

1145-J5-2556 **Amanda M Milewski*** (amilewsk@umich.edu), University of Michigan, 610 E. University Drive, Room 2405, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1259, **Patricio Herbst**, MI, and **Claudine Margolis** and **Enes Abugka**. *What do we know about courses in Geometry for Secondary Teachers?*

While most teacher preparation programs rely on courses taught in mathematics departments to support the development of the novices' mathematical knowledge for teaching (CBMS, 2012), many have questioned whether the content of such courses is sufficiently connected to the work of a secondary teacher (Wu, 2011; Zazkis & Leikin, 2010). In the context of a five-year project that leverages the improvement science approach (Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2015) to develop an inter-institutional system of support the improvement of the undergraduate college geometry course for secondary teachers, we sought to better define the problem and the systems that contribute to it, as well as identifying possible improvement levers. We examine 20 college geometry courses (using syllabi, interviews, and course descriptions) across the U.S to document the variation across these courses. Using that data, we ask: (1) What is the variation in the mathematical content and methods being covered in GeT courses across the United States? (2) How might considerations of the nature of the work of instruction in college help us understand that variability and its probable relationships with the problem of developing capacity for teaching the high school geometry course? (Received September 25, 2018)