

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences Date: 6/18/2026 Course(s): BIO 122
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) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>
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 would have been used to compare scores. If the average scores were similar (not significantly different) or were significantly better than Concordia on-campus students, the outcomes would have been considered to be comparable.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students recognize major phyla of the animal kingdom and relate unique and shared attributes to distinguish among the major groups? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Only one school was offering BIO 122 for Dual Credit. It had only 2 enrolled students so scores were not required to be reported. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> A t-test between Concordia and the dual-credit offering school was unable to be performed. 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? A comparison could not be made due to low enrollment.
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 action needed at this time. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> A t-test analysis will be able to be performed next year for any schools offering BIO 122 for dual credit as long as the enrollment is above 3 students. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> (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