**APPENDIX B**

**CROSSWALK BETWEEN EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND**

**SITE VISIT PROTOCOL QUESTIONS**

| **Evaluation Questions** | **PI /co-PIs** | **Staff** | | **Faculty** | | **Students** | | **Administrators** | **Partners** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1) How is the CPATH program (a) infusing computational thinking into a wide range of disciplines serving undergraduate education and (b) reaching a wide range of students to prepare them for STEM careers? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. What are the curricular and pedagogical models that have been created and developed through this program? | 4 | 4 | | 4 | | 1,2 | | 4 | 3 |
| 1. How, and to what extent, are the individual CPATH projects being implemented as planned? | 8 | 8 | | 8 | |  | | 6 |  |
| 1. How has the CPATH program supported the formal identification and specification of the core elements and competencies of computational thinking? | 5 | 5 | | 5 | | 6 | |  | 5 |
| 1. What are the factors that have supported successful implementation of strategies? | 10 | 11 | | 10 | |  | | 8 |  |
| 1. What do institutional leaders understand about the goals of the CPATH program and project(s)? | 9,10 | 9 | | 10 | |  | | 4,8 |  |
| 1. Who is benefitting from the projects? Students? Faculty? Departments? | 7 | 7 | | 7 | | 3,7 | | 5 | 4 |
| 1. How successful has the program been in targeting and engaging traditionally underrepresented groups (i.e., minorities, females, disabled and non-traditional computer majors) in classes or programs that promote computational thinking? | 7 | 7 | | 7 | | 5 | | 5,11 |  |
| 2) What is the evidence that university and community college departments and faculty are integrating computational thinking into their courses? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. What have been the program’s successes and highlights across projects in integrating best practices in computational thinking into courses across disciplines? What patterns do these indicate? | 6,10 | 6 | | 6 | | 4,5,7 | | 8 | 6 |
| 1. What have been the program’s barriers and challenges across projects to infusing computational thinking across disciplines? What patterns do these indicate? | 6, 8 | 8 | | 6,8 | |  | | 6 | 7 |
| 1. What do institutional documents (course catalogues, outlines of departmental majors, etc.) reveal about how IHEs are adapting to change by integrating computational thinking across the disciplines? |  |  | |  | |  | | 12 |  |
| 1. To what extent do faculty within university and community college departments produce educational scholarship to support grassroots efforts to promote computational thinking in and across the undergraduate curriculum? | 12 |  | | 11 | |  | | 10 |  |
| 1. What are the different social and resource supports within departments available to faculty bolstering their curricular reform efforts around computational thinking? | 9 |  | | 9 | |  | | 7 |  |
| 3) What is the evidence that the program is supporting the development of promising models of institutional change? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. How is the program supporting increases in student enrollment and course taking in computing over time? | 12 | 7 | | 11 | | 5,8 | | 10 |  |
| 1. How is the program catalyzing institutional change through faculty and administrative leadership governance in IHEs? | 11,13 | 10 | | 12 | |  | | 11 |  |
| 1. To what extent has the program influenced faculty culture and the rewards/incentive structure of IHEs? | 9,11,  13 | 10 | | 9,  12 | |  | | 7,11 |  |
| 1. What are some examples of promising models developed for infusing computational thinking across disciplines and institutions? | 4,14 | 4 | | 13 | |  | | 4,12 | 3,8 |
| 1. How have grantee institutions leveraged grant resources to support and sustain their reform models over time? | 11 | 12 | |  | |  | | 9 |  |
| 1. How are promising models sustained and replicated in new institutional settings? | 14 |  | | 13 | |  | | 12,16 | 15 |
| 4) What is the evidence that the program is developing communities of practitioners (among the different program stakeholders) that regularly share best practices across communities? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. How is the program supporting community building to share best practices in computational thinking? | 15 |  | 14 | |  | | 13 | | 9 | |
| 1. How has the program promoted the continued growth of the community of practitioners outside of the formal CPATH grantees? | 15 | 13 | 14 | |  | | 13 | | 14 | |
| 1. How have the program’s grantees contributed to a common understanding of computing competencies among the different stakeholder groups? | 15 |  | 14 | |  | | 13 | | 10 | |
| 1. How is the program supporting the inclusion of different stakeholders in these learning communities around computational thinking and education? | 15 |  | 14 | |  | | 13 | |  | |
| 1. What role has the program played in promoting shared learning about computational thinking among industry and professional/disciplinary associations? |  |  |  | |  | |  | | 10 | |
| 1. To what extent is the program creating strong links and synergy among the grantees involved in collaborative activities? | 20 |  |  | |  | |  | | 11 | |
| 5) How has the CPATH program promoted sustainable multi-sector partnerships that represent a broad range of stakeholders (i.e. industry, higher education, K12)? | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. To what extent have the program’s grantees created opportunities to develop multi-sector partnerships around computational thinking? | 17 | 14 | 15 | |  | | 14 | | 12 | |
| 1. How has the program supported pre-existing relationships between different sectors and promoted further buy-in to develop strong alliances around computational thinking? | 18 | 15 | 16 | |  | | 15 | | 13 | |
| 1. How has the program shaped the goals and theories of change of the different partnerships supporting computing education? | 18 | 15 | 16 | |  | | 15 | | 13 | |
| 1. What has the program done to define the roles, processes, and outcomes generated by the partnerships it supports? | 19 | 16 | 17 | |  | |  | | 14 | |
| 1. What has the program done to sustain multi-sector partnerships that hold promise for infusing computational thinking throughout the field? | 20 |  |  | |  | | 16 | | 15 | |