

## 2025 – 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Mathematics & Computer Science <b>Date:</b> 6/15/2026 <b>Course(s):</b> Math 333
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Dual Credit                      Select                      Select
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Ed Reinke
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Final Exams of the dual credit students were analyzed. 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). The number of dual credit students is so small, beyond looking and evaluating individual exams or exam scores, data analysis is not really possible.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students solve common linear algebra problems? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The three dual credit students performed well on their final exams, scoring 82, 88, and 91 out of 100 points, on exams that are reasonable for use in a college level linear algebra course. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The dual credit students are performing well. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) none 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> see above
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> 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
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year? no specific action will be taken at this time 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - What is the anticipated impact of the <b>ACTION*</b> on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? none 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the <b>ACTION*</b> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). none
<b>Submitted by:</b> Timothy Schroeder <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/16/2026
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> 6/16/26 <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na