DATE: April 11, 2016

TO: Randall Hannum, Chair

College Council Curriculum Committee

FROM: Curriculum Subcommittee

Kimberly Strickler (Chair), Lukasz Sztaberek and Ohbong Kwon

RE: Final Report for Proposal 15-08 Change in Entry Requirements for BS in Mathematics Education

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Proposal:**

To increase the admission requirement, add continuation requisites and increase the graduation requirement for the Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics Education

**Rationale:**

Standards for admission requisite to the Bachelor of Sciencedegree in Mathematics Education at City Tech are significantly lower than comparable programs in the New York City Area. We must increase our standards to meet the new accreditation standards set by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) to assure the grade point average for our BS candidate cohort meets or exceeds a minimum of 3.0.

To strengthen success potential; a freshman essay, personal interview and eligibility to enter MAT 1475 would be the new acceptance criteria. Students will be required to maintain a “C” or higher in major-related courses and graduate with a GPA minimum of 2.7. In addition, to improve program status and provide students with competitive opportunities in career placement, GPA standards for admission must increase not only to meet the new CAEP requirement, but to increase rates of completion and graduation. Enhanced standards will also improve prospects in future employment and support student acceptance to related Master’s degree programs

**Strengths:**

Solid Proposal; changes to admission requirements, continuation requisites and graduation requirements will allow for increased student retention and career success as well as increased standing within comparable mathematics’ programs

**Weaknesses:**

None

**Issues and Concerns Discussed and Resolved:**

1. Reword and concisely compose the brief rational to better reflect the proposed changes and additions
2. Edit the proposal to allow graphs and charts to be all on one page
3. Define “CAEP” in the brief rationale
4. Rework the summary to state goals of the proposal without suppositions presented as facts
5. Concern regarding the proposal for a 3.0 criteria yet may accept select students with lower GPA’s

All concerns and suggestions were well received by the proposers and incorporated into the final version of this proposal.

**Subcommittee Activities:** The subcommittee initially met with proposers to discuss concerns and modifications were suggested and incorporated in the final version of the proposal. On April 6, 2016, the subcommittee, along with Prof. Smith and Prof Andrew Douglas met with Provost Bonne August, Associate Provost Pamela Brown, Dean Justin Vazquez-Poritz, and Kimberly Cardascia to finalize proposal.