

Mathematical Sciences [BS] [BS-MSCI]

Cycles included in this report:

Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

This PDF document includes any files attached to fields in this report.

To view the attachments you should view this file in Adobe Acrobat XI or higher, or another PDF viewer that supports viewing file attachments.

The default PDF viewer for your device or web browser may not support viewing file attachments embedded in a PDF.

If the attachments are in formats other than PDF you will need any necessary file viewers installed.

Program Name: Mathematical Sciences [BS] [BS-MSCI]

Reporting Cycle: Jun 1, 2017 to May 31, 2018

1 Is this program offered via Distance Learning?

100% Traditional or less than 50% Distance/Traditional

2 Is this program offered at an off-site location?

No

2.1 If yes to previous, provide addresses for each location where 50% or more of program credits may be earned.

3 Example of Program Improvement

2015-2016:

In the spring semester of 2016 a history of mathematics course was developed (MATH 461-591) and added to the 2016-2017 catalog. The course was first taught in online format in the summer of 2016. The topics include Ancient, Greek and Medieval mathematics along with Theory of Equations and the creation of the calculus. Students are required to write three brief biographies of mathematicians: one classical, one medieval/renaissance, and one from the age of enlightenment/19th century. This paper requires some research and multiple sources. The creation of the course was in response to suggestions made by National Council for Teachers of Mathematics reviewers. The course will allow our majors an opportunity to better understand the historical context of the mathematics that are covered in their other courses.

2016-2017:

By applying the vocabulary and ideas from blooms taxonomy, the syllabi for all of the upper division mathematics courses have been rewritten. This was done as a response to the results from our course embedded assessment of the student learning outcome: 'Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the area of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics'. The new syllabi should prove helpful to the faculty who teach the courses involved in constructing more appropriate embedded exam questions and also more effectively evaluate the student responses to these questions. The result should be more useful data.

2017-2018:

To better meet the needs and interests of our majors, the department is introducing a new concentration in computer science for the BS in Mathematics.

The program for the mathematics education concentration is being considerably revised to meet the requirement imposed by the state of Louisiana that students must complete a year of student teaching rather than one semester as is currently the case.

4 Program Highlights from the Reporting Year

2015-2016:

Mathematical Sciences major Steven Dabelow won first place in the undergraduate student paper competition for his talk entitled "Regions of Stability of the BZ Reactions" at the 93rd annual meeting of the Louisiana-Mississippi Section of the Mathematical Association of America held at Louisiana State University-Shreveport, February 25-27, 2016.

2016-2017:

A four member team McNeese mathematics major (Hailee Gilroy, David Guillory, Phat Ngo, and Britt Qualls) took third place in the annual undergraduate team mathematics competition held in conjunction with the annual section meeting of the LA-MS section of the Mathematical Association of America in the spring of 2017 at Millsaps College in Jackson, MA. Some 17 four-student teams from universities and colleges from across Louisiana and Mississippi participated, including some of the big research universities.

Phat Ngo, a McNeese undergraduate mathematics major, took third place in the Integration Bee

held during the same section meeting. Some 30 students, again from universities and colleges from across Louisiana and Mississippi, competed individually, evaluating definite and indefinite integrals.

2017-2018:

The department is very pleased with the results of our graduating seniors on the Major Field Test. Three of the four achieved 86th, 92nd, and 96th percentile scores. This is our best performance in at least the last twenty years. The ETS[®] Major Field Tests are comprehensive undergraduate and MBA outcomes assessments designed to measure the critical knowledge and understanding obtained by students in a major field of study.

5 Program Mission

The purpose of the Bachelor of Science in Mathematical Sciences program is to provide students with a solid grounding in mathematics, encourage students to become effective problem solvers and foster the students' ability to effectively convey their mathematical knowledge. Concentrations in Mathematics, Statistics, Mathematics Education, Physics Education and Physics are offered within this degree program. The Mathematics/Physics Education concentrations provide graduates with practical skills in the professional competencies required of mathematics/physics teachers and lead to certification to teach mathematics/physics at the secondary level, grades 6-12, in the State of Louisiana. Other concentrations prepare students for a variety of careers in mathematical sciences or for entrance into a graduate program in mathematical sciences. Stakeholders: graduate schools, employers.

6 Institutional Mission Reference

This degree supports the University's fundamental mission to offer baccalaureate curricula in service to the residents and employers of the SWLA region and beyond. It prepares students to become effective in academic and professional environments.

7 Assessment and Benchmark MATH 190 Final Exam

Assessment: MATH 190 (Calculus I) final exam embedded questions.

Benchmark: 60% of students will achieve 60% success on items assessing problem-solving skills on the Math 190 final exam.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was for the MATH 170 exam.

Course Links

MATH190 [Calculus I (Lec. 3, Lab. 2, Cr. 4)]

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

7.1 Data

MATH 170:

Term	% of students with 60% or higher	Benchmark met?
Fall 2013	68%	Yes
Spring 2014	56%	No
Fall 2014	63%	Yes
Spring 2015	65%	Yes
Fall 2015	57%	No
Spring 2016	56%	No

MATH 190:

	Students with	
--	---------------	--

Term	60% or higher		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
Fall 2016*	-	-	-
Spring 2017*	-	-	-
Fall 2017	0/1	0%	No
Spring 2017	3/3	100%	Yes

*2016-2017: There is no new data. Assessment will begin in 2017-2018.

Course Links

MATH190 [Calculus I (Lec. 3, Lab. 2, Cr. 4)]

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

7.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Three of the five current assessment items occur at the end the semester in the curriculum. Material at this point is often rushed, especially if we unexpectedly lose a day of instruction administratively. The committee responsible for Math 170 will meet in the coming semester to discuss the possibility of selecting assessment items that are spread more evenly throughout the semester.

2016-2017:

No data. Assessment is new this year.

Rather than making this assessment in MATH 170 (Pre-calculus), we will make it in MATH 190 (Calculus I). This should be a better assessment point for our majors. MATH 190 instructors should find it easier to identify the math majors among their students.

2017-2018:

Three out of four students assessed this year achieved 60% or higher on the benchmark. The benchmark was met. The department will improve data collection to identify all math majors taking MATH 190.

Course Links

MATH190 [Calculus I (Lec. 3, Lab. 2, Cr. 4)]

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

8 Assessment and Benchmark MATH 411 Course-embedded Assessment

Assessment: MATH 411 Course-embedded assessments of ability to construct valid mathematical arguments.

Benchmark: 70% of majors will achieve 70% or greater success on the relevant final exam questions in MATH 411, Advanced Calculus.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was that 60% of majors will receive a success rate of 70% or higher.

Course Links

MATH411 [Advanced Calculus I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Mathematical Arguments [Program]

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

8.1 Data

Academic Year	% of majors achieving a 70% success rate	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	75%	Yes
2014-2015	95%	Yes
2015-2016	71%	Yes
2016-2017	55%*	No

*82% achieved 60%.

Academic Year	Majors achieving a 70% success rate		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2017-2018	4/6	67%	No

Course Links

MATH411 [Advanced Calculus I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links**Mathematical Arguments [Program]**

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

8.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This is the second year for the 70% benchmark. It was increased from 60% two years ago. Even though there was a drop from 71% to 55%, there is no cause for concern. The exam was made slightly more difficult and 82% of majors still achieved the old 60% benchmark.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met. The benchmark will be maintained. Starting next year the department will identify specific assessment items that the students found to be challenging.

Course Links

MATH411 [Advanced Calculus I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links**Mathematical Arguments [Program]**

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

9 Assessment and Benchmark MATH 421 Course-embedded Assessment

Assessment: MATH 421 Course-embedded assessments of ability to construct valid mathematical arguments.

Benchmark: 70% of majors will achieve 70% success on the relevant final exam questions in MATH 421, Modern Algebra.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was that 60% of majors will receive a success rate of 70% or higher.

Course Links

MATH421 [Modern Algebra I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links**Mathematical Arguments [Program]**

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

9.1 Data

Academic Year	% of majors achieving a 70% success rate	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	92%	Yes
2014-2015	77%	Yes
2015-2016	92%	Yes
2016-2017	63%	No

Academic Year	Majors achieving a 70% success rate		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2017-2018	10/13	77%	Yes

Course Links

MATH421 [Modern Algebra I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links**Mathematical Arguments [Program]**

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

9.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Faculty discussed possible reasons that the benchmark was not quite met this year.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. Starting next year the department will identify specific assessment items that the students found to be challenging.

Course Links

MATH421 [Modern Algebra I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links**Mathematical Arguments [Program]**

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

10 Assessment and Benchmark MATH 431 Course-embedded Assessments

Assessment: MATH 431 Course-embedded assessments of ability to construct valid mathematical arguments.

Benchmark: 70% of majors will achieve a 70% success rate on relevant final exam questions in MATH 431, Mathematical Statistics and Probability.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was that 60% of majors will receive a success rate of 70% or higher.

Course Links

MATH431 [Mathematical Statistics and Probability I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Mathematical Arguments [Program]

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

10.1 Data

Academic Year	% of majors achieving a 70% success rate	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	92%	Yes
2014-2015	97%	Yes
2015-2016	74%	Yes
2016-2017	N/A*	N/A

*For 2016-2017, the MATH/STAT 431 instructor was unavailable.

Academic Year	Majors achieving a 70% success rate		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2017-2018	5/7	71%	Yes

Course Links

MATH431 [Mathematical Statistics and Probability I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Mathematical Arguments [Program]

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

10.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Approved]

2016-2017:

No data for this year. This is the first year for the 70% benchmark. It has been increased from 60% the previous year.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. Starting next year the department will identify specific assessment items that the students found to be challenging.

Course Links

MATH431 [Mathematical Statistics and Probability I (Lec. 3, Cr. 3)]

11 Assessment and Benchmark MATH 491 Capstone Project

Assessment: MATH 491 Capstone Project

Benchmark 1: Average scores will be 80% on the following items from the presentation evaluation form filled out by faculty members: Content, Organization, and Delivery.

Benchmark 2: 100% of students will achieve a satisfactory rating on the research paper for the capstone project.

Course Links

MATH491 [Seminar (Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

11.1 Data [Approved]

	# of			Benchmark

Academic Year	students	Content	Organization	Delivery	met?
2013-2014	-	85.45%	86.67%	88.81%	Yes
2014-2015	-	90.00%	93.75%	85.00%	Yes
2015-2016	-	90.25%	94.45%	90.89%	Yes
2016-2017	-	94.53%	95.86%	97.42%	Yes
2017-2018		94.35%	93.46%	96.23%	Yes

Course Links

MATH491 [Seminar (Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

11.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Faculty have been using the same rubric for this assignment for three years, and they will begin using the new Navigate Your Future presentation rubric this academic year.

2017-2018:

The benchmark will increase to 90% from 80%.

Course Links

MATH491 [Seminar (Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

11.2 Data [Approved]

Academic Year	Students that achieved a satisfactory rating		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2013-2014	-	100%	Yes
2014-2015	-	100%	Yes
2015-2016	-	100%	Yes
2016-2017	-	100%	Yes
2017-2018		100%	Yes

Course Links

MATH491 [Seminar (Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

11.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

The faculty has been using a rubric to score these papers, and they will begin reporting the rubric-based scores in 2017-2018.

2016-2017:

The scores have shown improvement from 2015-2016. This may well be due to the changing of MATH 491 to a full three hour course taught by actual mathematics faculty. Previously the course has been taught by a computer science faculty member who was not well versed in the expectations and subject matter of a mathematical education. In addition the very extensive and close mentoring by a faculty member with whom the students have previously worked leads to very high scores among the students taking the course. No changes are recommended for the upcoming year beyond those imposed by the QEP committee. The current rubric will be compared with the QEP rubric. Changes will be made to provide relevant data to the QEP committee.

2017-2018:

The department will use the QEP rubric starting next year.

Course Links

MATH491 [Seminar (Cr. 3)]

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

12 Assessment and Benchmark Major Field Test [Approved]

Assessment: Major Field Test in Mathematics.

Benchmark: The mean score for mathematics students who take the major field test will be at or above the 50th national percentile. At least 80% of graduates in math education pass the Praxis II content exam on the first attempt.

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

12.1 Data

Academic Year	McNeese Results				National Results		McNeese's distance from national mean	Benchmark met?	
	# of students who took exam	Low	High	Mean	Median	Mean			Median
2013-2014	NA	136	154	146	148	156.4	151	-10.4	No
2014-2015	14	133	167	149	148	155	154	-6	No
2015-2016	6	126	158	142	140.5	156.3	154	-14.3	No
2016-2017	-	133	161	146.2	145	156.3	154	-10.1	No
2017-2018	4	147	200	171.5	181.5	156.3	154	+15.2	Yes

Academic Year	# of completers	% of program completers that passed PRAXIS II content exam (5161)	% of program completers that passed PRAXIS II content exam (5161) on 1st attempt
2013-2014	-	100%	100%
2014-2015	-	100%	67%
2015-2016	-	100%	0%
2016-2017	-	100%	100%
2017-2018	1	100%	0%

Outcome Links**Problem Solving [Program]**

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

12.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

After consideration of historical data, faculty will consider a possible adjustment to the current benchmark.

Review sessions for the MFT were provided. Program faculty will continue to provide guidance in preparing for the PRAXIS II exam and will encourage students to take advantage of opportunities to tutor lower division courses.

Students who have successfully passed the new Praxis II exam will organize study sessions for those students who are preparing to take the exam.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met this year for the MFT. The department is very pleased with the performance of graduating seniors on the MFT this year. Three of the four achieved 86th, 92nd, and 96th percentile scores. This is our best performance in at least the last 20 years.

Outcome Links**Problem Solving [Program]**

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

13 Assessment and Benchmark Alumni Survey

Assessment: Particular items on the Alumni Survey serve as indirect assessments of student learning.

Benchmark 1: The average scores for the following items will be 4.0:

7a - Critical thinking skills

7b - Mathematical problem solving

Benchmark 2: The average scores for the following items will be 4.0:

7e - Effective oral communications

7f - Effective written communications

Outcome Links**Problem Solving [Program]**

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

13.1 Data

Academic Year	# of respondents	Average 7a	Average 7b	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	-	4.0	4.0	Yes
2014-2015	-	5.0	5.0	Yes
2015-2016	-	5.0	5.0	Yes
2016-2017	-	4.75	5.0	Yes
2017-2018	9	4.77	4.88	Yes

Outcome Links**Problem Solving [Program]**

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

13.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

Senior faculty members created the survey specifically for the BS in Mathematical Sciences to be initially administered in 2013-2014. The survey is revised each academic year. The department continues to achieve its benchmark, so next year, the benchmark will raise from 3.5 to an average score of 4.0 on these items.

2016-2017:

Faculty continues to be pleased by the results of the alumni survey. Faculty are also pleased that there were more respondents this year.

2017-2018:

The benchmark will increase to 4.5 from 4.0.

[Outcome Links](#)

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

13.2 Data

Academic Year	# of respondents	Average 7e	Average 7f	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	-	4.5	4.0	Yes
2014-2015	-	4.67	4.33	Yes
2015-2016	-	4.0	4.0	Yes
2016-2017	-	4.0	4.25	Yes
2017-2018	9	4.33	4.44	Yes

[Outcome Links](#)

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

13.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

Senior faculty members created the survey specifically for the BS in Mathematical Sciences to be initially administered in 2013-2014. The survey is revised each academic year. The department continues to achieve its benchmark, so next year, the benchmark will raise from 3.5 to an average score of 4.0 on these items.

2016-2017:

Faculty are pleased that benchmarks continue to be met.

2017-2018:

The benchmark will stay at 4.0.

[Outcome Links](#)

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

14 Assessment and Benchmark Exit Survey

Assessment: Particular items on the Exit Survey serve as indirect assessments of student learning.

Benchmark: The average scores for the following items will be 3.5:

- 32 - Confidence in ability to solve a problem in your discipline
 33 - Confidence in ability to design a problem solution in your discipline

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

14.1 Data

Academic Year	Average 32	Average 33	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	4.2	4.3	Yes
2014-2015	4.3	3.9	Yes
2015-2016	3.8	3.6	Yes
2016-2017	4.0	4.4	Yes
2017-2018	4.5	4.5	Yes

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

14.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

Although the department continues to meet its benchmark, these scores are steadily declining. The department needs to brainstorm what may affect this decline in student confidence.

2016-2017:

Faculty are please that the scores have improved after a steady decline.

2017-2018:

The benchmark will be increased to 4.0 from 3.5.

Outcome Links

Problem Solving [Program]

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

15 Assessment and Benchmark Students [Approved]

Assessment: Students' professional participation.

Benchmark: At least one student will deliver a presentation at a professional event every two years.

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

15.1 Data

Academic Year	# of presentations	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	Two presentations at the 2014 McNeese State University Teaching and Learning Conference.	Yes
	Two presentations: Mathematical Sciences major Lauren Snider gave a talk entitled "Particular 1,M,N-Antiautomorphisms of	

2014-2015	Directed Triple Systems” at the Forty-Sixth Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory, and Computing held at Florida Atlantic University March 2-6, 2015. Lauren Snider and Steven Dabelow gave talks at Mathfest 2015 in Washington DC in August 2015.	Yes
2015-2016	One presentation: Mathematical Sciences major Steven Dabelow gave a talk entitled “Regions of Stability of the BZ Reactions” at the 93rd annual meeting of the Louisiana-Mississippi Section of the Mathematical Association of America held at Louisiana State University-Shreveport, February 25-27, 2016.	Yes
2016-2017	-	-
2017-2018	One presentation: Mathematical Sciences major Britt Qualls gave a talk entitled "Some Bicyclic Antiautomorphisms of Mendelsohn Triple Systems" at the 49th Southeastern International Conference on Combinatorics, Graph Theory and Computing held at Florida Atlantic University on March 5, 2018. Even though the talk was given after Britt graduated, the talk was an expanded version of his capstone project as an undergraduate.	Yes

15.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2015-2016:

In fall 2014, the department began new undergraduate mathematics research course, MATH 395. This course encourages students to engage in research earlier in their degree programs and provides more opportunities for presentations at professional meetings. Students will have the option to extend the research from this new course into their senior capstone projects.

2016-2017:

The department is meeting its benchmark for this assessment, and continues to encourage students to participate in research.

2017-2018:

Benchmark was met.

Outcome Links

Communication [Program]

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

16 Assessment and Benchmark Praxis II Content Exam

Assessment: The Mathematics Education, Grades 7-12 Praxis Content Exam is #5161. This exam must be passed prior to student teaching. The passing score required by the state for 2017-2018 is 160.

Benchmark 1: Students will earn a minimum 160 mean overall score on the Praxis II content exam.

Prior to 2016-2017, the benchmark was a mean of 140 for the overall score on the Praxis II exam.

Benchmark 2: Praxis II subscore averages corresponding to each area of mathematics tested are within or above the average score range.

Benchmark 3: 80% of Mathematics Education majors will achieve a passing score on the Praxis Mathematics Education Exam (#5161) on the first attempt. Passing score set by the state is 160.

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

16.1 Data [Approved]

Academic Year	# of students	Mean score	Benchmark met?
2013-2014	-	151	Yes
2014-2015	-	146	Yes
2015-2016	-	165.5	Yes
2016-2017	-	169.3	Yes
2017-2018		161	Yes

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

16.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Benchmark raised from 140 average to 160 average. Students continue to meet the benchmark.

2017-2018:

Benchmark was met. Data is based on one candidate. Her score was 161, exceeding the qualifying score by one point.

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

16.2 Data

Academic Year	Algebra and Number Theory	Measurement, Geometry, and Trigonometry	Functions and Calculus	Data Analysis, Statistics, and Probability	Matrix Algebra and Discrete Mathematics	Sub-scores above average?
2013-2014	5.75/8	7.25/12	9.25/14	5/8	6.25/8	Yes
2014-2015	5/8	8/12	9/14	6/8	6/8	Yes

Academic Year	Number and quantity, algebra, functions	Geometry, probability and statistics, and	Sub-scores
---------------	---	---	------------

	and calculus	discrete mathematics	above average?
2015-2016	24/34	11/15	Yes
2016-2017	24.5/34	13/16	Yes
2017-2018	22/34	9/16	Yes

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

16.2.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Students continue to achieve the benchmark. Program faculty will continue to provide guidance in preparing for this exam and will encourage students to take advantage of opportunities to tutor lower division courses as this experience encourages them to continually review precalculus topics that are tested on this exam.

2017-2018:

Benchmark met.

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

16.3 Data [Approved]

Academic Year	Graduates who passed on the first attempt		Benchmark met?
	#	%	
2013-2014	-	100%	Yes
2014-2015	-	67%	No
2015-2016	-	0%	No
2016-2017	-	100%	Yes
2017-2018		0%	No

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

16.3.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

The first attempt pass rate benchmark was met, and faculty are very pleased to achieve a 100% pass rate. With the new version of the exam (5161), it has become more difficult to achieve the Louisiana passing score of 160. The range for the middle 50% is 135-168.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was not met. Although program faculty continue to provide guidance in preparing for this exam and encourage students to take advantage of opportunities to tutor lower division courses to better prepare for the exam, the candidate was not able to take advantage of these opportunities.

Plan for continuous improvement:

The department will increase efforts to encourage group study for the Praxis Exam and will continue to encourage candidates to take advantage of the available opportunities to serve as

departmental tutors for lower-division courses.

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

17 Assessment and Benchmark Enrollment and Completers

Assessment: Enrollment numbers are based on candidates currently enrolled in the program who have submitted an EDUC 200 packet.

Benchmark: The EPP has set a goal to increase enrollment by 7% across programs each year from fall 2017 to fall 2021 to coincide with the MSU Strategic Plan goal concerning enrollment and recruitment.

Course Links

EDUC200 [Entrance into Teacher Education (Cr. 0)]

17.1 Data

Academic Year	# officially enrolled with an EDUC 499 packet	# of completers in fall semester	# of completers in spring semester	Total # of completers
2013-2014	16			4
2014-2015	14			3
2015-2016	14			2
2016-2017	-	-	-	-
2017-2018	9	1	0	1

Course Links

EDUC200 [Entrance into Teacher Education (Cr. 0)]

17.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2015-2016:

Enrollment dropped in 2014-2015 and remained consistent in 2015-2016. The benchmark was not met.

2016-2017:

This is the last year we will be conducting data analysis on this subject due to its assessment replacement.

2017-2018:

In 2017-2018 there were nine candidates in the mathematics education concentration having completed the EDUC 200 packet. There was one program completer. These numbers represent a five-year low.

Plan for continuous improvement:

We will continue our departmental recruitment efforts. We are also coordinating with Dwight Bertrand who is leading recruitment efforts in STEM disciplines in the College of Science and Agriculture, as well as with the Education Department and their program called Geaux Teach.

Course Links

EDUC200 [Entrance into Teacher Education (Cr. 0)]

18 Assessment and Benchmark FEE Content

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation Domain 5 measures the Content Specific

Components related to teaching observations.

The FEE Scoring Scale is as follows: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective

Benchmark: 90% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of Domain 5 (Content Specific Components) on the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric.

Prior to 2017-2018, the benchmark was 100% of students will meet or exceed the benchmark of 2.00, set by the State of Louisiana.

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

18.1 Data

MATH	Fall 2015			Spring 2016			Fall 2016			Spring 2017			Fall 2017		
	Component	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean	Range	#	Mean
5.1				2	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.2				2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.88	3.88	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.88	3.88
5.3				2	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.4				2	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.75	3.75	2	3.75	3.75	1	3.75	3.75
5.5				2	4.00	4.00	1	3.75	3.75	2	3.76	3.63-3.88	1	3.50	3.50
5.6				2	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.88	3.88	1	4.00	4.00
5.7				2	3.92	3.84-4.00	0			2	3.82	3.75-3.88	1	3.75	3.75
5.8				2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.9				2	4.00	4.00	0			2	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.10				2	4.00	4.00	1	3.75	3.75	2	3.82	3.75-3.88	1	4.00	4.00
5.11				2	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.88	3.75-4.00	1	3.88	3.88
5.12				2	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00	2	3.50	3.5	1	3.88	3.88
5.13				0			0			2	3.82	3.75-3.88	1	3.75	3.75
5.14				0			0			2	3.94	3.88-4.00	1	3.75	3.75
5.15				0			0								
5.16				1	4.00	4.00	1	4.00	4.00						

18.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

Data is based on one candidate and range from 3.50 to 4.00. The candidate's strongest areas were use of technology and ability to plan lessons that address learning goals and standards.

The candidate's weakest area was use of various assessments. Benchmark will be raised to 3.50 from 3.00.

19 Assessment and Benchmark inTASC Standards - Lesson Planning

Assessment: InTASC Standards are aligned to the components of the lesson plan rubric.

Lesson Plan Rubric scoring scale: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 80% of the candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element of the Lesson Plan Rubric.

Outcome Links

Instructional Planning [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in secondary classes (grades 6-12) to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student progress in secondary education.

19.1 Data

Rubric Element	Standard	InTASC Standard		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Essential Questions			Number	0	2	1	2	1	0
			Mean		2.00	1.00	1.50		
			Range		2.00	1.00	1.00-2.00		
			% Proficient or Higher		0%	0%	0%		
Content Standards			Number						
			Mean		3.00	4.00	3.00		
			Range		3.00	4.00	3.00		
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		
Student Outcomes		4n	Number						
			Mean		3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	
			Range		3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%	100%	
Technology		5l	Number						
			Mean		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
			Range		3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%	100%	
Educational Materials			Number						
			Mean		3.00	4.00	4.00		
			Range		3.00	4.00	4.00		
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%		
Procedures		3k	Number						
			Mean		3.00	3.00	1.50	4.00	
			Range		3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	0%	100%	
Lesson "Hook"		8j	Number						
			Mean		2.50	2.00	2.00	4.00	
			Range		2.00-3.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	
			%						

			Proficient or Higher		50%	0%	0%	100%	
Pre-Planned (Seed) Questions		8i	Number						
			Mean		2.00	2.00	2.50	4.00	
			Range		2.00	2.00	2.00-3.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		0%	0%	50%	100%	
Modeled, Guided, Collab, & Ind. Practice		7k	Number						
			Mean		3.00	3.00	1.50	4.00	
			Range		3.00	3.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	0%	100%	
Closure			Number						
			Mean		2.00	1.00	2.00		
			Range		2.00	1.00	2.00		
			% Proficient or Higher		0%	0%	0%		
Formative/Summative Assessment		6j	Number						
			Mean		2.50	3.00	3.00	4.00	
			Range		2.00-3.00	3.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		50%	100%	50%	100%	
Relevance & Rationale		2j	Number						
			Mean		3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	
			Range		3.00	3.00	2.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	0%	100%	
Exploration, Extension, Supplemental		1e	Number						
			Mean		2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	
			Range		2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		0%	0%	0%	100%	
Differentiation		7j	Number						
			Mean		2.00	1.00	1.50	4.00	
			Range		2.00	1.00	1.00-2.00	4.00	
			% Proficient or Higher		0%	0%	0%	100%	

19.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Essential Questions will be removed from the lesson plan rubric because they do not align to P-12 classroom instruction of completers.

Categories below benchmark are being addressed through the revision and clarification of the lesson plan instructions.

2017-2018:

Benchmark was met. Data is based on one candidate. The candidate scored 4.00/4.00 on assessed items. Benchmark will be raised to 3.50 from 3.00.

20 Assessment and Benchmark FEE - Specific inTASC Standards

Assessment: The Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) measures the following elements: Domain 1: Planning and Preparation; Domain 2: Classroom Environment; Domain 3: Instruction, and Domain 4: Professionalism.

The following scoring scale is used: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 90% of candidates will score a 3.00 or higher on each element in the Field Experience Evaluation (FEE) Rubric for Domains 1-4.

Outcome Links

Instructional Planning [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in secondary classes (grades 6-12) to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student progress in secondary education.

Instructional Delivery [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates successfully complete and demonstrate effective instructional planning and teaching within practica and student teaching settings, reflecting on and refining professional practices suitable for secondary education.

20.1 Data

Math Education - FEE with InTASC Standards

FEE pulled from Student Teaching Semester:

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2015 N=0		Spring 2016 N=2		Fall 2016 N=1		Spring 2017 N=2	
		Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation									
Component 1.1									
1.1.1	4n			3.94	3.88-4.00	3.88	3.88	4.00	4.00
1.1.2	6r			3.88	3.88	4.00	4.00	3.82	3.63-4.00
1.1.3	2g			3.88	3.88	3.75	3.75	3.88	3.88
1.1.4	1b			3.88	3.88	3.88	3.88	3.88	3.75-4.00
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment									
Component 2.1									
2.1.1	3j			3.69	3.63-3.75	3.75	3.75	3.57	3.25-3.88
2.1.2	3d			3.57	3.38-3.75	3.88	3.88	3.82	3.75-3.88
2.1.3	3d			3.75	3.75	3.63	3.63	3.57	3.50-3.63
2.1.4	3d			3.63	3.50-3.75	3.88	3.88	3.69	3.50-3.88
Component 2.2									
2.2.1	3c			3.26	2.88-3.38	3.88	3.88	3.69	3.63-3.75
2.2.2	3f			3.32	3.38-3.88	3.63	3.63	3.75	3.75
2.2.3	3f			3.63	3.25-3.38	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.75

Domain 3: Instruction									
Component 3.1									
3.1.1	8f			3.44	3.13-3.63	3.38	3.38	3.44	3.38-3.50
3.1.2	4c			3.32	3.38-3.50	3.25	3.25	3.44	3.25-3.63
3.1.3	5e			3.38	3.13-3.63	3.50	3.50	3.57	3.38-3.75
Component 3.2									
3.2.1	7a			3.82	3.63-4.00	3.38	3.38	3.38	3.38
3.2.2	3j			3.44	3.38-3.50	4.00	4.00	3.76	3.63-3.88
3.2.3	4f			3.69	3.63-3.75	3.38	3.38	3.32	3.13-3.50
3.2.4	3d			3.38	3.88-4.00	3.88	3.88	3.69	3.63-3.75
Component 3.3									
3.3.1	6d			3.57	3.50-3.63	3.63	3.63	3.44	3.38-3.50
3.3.2	6a			3.75	3.50-4.00	3.88	3.88	3.82	3.63-4.00
3.3.3	6d			3.88	3.88	4.00	4.00	3.94	3.88-4.00
3.3.4	8b			3.51	3.38-3.63	3.75	3.75	3.38	3.25-3.50
Domain 4: Professionalism									
Component 4.1									
4.1.1	9o			3.94	3.88-4.00	3.88	3.88	3.88	3.88
4.1.2	9l			3.94	3.88-4.00	3.88	3.88	3.75	3.75
4.1.3	9o			3.63	3.38-3.88	3.88	3.88	3.69	3.63-3.75

Element	InTASC Standard	Fall 2017 N=1			Spring 2018 N=0		
		Mean	Range	%*	Mean	Range	%
Domain 1: Planning and Preparation		3.85	3.75-3.88	100%			
Component 1.1		3.85	3.75-3.88	100%			
1.1.1	4n	3.88	3.88	100%			
1.1.2	6r	3.88	3.88	100%			
1.1.3	2g	3.88	3.88	100%			
1.1.4	1b	3.75	3.75	100%			
Domain 2: The Classroom Environment		3.65	3.63-3.88	100%			
Component 2.1		3.69	3.63-3.88	100%			
2.1.1	3j	3.63	3.63	100%			
2.1.2	3d	3.63	3.63	100%			
2.1.3	3d	3.88	3.88	100%			
2.1.4	3d	3.63	3.63	100%			
Component 2.2		3.59	3.38-3.75	100%			
2.2.1	3c	3.38	3.38	100%			
2.2.2	3f	3.63	3.63	100%			
2.2.3	3f	3.75	3.75	100%			

Domain 3: Instruction		3.60	3.25-4.00	100%			
Component 3.1		3.38	3.25-3.50	100%			
3.1.1	8f	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.1.2	4c	3.25	3.25	100%			
3.1.3	5e	3.38	3.38	100%			
Component 3.2		3.63	3.50-3.88	100%			
3.2.1	7a	3.63	3.63	100%			
3.2.2	3j	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.2.3	4f	3.50	3.50	100%			
3.2.4	3d	3.88	3.88	100%			
Component 3.3		3.75	3.36-4.00	100%			
3.3.1	6d	3.75	3.75	100%			
3.3.2	6a	3.36	3.36	100%			
3.3.3	6d	4.00	4.00	100%			
3.3.4	8b	3.88	3.88	100%			
Domain 4: Professionalism		3.84	3.75-3.88	100%			
Component 4.1		3.84	3.75-3.88	100%			
4.1.1	9o	3.88	3.88	100%			
4.1.2	9l	3.88	3.88	100%			
4.1.3	9o	3.75	3.75	100%			

*% Proficient or higher.

20.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

This benchmark has been met or exceeded.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The data are based on one candidate. She scored 3.00 or higher on the FEE on each element. Her strengths were in Planning and Preparation and Professionalism. Her lowest score (3.60/4.00) was in the area of instruction.

Plan for continuous improvement:

The Mathematics Education concentration is currently being revised to include a year-long residency in the senior year. This program revision should help to strengthen our candidates preparation in the area of instruction.

21 Assessment and Benchmark Outcomes - TCWS

Assessment: Teacher Candidate Work Sample.

The scoring scale for the Teacher Candidate Work Sample is: 1- Ineffective; 2- Effective: Emerging; 3- Effective: Proficient; 4- Highly Effective.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will score a 3.00 or above on each of the elements on the Teacher Candidate Work Sample Rubric.

Outcome Links

Secondary Student Learning Impact [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates promote academic success and support academic performance for youth within secondary settings (grades 6-12).

21.1 Data

Criteria		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
Choice of Assessment	Number	0	2	1	2	1	0
	Mean		2.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	
	Range		2.00-4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		50%	100%	100%	100%	
Pre-assessment	Number						
	Mean		2.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	
	Range		1.00-3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		50%	100%	100%	100%	
Post-assessment	Number						
	Mean		2.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	
	Range		2.00	4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%	100%	
Alignment of Lesson Evidence	Number						
	Mean		2.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	
	Range		2.00	4.00	2.00-4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%	100%	
Student Level of Mastery & Evaluation of Factors	Number						
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	
	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%	100%	
Data to Determine Patterns & Gaps	Number						
	Mean		3.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	
	Range		3.00	4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		100%	100%	100%	100%	
Response to Interventions	Number				1		
	Mean		1.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	
	Range		1.00	4.00	3.00-4.00	4.00	
	% Proficient or Higher		0%	100%	100%	100%	

Files: See list of attachments to view. (Requires Adobe Reader or compatible viewer).

Mathematics Education_TCWS_17-18

21.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement [Not Approved]

2016-2017:

Assessment is a weakness. We are revamping the lesson plan template and rubric, and we are rewriting the education assessment course.

2017-2018:

Benchmark was met. Data is based on one candidate. The candidate scored 4.00/4.00 on all assessed items. Benchmark will be raised to 3.50 from 3.00.

22 Assessment and Benchmark Math Praxis PLT

Assessment: Mathematics Education candidates must pass the Praxis PLT#5624 before student teaching. The Louisiana qualifying score is 157.

Benchmark: 80% of candidates will pass the Principles of Learning and Teaching Praxis exam on the first attempt.

Outcome Links

Content and Pedagogy [Program]

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

22.1 Data

		Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018
#5624 overall	Number	0	2	1	2	1	0
	Mean		175	188	1800	178	
	Range		174-176	188	177-182	178	
	% Pass 1st attempt		100%	0%	100%	100%	
#5624 breakdown:	Number	0	2	1	2	1	0
Students as Learners	Mean		16.5	15	17	16	
	Range		16-17	15	14-19	16	
	% correct (21)		79%	71%	81%	76%	
Instructional Process	Mean		13	18	17	16	
	Range		12-14	18	14-20	16	
	% correct (21)		62%	86%	81%	76%	
Assessment	Mean		11.5	13	11	8	
	Range		10-13	13	9-13	8	
	% correct (13)		88%	100%	85%	62%	
Professional Development Leadership and Community	Mean		9	12	10	9	
	Range		9	12	7-12	14	
	% correct (14)		64%	86%	71%	64%	
Analysis of Instructional Scenarios	Mean		12.5	12	12	14	
	Range		11-14	12	10-13	14	
	% correct (16)		78%	75%	75%	88%	

22.1.1 Analysis of Data and Plan for Continuous Improvement

2016-2017:

Although 100% of students passed prior to student teaching, only 66% passed on the first attempt.

Course content will be re-aligned to Praxis content requirements.

2017-2018:

The benchmark was met. The data is based on one candidate. Her score was 178, exceeding the qualifying score of 157. Her strongest area was in Analysis of Instructional Scenarios, her

weakest in Assessment.

Plan for continuous improvement:

The Mathematics Education concentration is currently being revised to include a year-long residency in the senior year. In the first semester of residency, the courses EDUC 470S (residency), EDUC 469 (field study), and EDUC 351 (educational measurements) will work hand-in-hand. The field study project will be based on what they are doing in their residency classroom and they will be learning how to perform the tasks needed for the project in EDUC 351. This program revision should help strengthen our candidates preparation in the area of assessment.

Program outcomes

Problem Solving

Graduates effectively solve problems in the mathematical sciences.

Mathematical Arguments

Graduates construct valid mathematical arguments in the areas of analysis, modern algebra, and statistics.

Communication

Graduates express mathematical thinking effectively through oral and written communications.

Content and Pedagogy

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates demonstrate knowledge of the content and pedagogical practices relevant to secondary education.

Instructional Planning

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates plan effectively for instruction in secondary classes (grades 6-12) to include effective instructional delivery, appropriate content, opportunities for student involvement in the learning process, and assessments for student progress in secondary education.

Instructional Delivery

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates successfully complete and demonstrate effective instructional planning and teaching within practica and student teaching settings, reflecting on and refining professional practices suitable for secondary education.

Secondary Student Learning Impact

Secondary mathematics teacher candidates promote academic success and support academic performance for youth within secondary settings (grades 6-12).

End of report