2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences **Date:** 6/18/2026 **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, 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*** *- 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, genetics, natural selection, and ecology, 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 76.5% +/- 16.1%. School 1 scored an average of 80.1% +/- 6.5%, School 2 scored an average of 78.6% +/- 11.6%, School 4 scored an average of 65.5% +/- 9.4%, School 6 scored an average of 82% +/- 14.9%, and School 7 scored an average of 89.5% +/- 8.4%. School 5 did not report their scores due to low enrollment (only 1 student). School 3 did not provide their scores at the time this assessment report was due.
*3). **INTERPRETATION*** *- Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* A t-test between Concordia and each school reveals that Schools 1, 2, and 6 showed no statistically significant difference from Concordia on-campus students, School 7 scored significantly higher than Concordia on-campus students, and while School 4 scored significantly lower than Concordia on-campus students.
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 an unexpected changes in their dual credit BIO 111 course during the year that made it difficult to retrieve common assessment scores. The school adminstrator has been spoken with and we have a gameplan moving forward to avoid this in the future.
5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** On average, our dual credit schools scored similar to or better than our Concordia on-campus students in their high school dual credit course with the exception of School 4.

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date:* 6/16/2026 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* email *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Rob Hermann, 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?* 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 will be communicated with as appropriate. School 4 will be communicated with to investigate possible causes for their significantly lower average scores and possible solutions for improvement will be encouraged.
2. **IMPACT*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Students enrolled in BIO 111 for dual credit should continue to score statistically similar or better than Concordia students, and School 4's scores should increase to this level next academic year if they offer BIO 111 again for Dual Credit.

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):** 6/22/26

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/22/26

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na