

2025 - 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Mathematics & Computer Science Date: 6/15/2026 Course(s): Math 132
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit Select Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Timothy Schroeder, Brian Albright, Ed Reinke
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Five prototypical questions, selected from four categories -- calculations, linear analysis, functional analysis, and applications -- were selected from final or late term exams and student performance was evaluated on a 5 point scale according to the attached rubric. 2). COMPARABILITY – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). For each question (two questions from the calculation category), the sample mean of dual credit student scores was compared against the attached rubric. No sample of traditional student scores is available.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students perform calculations, and algebraically manipulate expressions to make appropriate conclusions? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. In all four categories, and for each question, the sample mean of the 58 dual credit students fell in the 'Acceptable' to 'Very Good' range on the attached rubric. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results indicate that students in the dual credit courses are doing well on the material being assessed. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) none 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? see above
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 6/15/2026 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email Who were results shared with? (List names): Timothy Schroeder, Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, Kent Einspahr, Marcus Gubanyi
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year? no specific action taken at this time 2. IMPACT* - What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? none 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
Submitted by: Timothy Schroeder Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/16/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/16/26 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na