

## 2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Natural Sciences	<b>Date:</b> 6/15/2025	<b>Course(s):</b> Bio 243
<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> Kristy Jurchen, Rob Hermann, Raegan Skelton, Kyle Johnson		
<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). Cumulative final exam multiple choice questions will be graded and compared. 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). A t-test was performed to see if scores were significantly different.		
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students identify the relevant structures associated with a specific physiological function? Can students recall the function of a tissue, organ, or system that are associated with a specific function? Can students understand the terminology of anatomy and physiology? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> CUNE students scored a $56 \pm 11\%$ (mean and standard deviation) on the exam. The dual credit schools that I received results for: School 1 $89 \pm 9\%$ School 2 $53 \pm 9\%$ School 3 $74 \pm 7\%$ School 4 $70 \pm 15\%$ 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Results show that dual credit students typically scored a C or higher level of understanding of the questions that were surveyed. One school scored a F. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Only 4/7 schools sent me scores. 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> Most schools scored significantly higher. The one that didn't was not significantly different (P-Value > 0.05)		
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6/14/2025 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Emailed department dual credit instructors. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Kristy Jurchen, Rob Hermann, Raegan Skelton, Kyle Johnson		
<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? Results being superior at dual credit schools, no action will take place. Open and regular communication will be initiated with schools that did not send a report to encourage the timely reporting of results. 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> Kyle Johnson <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/30/25		
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> NA		