**#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes**

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department: Computer Science       Date:      5/15/2015** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:      Russ Mosemann, Kent Einspahr** |
| **See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology* |
| **Analysis of artifacts:**  *1).* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*  A four point rubric was applied to each of the outcomes. The four categories are "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Needs Improvements", and "Unacceptable". |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:**  *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*       Are students acquiring the fundamental skills and knowledge necessary to be successful in succeeding courses in the department?  *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*  4/5 of the students meet the expectations on the loop skill. 2/5 meet expectations for the conditional and calculations skills meaning the others need improvement on those skills.    *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*       The level of mastery for loops seems to be acceptable. The assessment indicates that more attention needs to be focused on the development of skills involving conditionals and calculations. Because of the small size of the group, the results likely do not show much difference from previous  terms. We noticed that the students who are CS majors tend to meet expectations in more of the areas than the non-CS majors.  *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      Small size of population and the mixed population of majors and non-majors make it difficult to determine trends. |
| **Sharing of Results:**  *When were results shared? Date:*      5/15/2015  *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)*      Met as a department  *Who were results shared with? (List names):*      Russ Mosemann, Don Sylwester, Kent Einspahr, Ed Reinke, Brian Albright, John Snow |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:**  *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*  More emphasis will be placed on developing the logic skills needed to correctly implement conditionals and calculations. Focusing on the mental models involved as well as the simple syntax of the programming language will complement the logic skills and understanding that are reinforced in the lectures and homework. Program quizzes will be incorporated into the course to check the students understanding and recall of the programming language.  *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*  The students will be able to demonstrate a higher degree of understanding of the components of the programming language.  *3.* **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the* **ACTION\*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). None |
| ***If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.*** |
| ***What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?*** Are students acquiring the skills and knowledge related to the fundamental concepts of classes and objects? |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Kent Einspahr, Russell Mosemann Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):  5/15/15** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed:  5/15/15     Revisions accepted 5/26/15**  **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:   na**  **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:   7/15** |