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**Introduction**

**Old Westbury’s Policy on Assessment**

According to SUNY Old Westbury’s Distance Learning Policies dated 4/8/2016, “Distance Courses as a category will be assessed once every five years” (p. 8). The first such assessment was carried out in 2016, but due to the Covid emergency a second assessment was delayed until the present time.

**The Open SUNY Online Institutional Readiness Assessment**

In the meantime, though, the College conducted an Open SUNY Online Institutional Readiness Assessment (OSIRA), which was a comprehensive self-study of the College’s online offerings that begin in the Fall of 2016 and concluded in the Fall of 2019. This review included sections on Institutional Support, Technology Support, Course Development and Instructional Design, Course Structure, Teaching and Learning, Faculty Support, Student Support, and Evaluation and Assessment. Each section included multiple items on which a team of faculty, staff, and administrators rated the College on a scale of 0 (Deficient) to 3 (Exemplary).

The section on Evaluation and Assessment included 3 of the 4 indicies for which the review team rated our program 0, and none of the indices in the section was rated 3. Combined with the fact that the College’s Assessment Co-Directors advised that an assessment would be strongest if it did not just look at student learning outcomes, but instead looked at many aspects of the program, it was decided to use the current assessment process to address this area of our Distance program’s OSIRA assessment by including, in addition to Student Learning Outcomes, sections on Academic Support Services, Student Retention in Courses, Student Evaluations of Faculty, Quality of Course Materials, Student Retention in Programs, Recruitment Practices, Accessibility, Technical and Administrative Support Services, and Stakeholder Satisfaction (including Students, Faculty, and Staff). These are grouped into two sections, one on Instructional Issues (Learning Outcomes through Quality of Course Materials), and one on Administrative Issues (Student Retention in Programs through Stakeholder Satisfaction).

**History and Overview of Distance Learning at Old Westbury**

Encouraged by SUNY System Administration, Old Westbury offered its first Online class in 1999. Over the next few years the number of offerings increased to about a dozen per semester, where it plateaued for the balance of the “2000 oughts.”

The next major step was taken by the Provost in 2010, when he appointed a faculty member to organize a “Hybrid Initiative” to promote the offering of this type of class at the College by organizing workshops to discuss and disseminate ideas about how to organize such classes and, crucially, offered small, $1000 stipends to faculty who trained, developed, and offered them. The number of Hybrids grew quickly, from 1 in the Spring of 2010 to 35 in the Spring of 2012, while the number of fully Online classes remained at its previous level. The Manager of the Hybrid Initiative became the Director of Distance Learning, charged with promoting Online as well as Hybrid classes, and by Fall of 2016 the number of fully Online classes had doubled to 24, while the number of Hybrid classes burgeoned to 91 (including both what the College called Hybrids, classes that met once rather than twice a week, and Blended classes, which offset some scheduled meeting time with asynchronous online activities, but on an eclectic schedule set by the instructor). For the next few years it was Online classes’ turn to grow, so that by Fall of 2019 the number had doubled to 50, while the number of Hybrid and Blended classes remained at 90. By then, approximately 275 faculty members had trained for and taught at least one Distance course at Old Westbury.

In addition to this steady growth of course offerings, the College adopted a set of Distance policies in 2016 and launched its first Online program, an Online track for its MS in Accounting degree, between 2016 and 2019, supported by a SUNY Performance Improvement Fund (PIF) grant that enabled the program to hire additional faculty, buy state-of-the-art equipment, train the faculty as a special cohort, help them develop more standardized and sophisticated online courses, and market the program. The College also hired an instructional designer in 2018, and embarked on a project to earn Open SUNY+ status, which would open up opportunities for additional marketing support from SUNY, and which led to the Open SUNY Online Institutional Readiness Assessment mentioned above.

Unfortunately, the Covid-19 pandemic in Spring 2020, threw these plans into disarray. The follow-up to the Institutional Readiness Assessment was an Enrollment Roundtable, which was conducted but never finalized with a written report because of Covid. Similarly, plans to follow up the PIF-funded marketing of the Online MS in Accounting track had to be abandoned, as was the stipend program for development of Distance courses.

While the first two of these impacts were definite setbacks, the last was not really consequential because of the “pivot online” in response to Covid that took place in March of 2020. This involved two major elements. First, every class that started the semester meeting on-campus ceased to do so. Second, they replaced their on-campus meetings not with asynchronous online activities, which had been the way that Online classes, and the online portion of Hybrid/Blended classes, had been conducted, but instead with synchronous online meetings using conferencing software, most notably Zoom.

As indicated, the College had no, and SUNY and most of the larger online education community had little, experience with this form of online instruction, and suddenly every faculty member had to learn to use it and organize their classes to be taught through it in the space of a few weeks. In addition, students who had little to no experience with online education suddenly had to adapt to it, which in some cases meant getting loaner equipment from the College, and in many cases meant taking classes in ad hoc spaces in their homes which might or might not have satisfactory privacy, quiet, and internet connections. Furthermore, as experience was gained with Zoom, it became clear that both because of many students’ technological limitations and because of the nature of synchronous online sessions involving 20 – 30 participants, classes often worked best with an admixture of asynchronous online activities to supplement shorter synchronous sessions. Thus most classes became effectively “Remote Blendeds,” and most faculty became experienced online instructors through this trial by fire. The College’s Instructional Design staff, which by this point numbered 3 people, worked tirelessly to train and support them during the pivot online, and then over the Summer of 2020 and beyond. Faculty also organized workshops and informal support for each other.

Instruction at the College remained almost all online through the Summer of 2021, but thereafter pivoted back to primarily on-campus activities, which brought strains of its own. In particular, many faculty had become used to combining synchronous and asynchronous online elements, and a good number were disinclined to return to the classroom with Covid still threatening. Thus, in the Fall of 2021 and Spring of 2022 many listed their classes as Blended, to take advantage of the flexibility of this modality to have a nominal number of on-campus meetings and then conduct the bulk of the course online. While some students appreciated not having to come to campus, and some determinedly avoided it because they did not want to get immunized, a requirement to take in-person classes, others resented what seemed like “bait and switch” because they wanted the classroom experience.

Students and faculty alike were in any case confused by the sudden proliferation of modalities, not only various combinations of hybrid/blended and remote and on-campus elements, but also the introduction of Flex mode, in which the instructor conducts class in a classroom with some students, while others attend via Zoom. The College convened a joint faculty-administration Task Force in the Spring and Summer of 2021 to update its Distance policies, but these were not enacted after they were turned in.

**New Modalities and this Assessment**

Because of the novelty of the Remote and Flex modalities, and their appearance toward the end of the period covered by this assessment, they are not considered here. Instead, the Distance Learning that is being subjected to the 5 year assessment is the “traditional” asynchronous online instruction. Thus, it must be understood that Blended and Hybrid classes mixed asynchronous with traditional in-class activities up to March 2020, then mixed them with synchronous online (remote) activities through the Summer of 2021, and then mixed them with one or the other, or both, thereafter.

Similarly, it must be understood that what are referred to as “Face-to-Face” classes in the following discussion were traditional in-class courses up to March 2020, then synchronous online, or Remote, classes through the Summer of 2021, and then a mix of traditional classroom and Remote classes thereafter. Furthermore, it must be pointed out that many of these Remote Face-to-Face classes undoubted included asynchronous online elements, because this mixture was not only accepted but encouraged for the pedagogical reasons given above.

Finally, Flex classes are virtually unmentioned, for the same basic reasons as for Remote. Fortunately, in the case of Flex classes, there are few offered. As for the other modalities, it will be seen that the assessment is remarkably rich and seemly complete, understood not to be a full assessment of all Distance instruction since 2016, but instead an assessment of the use of asynchronous instruction, both as the sole means of conducting a class, our Asynchronous Online modality, and, in Hybrid and Blended classes, as a complement to synchronous instructional activities, whether these are conducted in the classroom or through Zoom.

**Instructional Issues**

**Learning Outcomes**

Assessment Instruments: This assessment is based on 3 sets of data from assessments done in Academic Year 2021-2023 semester:

1. Liberal Education assessed student attainment of Learning Outcomes in 3 domains in Spring 2022, and the final reports, which include considerations of differences among modalities, are used here.
   1. Creativity and the Arts assessed 6 of 39 courses, of which 2 were Hybrids.
   2. Foreign Language assessed 4 of 21 courses, of which 2 were Asynchronous Online classes.
   3. Social Science assessed 9 of 50 courses, 4 of which were Blended and one of which was a Remote Hybrid.
2. Four majors conducted assessments of courses that included Distance classes:
   1. The Public Health department conducted assessments of 9 Distance classes (6 Blended, 3 Remote Hybrid).
   2. The School of Professional Studies department assessed 2 classes offered in Distance modalities (1 Asynchronous Online; 1 Blended).
   3. The Politics, Economics, and Law department assessed one of its classes that was offered as an Asynchronous Online class.
   4. The School of Education assessed one of its classes that was offered as a Blended class.
3. Student Evaluations of Courses conducted in Blended, Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and Asynchronous Online classes in the semesters from Fall 2018 through Spring 2022 via the Blue system include a response to the prompt: “How much do you feel you learned in this course? (1=Nothing, 5=A lot)”. This data is available for classes in all four Distance modalities and Face-to-Face as well.

Assessment Measures:

1. Among the Liberal Education domains:
   1. The Creativity and the Arts assessment reported the following comparison:

| **Modality/ SLO** | **Hybrid: Meet or Exceed** | **Face-to-Face: Meet or Exceed** | **Hybrid vs. Face-to-Face** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO1** | 91.70% | 77.08% | 14.62% |
| **LO2** | 68.42% | 73.77% | -5.35% |
| **LO3** | 83.33% | 77.05% | 6.28% |
| **LO4** | 100% | 78.46% | 21.54% |
| **Average** | **85.86%** | **76.59%** | **9.27%** |

In sum, student attainment of SLOs in assessed Hybrid Creativity classes was higher for 3 of the 4, and almost 10% higher overall, than in face-to-face classes. While the sample size is obviously small, the difference seems particularly significant given that the report noted that, “No other trends were observed based on course level, instructor status or academic department,” suggesting that the differences are not random fluctuations, but instead represent real differences in the student learning in the different modalities.

* 1. The Foreign Language assessment reported the following comparison:

| **Modality/ SLO** | **Asynch Online Meet or Exceed** | **Face-to-Face: Meet or Exceed** | **Asych Online vs. Face-to-Face** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LO1** | 95.00% | 97.44% | -2.44% |
| **LO2** | 95.00% | 100.00% | -5.00% |
| **Average** | **95.00%** | **98.72%** | **-3.72%** |

In this case, students in the Face-to-Face classes attained the Learning Outcomes at a slightly higher rate than the ones in the Distance classes, although, as the report noted that the two modalities “saw similar numbers” that were “consistently high” enough that “no meaningful differences could be seen” based on the modality (and, as with the Creativity classes, the same was true for instructor status and course level).

* 1. The Social Science report did not include the percentages meeting or exceeding expectations, but did report the conclusion that “No trends were seen in the percentages meeting or exceeding expectations by course level, instructor status, or teaching modality.” However, it went on to note that “the remote hybrid course reported 95% meeting or exceeding expectations for the first learning outcome and 100% … for the second.” It cautioned that since there was only one course, a comparison would not be meaningful, but in conjunction with the results reported by the Creativity domain above, this outcome reinforces the impression that hybrid courses can achieve their learning outcomes at least as well as traditional face-to-face ones.

1. None of the majors did a side-by-side comparison of Distance and Face-to-Face classes, but their data still reveals the extent to which students in courses in different Distance modalities meet or exceed expectations.
   1. Public Health’s assessment rated its students as Superior, Above Average, Average, or Below Average/Unacceptable. In both the 6 Blended and the 3 Remote Hybrid classes, 84% of the students were rated as Average or higher.

| **Rating / Modality** | **Superior** | **Above Average** | **Average** | **Below Average/ Unacceptable** | **Average or Above** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Blended 1** | 16% | 26% | 47% | 11% | **89%** |
| **Blended 2** | 21% | 38% | 8% | 33% | **67%** |
| **Blended 3** | 36% | 36% | 15% | 12% | **88%** |
| **Blended 4** | 18% | 73% | 9% | 0% | **100%** |
| **Blended 5** | 18% | 27% | 36% | 18% | **82%** |
| **Blended 6** | 12% | 15% | 54% | 19% | **81%** |
| **Averages** | **20%** | **36%** | **28%** | **16%** | **84%** |

| **Rating / Modality** | **Superior** | **Above Average** | **Average** | **Below Average/ Unacceptable** | **Average or Above** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hybrid 1** | 32% | 29% | 12% | 28% | **72%** |
| **Hybrid 2** | 19% | 56% | 19% | 6% | **94%** |
| **Hybrid 3** | 19% | 19% | 50% | 13% | **88%** |
| **Averages** | **23%** | **35%** | **27%** | **16%** | **84%** |

* 1. The Asynchronous Online Professional Studies course had 12 students assessed on one Learning Outcome, while the Blended class had 9 students assessed on two. The percentage attainment of Learning Outcomes in the two courses was as follows:

| **Rating / Modality** | **Not Meet** | **Approach** | **Meet** | **Exceed** | **Meet or Exceed** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Asych Online** | 0% | 8% | 33% | 58% | **91%** |
| **Blended** | 11% | 22% | 39% | 28% | **67%** |
| **Averages** | **6%** | **15%** | **36%** | **43%** | **79%** |

* 1. The School of Education’s Blended class had 8 students who were assessed on a 4-point scale in 13 areas outlined in a rubric. All 8 students scored a 4 in all 13 areas.
  2. The Politics, Economics, and Law Asynchronous Online class had 12 students assessed on one Learning Outcome. While the report does not contain summary percentages comparable to the other assessments, it does report that the average number of students who got the right answer on each of the 43 test questions used in the assessment was 90%, and “There were only 4 questions where fewer than 70% of students answered it correctly.” The instructor concluded that “Overall the results are very encouraging,” while the second reader commented that “students did surprisingly well … the outcomes exhibited in this course were excellent,” and the “class is a good example of how [an] asynchronous course can work.”

1. Student Evaluations Responses on How Much They Learned

Ratings ranged from a low of 3.97 for Asynchronous Online classes in Fall, 2018 to a high of 4.34 for Hybrid classes in Spring of 2020 (see Appendix A, Part 2). Examination of the data yields a number of significant observations:

* 1. The range of ratings is both relatively high and relatively narrow. If converted into the College’s 4.0 grading system, all modalities across all semesters would fall into the high B range, with all but one above the midpoint for a B (3.00, 4.00 here) and the majority (2/3) falling into the B+ range (3.17-3.49; 4.17 - 4.49 here).
  2. The ratings for Distance modalities are more variable than the ratings for Face-to-Face classes, with Blended and Hybrid tied at a range of .25, Asynchronous Online slightly higher at .27, and Face-to-Face almost exactly half at .124.

|  | **Low** | | **High** | | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Modality** | Rate | Sem | Rate | Sem |  |
| **Blended** | 4.07 | S19 | 4.32 | S22 | **0.25** |
| **Face-to-Face** | 4.15 | F18 | 4.27 | S21 | **0.124** |
| **Hybrid** | 4.09 | F18 | 4.3 | S20 | **0.25** |
| **Online** | 3.97 | F18 | 4.2 | S20 | **0.27** |

Why this should be so would seem to be the difference in sample size: Face-to-Face submitted evaluations total around 10,000 per semester (high 15,325; low 9,844), whereas Hybrids total in the low 1,000s (high 1583; low 1146), Asynchronous Online range from the high 100s to the mid-1000s (high 1691; low 678), and Blendeds from the low 100s to the low 1000s (high 1218; low 198). And, indeed, a random subset of 500 Face-to-Face evaluations was sampled from each semester, and the range was much closer to that of the Distance classes (.24, from a low of 4.13 in Spring 2021 to a high of 4.37 in Spring 2022).

* 1. While Blendeds were the highest rated modality most often (4 times – Fall 2018, Fall 2019, Spring 2021, and Spring 2022), Face-to-Face came in second at 3 times (Spring 2019, Fall 2020, and Fall 2021), and Hybrids topped the ratings once (Spring 2020), Asychronous Online was never the highest rated modality.
     1. Instead, it was most often the bottom rated one (4 times – Fall 2018, Fall 2019, Spring 2021, and Spring 2022), with Blendeds coming in second (2 times, Spring 2019 and Fall 2020) and Hybrids and Face-to-Face tied at one time each (Fall 2021 and Spring 2020, respectively).
     2. While the difference between the highest and lowest rated modalities are small, it seems clear that students have slightly less confidence in their learning in Asynchronous Online classes than in the other modalities. Overall, the average ratings for students give their learning in Online classes from Fall, 2018 to Spring 2022 was 4.15, while the average rating for Hybrid was 4.220, Blendeds was 4.226, and Face-to-Face 4.23.
  2. The last significant observation gleaned from the data is that student ratings of their learning in all classes has been increasing since Fall 2018. While the disruptions of the pivot online cloud the picture somewhat, contrasting the 3 semesters from Fall 2018 to Fall 2019 with the 3 from Spring 2021 to Spring 2022 shows that student ratings of their learning have increased across the board:

| Modality | Rating Fall 2018 To Fall 2019 | Rating Spring 2021-  To Spring 2022 | Change |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Blended | 4.20 | 4.27 | +.07 |
| Face-to-Face | 4.20 | 4.27 | +.07 |
| Hybrid | 4.19 | 4.28 | +.09 |
| Online | 4.09 | 4.18 | +.09 |

Of particular note here, not only have students’ rating of their learning increased in all modalities, but they have increased most in Asychronous Online and Hybrid classes. Of course, it is possible that this reflects changes in the composition of the student body, as the decline in enrollments by 20% since the pandemic may have weeded out the more marginal, and therefore more disaffected, students. It is also possible that it reflects a more direct effect of the pandemic, with students valuing their education more – and particularly instruction in modalities that are deliberately attuned to the new, virtual situation the pandemic forced us into.

Closing the Loop: Formal assessments of Student Learning Outcomes in 3 Liberal Education domains and 4 majors indicate that students’ meet or exceed expectations at least as readily in Distance classes as in traditional Face-to-Face ones. Student evaluations of their learning similarly suggest that learning in Distance classes is more-or-less comparable to Face-to-Face classes, except that students have slightly lower confidence in Online classes than in the others. To the extent that this is because students don’t know the comparability of the modalities, the College should make an effort to educate them about it. To the extent, though, that this is because it reflects something about their actual experience with Distance classes, their experience should be investigated more closely to determine what aspects of these classes lead to this evaluation and devise measures to lessen this effect. (Note that student evaluations are considered in regard to both student attitudes toward faculty and students’ evaluation of courses overall in sections below, which will reveal at least some clues about the causes and possible measures to mitigate this issue.)

**Academic Support Services**

Introduction: The four primary academic support services are tutoring (including writing help), academic advising, the Library, and the Bookstore.

Assessment Instruments:

1. Tutoring: Usage Data and Student Feedback from Smarthinking

2. Advising: Information collected for the Proposal to offer an Online track for the BPS in Professional Studies.

3. Library: Information collected for the Proposal to offer an Online track for the BPS in Professional Studies and a debriefing of Library Director

4. Bookstore: Information collected for the Proposal to offer an Online track for the BPS in Professional Studies.

Assessment Measure:

1. Tutoring:

Between March 23, 2017 and March 22, 2022 a total of 8547 students registered for the Smarthinking Online Tutoring service, of whom 479 used it in a total of 898 sessions totaling 33,290 minutes, or 554.82 hours.

Of a total 1192 sessions, 618 (52%) were for Math topics, 248 (21%) were for Writing topics, 208 (17%) were for Science topics, 73 (6%) were for Accounting topics, 17 (1%) were for Economics topics, and 28 (2%) were for other (including Spanish and computer programming).

Overall, about 1/3, 35%, of the students submitted post-session surveys. 79% of these said they would recommend the service to a friend. The average rating they gave the Tutors was 3.78 out of 5; the average rating they gave the Tutors’ feedback specifically was 3.84; they gave the service’s Technology a 3.55 rating; and rated the Process overall 4.61.

Both the recommendation rating and the overall Process rating indicate a high level of satisfaction with the service.

2. Advising

Advising is handled by the faculty or advising staff in the school or department offering a program, and can be done through the College’s email system, Zoom or MS Teams, or the College’s instance of EAB Navigate. The College's Student Information System is accessible to students via the Student Portal and allows access to their unofficial transcript and the Degree Works degree audit system, which provides students with the ability to see which degree requirements they have or have not yet fulfilled. Navigate has a mobile app that has resources and contact information, and students can use it to schedule appointments with advisers. It also has an electronic academic planner that students may use to plan out their course of study, which advisers can review and provide guidance on. Advisers can use it to contact students and document interactions.

A recent survey by the Student Government Association revealed that there is a relatively high level of student dissatisfaction with advising, but this concerned advising via all modalities, not online advising in particular. Determining the reason for this is therefore beyond the scope of this assessment, though ironically it could be related to the very richness of electronic sources of information: students may want personal guidance, and the reliance of the campus on automated systems (as is true of most campuses these days) may actually foster dissatisfaction even as it provides a much richer set of tools and guidance mechanisms than in the past.

3. Library:

The library can be accessed from the Student and Faculty portal homepages, and all of the library’s catalogs and databases can be accessed online. A substantial proportion of the library's reference and research materials like periodicals and e-books are accessible through the library's electronic databases, which is how the great majority of students have accessed materials since the pandemic; checkouts of physical books dropped for about 1000 per month to almost 0, except for a few specialty items like art books. Consequently, the library purchases few print books anymore, and almost no other materials like periodicals or magazines.

The library supports students through virtual chat reference, which is available 24/7, and which handles 250-300 questions a month. Students can also find assistance by phone or email. The library can also provide access to additional resources by Interlibrary Loan (ILL), and can ship books to students through the resource sharing program Old Westbury participates in with other SUNYs. Librarians and faculty can also embed research guides in the course spaces of classes in the College’s LMS.

The biggest problem noted by the library director is students’ underutilization of the library’s resources. The library staff promotes them as vigorously as it can, but many of its tools go un-, or at least under-used.

4. Bookstore

The Student Portal consists of a home page and separate pages for Registration, Academics, Finances, and Campus Life that provide access to comprehensive information about the College and a variety of online tools for interacting with it.

Closing the Loop:

1. Tutoring:

Smarthinking should be informed that the lowest rated aspect of their service is the technology.

Given the satisfaction students who use it evince but the relatively modest usage for a student body of 4-5000, efforts should be made to publicize the service and help students get started with it. This publicity effort should include not only the currently used topics (math, science, writing, and accounting), but also topics like economics, Spanish, and computer programming.

2. Advising

The College should devise a means to determine why students express particular dissatisfaction with advising, and devise strategies to alleviate the sources of dissatisfaction. To the extent that this process involves reliance on or limitations of electronic systems this will be of particular importance for the Distance program, although the high degree of reliance on electronic systems at this point means that this will be just part of a much larger whole.

3. Library

The library should continue to enhance its electronic materials and promote the use of its resources and services to the maximum extent it can.

4. Bookstore: No changes indicated

**Student Retention in Courses**

Assessment Instrument: DFW rates of Distance courses compared with DFW rates of traditional courses. Sources include data from Institutional Research, supplemented by data from Tableau. (See Appendix B, Parts 1 and 2)

Assessment Results:

*Hybrid classes*

Between Fall 2013 and Fall 2021 the DFW rates in Hybrid classes were fairly consistent, fluctuating between a low of 11.8% in both Spring 2015 and Fall 2019 and a high of 19.2% in Fall 2014, for an average of 13.9% during the period overall (note that Spring 2020 is not considered here since DFW rates in all modalities were anomalously low due to the College’s policy of accommodating students due to the disruptions caused by Covid). In comparison, the DFW rates in traditional classes fluctuated between a low of 12.6% in Fall 2013 and a high of 15.9% in Fall 2021, with an average of 13.2% overall.

Looked at another way, the DFW rate in Hybrid classes was less than 1% higher on average than in Traditional classes (13.9% vs. 13.2%, or 0.7%) for the period overall. Furthermore, in 6 of the 17 terms, or almost 1/3, the DFW rates in Hybrid classes were actually lower than those in Traditional classes.

Since the Covid crisis not only caused disruptions that affected faculty and students, but also muddled the College’s classification of and record-keeping about modalities, it is important to note that the results and relationships reported here were only marginally impacted by Covid. From Fall 2013 to Fall 2019, the period before Covid, the average DFW rate for Hybrid classes was just 3/10ths of 1% higher than for the period overall (14.2% vs. 13.9%). Similarly, the difference between the DFW rates of Hybrid and Traditional classes was just 0.1% higher than the average for the whole period (0.8% vs. 0.7%; 14.2% vs. 13.4%, and they were lower in 4 of the 13 terms (again almost 1/3).

*NET classes*

In contrast to the relative stability of DFW rates in Hybrid classes, both in absolute terms and in relationship to traditional classes, both the absolute DFW rate of Asynchronous Online (NET) classes and its relationship to the DFW rate of Traditional classes has changed dramatically in the past decade. In Fall 2013 the DFW rate in NET classes was 27.3%, more than twice the 12.6% in Traditional classes, but by Fall, 2021 the DFW rate in NET classes had dropped to 13.4%, while the DFW rate in Traditional classes was actually 2.5% higher, 15.9%.

On the other hand, as with the DFW rate of Hybrids, the data from 2013 to 2019 indicates that the Covid crisis had only a limited impact on the absolute DFW rate of NET classes and its relationship to Traditional classes. Overall, the DFW rate in NET classes declined gradually from the high of 27.3% in Fall 2013 to 15.7% in Fall 2019, while the difference between NET and traditional classes dropped from 14.7% in Fall 2013 to just 1.1% (15.7% vs. 14.5%) in the same semester.

Comparing the average DFW rates in the first half of the pre-Covid period with the second half tells the same story. From Fall 2013 to Fall 2016 the average DFW rate for NET classes was 22.7%, which was 9.6% higher than the rate for Traditional classes. In contrast, from Spring 2017 through Fall 2019, the NET DFW rate averaged 17.5%, about 5% lower, while the difference between NET and Traditional classes declined even more, almost 6%, down to 3.7%.

While the confusion caused by Covid makes the data set used in the above analysis uncertain beyond Fall 2019, data from a different source indicates that the decline in DFW rates in NET classes has continued to decline. Specifically, the Grade Distribution dashboard in Tableau indicates that the DFW rate for NET classes was 13.5% in Fall 2021 and 14.3% in Spring 2022, whereas the DFW rates for all other classes (presumably a mixture of Traditional, Hybrid, Remote, and the handful of Flex classes) were 11.4% in the Fall, 2.1% lower, and 17.7% in the Spring, 3.4% *higher* than the corresponding rates for NET classes.

Closing the Loop:

It seems clear that over the past decade the DFW rate of Hybrid classes has remained roughly comparable to that of Traditional classes, while the rate of NET classes has dropped for significantly higher than Traditional classes to roughly comparable as well. Why the latter has happened is not clear. One possibility is that as the number of Hybrid and NET classes has increased, students have become more familiar with and capable in them. Regardless of the cause, the data indicates that there is not a present a need for any remedial action in regard to retention of students in online classes.

**Student Evaluations of Faculty**

Assessment Instrument: Students ratings of Faculty in the Blue course evaluations in Blended, Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and Asynchronous Online classes in the semesters from Fall 2018 through Spring 2022 in response to the prompt: “Please provide an overall rating of this instructor's teaching. (1=Very Negative, 5=Very Positive).”

The overall data for Student Evaluations is contained in Appendix A, Part 1, and a graph and table with student ratings of instructors drawn from that is contained in Appendix A, Part 3.

Assessment Measure:

Ratings ranged from a low of 3.90 for instructors of Asynchronous Online classes in Fall, 2018 to a high of 4.44 for faculty who taught Hybrid classes in Spring of 2020. Examination of the data yields a number of significant observations:

1. As with students ratings of how much they learned, the range of ratings is both relatively high and relatively narrow. If converted into the College’s 4.0 grading system, all modalities across all semesters would fall into the high B range, with all but one above the midpoint for a B (3.0, 4.0 here) and the majority (2/3) falling into the B+ range (3.17-3.49; 4.17 - 4.49 here).
2. As with students’ ratings for learning, their ratings for instructors in Distance modalities are more variable than the ratings for those of Face-to-Face classes, with Blended with a .21 range, Hybrid with a range of .34, and Asynchronous Online slightly higher at .37. In contrast, ratings of Face-to-Face instructors just ranged .16.

|  | **Low** | | **High** | | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Modality** | Rate | Sem | Rate | Sem |  |
| **Blended** | 4.13 | S19 | 4.412 | S22 | **0.212** |
| **Face-to-Face** | 4.20 | F18 | 4.36 | S21 | **0.16** |
| **Hybrid** | 4.10 | F18 | 4.44 | S20 | **0.34** |
| **Online** | 3.90 | F18 | 4.27 | S20 | **0.37** |

* 1. As discussed in the section on Student Evaluations’ ratings of how much students feel they learned, the difference can to some extent be explained by the differences in sample size since evaluations of Face-to-Face instructors are almost an order of magnitude more numerous than evaluations of Distance faculty.
  2. However, the fact that the range for Blended instructors is closer to that of Face-to-Face ones than to the ones using other Distance modalities suggests that something else is at play in this case. Assuming that students in Blendeds have more synchronous interactions with faculty than the other Distance modalities, both because they had twice-weekly meetings in the classroom to some extent before the pandemic, and because since then the “blendedness” of many has reflected a mixture of remote and classroom meetings as well as meetings and asynchronous work, the evaluations of faculty would seem to be connected to the extent to which students have live interactions with faculty, with students in Face-to-Face classes meeting most frequently and forming the strongest connections to faculty at one extreme, and students in Asychronous Online classes never meeting with faculty and therefore forming the weakest connections with them at the other.

1. Reinforcing this impression, while, as noted, the overall range between the different modalities was relatively narrow, there was one aspect of this range that seems to be particularly significant: not only did Asynchronous Online instructors have the lowest average ratings from Fall 2018 to Spring 2022, they were always rated lowest relative to instructors in other modalities that semester. Ranking the modalities each semester (1 (highest rated) to 4 (lowest rated)) and then averaging the ranks for the whole period, Blended instructors actually had the highest average relative ranking, 1.75; Face-to-Face were close behind at 1.875; Hybrid faculty came in at 2.5; while Asynchronous Online instructors average relative ranking was a flat 4.0.
2. In addition to the difference in relative rankings, the average absolute rankings of instructors in different modalities from Fall 2018 to Spring 2022 shows that instructors in Asynchronous Online classes have been rated notably below instructors in the other modalities: 4.11 on average, with Blended and Face-to-Face instructors essentially tied at 4.31 (.2, or 5%, higher), and Hybrid in between at 4.26 (.15, or 4%, higher).
   1. The intermediate average ranking of instructors of Hybrid classes, which meet for only ½ the time of Face-to-Face classes, but at about ¾ the differential between Asynchronous Online and Face-to-Face instructors, suggests that synchronous contact has a significant positive impact on students’ ratings of their instructors.
   2. However, the fact that Blended instructors are actually rated slightly higher on average than Face-to-Face instructors suggests that this relationship is not absolute. Instead, since Blended classes are designed to meet eclectically, twice a week at times, once a week at times, and even sometimes not at all in a week, the averages suggest that students appreciate instructors who not only interact with them face-to-face, but also adapt their meeting schedules and assignments to reflect the needs of the course and its students.
3. Finally, while instructor ratings are the highest of the three overall ratings students give in the evaluations (learning, instructor, course overall) for Blended, Face-to-Face, and Hybrid classes every semester from Fall 2018 to Spring 2022, instructor ratings are the *lowest* of the three overall ratings from Fall 2018 to Spring 2021. For some reason they are now in the middle, below learning but slightly above the rating for the course overall in the past two terms, but this strong reverse correlation until recently reinforces the suggestion of the importance of the role that direct contact with the instructor has in students’ ratings.

Closing the Loop: Once again, while the difference between the top rated and bottom rated modality each semester has not been particularly large, an overall average of .25, less than a third of a point, the fact that instructors in Asynchronous Online classes are consistently rated lower than instructors in other modalities, combined with the fact that instructors in Hybrid classes are rated between Asynchronous and Face-to-Face instructors, suggests that we need to address the impact that asynchronous activities have on students’ perceptions of their instructors.

The first step in this should be to get faculty governance agreement for a limited, focused, and anonymized study of the comments in the student evaluations to glean an impression of what kinds of problems students encounter with instructors in Distance classes, and how these relate to the quantitative ratings discussed above. The second step would then be for the Instructional Design and Distance Learning staffs to devise strategies to address these problems. The third step should be to incorporate these strategies into the training program faculty are required to take before teaching in Distance modalities, and into the professional development workshops that faculty are encouraged to participate in on an ongoing basis. The fourth and final step should be to disseminate materials to departments and schools to guide evaluation of Distance courses during five-year reviews.

**Quality of Course Materials**

Assessment Instrument: The Faculty Satisfaction survey (see below, Stakeholder Satisfaction, Faculty, for a general discussion of the survey) included the question, “Have you had difficulties obtaining course materials that are comparable to the ones you use in you in class courses?” Respondents were asked to answer yes or no, and were then given space to explain if they answered “yes.”

Assessment Measure: Of the 56 faculty members who responded to the survey, all but 2 (54, or 96%) answered no, indicating that they have not had difficulties obtaining course materials for their online classes comparable to those they use in their in-class classes. The two who answered yes explained that “I can’t use in online classes most of the experiential learning activities I use in in-person classes,” in one case, and “Had to write, revamp and create materials myself because they were not available,” in the other.

Closing the Loop: Since the overwhelming majority of faculty have not had difficulties obtaining course materials comparable to those they use in their in-class classes, the two who did have difficulties appear to be special cases that do not warrant systemic changes.

**Administrative Issues**

**Student Retention in Programs**

Assessment Instrument: Interview with the Dean of the School of Business, the MS in Accounting SUNY Performance Improvement Fund final report (January 2021), and the SOB’s data on Fall 2016 to Spring 2021 graduation rates of “special admit” vs. regular students reported to AACSB (conveyed by Assistant Dean Feiner in an email dated August 2, 2022).

Assessment Measure: The College currently has only one online program, which is not considered to be a separate program, but instead is a track within the MS in Accounting program. Consequently, the College do not classify students as online or not, and cannot track them. Instead, it assumes that many if not most students in the program are taking a mix of online and on-campus classes, while some number of students may be attending online classes only. In order to accommodate the latter, it has committed to offering online sections in a rotation that will enable them to complete the program entirely online in two calendar years (as opposed to its commitment to enabling students who can come to campus to complete the program in one calendar year).

Despite the lack of regular record-keeping about online MS in Accounting, a study was done of online enrollments in the program in January 2021 in order to complete the final report on a Performance Improvement Fund grant the SUNY system awarded the College in 2017 to help the online track of the MS in Accounting get off the ground. The report noted that:

analysis of enrollment patterns and individual transcripts revealed that 25 of our 73 MS in Accounting students (33%) were online students according to the SED definition (50% or more classes taken online) from Fall, 2018, the first semester in which we were authorized to offer the degree as an online program, to Fall 2020. Of these 25 students, 3 were from outside our geographic region, another 7 were Long Islanders who took online classes only, and the remaining 15 took a mix (over half of whom, 9, took 70% or more of their classes online). Note that while the pivot to online would seem to have had the potential to distort these numbers since all Fall, 2020 classes that were not traditional asynchronous online classes were offered with synchronous online meetings (Remote), presumably because of the sequencing of the online track’s classes relatively few (6) of the online students took any of Remote classes, and 5 of them only took 1, while the 6th took 2.

The report went on to note that “of the 24 online students, 9 have graduated and another 6 are enrolled in Spring 2021 as their final semester. Another 3 are enrolled in Spring 2021 but will not complete their degrees in the term, while the remaining 6 have stopped out.” This data from just two years is hardly definitive, but it suggests that the stop-out rate during the period, 25%, is not far from the 29% non-completion rate for the program overall between 2016 and 2021.

Furthermore, the report went on to note that:

While supporting online students was the primary purpose of the project and creation of the online track of the degree program, an important byproduct was providing our traditional students with the ability to take advantage of the flexibility asynchronous online classes offer as a supplement to classroom classes. …enrollment in online classes almost quadrupled from 26 in one class in Fall, 2017 to 91 in 6 classes in Fall, 2019, and that trend continued in Spring 2020, when 111 students were enrolled in 8 classes online. In Fall 2020 the Covid crisis confused the situation because all classes went online, and the number of traditional asynchronous online classes dropped to 3, with 75 students, but in Spring 2021 the number of classes [rose] to 10, with 168 enrollments, indicating that the online track of the MS in Accounting program is not just a side-offering for a minority of students, but a fully integrated component of the full program. Further evidence of this is that in the two years that the online track has existed, overall enrollments in the [MS in Accounting] program [as a whole] have risen from 30 in the Fall of 2018 to 52 in the Fall of 2020. Correlation is not causation, of course, but the evidence … suggests that the online option … makes the program attractive to a wider pool of potential students, working adults for whom the 4 courses requiring commuting to campus on two evenings a week plus similarly intense summer attendance is infeasible.

The evidence the report cites is that while:

Ironically, time to completion for online students actually appears to be slightly longer than for traditional students, 4 terms rather than 3 … closer examination of the students’ enrollment patterns and verbal feedback from students and prospective students indicates that this is actually evidence of a good thing: the online track is attractive to working adults who find the traditional track, with its need to travel to campus two full evenings a week to take 4 classes each semester and 2 in the compressed summer sessions, infeasible. Instead, they show patterns of less intense enrollment, and talk enthusiastically about the reduced call on their time for commuting and the flexibility they have in doing the work in online classes.

Extrapolating from the attractiveness of the “hybrid” program structure to prospective students and the endorsement of current students, it seems reasonable to conclude that not only does the online track retain students at roughly the level of students in the program overall, but also it may well contribute to retention of students who take less than 50% of their courses online, but who nevertheless benefit from the reduced commute and fixed-time commitment that online classes offer.

Closing the Loop: If the above analysis is valid, then remedial measures do not seem to be needed. If anything, the flexibility offered by our online classes might be effectively featured in recruitment materials and activities as a complement to the face-to-face support offered by our on-campus classes.

**Recruitment Practices**

Assessment Instrument: Interviews with the Director of the SPS/Distance Learning and Director of Admissions.

Assessment Measure: As discussed in the previous section on Retention in programs, the College currently has only one online program, which is not considered to be a separate program, but instead is a track within the MS in Accounting program, and it does not classify or track students as online. Correspondingly, as its standard practice it does not market the online track of the program separately. It does list the program in the SUNY Online Navigator and has a separate web page for it on the College website (both of which are free). The latter is mentioned on and linked to separately from the School of Business general Graduate program page, but not on the School of Business’ homepage, and while the main MS in Accounting page mentions the online option in its last paragraph, there is no link to the separate page, even in the sentence inviting students to “visit the Online M.S. in Accounting page for more information.”

The College did use approximately $50,000 of a SUNY Performance Improvement Fund award to promote the online MS in Accounting during 2019 with ads in and email blasts by an Accounting publication, Accounting Today, and Google Adwords. It also conducted a SUNY Online “Enrollment Roundtable” to evaluate the College’s current and plan its future ability to promote increased enrollments via online program offerings. Unfortunately, the Covid crisis prevented evaluation of the effectiveness of and conduct of follow-ons to the 2019 publicity efforts, as well as conclusion of the Enrollment Roundtable process with a written report to submit to SUNY. Since then, funds for marketing have been too limited to promote a specialized part of the larger program, personnel resources have been too strained to permit further analysis and planning of advertising efforts, and the data collected and planning conducted for the report has become too dated to be resuscitated.

At this point, our main recruitment channels are the SUNY Online Navigator and our own website, both of which prompt students to submit inquiries we can follow up. These are received by Enrollment Services and entered into our new Customer Relations Management system, Slate, which then has regularly forwarded the ones from our website to the School of Business’ Director of Graduate Studies for him to follow up by contacting the prospect. Of 126 inquiries about the graduate accounting program currently, 41 are specifically about the online track.

By late Fall 2022, Enrollment Services expects to have Slate’s payment gateway in place, which will enable it to fully implement the application process in the system. This will make it possible to trace prospects from first inquiry to enrollment. In addition, Enrollment Services is planning to use Google Adwords connected with specific landing pages to begin energetically promoting the College’s graduate programs, including the online track of the MS in Accouinting, and it is considering initiating virtual info sessions for prospective students who indicate an interest in the MS in Accounting’s Online track to complement the in-person sessions it runs for prospects for the traditional version. Finally, the College intends to hire a new Director of Graduate Admissions to oversee and expand this new concerted effort.

Closing the Loop: First of all, the College’s website should be updated to make maximum use of this free and crucial marketing resource. Secondly, the planned enhancements to Enrollment Services technology, procedures, and personnel should be put in place as planned.

**Accessibility**

Assessment Instruments: Review of the College’s policies, interview with Manager of Instructional Design, the final report on the “SUNY Old Westbury Accessibility Project” by CourseArc, LLC, and the College’s Electronic Information Technology Accessibility Plan.

Assessment Measures: The College’s efforts to promote the accessibility of its distance courses began with the inclusion of the OSCQR Accessibility rubric in the training of faculty who were offering their first course in a new Distance modality (NET or Hybrid/Blended) in the Fall of 2015. Its next step was to include a section on Accessibility in the College’s Distance Policy document that was issued in April 2016 which stipulated that “Faculty are responsible for implementing standard accessibility features” laid out in the OSCQR rubric, while “the College is responsible to disseminate the OSCQR rubric … and incorporate it into training of faculty.” (DL Policies, April 8, 2016) The rubric was already being used in the training, and was included as an appendix in the policy document.

The third step in this process came in January 2018, when the call for proposals from faculty offering a stipend for development of new Distance courses in Spring and Summer 2018 to be offered in academic year 2018-19 included a provision that all new Distance courses adhere to the college’s accessibility rubric. A fourth step was taken in Fall of 2018 with the piloting of Blackboard’s Ally accessibility checker in 14 Online classes. The College adopted Ally in Fall 2019 with the intention of using it to vet all new Distance classes starting in 2020.

Unfortunately, the Covid crisis disrupted our progress in heightening incorporation of accessibility into our online offerings as our limited Distance personnel were stretched to the limit supporting the pivot online in March, 2020 of the majority of our faculty who had little to no experience with online instruction into a modality that was new even to the instructional design staff and faculty with experience (“Remote” synchronous (Zoom-based) classes). Nevertheless, spurred by the SUNY Board of Trustees’ Electronic Information Technology (EIT) Accessibility initiative, in Fall 2021 Instructional Design used Ally to identify courses with less than 50% compliance, and then picked the 105 least-compliant courses to have the company CourseArc help remediate. Another 7 courses were added to the list by faculty, bringing the total reviewed to 112. Instructors of these courses were given the option of working with Course Arc or implementing improvements on their own, while the courses of those who did not respond were remediated by Course Arc. The goal was to improve their compliance above 50%, and of the 112 courses, 81, or 72.3%, were remediated to above 50%, according to CourseArc’s final project report dated 3/31/22. Another 24, or 21%, were identified as needing more remediation by the Instructional Design staff to reach the compliance goal; and 7 could not be remediated significantly. Overall, the CourseArc project brought the average compliance of the 105 remediable courses from 39% to 65%.

While the Course Arc project remediated the most problematic courses, according to the Manager of Instructional Design, who conducts the training of new Distance faculty and offers workshops to the faculty in general, overall compliance with accessibility requirements is limited. Faculty attend the accessibility training for new Distance modalities and listen, but often do not actually take the steps necessary to make their courses accessible. Similarly, participation in voluntary workshops is low: in Spring 2022 only one person came the first time an open workshop on accessibility in our new LMS, Brightspace, was offered, and no one attended subsequent sessions. The EIT Accessibility plan the College submitted to SUNY in December 2020 indicated that our implementation of accessibility in both asynchronous and synchronous Distance modalities will rely on voluntary faculty initiatives, but how far this will take us is uncertain. Our continued licensing of Ally even as we move from Blackboard’s LMS to Brightspace gives us a powerful tool for monitoring accessibility and assisting compliance to supplement Brightspace’s more limited built-in accessibility features, while the College’s requirement that all faculty go through training and supervised course development before offering their first course in a new modality gives us a “choke point” at which to train and enculturate faculty, but both of these currently rely essentially on voluntary compliance by faculty.

Closing the Loop:

The CourseArc final report contains a number of recommendations that would certainly be good to incorporate into Instructional Design’s workshops and training. However, these are basically elaborations of guidance that is already incorporated in them, and so this will not address the most salient issue, which is whether, given the SUNY Board of Trustees’ mandate and the evolving legal standards for accessibility, we can continue to rely on essentially voluntary compliance by faculty. Given the limited number of new Distance course developments per year relative to the overall number of Distance courses already in place, the termination of the stipend program for new Distance course development in 2020, and the limited response of faculty to accessibility workshops and calls for voluntary compliance, the current approach seems unlikely to suffice in the medium-to-long run. The Digital Content Standard Committee of the EIT implementation effort will need to work with Academic Affairs and Instructional Design to come up with a plan for our next step in achieving compliance in this area. This will probably need to eventually include systematic evaluation of all course shells using Ally, and mandatory remediation by faculty, to achieve accessibility’s goal of inclusiveness and avoid the legal liability of inaccessibility.

**Technical and Administrative Support Services**

Introduction: Students’ performance and experience is affected by the availability and effectiveness of technical support and administrative services, so these are assessed here.

Assessment Instruments:

1. Technical Support: Information collected for the Proposal to offer an Online track for the BPS in Professional Studies.
2. Administrative Support Services: Information collected for the Proposal to offer an Online track for the BPS in Professional Studies.

Assessment Measure:

1. Technical Support

The Technical Support staff utilizes a Team Dynamics online ticketing system and maintains an online FAQ section. Besides a physical presence on campus, before the pandemic it provided about half of its support remotely; during the pandemic it moved to essentially completely remote support; and it continues to provide much of its support in this way. An automated system was put into place as part of the College’s in-process adoption of Microsoft 365 to allow students to reset passwords remotely. Students and faculty having problems working in the College’s LMS, can be assisted remotely by both our Instructional Designer staff and the SUNY Online Helpdesk, whose services the College gets as part of its membership in SUNY Online.

1. Administrative Support Services:

Students can contact the offices of Admissions, Bursar, Financial Aid, IT, and the Registrar via an automated call-routing system via the College’s main phone number. Other offices can be contacted by phone, and all offices can be contacted via email, using information given on the College’s website. Most of the College’s offices utilized online procedures routinely before the pandemic, and since the pivot online all have become accustomed to doing so. Therefore, remote students can interact fully with them to utilize their services via computer or phone. Students have the ability to enroll, obtain financial aid, register for classes, pay their bill, and conduct other necessary administrative tasks completely online. The Student Portal provides a convenient access point to these, since it consists of a home page and separate pages for Registration, Academics, Finances, and Campus Life that provide links to comprehensive information about the College and a variety of online tools for interacting with it.

Closing the Loop:

1. Technical Support

Given the ubiquity and centrality of computer systems for the College’s operations, conventional as well as Distance, it should continue to support and refine its technical support staff and infrastructure to the maximum extent possible

1. Administrative Support Services

The College should continue to upgrade its electronic systems to maintain and refine the accessibility of its operations to students in Distance as well as in-person classes and programs.

**Stakeholder Satisfaction**

***Students***

Assessment Instrument: Students Overall ratings of Courses in the Blue course evaluations in Blended, Face-to-Face, Hybrid, and Asynchronous Online classes in the semesters from Fall 2018 through Spring 2022 in response to the prompt: “Please provide an overall rating of this course. (1=Very Negative, 5=Very Positive).”

~The overall data for Student Evaluations is contained in Appendix A, Part 1, and a graph and table with student overall ratings of courses drawn from that is contained in Appendix A, Part 4.

Assessment Measure:

Ratings ranged from a low of 3.96 for Asynchronous Online classes in Fall, 2018 to a high of 4.38 for Hybrid classes in Spring of 2020. Examination of the data yields a number of significant observations:

1. As with the ratings for instructors and learning, the range of overall course ratings was both relatively high and relatively narrow, so if converted into the College’s 4.0 grading system, all modalities across all semesters would fall into the high B range, with all but one above the midpoint for a B (3.0, 4.0 here) and the majority (almost 2/3) falling into the B+ range (3.17-3.49; 4.17 - 4.49 here).
2. The ratings for Distance modalities are more variable than the ratings for Face-to-Face classes, with Hybrid the highest at .33, Online next at .29 (.04 less), Blended .04 below that at .25, and Face-to-Face three times as far below that at .115.

|  | **Low** | | **High** | | **Range** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Modality** | Rate | Sem | Rate | Sem |  |
| **Blended** | 4.08 | S19 | 4.36 | S22 | **0.25** |
| **Face-to-Face** | 4.18 | F18 | 4.295 | S21 | **0.115** |
| **Hybrid** | 4.05 | F18 | 4.38 | S20 | **0.33** |
| **Online** | 3.96 | F18 | 4.25 | S20 | **0.29** |

The reason for these differences in variability would seem to be an intermediate position between the dominant influence of simple sample size on the range of students’ evaluations of how much they learned in different modalities and the apparent influence of synchronous interaction on their evaluations of their instructors. An intermediate position makes a certain *prima facia* sense: students’ attitudes toward their instructors could be expected to be strongly influenced by their face-to-face interpersonal interactions, while their sense of how much they learned would be less sensitive to this since the asynchronous environment allows for most of the instructional activity of the synchronous (live lectures are not particularly more instructive than videos of lectures, for example, except for the limited possibilities for students to interrupt the lectures, the effect of which can be achieved asynchronously through Q&A boards and email; discussion boards can actually allow for more student-student interaction than in many classes; and faculty can set up small group work in an LMS to parallel group work in classes). Consequently, their evaluations of the course overall would be a reconciliation of their attitude toward their instructor and their sense of how much they learned, resulting in an intermediate influence of modality on this rating.

1. As with students’ evaluations of how much they learned, among students’ overall ratings of courses Blendeds were the highest rated modality most often (4 times – Fall 2018, Fall 2019, Spring 2021, and Spring 2022), Face-to-Face came in second at 3 times (Spring 2019, Fall 2020, and Fall 2021), and Hybrids topped the ratings once (Spring 2020), while Asychronous Online was never the highest rated modality.
   1. Instead, it was more often the bottom rated one, at 6 times (Fall 2018, Fall 2019, Spring 2020, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, and Spring 2022), with Blendeds coming in last 2 times (Spring 2019 and Fall 2020).
   2. Once again, students’ overall ratings of courses falls between their evaluations of how much they learned and what they thought of their instructors (which, as reported above, always had Asynchronous Online ranked lowest).
2. As was noted for Student Evaluations of Learning (and was actually true of students’ ratings of Instructors as well), students’ ratings of Courses Overall have risen over the period covered by this assessment.

| **Modality** | **Fall 18** | **Spr 19** | **Fall 19** | **Aver** |  | **Spr 21** | **Fall 21** | **Spr 22** | **Avrg** | **Chnge** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Blended | 4.26 | 4.08 | 4.29 | 4.21 |  | 4.35 | 4.2 | 4.36 | 4.29 | +0.08 |
| Face-to-Face | 4.18 | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.21 |  | 4.30 | 4.29 | 4.27 | 4.24 | +0.10 |
| Hybrid | 4.05 | 4.18 | 4.18 | 4.14 |  | 4.20 | 4.19 | 4.32 | 4.14 | +0.09 |
| Online | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.07 | 4.05 |  | 4.10 | 4.17 | 4.16 | 4.24 | +0.09 |
| Average | 4.11 | 4.15 | 4.19 | 4.15 |  | 4.24 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.23 | +0.09 |

In contrast to the students’ ratings of their learning, which rose the most for Hybrid and Asynchronous Online modalities, overall ratings rose the most for Face-to-Face classes after the pandemic, perhaps reflecting students’ newfound appreciation for in-class classes. The relatively low increase of Blendeds could similarly reflect the dissatisfaction that students have voiced about classes that appear to be mainly in-class, but turn out to be run substantially through Zoom and/or asynchronously.

1. Finally, the relationship of students’ ratings of their courses Overall to the two more specific categories – Learning and Instructor – shows a stronger association between it and what they think they learned than how they felt about their instructor. Over 50% of the Overall ratings

|  | **Blended** | **F2F** | **Hybrid** | **Online** | **Total** | **Percent** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Lowest** |  | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 22% |
| **Equal Learn** | 3 | 1 |  | 1 | 5 | 16% |
| **Mid-Learn** | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 13 | 41% |
| **Mid-equal** | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 6% |
| **Mid-Teach** |  | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 9% |
| **Equal Teach** |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6% |
| **Highest** |  |  |  |  |  | 0% |
| **Total** | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 32 | 100% |

Note: “Lowest” means that the Overall rating was the lowest of the three ratings; “Equal Learn” means the Overall rating was equal to the rating for Learning (which was always lower); Mid-Learn means the Overall rating was between the ratings for Learning (lower) and the Teacher (higher), but closer to the rating for Learning; “Mid-Equal” means that the Overall rating was equidistant between the other two, and so on.

Interestingly, the correlation between the Overall rating and the Learning rating is strongest for Face-to-Face and Blended classes, while for Hybrids it was most often lower than either of the other two ratings, and Asychronous Online classes were evenly distributed between Learning-leaning and Teacher-leaning ratings. This suggests that while fostering students’ interactions and sense of connection with instructors is important, it is not as likely to raise students overall satisfaction with Distance courses than measures that give them the confidence that they are learning as much as or more than they do in other modalities.

Closing the Loop: Since 1) assessments of Learning Outcomes indicate that Distance classes are as effective in fostering student learning as traditional face-to-face classes, but 2) Student Evaluations indicate that a) students have slightly less confidence in Distance classes, and particularly Asychronous Online classes, than they do in traditional Face-to-Face classes, and b) students’ overall ratings of courses are more closely tied to their ratings of how much they learned than to what they thought of their instructor, 3) we should endeavor to increase students’ confidence in what they are learning in Distance classes by a) making them aware of the comparability of learning in the different modalities, and b) implementing measures to make their learning more palpable to them as it takes place – in other words, finding ways of raising the visibility of the learning that’s going on in their classes (examples might be finding ways to increase instructors’ interactions with students in the course – not simply to improve students’ satisfaction with their instructors, but also to provide instruction in a way that makes clear to them that they are learning and they are learning because of what the

***Faculty***

Assessment Instrument: Faculty were sent an email via the Faculty group in Old Westbury email with a request to complete a survey and the link to the survey instrument. The survey asked them the number of times they have taught Online, Hybrid, and Blended classes; to rate their satisfaction working with the College’s online program on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the greatest satisfaction; and to add comments on their satisfaction if they cared to.

The survey also asked respondents if they have had difficulties obtaining course materials comparable to those they use in their in-class courses (Yes or No), and to leave any comments on this if they cared to. These answers were used for the assessment of the Quality of Instructional Materials (see above).

Finally, the survey included space for respondents to leave any general comments they might have about things they think would enhance their ability to teach online or would enhance the student experience.

Assessment Measure:

To begin with, it became clear from the responses that there was some confusion about what was meant by “Online” classes. As mentioned in the Introduction, the intent was for this assessment to focus on our traditional Distance classes – Asynchronous Online, which we have traditionally referred to as Online (or NET); Hybrid; and Blended – and exclude the newer Remote and Flex formats. Because of the wording of the questions, though, some faculty took “Online” to mean Remote.

Be that as it may, of the 56 respondents, 15 gave Old Westbury’s online program a rating of 5, 20 gave it a rating of 4, 12 rated it 3, 6 gave it a rating of 2, and 3 gave it a rating of 1. The average rating was thus 3.7, indicating that faculty are generally more satisfied than not with distance learning at Old Westbury, but not overwhelmingly so, and have some serious concerns.

The nature of at least some of these concerns were revealed by the comments. A total of 38 of the 56 of the respondents – 67%, or 2/3 – left comments, and they fell for the most part into 5 main categories. In order of frequency these included 1) Students’ lack of readiness and engagement (11 mentions), 2) Problems with Technology (7 mentions), 3) Unhappiness about the LMS migration (6 mentions), 4) Need for more Professional Development support for faculty (4 mentions), and 5) Academic integrity (3 mentions).

Closing the Loop:

1. Student Preparedness: The College needs to do more to prepare students for asynchronous online instructional activities, whether in asynchronous online or hybrid/blended classes.
2. Technology: The College needs to do everything it can to maintain up-to-date and reliable computer systems.
3. LMS Migration: this is a transitory problem that would not seem to need any special measures in the scope of this assessment to address
4. Professional Development support: The Instructional Design staff has had to focus almost exclusively on the LMS migration, but once that’s behind us it should address this call.
5. Academic Integrity: The College should continue to contract for proctoring software, and promote its use. It should also continue to offer Professional Development sessions on “authentic assessments” to avoid situations that promote plagiarism.

***Staff***

Assessment Instrument: The staff members who are most involved with Distance Learning are the College’s two Instructional Designers, and the Director and Assistant Director of the School of Professional Studies, which oversees Distance Learning as one of its campus-wide support activities. They were asked to respond to a series of three open-ended prompts.

Assessment Measure:

1. The first prompt was, “What aspects of our Distance program do you find satisfactory?” The answers included the following points:
   1. The increased utilization of software applications and tools that allow online learning to take place from any location. This has increased the offers of flexibility to accommodate participant schedules. Faculty have opportunities to participate in virtual professional development and training programs to enhance knowledge and skills to advance career growth.
   2. The requirement for faculty to get training in both technology and pedagogy and supervised course development before teaching their first class in a new modality. When this was supported by stipends for developing Distance classes between 2010 and 2020 this made Old Westbury’s program exemplary. Since then both the confusion caused by the Covid pivot and adoption of the Remote (Zoom) modality and the financial distress of the College has degraded the policy’s effectiveness, which will be discussed below
   3. The College has had a clear and succinct set of policies governing its Distance offerings. Once again, prior to Covid this made the program exemplary, but the disruptions caused by that crisis have created problems to be discussed below.
   4. In the great majority of cases faculty initiate the development of courses for Distance modalities. Those who are interested in teaching this way are able to do so, while those who are not are not compelled to. (The only exception to this was the creation of the Online track for the MS in Accounting program, which was initiated by the administration for strategic reasons.) The result is that faculty acceptance of Distance modalities and courses as part of the College’s mix has been high.
2. The second prompt was, “What aspects of our Distance program do you find less than satisfactory?” The answers included the following points:
   1. There is the need to explore new technology, software and Instructional Design methods that are user friendly and cost effective.
   2. The need to increase communication and awareness for workshops/training to increase attendance for workshops, explore opportunities to build new skills and/or obtain certifications for specific methods of pedagogy to improve the learning experience such as Universal Design and Accessibility.
   3. The lack of resources available to support Distance Learning has impacted the ability to sustain the training and supervised development policy.
   4. The non-adoption of the updated Distance policies drafted by the joint faculty-administration task force in Spring-Summer 2021 has meant that the policies in force are decisively out-of-date, lacking any reference to the Remote and Flex modalities or to the substantial experience many faculty gained with them as well as asynchronous course elements during the Covid emergency.
   5. The eclectic use of the Blended modality to cope with the Covid emergency has resulted in a problematic situation in which some faculty have become used to the wide latitude it has given them to utilize Remote and asynchronous modalities at their own discretion and according to a schedule only they have ready access to. This has provoked a significant outcry from students who feel that they have been subjected to a “bait and switch” situation in which they think they are getting a substantially face-to-face classroom experience, but in fact end up with some mix of Zoom classes and asynchronous work, with just a few in-class classes.
3. The third prompt was, “Are there any other things about your satisfaction with our Distance program that you think are important to note that aren't covered in 1 or 2 above?” The answers included the following points:
   1. Identify where staff and faculty are lacking in knowledge and skills in order to identify the need for professional development.
   2. Focus on improving and updating course content to be up to the WCAG (Web Content Accessibility Guidelines) guidelines, with a focus on design for all (usability and inclusion).
      1. Provide more support and resources to make this a priority moving forward so students will have a better learning experience in the future.

Closing the Loop:

1. The recommendations under the third prompt above should be implemented.
2. Items 2a and 2b, above, should also be implemented.
3. More resources should be devoted to supporting the training and supervised development policy.
4. The draft updating of the College’s distance policies should be finalized and adopted.
   1. Finalization should include clarification of acceptable uses of the Blended modality.

**Conclusions**

There are a number of areas where this assessment indicates that the College is doing well, and little or no action is needed to “close the loop.”

The most significant is in the area of Retention of Students in courses, where the rough parity of the DFW rate in Hybrid/Blended classes with Traditional Face-to-Face classes plus the marked decline in the DFW rate of Asynchronous Online classes indicates that what might have been a problem 10 years ago is no longer problematic.

Other areas of overall success include Online Tutoring, where the main follow-up would seem to be to promote more widespread use by students of this service; the Library’s online presence, which similarly needs to be promoted to make full use of what’s there; the Quality of Online Course Materials, for which faculty report no problems arranging for equivalents to what the use for Face-to-Face classes; IT and Administrative Support services; and Student Retention in our MS in Accounting program.

Areas where remedial “closing the loop” activities are called for include Student Stakeholder Satisfaction, which, combined with the assessment here of Learning Outcomes, including both faculty course assessments and student’s ratings of how much they learned, and Student’s Evaluations of Faculty, indicate that while Students’ actual attainment of learning outcomes in Distance classes is satisfactorily comparable to that in traditional Face-to-Face classes, students perceptions of their learning, and of faculty performance, do not match this, and so a two-pronged action is called for: 1) heighten students’ awareness of the comparability of the different modalities’ effectiveness, while 2) promoting steps to incorporate course management and teaching practices that heighten both students’ connections with their instructors and their awareness of the learning they are achieving as it happens.

Other areas calling for remedial action include Advising, which needs to be addressed as part of a larger response to student dissatisfaction in this area at the College; Accessibility, which similarly needs to be addressed as part of the College’s larger EIT Accessibility effort; Recruitment practices, where recently initiated improvements need to be carried through; and Faculty and Staff satisfaction, where a variety of specific actions are called for – perhaps most notably intensified Professional Development efforts once the LMS migration has concluded; increased emphasis on adoption of new technologies and pedagogies; reintroduction of support for faculty course development activities; increased efforts to prepare students for and support them in online classes; an ongoing effort to maintain and improve our technological infrastructure; and finalization and adoption of updated Distance policies.

**Appendix A**

**Part 1**

**Student Evaluation (“Blue”) Data,**

**Fall 2018 to Spring 2022**

| **Fall 2018** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Modality** | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | | | | **Rate** | | | **Learned** | | **Teacher** | | | | | | **Course** | | | | |
| Blended | 313 | | | 198 | | | | 63% | | | 4.24 | | 4.34 | | | | | | 4.26 | | | | |
| Face-to-Face | 15025 | | | 9066 | | | | 60% | | | 4.15 | | 4.20 | | | | | | 4.18 | | | | |
| Hybrid | 1450 | | | 815 | | | | 56% | | | 4.09 | | 4.10 | | | | | | 4.05 | | | | |
| Online | 678 | | | 340 | | | | 50% | | | 3.97 | | 3.90 | | | | | | 3.96 | | | | |
| **Spring 2019** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | | | **Rate** | | | **Learned** | | | | | **Teacher** | | | | | | **Course** | |
| Blended | 309 | | | 198 | | | 64% | | | 4.07 | | | | | 4.13 | | | | | | 4.08 | |
| Face-to-Face | 14713 | | | 8604 | | | 58% | | | 4.23 | | | | | 4.30 | | | | | | 4.22 | |
| Hybrid | 1434 | | | 726 | | | 51% | | | 4.19 | | | | | 4.24 | | | | | | 4.18 | |
| Online | 804 | | | 373 | | | 46% | | | 4.19 | | | | | 4.11 | | | | | | 4.13 | |
| **Fall 2019** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | | | **Rate** | | | **Learned** | | **Teacher** | | | | | | **Course** | | | | |
| Blended | 418 | | | 270 | | | 65% | | | 4.29 | | 4.3 | | | | | | 4.29 | | | | |
| Face-to-Face | 15325 | | | 9301 | | | 61% | | | 4.21 | | 4.29 | | | | | | 4.23 | | | | |
| Hybrid | 1409 | | | 1101 | | | 78% | | | 4.19 | | 4.20 | | | | | | 4.18 | | | | |
| Online | 839 | | | 445 | | | 53% | | | 4.12 | | 4.05 | | | | | | 4.07 | | | | |
| **Spring 2020** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | | | | **Rate** | | | **Learned** | | | **Teacher** | | | | | | **Course** | | |
| Blended | 514 | | | 215 | | | | 42% | | | 4.28 | | | 4.41 | | | | | | 4.29 | | |
| Face-to-Face | 14688 | | | 6464 | | | | 44% | | | 4.241 | | | 4.31 | | | | | | 4.27 | | |
| Hybrid | 1322 | | | 526 | | | | 40% | | | 4.34 | | | 4.44 | | | | | | 4.38 | | |
| Online | 863 | | | 291 | | | | 34% | | | 4.243 | | | 4.27 | | | | | | 4.25 | | |
| **Fall 2020** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | | **Rate** | | | **Learned** | | **Teacher** | | | | | | **Course** | | | | |
| Blended | | 593 | | | 274 | | 46% | | | 4.11 | | 4.19 | | | | | | 4.11 | | | | |
| Face-to-Face | | 14775 | | | 7340 | | 50% | | | 4.21 | | 4.31 | | | | | | 4.26 | | | | |
| Hybrid | | 1146 | | | 508 | | 44% | | | 4.18 | | 4.23 | | | | | | 4.23 | | | | |
| Online | | 1123 | | | 489 | | 44% | | | 4.13 | | 4.10 | | | | | | 4.13 | | | | |
| **Spring 2021** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | | | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | **Rate** | | **Learned** | | | | | | | **Teacher** | **Course** | | | | |
| Blended | | | 536 | | | 268 | 50% | | 4.30 | | | | | | | 4.40 | 4.35 | | | | |
| Face-to-Face | | | 13383 | | | 6682 | 50% | | 4.27 | | | | | | | 4.35 | 4.29 | | | | |
| Hybrid | | | 1247 | | | 550 | 44% | | 4.24 | | | | | | | 4.24 | 4.20 | | | | |
| Online | | | 1137 | | | 493 | 43% | | 4.08 | | | | | | | 4.10 | 4.10 | | | | |
| **Fall 2021** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | | | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | **Rate** | | **Learned** | | | | | | | **Teacher** | | **Course** | | | |
| Blended | | | 2276 | | | 1218 | 54% | | 4.20 | | | | | | | 4.28 | | 4.20 | | | |
| Face-to-Face | | | 9844 | | | 5208 | 53% | | 4.26 | | | | | | | 4.36 | | 4.29 | | | |
| Hybrid | | | 1583 | | | 807 | 51% | | 4.18 | | | | | | | 4.26 | | 4.19 | | | |
| Online | | | 1691 | | | 838 | 50% | | 4.22 | | | | | | | 4.19 | | 4.17 | | | |
| **Spring 2022** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Modality** | | | **Total** | | | **Submitted** | **Rate** | | **Learned** | | | | | | | **Teacher** | | **Course** | | | |
| Blended | | | 1922 | | | 834 | 43% | | 4.32 | | | | | | | 4.41 | | 4.36 | | | |
| Face-to-Face | | | 9519 | | | 4609 | 48% | | 4.27 | | | | | | | 4.33 | | 4.27 | | | |
| Hybrid | | | 1232 | | | 614 | 50% | | 4.31 | | | | | | | 4.39 | | 4.32 | | | |
| Online | | | 1326 | | | 598 | 45% | | 4.23 | | | | | | | 4.17 | | 4.16 | | | |

| **Averages Fall 2018 to Spring 2020** | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Modality** | **Total** | **Submitted** | **Rate** | **Learned** | **Teacher** | **Course** |
| Blended | 860 | 434 | 53% | 4.23 | 4.308 | 4.24 |
| Face-to-Face | 13409 | 7159 | 53% | 4.23 | 4.306 | 4.25 |
| Hybrid | 1353 | 706 | 52% | 4.22 | 4.26 | 4.22 |
| Online | 1058 | 483 | 46% | 4.15 | 4.111 | 4.12 |

**KEY:**

**Modality** =Instructional Modality

**Total** = Total number of student evaluations prepared; equals number of students enrolled in relevant classes

**Submitted** = Number of student evaluations with input recorded for students. Note that this includes both evaluations formally submitted by students and evaluations saved but students even though not formally submitted.

**Rate** = response rate (percent of total evaluations that were submitted or saved)

**Learned** = Average rating given by students to the prompt: “How much do you feel you learned in this course? (1=Nothing, 5=A lot)”

**Teacher** = Average rating given by students to the prompt: “Please provide an overall rating of this instructor's teaching. (1=Very Negative, 5=Very Positive)”

**Course** = Average rating given by students to the prompt: “Please provide an overall rating of this course. (1=Very Negative, 5=Very Positive)”

**Appendix A  
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**Appendix A  
Part 3**

**Appendix A, Part 4: Changes in Ratings of Specific Instructor Actions**

| **Fall 2018** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presented Clearly** | **Stimulated Interest** | **Confusion Cleared Up** | **Tests & Class Related** | **Graded Fairly** | **Clear Objectives** |
| 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.44 | 4.62 | 4.57 | 4.40 |
| 4.31 | 4.39 | 4.28 | 4.53 | 4.49 | 4.36 |
| 4.22 | 4.33 | 4.15 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.21 |
| 4.11 | 4.02 | 3.99 | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.17 |

| **Spring 2020** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presented Clearly** | **Stimulated Interest** | **Confusion Cleared Up** | **Tests & Class Related** | **Graded Fairly** | **Clear Objectives** |
| 4.42 | 4.56 | 4.43 | 4.5721 | 4.44 | 4.45 |
| 4.38 | 4.45 | 4.38 | 4.5695 | 4.50712 | 4.44 |
| 4.45 | 4.57 | 4.46 | 4.66 | 4.50766 | 4.50 |
| 4.41 | 4.30 | 4.27 | 4.63 | 4.51399 | 4.49 |

| **Change from Fall 2018** | |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presented Clearly** | **Stimulated Interest** | **Confusion Cleared Up** | **Tests & Class Related** | **Graded Fairly** | **Clear Objectives** |
| 0.02 | 0.03 | -0.01 | -0.05 | -0.13 | 0.05 |
| 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.08 |
| 0.23 | 0.24 | 0.31 | 0.23 | 0.17 | 0.29 |
| 0.30 | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.22 | 0.32 |

| **Fall 2021** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presented Clearly** | **Stimulated Interest** | **Confusion Cleared Up** | **Tests & Class Related** | **Graded Fairly** | **Clear Objectives** |
| 4.38 | 4.42 | 4.38 | 4.59 | 4.51 | 4.45 |
| 4.42 | 4.48 | 4.42 | 4.604 | 4.55 | 4.45 |
| 4.32 | 4.42 | 4.32 | 4.49 | 4.48 | 4.37 |
| 4.35 | 4.21 | 4.22 | 4.599 | 4.49 | 4.44 |

| **Change from Spring 2020** | |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presented Clearly** | **Stimulated Interest** | **Confusion Cleared Up** | **Tests & Class Related** | **Graded Fairly** | **Clear Objectives** |
| -0.04 | -0.14 | -0.05 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.00 |
| 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.01 |
| -0.13 | -0.15 | -0.14 | -0.17 | -0.03 | -0.13 |
| -0.06 | -0.09 | -0.05 | -0.03 | -0.02 | -0.05 |

**Appendix A  
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**Appendix B**

**Grade Data for DFW Analysis**

**Part 1, From Institutional Research**

|  | **Fall 2013** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** | **Spring 2015** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2016** | **Fall 2016** | **Spring 2017** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NET | 27.3% | 21.4% | 22.0% | 25.4% | 23.6% | 18.6% | 20.7% | 19.4% |
| HYB | 14.2% | 16.2% | 19.2% | 11.8% | 13.4% | 13.4% | 13.3% | 14.4% |
| Trad | 12.6% | 13.8% | 12.7% | 13.1% | 13.0% | 13.3% | 13.4% | 12.9% |
| NET v. Trad | 14.7% | 7.7% | 9.4% | 12.3% | 10.6% | 5.3% | 7.3% | 6.5% |
| HYB v. Trad | 1.5% | 2.4% | 6.5% | -1.3% | 0.4% | 0.1% | -0.1% | 1.5% |
| Both v Trad | 8.1% | 5.0% | 8.0% | 5.5% | 5.5% | 2.7% | 3.6% | 4.0% |
| Drop in NET |  | -5.9% | 0.6% | 3.3% | -1.8% | -5.0% | 2.0% | -1.3% |

| **Fall 2017** | **Spring 2018** | **Fall 2018** | **Spring 2019** | **Fall 2019** | **Spring 2020** | **Fall 2020** | **Spring 2021\*\*** | **Fall 2021** | **Average** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 19.4% | 16.8% | 16.5% | 16.9% | 15.7% | 10.8% | 16.6% | 17.5% | 13.4% | 18.9% |
| 13.7% | 13.7% | 15.0% | 14.6% | 11.8% | 6.9% | 14.0% | 13.9% | 17.1% | 13.9% |
| 12.8% | 14.0% | 14.1% | 14.2% | 14.5% | 7.5% | 14.1% | 0%\*\* | 15.9% | 13.2% |
| 6.6% | 2.9% | 2.4% | 2.7% | 1.1% | 3.3% | 2.5% | NA | -2.5% | 5.7% |
| 0.9% | -0.2% | 0.8% | 0.4% | -2.7% | -0.6% | -0.1% | NA | 1.2% | 0.7% |
| 3.8% | 1.3% | 1.6% | 1.5% | -0.8% | 1.3% | 1.2% | NA | -0.6% | 3.2% |
| 0.0% | -2.6% | -0.3% | 0.3% | -1.2% | -4.9% | 5.8% | 0.9% | -4.0% |  |

**Appendix B**

**Grade Data for DFW Analysis**

**Part 2, From Institutional Research**

| **Term** | **NET** | | | | | | |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **D+** | **D** | **D-** | **NC** | **F** | **W** | **WN** | **Total** | **Change** |
| F16 | 0.6% | 2.4% | 1.1% | 0.1% | 10.2% | 11.0% | 0.6% | **26.0%** |  |
| S17 | 0.9% | 3.5% | 0.2% | 0.2% | 9.3% | 9.3% | 0.3% | **23.7%** | **-2.3%** |
| F17 | 1.3% | 1.1% | 0.8% | 0.0% | 7.4% | 10.1% | 1.1% | **21.8%** | **-1.9%** |
| S18 | 9.1% | 1.5% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.7% | 8.9% | 0.2% | **20.7%** | **-1.1%** |
| F18 | 1.4% | 2.1% | 0.9% | 0.1% | 5.3% | 7.6% | 0.5% | **17.9%** | **-2.8%** |
| S19 | 1.1% | 1.2% | 0.4% | 0.1% | 7.8% | 6.6% | 0.9% | **18.1%** | 0.2% |
| F19 | 1.1% | 1.7% | 0.6% | 0.0% | 5.8% | 7.6% | 1.5% | **18.3%** | 0.2% |
| S20 | 1.1% | 1.0% | 0.9% | 0.8% | 5.8% | 4.1% | 0.6% | **14.3%** | **-4.0%** |
| F20 | 0.6% | 1.4% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 5.7% | 8.3% | 2.0% | **18.6%** | 4.3% |
| S21 | 0.6% | 2.0% | 0.9% | 0.3% | 8.1% | 5.5% | 1.4% | **18.8%** | 0.2% |
| F21 | 0.8% | 1.2% | 0.8% | 0.6% | 3.0% | 5.9% | 1.2% | **13.5%** | **-5.3%** |
| S22 | 1.0% | 1.0% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 5.6% | 5.2% | 1.3% | **14.3%** | 0.8% |
| **Average** | **1.6%** | **1.7%** | **0.6%** | **0.2%** | **6.2%** | **7.5%** | **1.0%** | **18.8%** | **-1.1%** |

| **Not NET** | | | | | | |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **D+** | **D** | **D-** | **NC** | **F** | **W** | **WN** | **Total** | **Change** | **Difference** | **Change** |
| 1.3% | 2.1% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 4.1% | 6.2% | 0.3% | **14.9%** |  | **11.1%** |  |
| 1.1% | 1.7% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 4.2% | 6.0% | 0.3% | **14.6%** | **-0.3%** | **9.1%** | **-2.0%** |
| 1.2% | 1.9% | 0.5% | 0.1% | 4.9% | 5.5% | 0.2% | **14.3%** | **-0.3%** | **7.5%** | **-1.6%** |
| 1.0% | 2.1% | 0.6% | 0.2% | 5.4% | 5.6% | 0.4% | **15.3%** | 1.0% | **5.4%** | **-2.1%** |
| 1.2% | 1.9% | 0.8% | 0.1% | 5.4% | 0.6% | 0.2% | **10.2%** | **-5.1%** | **7.7%** | 2.3% |
| 1.3% | 1.8% | 0.8% | 0.1% | 5.2% | 6.1% | 0.4% | **15.7%** | 5.5% | **2.4%** | **-5.3%** |
| 1.2% | 2.0% | 0.6% | 0.1% | 5.9% | 5.0% | 0.4% | **15.2%** | **-0.5%** | **3.1%** | 0.7% |
| 0.7% | 1.5% | 0.5% | 0.9% | 4.8% | 2.8% | 0.3% | **11.5%** | **-3.7%** | **2.8%** | **-0.3%** |
| 0.8% | 1.3% | 0.6% | 0.3% | 0.6% | 5.6% | 0.7% | **9.9%** | **-1.6%** | **8.7%** | 5.9% |
| 0.8% | 1.4% | 0.6% | 0.4% | 5.7% | 4.3% | 0.4% | **13.6%** | 3.7% | **5.2%** | **-3.5%** |
| 1.1% | 1.9% | 0.7% | 0.2% | 0.7% | 6.3% | 0.5% | **11.4%** | **-2.2%** | **2.1%** | **-3.1%** |
| 1.3% | 1.9% | 0.9% | 0.3% | 7.9% | 4.9% | 0.5% | **17.7%** | 6.3% | **-3.4%** | **-5.5%** |
| **1.1%** | **1.8%** | **0.7%** | **0.3%** | **4.6%** | **4.9%** | **0.4%** | **13.7%** | **0.3%** | **5.2%** | **-1.3%** |