

NATIONAL RECOGNITION REPORT

Initial Preparation of Mathematics Teachers at the Secondary Level (2012 Standards)

National recognition of this program is dependent on the review of the program by representatives of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM).

COVER PAGE

Name of Institution

Clarion University, PA

Date of Review

MM DD YYYY

08 / 01 / 2018

This report is in response to a(n):

- Initial Review
- Revised Report
- Response to Conditions Report

Program Covered by this Review

Bachelor of Science in Mathematics Education

Grade Level⁽¹⁾

7-12

(1) e.g. Early Childhood; Elementary K-6

Program Type

First teaching license

Award or Degree Level

- Baccalaureate
- Post Baccalaureate
- Master's

PART A - RECOGNITION DECISION

SPA decision on national recognition of the program(s):

- Nationally recognized
- Nationally recognized with conditions
- Further development required OR Nationally recognized with probation OR Not nationally recognized [See Part G]

Test Results (from information supplied in Assessment #1, if applicable)

The program meets or exceeds SPA benchmarked licensure test data requirement, if applicable:

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable
- Not able to determine

Comments, if necessary, concerning Test Results:

Under CAEP, there is no stated policy and no CAEP standard stating an 80% pass rate requirement on licensure tests. Additional information can be found at <http://caepnet.org/accreditation/caep-accreditation/program-review-options/data-requirements>.

Summary of Strengths:

Candidates have a wide variety of field experiences. Content preparation is strong.

PART B - STATUS OF MEETING SPA STANDARDS

Standard 1: Content Knowledge

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics demonstrate and apply knowledge of major mathematics concepts, algorithms, procedures, connections, and applications within and among mathematical content domains.

Preservice teacher candidates:

1a) Demonstrate and apply knowledge of major mathematics concepts, algorithms, procedures, applications in varied contexts, and connections within and among mathematical domains (Number, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, Statistics, Probability, Calculus, and Discrete Mathematics) as outlined in the NCTM Mathematics Content for Secondary.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Standard 1 Comments:

State-required licensure test(s) aligned to NCTM CAEP Mathematics Content for Secondary and at least one additional assessment collectively demonstrating at least an 80% alignment to each domain of the NCTM CAEP Mathematics Content for Secondary providing evidence that Element 1a* is met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 1.

*: Indicates essential (required) element

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 1, 2, and 6 address this standard.

*Element 1a: MET

Assessment 1 (Praxis 5161) provided evidence for 1a in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report.

Assessment 2 (Course Grades--Revised) provides additional evidence for 1a. Expanded course descriptions provide necessary detail to address previously unmet competencies.

Assessment 6 (Comprehensive Exam) provides supporting evidence for this element. This assessment is new and contains a six-part comprehensive exam, one for each of the six competencies. In some cases, the alignment includes multiple elements for a single item, making analysis by competency impossible. Since a score of 75% for each exam is acceptable, it is possible that candidates can miss up to ¼ of the solutions and may not demonstrate every competency as a result. Varied point values on items are unexplained and there are no criteria for assigning points.

Feedback on the NCTM CAEP Mathematics Content for Secondary alignment:
A.1 Number and Quantity Competencies SATISFIED (At least 80% competency alignment)

Assessment 1 provided evidence for A 1.1, A 1.2, A 1.3 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report.

Assessment 2 provided evidence for A 1.4 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report. The revised report provides evidence for A 1.1 and A 1.2 (Math 451), A

1.3 (Math 271, 272) and A 1.5 (Math 390). Math 321 and CPSC 201 do not provide additional evidence.

Assessment 6 provides supporting evidence for A 1.1 - A 1.5. See element 1a for additional comments.

A.2 Algebra Competencies SATISFIED (At least 80% competency alignment)

Assessment 1 provided evidence for A 2.1, A 2.2, A 2.3, A 2.4 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report.

Assessment 2 provided evidence for A 2.5 and A 2.6 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report. The revised report provides evidence for A 2.1 (Calculus Sequence), A 2.2 (Calculus Sequence and CPSC 201), A 2.3 and A 2.4 (Calculus Sequence)

Assessment 6 provides minimal supporting evidence for this competency. See element 1a for additional comments.

A.3 Geometry and Trigonometry Competencies SATISFIED (At least 80% competency alignment)

Assessment 1 provided evidence for A 3.2 - A 3.9 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report.

Assessment 2 provided evidence for A 3.1 and A 3.8 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report. The revised report provides evidence for A 3.2 (Math 347, 370, 451), A 3.3 (Math 357, 370), A 3.4 (Math 357), A 3.5 (Calculus Sequence), A 3.6 (Calculus Sequence, Math 357, 370), A 3.7 (Calculus Sequence, Math 357), A 3.9 (Calculus Sequence), A.3.10 (Math 357).

Assessment 6 provides minimal supporting evidence for this competency. See element 1a for additional comments.

A.4 Statistics and Probability Competencies SATISFIED (At least 80% competency alignment)

Assessment 1 provided evidence for A 4.1, A 4.3, A 4.4, and A 4.5 in the previous review.

Assessment 2 provides evidence for A 4.1, A 4.4, A 4.5 (Math 321) and A.4.6 (Math 390). The courses provide partial evidence for A 4.2 (no creation of surveys), A 4.3 (No mention of graphical displays).

Assessment 6 provides minimal supporting evidence for this competency. See element 1a for additional comments.

A.5 Calculus Competencies SATISFIED (At least 80% competency alignment)

Assessment 1 provided evidence for A 5.1, A 5.3, and A 5.5 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report.

Assessment 2 provided evidence for A 5.1, A 5.3, A 5.4 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report. The revised report provides evidence for A 5.2 (Math 271, 272), A 5.5 (Calculus Sequence), A 5.6 (Calculus Sequence and Math 390).

Assessment 6 provides minimal supporting evidence for this competency. See element 1a for additional comments.

A.6 Discrete Mathematics Competencies SATISFIED (At least 80% competency

alignment)

Assessment 1 provided evidence for A 6.2 and A 6.3 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report.

Assessment 2 provided evidence for A 6.1 and A 6.2 in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report. The revised report provides evidence for A 6.3 (Math 300), A 6.4 (Math 340), A 6.5 (Math 390).

Assessment 6 provides supporting evidence for competencies A 6.1 - A 6.5. See element 1a for additional comments.

Standard 2: Mathematical Practices

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics solve problems, represent mathematical ideas, reason, prove, use mathematical models, attend to precision, identify elements of structure, generalize, engage in mathematical communication, and make connections as essential mathematical practices. They understand that these practices intersect with mathematical content and that understanding relies on the ability to demonstrate these practices within and among mathematical domains and in their teaching.

Preservice teacher candidates:

2a) Use problem solving to develop conceptual understanding, make sense of a wide variety of problems and persevere in solving them, apply and adapt a variety of strategies in solving problems confronted within the field of mathematics and other contexts, and formulate and test conjectures in order to frame generalizations.

2b) Reason abstractly, reflectively, and quantitatively with attention to units, constructing viable arguments and proofs, and critiquing the reasoning of others; represent and model generalizations using mathematics; recognize structure and express regularity in patterns of mathematical reasoning; use multiple representations to model and describe mathematics; and utilize appropriate mathematical vocabulary and symbols to communicate mathematical ideas to others.

2c) Formulate, represent, analyze, and interpret mathematical models derived from real-world contexts or mathematical problems.

2d) Organize mathematical thinking and use the language of mathematics to express ideas precisely, both orally and in writing to multiple audiences.

2e) Demonstrate the interconnectedness of mathematical ideas and how they build on one another and recognize and apply mathematical connections among mathematical ideas and across various content areas and real-world contexts.

2f) Model how the development of mathematical understanding within and among mathematical domains intersects with the mathematical practices of problem solving, reasoning, communicating, connecting, and representing.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Standard 2 Comments:

At least two assessments providing evidence that Elements 2a*, 2b*, and at least 2 additional elements are met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 2.

*: Indicates essential (required) elements

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 address this standard. Although Section III of the program report indicates Assessment 6 provides evidence to support this standard, no alignment to elements of this standard is found.

*Element 2a: MET

Met in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report by Assessment 2 (Course Grades). Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 2a. The language of many rubrics' performance descriptors in this assessment are vague and do not articulate clear levels of performance. For example, it is unclear how rubric descriptors (e.g. "adequately demonstrates" and "fully demonstrates") describe the actual expectations for the candidate. Further

many rubric components are not disaggregated sufficiently to determine which of the included behaviors are actually demonstrated by candidates (for example element 2a). Finally, the program is encouraged to provide more discussion on the how the portfolio and the individual assignments are evaluated. For example, are individual assignments evaluated with a targeted rubric (such as the one included with the Common Core Reflection documentation) and then again with the portfolio?

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for element 2a.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 2a. The language of many rubrics' performance descriptors in this assessment are vague and do not articulate clear levels of performance. For example, there is no description of the difference among "a developing degree", "an acceptable degree", and "a high degree". Further many rubric components are not disaggregated sufficiently to determine which of the included behaviors are actually demonstrated by candidates.

*Element 2b: MET

Assessment 2 (Course Grades) provides evidence for element 2b.

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for this element. See additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides partial evidence for element 2b. The acceptable level of performance for 2.b.2, 2.b.4, and 2.b.5 do not satisfy all components of the sub-element.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 2b. See additional comments in element 2a.

Element 2c: MET

Met in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report by Assessment 2 (Course Grades). Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for element 2c.

Element 2d: MET

Met in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report by Assessment 2 (Course Grades). Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides partial evidence for element 2d. The acceptable level of performance does not satisfy all components of the element.

Element 2e: MET

Met in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report by Assessment 2 (Course Grades).

Element 2f: MET

Met in the 08/01/2017 Recognition Report by Assessment 2 (Course Grades).

Standard 3: Content Pedagogy

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics apply knowledge of curriculum standards for mathematics and their relationship to student learning within and across mathematical domains. They incorporate research-based mathematical experiences and include multiple instructional strategies and

mathematics-specific technological tools in their teaching to develop all students' mathematical understanding and proficiency. They provide students with opportunities to do mathematics – talking about it and connecting it to both theoretical and real-world contexts. They plan, select, implement, interpret, and use formative and summative assessments for monitoring student learning, measuring student mathematical understanding, and informing practice.

Preservice teacher candidates:

- 3a) Apply knowledge of curriculum standards for secondary mathematics and their relationship to student learning within and across mathematical domains.
- 3b) Analyze and consider research in planning for and leading students in rich mathematical learning experiences.
- 3c) Plan lessons and units that incorporate a variety of strategies, differentiated instruction for diverse populations, and mathematics-specific and instructional technologies in building all students' conceptual understanding and procedural proficiency.
- 3d) Provide students with opportunities to communicate about mathematics and make connections among mathematics, other content areas, everyday life, and the workplace.
- 3e) Implement techniques related to student engagement and communication including selecting high quality tasks, guiding mathematical discussions, identifying key mathematical ideas, identifying and addressing student misconceptions, and employing a range of questioning strategies
- 3f) Plan, select, implement, interpret, and use formative and summative assessments to inform instruction by reflecting on mathematical proficiencies essential for all students.
- 3g) Monitor students' progress, make instructional decisions, and measure students' mathematical understanding and ability using formative and summative assessments.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Standard 3 Comments:

At least two assessments providing evidence that Elements 3a*, 3c*, 3f*, and at least 1 additional element are met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 3.

*: Indicates essential (required) elements

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address this standard.

*Element 3a: MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 3a. See additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for element 3a.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 3a. See additional comments in element 2a.

Element 3b: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 3b. See additional comments in element 2a.

*Element 3c: MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) provides some but not sufficient evidence for element 3c. Specifically the rubric item addresses use of a variety of strategies and differentiated instruction for diverse populations, but not the other aspects of the element. See additional comments in element 2a when revising rubric items.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for element 3c.

Element 3d: MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) provides evidence for element 3d.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 3d. Although elements 3d and 3e are related the breadth and focus of the elements are not addressed in the single rubric item. Aligning multiple indicators with a single rubric item limits the element-specific analysis of candidate performance. See additional comments in element 2a.

Element 3e: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 3e. The rubric elements do not align with the language of the element. Additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 3e. See additional comments in elements 2a and 3e.

*Element 3f: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) provides partial but not sufficient evidence for element 3f. Specifically the role of interrupting and using data are not addressed. Additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) does not provide evidence for element 3f. The acceptable level of performance does not satisfy all components of the element.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 3f. See additional comments in element 2a.

Element 3g: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) provides partial but not sufficient evidence for element 3g. Specifically the element includes monitoring students progress through both formative and summative assessments which is difficult to accomplish in a single lesson plan. See additional comments in element 2a when revising rubric.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 3g. See additional comments in element 2a.

Standard 4: Mathematical Learning Environment

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics exhibit knowledge of adolescent learning, development, and behavior. They use this knowledge to plan and create sequential learning opportunities grounded in mathematics education research where students are actively engaged in the mathematics they are learning and building from prior knowledge and skills. They demonstrate a positive disposition toward mathematical practices and learning, include culturally relevant perspectives in teaching, and demonstrate equitable and ethical treatment of and high expectations for all students. They use instructional tools such as manipulatives, digital tools, and virtual resources to enhance learning while recognizing the possible limitations of such tools.

Preservice teacher candidates:

- 4a) Exhibit knowledge of adolescent learning, development, and behavior and demonstrate a positive disposition toward mathematical processes and learning.
- 4b) Plan and create developmentally appropriate, sequential, and challenging learning opportunities grounded in mathematics education research in which students are actively engaged in building new knowledge from prior knowledge and experiences.
- 4c) Incorporate knowledge of individual differences and the cultural and language diversity that exists within

classrooms and include culturally relevant perspectives as a means to motivate and engage students.
4d) Demonstrate equitable and ethical treatment of and high expectations for all students.
4e) Apply mathematical content and pedagogical knowledge to select and use instructional tools such as manipulatives and physical models, drawings, virtual environments, spreadsheets, presentation tools, and mathematics-specific technologies (e.g., graphing tools, interactive geometry software, computer algebra systems, and statistical packages); and make sound decisions about when such tools enhance teaching and learning, recognizing both the insights to be gained and possible limitations of such tools.

Met



Met with Conditions



Not Met



Standard 4 Comments:

At least two assessments providing evidence that Elements 4b*, 4d*, and 4e* are met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 4.

*: Indicates essential (required) elements

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address this standard.

Element 4a: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 4a. The language of this rubric element does not address all components of the element. Additional comments in element 2a.

*Element 4b: MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 4b. The language of this rubric elements does not address all components of the element. Additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for element 4b.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 4b. See additional comments in element 2a.

Element 4c: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 4c. The language of this rubric elements does not address all components of the element. Additional comments in element 2a.

*Element 4d: MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 4d. Additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for 4d.

Although the acceptable and target levels of the rubric are the same, there is a distinct difference between meeting expectations and not meeting expectations.

*Element 4e: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 4e. The language of this rubric elements does not address all components of the

element. Additional comments in element 2a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides partial evidence for element 4e. The acceptable level of the rubric presents and either/or assessment.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 4e. Although elements 4e and 5b are related the breadth and focus of the elements are not addressed in the single rubric item. Aligning multiple indicators with a single rubric item limits the element specific analysis of candidate performance. See additional comments in element 2a.

Standard 5: Impact on Student Learning

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics provide evidence demonstrating that as a result of their instruction, secondary students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, strategic competence, adaptive reasoning, and application of major mathematics concepts in varied contexts have increased. These teachers support the continual development of a productive disposition toward mathematics. They show that new student mathematical knowledge has been created as a consequence of their ability to engage students in mathematical experiences that are developmentally appropriate, require active engagement, and include mathematics-specific technology in building new knowledge.

Preservice teacher candidates:

5a) Verify that secondary students demonstrate conceptual understanding; procedural fluency; the ability to formulate, represent, and solve problems; logical reasoning and continuous reflection on that reasoning; productive disposition toward mathematics; and the application of mathematics in a variety of contexts within major mathematical domains.

5b) Engage students in developmentally appropriate mathematical activities and investigations that require active engagement and include mathematics-specific technology in building new knowledge.

5c) Collect, organize, analyze, and reflect on diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment evidence and determine the extent to which students' mathematical proficiencies have increased as a result of their instruction.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Standard 5 Comments:

At least two assessments providing evidence that Element 5c* and at least 1 additional element are met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 5.

*: Indicates essential (required) elements

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address this standard.

Element 5a: NOT MET

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 5a. See additional comments in element 2a.

Element 5b: NOT MET

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides partial but not sufficient evidence for element 5b. The acceptable level of the rubric does not address all components of this element.

*Element 5c: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) provides minimal but not sufficient evidence for element 5c. The language of this rubric elements does not address all components of the element. See additional comments in element 2a when

revising rubric.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides partial evidence for element 5c. The types of assessment data being used are not specified. Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 5c. See additional comments in elements 2a and 4e.

Standard 6: Professional Knowledge and Skills

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics are lifelong learners and recognize that learning is often collaborative. They participate in professional development experiences specific to mathematics and mathematics education, draw upon mathematics education research to inform practice, continuously reflect on their practice, and utilize resources from professional mathematics organizations.

Preservice teacher candidates:

- 6a) Take an active role in their professional growth by participating in professional development experiences that directly relate to the learning and teaching of mathematics.
- 6b) Engage in continuous and collaborative learning that draws upon research in mathematics education to inform practice; enhance learning opportunities for all students' mathematical knowledge development; involve colleagues, other school professionals, families, and various stakeholders; and advance their development as a reflective practitioner.
- 6c) Utilize resources from professional mathematics education organizations such as print, digital, and virtual resources/collections.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Standard 6 Comments:

At least two assessments providing evidence that Element 6b* and at least 1 additional element are met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 6.

*: Indicates essential (required) elements

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address this standard. Although Section III of the program report indicates Assessment 4 provides evidence to support this standard, no alignment to elements of this standard is found.

Element 6a: NOT MET

No assessments were cited for this element.

*Element 6b: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) provides partial but not sufficient evidence for element 6b. The language of this rubric elements does not address all components of the element.

Element 6c: NOT MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 6c. See additional comments in element 3a.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 6c. See additional comments in element 2a.

Standard 7: Secondary Mathematics Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

Effective teachers of secondary mathematics engage in a planned sequence of field experiences and clinical practice under the supervision of experienced and highly qualified mathematics teachers. They develop a broad experiential base of knowledge, skills, effective approaches to mathematics teaching and learning, and professional behaviors across both middle and high school settings that involve a

diverse range and varied groupings of students. Candidates experience a full-time student teaching/internship in secondary mathematics directed by university or college faculty with secondary mathematics teaching experience or equivalent knowledge base.

Preservice teacher candidates:

7a) Engage in a sequence of planned field experiences and clinical practice prior to a full-time student teaching/internship experience that include observing and participating in both middle and high school mathematics classrooms and working with a diverse range of students individually, in small groups, and in large class settings under the supervision of experienced and highly qualified mathematics teachers in varied settings that reflect cultural, ethnic, linguistic, gender, and learning differences.

7b) Experience full-time student teaching/internship in secondary mathematics that is supervised by a highly qualified mathematics teacher and a university or college supervisor with secondary mathematics teaching experience or equivalent knowledge base.

7c) Develop knowledge, skills, and professional behaviors across both middle and high school settings; examine the nature of mathematics, how mathematics should be taught, and how students learn mathematics; and observe and analyze a range of approaches to mathematics teaching and learning, focusing on tasks, discourse, environment, and assessment.

Met

Met with Conditions

Not Met



Standard 7 Comments:

Information included in Section I - Context #2 of the program report for Element 7a* and in Section I - Context #2 and #6 for Element 7b* and at least one assessment for Element 7c* providing evidence that Elements 7a*, 7b*, and 7c* are met at the acceptable or target level are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence for Standard 7.

*: Indicates essential (required) elements

Section III of the program report indicates Assessments 3, 4, and 5 address this standard.

*Element 7a: MET

Section I Context #2 provides evidence for element 7a. Candidates engage in a sequence of planned field experiences and clinical practice prior to a full-time student teaching. They have experiences in both middle school and high school. Placements include diversity in grade level, content areas, school and community size, multicultural settings.

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 7a. See additional comments in elements 2a and 3a.

*Element 7b: MET

Section I Context #2 and #6 provide evidence for element 7b. Candidates student teach full-time with highly qualified cooperating teachers and supervisors who are licensed and have experience teaching secondary mathematics.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 7b. Aligning multiple indicators with a single rubric item limits the element specific analysis of candidate performance. See additional comments in element 2a.

*Element 7c: MET

Assessment 3 (Course Portfolio) does not provide evidence for element 7c. See

additional comments in elements 2a and 3a.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides evidence for element 7c.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) does not provide evidence for element 7c. Aligning multiple indicators with a single rubric item limits the element specific analysis of candidate performance. See additional comments in element 2a.

PART C - EVALUATION OF PROGRAM REPORT EVIDENCE

C.1. Candidates' knowledge of content

Candidates have strong content courses that emphasize mathematical processes as well as content.

C.2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions

Assessment 3 (Portfolio) contains a variety of artifacts that address pedagogy, mathematics research, standards, and reflection. It has the potential to provide evidence when scoring issues are clarified and rubrics refined.

Assessment 4 (Student Teaching Assessment) provides specific evidence of the mathematics specific pedagogy outline in the NCTM standards. More information will be available for analysis when some rubric elements are revised.

Assessment 5 (Candidate Effect on Student Learning) has the structure to provide evidence of the candidates' ability to plan meaningful lessons when issues with rubrics are addressed.

C.3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning

Assessments 3 and 5 will provide evidence for Standard 5 when issues with rubrics are addressed.

PART D - EVALUATION OF THE USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Evidence that assessment results are evaluated and applied to the improvement of candidate performance and strengthening of the program (as discussed in Section V of the program report)

The mathematics education program has studied data from revised and additional assessments. There has only been one program completer since the revision occurred; faculty indicated that the student teaching assessment revisions had resulted in better supervision and reflection. Further, the program has worked to better align expectations with NCTM CAEP standards even though further work on rubrics is necessary.

PART E - AREAS FOR CONSIDERATION

Areas for consideration

Consider revision of rubrics for Assessments 3, 4, and 5 as the language of the rubrics' performance descriptors is vague and does not articulate clear levels of performance.

Consider developing guidelines for scoring content exams that indicate to what extent candidates' performance specifically addresses the expected outcomes with a more uniform distribution of ratings across exams.

PART F - ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

F.1. Comments on Section I (Context) and other topics not covered in Parts B-E:

None

F.2. Concerns for possible follow-up by the CAEP site visitors:

None

PART G - DECISIONS

Please select final decision:

- National Recognition with Conditions. The program has received a decision of conditional national recognition. See below for details.

NATIONAL RECOGNITION WITH CONDITIONS

The program is recognized through:

MM DD YYYY
08 / 01 / 2019

Subsequent action by the institution: Programs will have a maximum of two opportunities to resubmit a report with revisions to receive National Recognition. A report addressing the conditions must be submitted in accordance with the dates provided on the National Recognition Report. A program should NOT submit its Response to Conditions until it has the required data and is confident that it has addressed all the conditions in Part G of this Recognition Report. If no reports are submitted by the noted date, the program's recognition status will expire and revert to Not Recognized. In case the status expires, the program will not be able to submit a Response to Conditions Report, but may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review if time permits for the current CAEP accreditation cycle. Otherwise, the program may submit a new, complete program report and initiate a new program review for the next CAEP accreditation cycle, three years before the site visit.

If the program is currently Recognized with Conditions and is submitting a second Response to Conditions Report, the next report must be submitted by the date below. Failure to submit a report by the date below will result in loss of national recognition.

MM DD YYYY
03 / 15 / 2019

The following conditions must be addressed within the date specified above:

More than 50% of the elements (essential and other required) of each standard must be met.

There is a lack of quality in some assessments or scoring guides/rubrics.

At least two assessments supporting each of Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are required in order to satisfy the preponderance of evidence.

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.