

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences Date: 6/18/2026 Course(s): BIO 243
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> Can students identify the relevant structures associated with a specific physiological function? 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 56.1% +/- 11.2%. School 2 students scored an average of 50.5% +/- 7.6%, School 4 scored an average of 82.1% +/- 15.4%, School 5 scored an average of 70.5% +/- 10.1%, and School 6 scored an average of 76.9% +/- 9.5%. Schools 1 and 3 did not send in their scores by the time of this assessment, 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 (School 2) or that the dual credit offering schools scored significantly better than Concordia on-campus students (Schools 4, 5, and 6). 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 or better than Concordia on-campus students.
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. Schools whose scores were not received will be communicated with as appropriate to ensure scores are shared as required in the future. 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 243 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