

2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences	Date: 6/12/2025	Course(s): BIO 111		
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: Rob Hermann, Kyle Johnson, Kristy Jurchen				
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). Cumulative final exam multiple choice questions were graded and averaged independently for on-campus Concordia student scores and for student scores from each of the dual credit schools. 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). A t-test was used to compare scores. If the average scores are similar (not significantly different) or are significantly better than Concordia on-campus students, the outcomes are considered to be comparable.				
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Do students understand basic concepts of the process of science, cell biology, biochemistry, genetics, and molecular biology, and can they apply their knowledge of these topics? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. Concordia students scored an average of 77 +/- 13%. School 1 students scored an average of 59 +/- 9%, School 2 students scored an average of 67 +/- 8%, and School 3 students scored an average of 65 +/-14%. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Calculated p-values demonstrate that students from all three Dual Credit schools scored, on average, significantly lower than Concordia on this year's assessment. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) School 3 had a change in instructor mid-way through the year. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? On average, the dual-credit students scored significantly lower than Concordia on-campus students.				
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 6/12/2025 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email Who were results shared with? (List names): Rob Hermann, Kyle Johnson, Kristy Jurchen				
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? Dual credit instructors at each school will be contacted to determine if external factors impacted their instruction this year. Liaison will work with and communicate with dual credit instructors to ensure proper implementation of learning objectives are occurring for this course. Specific actions to be taken include: (A) Asking dual credit instructors if there were any known factors that could have impacted their scores this year, (B) Sharing, as requested by dual credit instructors, my course syllabus along with the master syllabus to provide them a tentative chapter timeline for the textbook as Concordia covers it in our class, (C) Asking dual credit instructors if there is any additional information I can help provide them prior to or during/throughout the school year to aid in their instruction, (D) considering if the cumulative final exam is the best dual credit assessment for this course, and (E) ensuring pre-requisite requirements for this course are being checked for dual credit students as well. 2. IMPACT* - What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Students taking the course for dual credit will perform at the same or better level as students taking the course at Concordia on-campus. Calculated t-tests will come back not statistically different or, if statistically different, dual credit students will have scored higher than the students at Concordia. 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: Raegan Skelton Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/16/2025				
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved				
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na				