

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences Date: 6/18/2026 Course(s): BIO 110
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, Kristy Jurchen, Raegan Skelton
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> 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 – <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 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). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Do students understand basic concepts of the process of science, cell biology, genetics, natural selection, and ecology, and can they apply their knowledge of these topics? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Concordia on-campus students scored an average of 74.3% +/- 16.5%. School 1 scored an average of 70.1% +/- 9.6%, School 2 scored an average of 68.9% +/- 12.9%, and School 3 did not provide their scores at the time this assessment report was due despite multiple attempts to retrieve them. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> A t-test between Concordia and each dual credit-offering school reveals no statistically significant difference between the scores. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) N/A 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? On average, our dual credit schools scored similar to our Concordia on-campus students in their high school dual credit course.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/18/2026 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Rob Hermann, Kristy Jurchen
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 foreseeable changes at this time. The cumulative, multiple choice final exam will continue to serve as the common assessment for this course next academic year. Schools whose scores were not received have been reached out to by me and our Dual Credit office to communicate the importance of sending along scores. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Students enrolled in BIO 110 for dual credit should continue to score statistically similar or better than Concordia on-campus students. 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: Raegan Skelton Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/22/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/22/26
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na