need for strong justification of every step in a proof and to more clearly reinforce that in assignments in all proof writing classes. Since making those changes, we seem to be seeing fewer weak justifications in proofs.

Proof Writing Rubric (MTH3012, MTH4024, MTH4044)

	Unsatisfactory	Low Satisfactory	High Satisfactory	Outstanding
Statement of the Problem	Can not determine what is given and what needs to be proved	Misses one part of the hypothesis or the conclusion	Makes one minor error in identifying hypothesis or conclusion	Understands what is given and what is to be proved
Logic	Proof has major flaws that make it invalid.	Proof misses more than one major element.	Proof has the main flow of the logic correct but misses one major element	Statements flow logically from one another
Symbolism	There are many errors in the use of symbolic notation	There are more than two errors in symbolic notation	There are two or fewer minor errors in symbolic notation (e.g. missing parentheses)	All symbols are used correctly
Justification	There are several errors in the justification	There is one major mistake in justification or more than two minor errors.	There are two or fewer minor errors in justification for the steps.	Every logical step has the appropriate reason (theorem, definition, lemma, etc.)

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to demonstrate facility with algebraic structures.

Outcome Measure: Annual: ETS Major Field Test in Mathematics: Algebra subscore

Criteria for Success: The department subscore will be at the 50th percentile or higher.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

This is the most recent 10 years of data:

Year	Percentile
2009-10	65
2010-11	90
2011-12	85
2012-13	72
2013-14	49
2014-15	*
2015-16	42
2016-17	8
2017-18	*
2018-19	32
2019-20	N/A

* Insufficient students for score to be calculated

Note the ETS changed the Mathematics test in 2012-13.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Before the change in the exam in 2013, the students were meeting our expectations, since the exam changed they have not. We need to look at the questions that make up this subscore to see if we need to make curricular adjustments or if the questions being asked mean that this tool is no longer measuring what we want to measure.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We made curricular adjustments in about 2008-09 to reduce the amount of abstract algebra (two semesters to one) in order to create space for additional course work. We did increase the amount of linear algebra that we are requiring each student to take, so that may have balanced the reduction in abstract algebra.

The drop in the scores that corresponds to the change in the ETS test has us concerned. This may no longer be the right tool for measuring student learning in this area. Digging into this issue will be part of our upcoming program review.

The department has decided to discontinue using the ETS MFT. We are in the process of aligning this learning outcome with a signature assignment in a class.

Rubric Used

None. The scores are computed by ETS.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to apply their mathematical knowledge and critical thinking to solve problems.

Outcome Measure:

ETS Major Field Test in Mathematics: Applied subscore (Annual)

ETS Proficiency Profile – Reading/Critical Thinking (Annual)

Criteria for Success:

ETS MFT: The department subscore will be at the 50th percentile or higher

ETS Proficiency Profile: 85% of the students will be marginal or proficient at Level 2 Reading/Critical Thinking.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

This is the data from the most recent 10 years.

Year	Percentile
2009-10	85
2010-11	70
2011-12	96
2012-13	60
2013-14	39
2014-15	*
2015-16	55
2016-17	55
2017-18	*
2018-19	32
2019-20	N/A

* Insufficient students for score to be calculated

Note the ETS changed the Mathematics test in 2012-13.

ETS Proficiency Profile	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient							
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Critical Thinking	80%	92%	100%	84%	92%	76%	79%	80%

*This data is for the entire department, not just mathematics.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

MFT: The students have been meeting our expectations. Our sample size is relatively small, so we expect some variation from year to year because of the size of the standard deviation on small samples. We are concerned about the drop in the scores with the exam change in 2012-13, however they seem to have recovered in the last few years.

Proficiency Profile: The students are meeting our criteria with the expected variation based on sample size.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

MFT: We have increased the amount of applied mathematics problems in our coursework, so the ETS results are somewhat puzzling. We will be reviewing this as part of our program review process.

The department has decided to discontinue using the ETS MFT. We are in the process of aligning this learning outcome with a signature assignment in a class.

Proficiency Profile: No changes at this time. The students are generally meeting our expectations.

Rubric Used

None. The scores are computed by ETS.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be comfortable using technology to solve problems.

Outcome Measure: Annual: MTH382/MTH383 Signature Assignment and CSC254 Signature Assignment (through 2014-15)

Criteria for Success:

MTH382/MTH383: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas.

Fall 2014 and before:

CSC254: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2 in each of the major areas.

Fall 2015 and later:

Mathematics majors are now taking CSC252 (the first half of CSC254) and are not being assessed at the end of CSC254.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	MTH383 Percentage of students at 2.5 or higher							
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Students will be able to use technology to solve problems	100%	skipped	100%	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%

	CSC254 Percentage of Class at 2 or Higher			
	2011	2012	2013	2014
Compilation	100%	100%	92%	100%
Runtime Correctness	86%	58%	85%	75%
Problem Solving	100%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

MTH382/MTH383: Students have been able to satisfactorily analyze data using technology.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

MTH382/MTH383: Continue to use a hands on data analysis project.

MTH382 Signature Assignment Rubric

	Outstanding (4)	High Satisfactory (3)	Low Satisfactory (2)	Unsatisfactory (1)
Use of technology to solve problems	<p>Other than checking results, uses only the relevant operations $\{+, -, \times, \div, \sqrt{\square}, \text{and Sum()}\}$ in formulas in a manner that is typical of Excel usage in industry.</p> <p>and</p> <p>Uses cell addresses instead of typing in numerical results (other than typing n or $n-1$).</p>	<p>Other than checking results, uses only the relevant operations $\{+, -, \times, \div, \sqrt{\square}, \text{and Sum()}\}$ in formulas.</p> <p>and</p> <p>Uses one or fewer instances of typing a numerical result (other than n or $n-1$) instead of a cell address in a formula.</p>	<p>Other than checking results, uses one of the built in functions (Average, StDev) instead of $\{+, -, \times, \div, \sqrt{\square}, \text{and Sum()}\}$.</p> <p>or</p> <p>Occasionally types numerical results (other than n or $n-1$) instead of cell addresses in formulas.</p>	<p>Other than checking results, uses both of the built in functions (Average, StDev) instead of $\{+, -, \times, \div, \sqrt{\square}, \text{and Sum()}\}$.</p> <p>or</p> <p>Often types in numerical results instead of cell addresses in formulas.</p>
Computation correctness	Completely correct	Made a minor error	Made a major error	More than one major error including completely incorrect.

Criterion: 80% of students will score at or above 2.5.

CSC 254 Signature Assignment Rubric

	Unsatisfactory (1)	Satisfactory (2)	Good (3)	Excellent (4)
Compilation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compiles with errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compiles with no errors, but has linking errors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compiles with no syntax errors or linking errors, but has warnings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compiles and links with no errors
Runtime correctness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No correct response to any test case from the sample data provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executes correctly on at least one test case from the sample data provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Executes correctly on the given sample data, but not accepted by the online judge (no need to look at source code in this case) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepted by the online judge, indicating that it has passed numerous independent test cases unknown to the student.
Problem solving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of program source code indicates that program is NOT close to working, and could NOT easily be modified to work given additional time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of program source code indicates that the student partially understands the problem solution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of program source code indicates that program is close to working, and could be modified to work given additional time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepted by judge

Criterion: 80% of students will average 2 in Runtime correctness and Problem solving.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to speak about their work with precision, clarity and organization (Oral Communication).

Outcome Measure: Annual: Each student will be required to give an oral presentation on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance of their presentation and will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) in the following areas:

- Command of background material
- Organization
- Oral presentation skills (added as part of the new rubric in the spring of 2010)
- Use of presentation tools
- Ability to field questions from the audience

Note that the department has a mapping between its rubric and the AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric.

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas in the department rubric. This translates to 80% of the students being above a 3.5 in the AAC&U rubric.

Our translation from our data to the AAC&U is included. Our department continues to provide the students with our departmental rubric because it has been developed over many years and works effectively with our majors.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Oral Presentation	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Background	95%	100%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%	100%
Organization	85%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	94%	100%	100%
Oral Presentation Skills	90%	100%	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%	100%
Presentation Tools	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Ability to Field Questions	100%	83%	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	94%	94%

AAC&U “translation” (we have only done this for the years that PLNU has been making use of the DQP)

Oral AAC&U	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Organization	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	94%	100%	100%
Language	100%	92%	100%	100%	100%	100%	95%	100%
Delivery	100%	92%	100%	95%	100%	100%	95%	100%
Supporting Material	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Central Message	100%	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	94%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in the area of giving oral presentations. We attribute this to the fact that we intentionally have students presenting technical material in front of others starting in their freshman year.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Over time we have increased our standards and expanded the rubric to increase clarity for students and to push them to speak at a professional level. We have been incorporating more oral presentations into classes and saw an improvement once we began doing that (before 2010).

Oral Presentation Rubric Update (4/12/17)

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Command of background material	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly knows material and key facts by memory <input type="checkbox"/> Expands on PPT slides <input type="checkbox"/> Content appropriate for audience	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly knows key facts with a few memory slips <input type="checkbox"/> Some expansion on PPT slides <input type="checkbox"/> Partial audience adaptation of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads some information; knows some facts from memory <input type="checkbox"/> No expansion of PPT slide content <input type="checkbox"/> Little audience adaptation of content	<input type="checkbox"/> Reads sentences from slides <input type="checkbox"/> Dependent on notes <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks audience adaptation of content
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear and concise outline <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant graphics and key text items on slides <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation is between 10-15 minutes	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear outline <input type="checkbox"/> Too much information on slides (not concise) <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 1 minute outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	<input type="checkbox"/> Some sense of outline <input type="checkbox"/> Too much detailed information on slides <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 2 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)	<input type="checkbox"/> No clear outline <input type="checkbox"/> Slides are in paragraphed; too much detailed information on one slide <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation 3 minutes outside of the range (10-15 minutes)
Oral Presentation skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly has practiced several times; smooth transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience in content multiple time and engagement is well connected to talk (questions, examples, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> Free of disfluencies (ah, umh) <input type="checkbox"/> Is clearly heard in the room and makes an uses inflection for emphasis <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged audience through eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Engaged audience through gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> Has practiced but transitions are not smooth <input type="checkbox"/> Engages audience at least twice in content (questions, examples, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> A few disfluencies (ah, umh, er) <input type="checkbox"/> Can be understood most of the time and uses some inflection <input type="checkbox"/> Some engagement of audience through eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Some engagement of audience through gestures	<input type="checkbox"/> Has practiced presentation but cannot verbally make transitions between slides <input type="checkbox"/> Audience engagement at least once with content (questions, examples, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Many disfluencies (ah, umh, er) <input type="checkbox"/> Can sometimes be understood and uses little inflection <input type="checkbox"/> Infrequent eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Distracting gestures or mannerisms	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly did not practice presentation; Does not anticipate content of next slide <input type="checkbox"/> No audience involvement <input type="checkbox"/> Disfluencies (ah, umh, er) detract from presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Can not be heard and/or speaks in a monotone <input type="checkbox"/> Little audience awareness or eye contact <input type="checkbox"/> Frequent distracting gestures or mannerisms
Use of Presentation Tools	<input type="checkbox"/> PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions <input type="checkbox"/> Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate PPT slide backgrounds, transitions & font <input type="checkbox"/> Most graphics imbedded and matched to topic, most necessary hyperlinks work	<input type="checkbox"/> Distracting PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font hard to read <input type="checkbox"/> Some inappropriate graphics or use of PPT embellishments, necessary hyperlinks don't work	<input type="checkbox"/> No attention given to PPT slide backgrounds and transitions, font illegible <input type="checkbox"/> Distracting use of embellishments, graphics not connected to topic
Ability to field questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation and prepared material to answer anticipated questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Can answer all questions with some hesitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to answer half of the questions with hesitation	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to answer any questions

Translation between MICS and AAC&U Rubric

MICS Category	MICS Item Position in Rubric	AAC&U Category
Clear and concise outline	4	Organization
Relevant graphics and key text items on slides	5	Organization
Presentation length is +/- 30 seconds of time limit	6	Organization
Expands on PPT slides	2	Language
Content appropriate for audience	3	Language
Engages audience	8	Language
Transitions	7	Delivery
Free of disfluencies (ah, uhm)	9	Delivery
Is clearly heard in the room and uses inflection for emphasis	10	Delivery
Engaged audience through eye contact	11	Delivery
Engaged audience through gestures	12	Delivery
PPT background is matched to content, legible font, seamless transitions	13	Delivery
Relevant graphics and key text items on slides	5	Supporting
Graphics imbedded and matched to topic, necessary hyperlinks work	14	Supporting
Clearly knows material and key facts by memory	1	Central Message
Able to answer questions clearly and without hesitation	15	Central Message

AAC&U Value Rubric

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation.
Language	Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.	Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience.
Delivery	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.	Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable.
Supporting Material	A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.	Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.
Central Message	Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)	Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material.	Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.	Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to write about their work with precision, clarity and organization (Written Communication).

Outcome Measure:

Annual: Each student will be required to write a paper on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance of their presentation and will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (outstanding) to 1 (unsatisfactory) in the following areas:

- Bibliography and other supporting documentation
- Organization
- Grammar and spelling
- Depth of information
- Clarity of writing

Note that the department has a mapping between its rubric and the AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric.

Annual: ETS Proficiency Profile.

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas in the department rubric. This translates to 80% of the students being above a 3.5 in the AAC&U rubric.

ETS: 85% of our students will be marginal or proficient on the Level 2 Writing test.

Our translation from our data to the AAC&U is included. Our department continues to provide the students with our departmental rubric because it has been developed over many years and works effectively with our majors

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

Written Report	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Bibliography and Support	55%	93%	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	76%	89%	81%
Organization	65%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	94%	100%	100%
Grammar and Spelling	60%	79%	100%	92%	89%	84%	100%	88%	94%	94%
Depth of Information	50%	93%	91%	77%	78%	89%	85%	76%	83%	94%
Clarity of Writing	70%	79%	91%	77%	78%	89%	85%	88%	94%	88%

AAC&U “translation” (we have only done this for the years that PLNU has been making use of the DQP)

Written AAC&U	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Context and Purpose for Writing	100%	100%	100%	89%	92%	94%	100%	100%
Content Development	100%	92%	100%	89%	85%	76%	83%	94%
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions	100%	92%	100%	100%	85%	94%	100%	81%
Sources and Evidence	100%	100%	100%	89%	100%	76%	89%	88%
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	100%	100%	89%	84%	85%	88%	94%	100%

Written ETS	Percentage at Marginal or Proficient							
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
ETS Proficiency Profile Writing Level 2	60%	85%	100%	89%	85%	76%	84%	93%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

In general, the students have been performing reasonably well in writing technical reports. We still have some weaknesses in the quality of their writing and the use of their source material. The sample size for ETS in the first year was extremely small so we are not particularly concerned about the fact that the score was below the benchmark. The balance of the ETS scores are at or near benchmark (due to small sample sizes, the difference can often be a single person).

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Over time we have increased our standards and expanded the rubric to increase clarity for students and to push them to write at a professional level. The current rubric has been in use for the last 10 years. We have instituted more formal faculty reviews of their draft papers and are trying to give more specific feedback, particularly about the use of references.

MICS Written Presentation Rubric

Criteria	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Bibliography and supporting documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> References cited in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Some citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references from reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Limited citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet <input type="checkbox"/> No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic <input type="checkbox"/> Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure <input type="checkbox"/> Includes both an abstract and table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Includes introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear <input type="checkbox"/> Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Has little or no focus on central idea or topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body or conclusion absent <input type="checkbox"/> No abstract or table of contents
Grammar and spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> No use of first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Few uses of the first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Several uses of the first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Written in first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least two personal insights or conclusions stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least one personal insight or conclusion stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary reporting of information without synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> No personal insights <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
Clarity of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences flow <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Any and all terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence to support points	<input type="checkbox"/> Good sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Most terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks support for some points	<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between paragraphs unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Some terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides minimal support for points	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Lacked transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Many terms and acronyms are undefined <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas not supported

Translation between MICS and AAC&U Rubric

MICS Category	MICS Item Position in Rubric	AAC&U Category
Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic	3	Purpose
Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources	8	Development
Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis	9	Development
Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	10	Development
Provides evidence to support points	14	Development
Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure	4	Genre
Includes both an abstract and table of contents	5	Genre
Multiple references from distinct reputable sources	1	Source
References cited in the body of the document	2	Source
No use of first- person tense	6	Syntax
No grammatical or spelling errors	7	Syntax
Sentences flow	11	Syntax
Smooth transitions between paragraphs	12	Syntax
Any and all terms and acronyms are defined	13	Syntax

AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric

	Capstone 4	Milestones 3	Milestones 2	Benchmark 1
Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i>	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.	Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).	Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).	Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).
Content Development	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.	Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.	Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i>	Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices	Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices	Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation	Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.
Sources and Evidence	Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing	Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.	Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.
Control of Syntax and Mechanics	Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.	Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors.	Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.	Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and cite information for the task at hand (Information Literacy).

Outcome Measure: Annual: Each student will be required to write a paper on a topic in their field as a part of their participation in the Senior Seminar. The audience for this talk will include department faculty, fellow students and possibly some alumni. The students will be given the evaluation criteria in advance and their paper will be rated by the faculty using a rubric with a scale of 4 (capstone) to 1 (benchmark) in the following areas:

- References: Multiple references from distinct reputable sources
- Citation: References cited in the body of the document
- Synthesis: Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources.

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 3 in each of the major areas.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percentage of Students at 2.5 or Higher							
Information Literacy	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
References				95%	100%	71%	89%	81%
Citation				84%	92%	76%	89%	81%
Synthesis				84%	85%	82%	78%	81%
Determine the Extent of Information Needed	100%	62%	78%					
Access the Needed Information	91%	69%	100%					
Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	91%	85%	89%					
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	91%	77%	100%					

Note that in 2015-16 we returned to gathering information literacy data from our writing rubric. The AAC&U rubric was not working well for our purposes.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are meeting our expectations. For the first two years we applied the AAC&U rubric to the student's final senior paper to measure their use of information. The quality of the use of information was uneven and we had not made our expectations clear. The students much more clearly understand the expectations regarding information literacy that are embedded in our writing rubric. This is still one of the areas with which the students have the most challenges.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We have tried a variety of approaches, using the AAC&U IL rubric and expanding on that rubric. After looking at the AAC&U results in parallel with the departmental writing rubric, it was clear that the difference in results were insignificant. It is a great deal less work for the department and clearer for the students to simply use the departmental writing rubrics IL components to assess students' IL. We continue to work with students in giving them clear feedback about the need to do a better job with references in technical papers.

Rubric

Next Page

Bibliography and supporting documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> References cited in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Most references from distinct reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Some citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> Some references from reputable sources <input type="checkbox"/> Limited citation of references in the body of the document	<input type="checkbox"/> No bibliography or all references from untrusted sites on the internet <input type="checkbox"/> No citation of references in the body of the document
Organization	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central theme with all ideas connected, arrangement of ideas clearly related to topic <input type="checkbox"/> Clear introduction, body (with sections), and conclusion includes summary and closure <input type="checkbox"/> Includes both an abstract and table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Conveys a central idea or topic with some ideas connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Includes introduction, body and conclusion <input type="checkbox"/> Includes abstract and table of contents (one partial and one complete)	<input type="checkbox"/> Attempts to focus on an idea or topic with many ideas not connected to the topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body, conclusion detectable but not clear <input type="checkbox"/> Includes partial abstract and partial table of contents	<input type="checkbox"/> Has little or no focus on central idea or topic <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction, body or conclusion absent <input type="checkbox"/> No abstract or table of contents
Grammar and spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> No use of first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> No grammatical or spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Few uses of the first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Few grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Several uses of the first- person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Some grammatical and spelling errors	<input type="checkbox"/> Written in first-person tense <input type="checkbox"/> Many grammatical and spelling errors
Depth of information	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately synthesizes information from multiple distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> Draws conclusions and personal insights from synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least three distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least two personal insights or conclusions stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is good	<input type="checkbox"/> Synthesis of information from at least two distinct sources <input type="checkbox"/> At least one personal insight or conclusion stated <input type="checkbox"/> Has the minimum number of pages including penalty pages; subject coverage is adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Summary reporting of information without synthesis <input type="checkbox"/> No personal insights <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have the minimum number of pages including penalty pages
Clarity of writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Sentences flow <input type="checkbox"/> Smooth transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Any and all terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides evidence to support points	<input type="checkbox"/> Good sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Most terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks support for some points	<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions between paragraphs unclear <input type="checkbox"/> Some terms and acronyms are defined <input type="checkbox"/> Provides minimal support for points	<input type="checkbox"/> Frequent poor sentence structure <input type="checkbox"/> Lacked transitions between paragraphs <input type="checkbox"/> Many terms and acronyms are undefined <input type="checkbox"/> Ideas not supported

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will collaborate effectively in teams.

Outcome Measure:

Annual: CSC324 Signature Assignment – evaluation of group while working on a project (before 2015-16) and ISS3042 Project Management – evaluation of group while working on a project (2016-17 and beyond)

Annual: MTH3052 Signature Assignment – evaluation of group while working on a project

Criteria for Success: 80% of the students should have an average score of at least 2.5 in each of the major areas.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Percent of students with average at least 2.5			
	Fall 2012 CSC324	Fall 2014 CSC324	Fall 2016 ISS342*	Fall 2018 ISS342
Contributes to team meetings	86%	80%	90%	100%
Encourages team members	93%	84%	N/A	100%
Contributes individually outside of team meetings	93%	88%	86%	100%
Attitude	100%	96%	N/A	100%
Fosters constructive team climate	100%	92%	N/A	100%
Responds to conflict	100%	100%	90%	100%

*Note that the full group work rubric will be used in future years.

	MTH3052 Percent of students with average at least 2.5			
	Spring 2013	Spring 2015	Spring 2017	Spring 2019
Contributes to team meetings	91%	86%	100%	100%
Encourages team members	91%	93%	100%	100%
Contributes individually outside of team meetings	82%	93%	100%	100%
Attitude	100%	100%	100%	100%
Fosters constructive team climate	91%	100%	100%	100%
Responds to conflict	91%	100%	100%	100%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

The students are performing well as member of teams.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Continue to make use of group activities throughout the curriculum.

MICS Teamwork Rubric

Definition

Teamwork is behaviors under the control of individual team members (effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet unsatisfactory (cell one) level performance.

The purpose of this is to evaluate individual team members. Although no team member will ever see your evaluation of them, please take it seriously.

Directions:

- Do not put your own name anywhere on this form, the evaluations are to be anonymous.
- Please write the name of the person you are evaluating here_____
- Please fill out one copy of this form for every person who was on your team, including one for yourself.
- For each row, place a checkmark in the box that best describes your teammate's performance.

	Outstanding	High Satisfactory	Low Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Contributes to team meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Helps the team move forward by articulating the merits of alternative ideas or proposals.	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers new suggestions to advance the work of the group.	<input type="checkbox"/> Shares ideas but does not advance the work of the group.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sits quietly in team meetings and does not contribute
Encourages members of the team	<input type="checkbox"/> Actively seeks to find opportunities to encourage all members of the team.	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers encouragement to all members of the team	<input type="checkbox"/> Offers words of encouragement to friends	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not offer word of encouragement to anyone
Individual contributions outside of team meetings	<input type="checkbox"/> Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough. Proactively helps other team members complete their assigned tasks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completes all assigned tasks by deadline; work accomplished is thorough.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completes all assigned tasks by deadline.	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not complete all assigned tasks by deadline.
Attitude	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude rarely and helps others to become more positive.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude rarely .	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude less often than a positive attitude.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates (comments, facial expressions, etc.) a negative attitude more often than a positive attitude.

Fosters constructive team climate	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>all of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>any two of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>any one of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it. 	<input type="checkbox"/> Supports a constructive team climate by doing <u>none of the following</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treats team members respectfully by being polite and constructive in communication. • Uses positive vocal or written tone, facial expressions, and/or body language to convey a positive attitude about the team and its work. • Motivates teammates by expressing confidence about the importance of the task and the team's ability to accomplish it.
Responds to conflict	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and acknowledges conflict and acknowledges that relationships can be damaged. Seeks to restore relationships.	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and acknowledges conflict and acknowledges that relationships can be damaged.	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies and acknowledges conflict but will not acknowledge that relationships can be damaged.	<input type="checkbox"/> Will not acknowledge that conflict has occurred or that relationships can be damaged.

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Students will be able to understand and create arguments supported by quantitative evidence, and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (Quantitative Reasoning).

Outcome Measure: Annual: Each student will participate in the ETS Proficiency Profile exam.

Criteria for Success: 90% of the students will be Marginal or Proficient at Level 2. Note that we dropped the criteria of success so that it is possible for the department to pass even if a single student misses the criteria.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

ETS Proficiency Profile	Percentage of Students Marginal or Proficient							
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
ETS Proficiency Profile Level 2 Mathematics	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	82%	95%	93%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Students are in general meeting our criteria. The variation often comes down to a single student because of small sample sizes.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

None at this time. We will continue to monitor the results.

Rubrics

ETS Proficiency Profile (no rubric involved)

Assessment Data Mathematical, Information and Computer Sciences

Learning Outcome: Mathematics graduates will be adequately prepared for graduate study, teaching and careers using Mathematics.

Outcome Measure:

Annual: Require students to take the ETS Major Field Test in Mathematics as the mid-term exam for the capstone course, Mathematics 481, Senior Seminar in Mathematics.

Annual: Fieldwork evaluations of prospective teachers in EDU302 (EDU304 before 2014-15). The students are rated in several areas of competence using a three point rubric (weak =1, acceptable =2 and strong =3). From these scores an overall rating is computed by taking the mean.

Every 5 Years: Alumni will be surveyed every five years. They will be asked at least the following questions:

1. If you have a job in industry: On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being outstanding and 5 being poor, how well do you think that the undergraduate Mathematics curriculum at PLNU prepared you for your work in the field?
2. If you are going to graduate school or went to graduate school: On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being outstanding and 5 being poor, how well do you think that the undergraduate Mathematics curriculum at PLNU prepared you for graduate school?
3. If you are in a teaching credential program or working as a teacher: On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being outstanding and 5 being poor, how well do you think that the undergraduate Mathematics curriculum at PLNU prepared you for teaching?

Criteria for Success:

MFT: 50% of our students achieve above the 50th percentile on the exam.

Classroom: 80% of the students will have an average score of 2.5 or higher.

Alumni Survey: 75% of the respondents say they were well prepared or higher.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

ETS Major Field Test:

Most recent 10 years of data.

	Overall Benchmark Met	Calculus	Algebra	Routine	Non- Routine	Applied
Year		Percentile	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile	Percentile
2009-10	Y	90	65	75	20	85
2010-11	Y	70	90	85	35	70
2011-12	Y	99	85	98	99	96
2012-13	Y	38	72	69	72	60
2013-14	Y	72	49	57	51	39
2014-15	Y	*	*	*	*	*
2015-16	N	16	42	32	36	55
2016-17	N	13	8	15	18	55
2017-18	Y	*	*	*	*	*
2018-19	N	57	32	60	47	32
2019-20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Insufficient students for score to be calculated

Note the ETS changed the Mathematics test in 2012-13

School of Education Fieldwork:

This data is based on assessment conducted by the supervising teachers for students engaging in classroom fieldwork.

Year	Percentage of Students Scoring 2.5 or Higher
2011-12	N/A
2012-13	100%
2013-14	N/A
2014-15	N/A
2015-16	100%
2016-17	100%
2017-18	N/A
2018-19	100%
2019-20	COVID-19

Alumni Data:

In the spring of 2017, the department surveyed alumni who had graduated in the last 15 years. The survey is data used to inform the department's program review. Below are the components of the survey relevant to our assessment plan for mathematics.

How well did the undergraduate curriculum prepare you for:

	Well or higher	OK	Poorly
Work in the field (if went into the field)	83.6%	16.4%	0.0%
Graduate school	88.6%	11.4%	0.0%
Teaching	69.3%	28.2%	2.6%

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

ETS Results:

Our scores show that our benchmark generally being met for overall performance on the test (it is a matter of a single student when it has been missed). We are continuing to evaluate the changes made by ETS in 2012-13 to determine if we are concerned about any the changes in student results. It may be that they are now including questions on some material that we do not teach. We have noticed a cyclical patten in some subscore results and are investigating to if this correlates with our two year rotation of upper division courses. Reviewing the exam and the data is part of the work that we will undertake as part of our next program review and we are questioning if this is the best tool to measure these outcomes.

School of Education Fieldwork:

We view this fieldwork as a time of vocational discernment for our prospective teachers. We want to be sure that truly understand the work of a teacher and the time in the classroom helps them with that. The input from their supervising teacher is also valuable in that discernment process. Our students have done well in their fieldwork. 2019-20 proved to be challenging for data gathering because of COVID-19.

Alumni Survey:

Overall, our alumni believe that they were well prepared and far exceeds the benchmarks that we set. The place where there is room for improvement is in teacher preparation. The department has just designed a path for a student to earn a BS in mathematics at the same time as getting a teaching credential. This program will require far more coursework in education than previous degrees and will hopefully allow alumni who become teachers to feel better prepared for the classroom.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

ETS Results:

We have used ETS data to small modifications (changes in pedagogy or assignments) as well as larger curricular modifications (addition or alteration of classes). We are currently evaluating if the overall score and subscores are helpful in informing curricular choices.

The department has decided to discontinue using the ETS MFT. We are in the process of aligning this learning outcome with a signature assignment(s) in a class.

School of Education Fieldwork:

None in MICS, but the School of Education uses this as a tool to adjust their education classes that our students take while doing fieldwork. The teachers have been satisfied with the performance in of our students.

Alumni Survey:

See comments above about adding a credential track to the BS in Mathematics.

Rubric:

ETS:

The ETS provides the data.

Field Work:

School of Education uses the rubric shown below.

Alumni Survey:

This is not rubric scored, but the data is tabulated.

School of Education Fieldwork Rubric

	Weak Candidate	Acceptable Candidate	Strong Candidate
Cultural Sensitivity: Demonstrates respect and cultural sensitivity toward ethnically and culturally diverse students.			
Basic Skills: Models appropriate literacies.			
Attendance: Punctuality and dependability.			
Cooperation: Fulfills assignments/follows instructions.			
Initiative: Anticipates needs/assumes responsibilities.			
Attitude: Maintains poise and positive interaction with students.			
Interest: Shows enthusiasm/communicates with supervisors.			
Appearance: Dresses appropriately.			