

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Computer Science Date: 6/12/2026 Course(s): CS131
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: Marcus Gubanyi and Kent Einspahr
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* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Each student's programming ability in the dual credit section was assessed by manually examining artifacts from a formative, secure assessment for writing programs. Programming ability is assessed based on the following statement, rated on a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree ... 5 = Strongly Agree). "The students' program successfully satisfies the problem specification with minimal logic errors." 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable?</i> (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). A random sample of student artifacts from the traditional section of CS131 were also assessed. The two small samples are compared manually.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students develop a program to solve a problem? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The two student artifacts from the dual credit section scores were 5 and 5, both max scores. The five student artifacts from the traditional section were 5, 5, 5, 2, 4. Due to small samples, we interpret these findings without statistical analysis. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Students in this dual credit section can develop programs that solve problems, based on our findings. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> The dual credit instructor accidentally did not collect an artifact for one of the three students in the section. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Our data collection and manual analysis suggests that students in the dual credit section of CS131 are achieving the learning outcomes of CS131 at least as well as the traditional section of CS131.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 06/12/2026 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Shared via email. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Marcus Gubanyi, Kent Einspahr, and Brian Albright.
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> No changes need to be made to the dual credit (alternative format) offering of this course, based on the fact that dual credit students outperformed traditional students. However, the dual credit liaison notes that sending dual credit instructors reminders regarding collecting student artifacts is worthwhile, to avoid missing data. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We anticipate that students in our dual credit sections of CS131 will continue to successfully meet the learning objects of the course. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> None
Submitted by: Marcus Gubanyi Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/26/16
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/16/26
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na