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## Introduction

The Crafton Hills College (CHC) Distance Education (DE) Committee utilizes an online course evaluation to measure student perception of and satisfaction with DE online and hybrid courses. Aggregated results are presented to the DE Committee, and disaggregated results are presented to individual instructors as appropriate. The purpose of this brief is to illustrate the aggregated results of the Distance Education Course Evaluations from Spring 2013 consisting of 86 responses from students enrolled in one or more online or hybrid courses.

## Summary of Results

## General:

- $95 \%$ of respondents would recommend their professor to another student, and $91 \%$ would recommend the specific course.
- $74 \%$ of respondents were female.
- $25 \%$ of respondents do not work, while $55 \%$ work at least 21 hours a week.
- $54 \%$ of respondents typically spent 4-6 hours each week on their course.
- $59 \%$ of respondents reported that video lectures should be an added component to their course.


## Perceptions and Ethnicity/ Race:

Hispanics and Latinos were statistically significantly and substantially less likely to agree than Caucasians that their instructor demonstrated knowledge of course subject matter ( $\mathrm{p}=.027$, $\mathrm{ES}=1.01$ ) or used explanations that were clear and understandable ( $\mathrm{p}=.026, \mathrm{ES}=.92$ ).

## Methodology

The DE Committee in collaboration with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (OIERP) prepared an online course evaluation. All students enrolled in a DE course at CHC in the Spring 2013 term were given access to the evaluations via an online link provided by their instructor. There were 11 instructors teaching 17 DE sections. Eighty-six students enrolled in 14 DE sections and 10 instructors completed the online survey.

The evaluation explored the following five themes:

- Course Components
- Instructional Approach
- Instructional Resources
- Student Satisfaction
- Student Demographics \& Characteristics

Responses to questions related to course components, instructional approach, and student satisfaction were recorded on a four-point Likert scale ( $4=$ Strongly Agree, $3=$ Agree, $2=$ Disagree, $1=$ Strongly Disagree $)$. Responses to questions related to instructional resources were recorded on a three-point Likert scale ( $3=$ Very Useful, $2=$ Useful,
$1=$ Not Useful). In addition, there was an option to choose "Not Applicable" as a response to all scaled questions. Respondents were also asked to select whether other components should be used in future courses, if they would recommend their course to another student, and if they would recommend their instructor to another student. Finally, respondents were given an open response for suggestions and comments.

The effect size statistic is commonly used in meta-analyses. A meta-analysis uses quantitative techniques to determine the average effect of a given technique over multiple studies. Noticing that even small differences can be statistically significant when large pools of data are analyzed, Jacob Cohen developed one method of interpreting effect size. Cohen defined "small," "medium," and "large" effect sizes and explained that an effect size of 20 can be considered small, an effect size of .50 can be considered medium, and an effect size of .80 can be considered large. Effect size is calculated by dividing the difference of the two means by the pooled standard deviation. It is important to mention that the number of students in each group does not influence Effect Size; whereas, when statistical significance is calculated, the number of students in each group does influence the significance level (i.e., "p" value being less than .05). Accordingly, using Cohen as a guide, a substantial effect would be .20 or higher.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests and post-hoc multiple comparisons are common procedures for examining differences between a nominal independent variable and a continuous dependent variable to determine if the differences between and within the variables' mean values are statistically significant. Because levels of significance are impacted by population or sample size, a generally accepted significance level is where the " p " value is less than .05 , meaning that there is less than a $5 \%$ chance that a selected value occurred randomly. Post-hoc analyses are used after an ANOVA test to examine the strength of statistically significant differences as compared between the dependent variable's values. A common post-hoc analysis was developed by John Tukey, known as Tukey's HSD (honestly significant difference), which tests the variance between each of the dependent variable's mean values while correcting for statistical errors.

## Sample:

Referring to Table 1, "\#" refers to the number of students in each DE section who responded to the survey, "N" refers to the Number of GOR earned, and "\%" refers to the response rate. For example, Professor Yau taught one section, CIS 101-70, which had 32 students and 16 total responses for a response rate of $50 \%$.

Table 1: Number of responses and response rate by section and instructor.

| Instructor \& Section | \# | N | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Allen | 2 | 11 | 18.2\% |
| CIS 141X2-70 | 2 | 11 | 18.2\% |
| Brink | 18 | 94 | 19.1\% |
| PHIL 103-70 | 3 | 26 | 11.5\% |
| PSYCH 100-71 | 3 | 28 | 10.7\% |
| PSYCH 111-70 | 12 | 40 | 30.0\% |
| Carroll | 0 | 11 | 0.0\% |
| CIS 143X2-70 | 0 | 11 | 0.0\% |
| DiPonio | 1 | 58 | 1.7\% |
| ENGL 101-70 | 0 | 23 | 0.0\% |
| ENGL 102-70 | 1 | 35 | 2.9\% |
| Downey | 2 | 37 | 5.4\% |
| PSYCH 100-70 | 2 | 37 | 5.4\% |
| Franko | 31 | 40 | 77.5\% |
| HIST/RELIG 135-70 | 31 | 40 | 77.5\% |
| Hansler | 5 | 20 | 25.0\% |
| ENGL 101-71 | 5 | 20 | 25.0\% |
| McCambly | 1 | 34 | 2.9\% |
| ART 102-70 | 1 | 34 | 2.9\% |
| McLaren | 2 | 34 | 5.9\% |
| CD 105-70 | 2 | 34 | 5.9\% |
| Urbanovich | 8 | 91 | 8.8\% |
| SPEECH 100-70 | 1 | 30 | 3.3\% |
| SPEECH 100-71 | 6 | 31 | 19.4\% |
| SPEECH 125-70 | 1 | 30 | 3.3\% |
| Yau | 16 | 32 | 50.0\% |
| CIS 101-70 | 16 | 32 | 50.0\% |
| TOTAL | 86 | 462 | 18.6\% |

a. N equals the number of students with a grade on record (GOR), which is A, B, C, D, F, I, P, NP, and W.

## Demographics

Table 2 illustrates respondents' age, gender, and ethnicity. Fifty-six percent of respondents were 18-24, 74\% of respondents were female, $49 \%$ were Caucasian, and $16 \%$ were Hispanic.

Table 2: Respondent's age and gender

| Demographic Categorization | N | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| My age is in the following range: | 84 | $100.0 \%$ |
| $18-24$ 47 <br> $25-30$ $56.0 \%$ <br> $31-35$ 15 <br> $36-40$ $17.9 \%$ <br> 41 and above 5 <br>  $4.8 \%$ <br> My gender is: 13$) 15.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Female | 81 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Male | 60 | $74.1 \%$ |
| Race/Ethnicity: | 21 | $25.9 \%$ |
| African American | 84 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Asian | 2 | $2.4 \%$ |
| Caucasian | 4 | $4.8 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 41 | $48.8 \%$ |
| Multi-racial | 13 | $15.5 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | 3 | $3.6 \%$ |
| Native American | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Other | 1 | $1.2 \%$ |

Table 3 analyzes the respondents' age and gender in relation to each other to provide a better profile of the respondents. For example, $40 \%$ of the respondents were female between 18 and 24 years of age.

Table 3: Crosstabulation of respondent's age and gender

|  |  | My gender is: |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female |  | Male |  |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |  |
| My age is in the <br> following range: | $18-24$ | 32 | $40.0 \%$ | 14 | $17.5 \%$ |
|  | $25-30$ | 14 | $17.5 \%$ | 1 | $1.3 \%$ |
|  | $36-45$ | 4 | $5.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
|  | 41 and above | 5 | $5.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
|  |  | 5 | $6.3 \%$ | 6 | $7.5 \%$ |

When examining ethnicity, findings could not be drawn from the multiple categories due to a low number of responses. Low-response categories were combined into the "Other" category allowing for the isolation of the two larger response categories, Caucasian and Hispanic. Results of the new isolated categories are illustrated in Table 4. A large plurality of respondents identified as Caucasian (49\%) and $16 \%$ identified themselves as Hispanic.

Table 4: Respondents' race/ethnicity

| Race/Ethnicity | N | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Caucasian | 41 | $48.8 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 13 | $15.5 \%$ |
| Other | 30 | $35.7 \%$ |
|  | TOTAL | 84 |

Table 5 illustrates various employment and instructional characteristics of respondents. Twenty-five percent of respondents reported not working any hours while a majority ( $55 \%$ ) worked 21 or more hours per week. Fifty-nine percent enrolled in 1-3 courses in the Spring 2013 term, and $49 \%$ reported that this was their first online course. Additionally, $54 \%$ percent of respondents devoted 4-6 hours each week to their online course.

Table 5: Employment \& instructional characteristics of respondents

| Statement/Question | N | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I currently work: | 83 | 100.0\% |
| 0 hours per week | 21 | 25.3\% |
| 1-10 hours per week | 6 | 7.2\% |
| 11-20 hours per week | 10 | 12.0\% |
| 21-30 hours per week | 18 | 21.7\% |
| 31-40 hours per week | 12 | 14.5\% |
| 40 or more hours per week | 16 | 19.3\% |
| This semester I took: | 85 | 100.0\% |
| 1-3 classes | 50 | 58.8\% |
| 4-6 classes | 35 | 41.2\% |
| 7-9 classes | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Throughout my entire time at Crafton Hills College, I have taken: | 85 | 100.0\% |
| 1 online class | 42 | 49.4\% |
| 2 online classes | 13 | 15.3\% |
| 3 online classes | 9 | 10.6\% |
| 4 online classes | 5 | 5.9\% |
| 5 or more online classes | 16 | 18.8\% |
| How much time did you typically devote each week to this course? | 84 | 100.0\% |
| 1-3 hours | 23 | 27.4\% |
| 4-6 hours | 45 | 53.6\% |
| 7-9 hours | 11 | 13.1\% |
| 10 or more hours | 5 | 6.0\% |

## Findings

Tables 6 through 9 illustrate the aggregated responses to the first four themes of the evaluation. In an evaluation of the responses, a common theme appeared with group projects and student interactions receiving the least strongly agreed and agreed responses across all four tables.

Table 6 illustrates respondents' perceptions about various course components. Over $90 \%$ of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with all statements.

Table 6: Course components and instructional procedures

| Statement | Strongly Agree |  | Agree |  | Disagree |  | Strongly <br> Disagree |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| The instructor posted a syllabus for this course in a timely manner. | 77 | 90.6\% | 7 | 8.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 85 |
| The syllabus accurately described what was involved in the course. | 70 | 82.4\% | 14 | 16.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 85 |
| All course materials were posted in a timely manner. | 70 | 82.4\% | 13 | 15.3\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 85 |
| The instructor gave assignments and exams that were related to the learning objectives of this course. | 69 | 82.1\% | 14 | 16.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 84 |
| The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course subject matter. | 67 | 80.7\% | 14 | 16.9\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 83 |
| The instructor allowed sufficient time for assignments to be completed. | 66 | 77.6\% | 19 | 22.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 85 |
| The method of grading for this course was clearly stated in the syllabus with an outline of assignments. | 66 | 77.6\% | 16 | 18.8\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 85 |
| The instructor organized the schedule effectively to promote learning. | 62 | 72.9\% | 22 | 25.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 85 |
| The instructor used explanations that were clear and understandable. | 55 | 67.1\% | 24 | 29.3\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 82 |
| The instructor inspired interest/excitement in the subject matter. | 52 | 63.4\% | 25 | 30.5\% | 5 | 6.1\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 82 |

Table 7 illustrates respondents' perceptions about various instructional components. Over $90 \%$ of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with all but one statement; $87 \%$ of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that the instructor allowed group interaction or assigned group projects. The statements are sorted from the most number of positive responses to the least number of positive responses, and not applicable responses have been excluded.

Table 7: Instructional approaches and techniques

| Statement | Strongly Agree |  | Agree |  | Disagree |  | Strongly <br> Disagree |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| The instructor responded to student communication within the guidelines described in the course syllabus. | 65 | 77.4\% | 18 | 21.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 84 |
| The instructor was available to help students and made it clear how to contact him/her outside of class. | 64 | 76.2\% | 19 | 22.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 84 |
| The instructor returned test and assignment grades/evaluations in a reasonable length of time. | 62 | 75.6\% | 18 | 22.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 82 |
| The exams were fair and understandable. | 61 | 74.4\% | 20 | 24.4\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 82 |
| The instructor treated students in an unbiased manner. | 61 | 79.2\% | 16 | 20.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 77 |
| The instructor's system of grading was fair. | 60 | 73.2\% | 18 | 22.0\% | 3 | 3.7\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 82 |
| The instructor made an effort to help students succeed in the course. | 59 | 73.8\% | 19 | 23.8\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 1 | 1.3\% | 80 |
| The instructor applied course material to the real world. | 58 | 69.9\% | 23 | 27.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 83 |
| The instructor provided opportunities for student input/class discussion and was open to other people's viewpoints. | 53 | 69.7\% | 20 | 26.3\% | 3 | 3.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 76 |
| The instructor was sensitive to gender and multicultural concerns. | 51 | 76.1\% | 13 | 19.4\% | 3 | 4.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 67 |
| The instructor allowed group interaction or assigned group projects. | 37 | 60.7\% | 16 | 26.2\% | 7 | 11.5\% | 1 | 1.6\% | 61 |

Table 8 illustrates respondents' perceptions about the usefulness of various instructional resources. The statements are sorted from the highest percentage of positive responses to the lowest percentage of positive responses, and not applicable responses have been excluded. Notably, a large majority of responses for group projects was "not applicable" ( $68 \%$ ), which was excluded from the table.

Table 8: Usefulness of instructional resources

| Type of Resource | Very Useful |  | Adequately Useful |  | Not Useful |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| Instructor-generated content (e.g. PowerPoints, videos, podcasts, etc.) | 52 | 80.0\% | 12 | 18.5\% | 1 | 1.5\% | 65 |
| Online Gradebook | 65 | 78.3\% | 15 | 18.1\% | 3 | 3.6\% | 83 |
| Online lectures given by the instructor | 42 | 71.2\% | 14 | 23.7\% | 3 | 5.1\% | 59 |
| Required assignments | 58 | 69.0\% | 25 | 29.8\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 84 |
| Quizzes and exams | 58 | 68.2\% | 25 | 29.4\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 85 |
| Group projects | 17 | 63.0\% | 7 | 25.9\% | 3 | 11.1\% | 27 |
| Discussion Boards | 40 | 61.5\% | 22 | 33.8\% | 3 | 4.6\% | 65 |
| Internet resources | 48 | 60.8\% | 29 | 36.7\% | 2 | 2.5\% | 79 |
| Textbook(s)/Workbook(s) used in this course | 50 | 59.5\% | 29 | 34.5\% | 5 | 6.0\% | 84 |

Table 9 illustrates respondents' general satisfaction with various aspects of the course. Over $80 \%$ of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with all but one statement; a significant percentage of respondents (40\%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they communicated at least as much with other students in this online course as they would in a face-to-face course. The statements are sorted from the most number of positive responses to the least number of positive responses, and not applicable responses have been excluded.

Table 9: Course Satisfaction

| Statement | Strongly Agree |  | Agree |  | Disagree |  | Strongly <br> Disagree |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |  |
| I would choose to take another online course. | 62 | 74.7\% | 17 | 20.5\% | 3 | 3.6\% | 1 | 1.2\% | 83 |
| I would recommend the online course experience to another student. | 62 | 74.7\% | 15 | 18.1\% | 6 | 7.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 83 |
| This course was more convenient to take than a traditional face-to-face course. | 59 | 69.4\% | 21 | 24.7\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 3 | 3.5\% | 85 |
| I had to work at least as hard in this course as I would have in a traditional face-to-face course. | 52 | 61.2\% | 24 | 28.2\% | 7 | 8.2\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 85 |
| Without the availability of this course via Internet, I would not have been able to enroll in this course/program. | 52 | 64.2\% | 13 | 16.0\% | 12 | 14.8\% | 4 | 4.9\% | 81 |
| I found that I learned at least as much in this online course as I probably would in a face-to-face course. | 51 | 60.7\% | 28 | 33.3\% | 3 | 3.6\% | 2 | 2.4\% | 84 |
| I communicated at least as much with other students in this online course as I would in a face-to-face course. | 29 | 37.7\% | 17 | 22.1\% | 25 | 32.5\% | 6 | 7.8\% | 77 |

Table 10 illustrates whether respondents would recommend the instructor and, separately, the course to another student. Ninety-five percent of respondents would recommend their instructor to another student, and $91 \%$ would recommend their course.

Table 10: Recommendation of instructor and course

| Question |  | N | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Would you recommend this instructor to | Yes | 82 | $95.3 \%$ |
|  | No | 4 | $4.7 \%$ |
| Would you recommend this course to | Yes | 78 | $90.7 \%$ |
| another student? | No | 8 | $9.3 \%$ |

Table 11 illustrates additional instructional resources requested by respondents. The only response to garner majority support was video lectures, which was identified by $59 \%$ of respondents.

Table 11: Additional requested instructional resources

| Type of Resource | N | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Video lectures | 41 | $59.4 \%$ |
| Website links related to course content | 34 | $49.3 \%$ |
| Videos on related course content from a variety of | 32 | $46.4 \%$ |
| sources | 30 | $43.5 \%$ |
| Instructor podcasts | 28 | $40.6 \%$ |
| Chat rooms | 13 | $18.8 \%$ |
| Instructional videos on how to use Blackboard |  |  |

All responses were analyzed across age categories, genders and ethnicities to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between any statement and the respondents' demographics. When comparing all statements, a statistically significant ( $\mathrm{p}<0.05$ ) and substantial (ES>|0.8|) difference was identified between a respondent's race/ethnicity and responses on the following two statements:

- The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course subject matter.
- The instructor used explanations that were clear and understandable.

No other statements or responses were found to have statistically significant differences between the respondents' demographics and are subsequently not shown here.

When examining the two statements, Hispanics were statistically significantly ( $\mathrm{p}>.05$ ) and substantially ( $\mathrm{ES}>-0.8$ ) less likely to agree or strongly agree than Caucasians that their instructor demonstrated knowledge of course subject matter ( $91 \%$ to $100 \%$ ) or used explanations that were clear and understandable ( $82 \%$ to $100 \%$ ). Although Hispanics were still overwhelmingly in agreement with both statements, they were proportionately less likely to strongly agree than Caucasians with both statements. Table 12 illustrates the relationship between the respondents' races/ethnicities and responses to the above stated statements.

Table 12: Crosstabulation of respondents' races/ethnicities and responses to select questions

|  |  | Race/Ethnicity |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Caucasian |  | Hispanic |  |  |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |  |
| The instructor demonstrated knowledge of course <br> subject matter. | 41 | $100.0 \%$ | 11 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
|  | Strongly Agree | 36 | $87.8 \%$ | 6 | $54.5 \%$ |
| Agree | 5 | $12.2 \%$ | 4 | $36.4 \%$ |  |
|  | Disagree | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 1 | $9.1 \%$ |
| Strongly Disagree | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| The instructor used explanations that were clear and | 40 | $100.0 \%$ | 11 | $100.0 \%$ |  |
| understandable. |  | 29 | $72.5 \%$ | 5 | $45.5 \%$ |
|  | Strongly Agree | 11 | $27.5 \%$ | 4 | $36.4 \%$ |
|  | Agree | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 1 | $9.1 \%$ |
|  | Disagree | 0 | $0.0 \%$ | 1 | $9.1 \%$ |

Figures 1 and 2 are graphical representations of the data presented in Table 12.
Figure 1

a. The respondent's race/ethnicity identification was truncated

Figure 2

a. The respondent's race/ethnicity identification was truncated

Table 13 analyzes the respondents' races/ethnicities against the two select statements, where N is the number and mean is the arithmetic average of responses. The values in mean, maximum, and minimum are the numerical representation of the responses to the select statements where $4=$ Strongly Agrees, $3=$ Agrees, $2=$ Disagrees, $1=$ Strongly Disagrees, and responses of Not Applicable are omitted. All Caucasian respondents either strongly agreed or agreed, as illustrated by a maximum value of 4 and a minimum value of 3 , respectively. With a minimum value of either 1 or 2 , some Hispanic respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed to the same statements. The weight of the number of negative responses is reflected in the lower mean values of Hispanic respondents.

Table 13: Descriptives of race/ethnicity layered into select questions

|  |  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The instructor demonstrated <br> knowledge of course subject <br> matter. | Caucasian | 41 | 3.88 | .331 | 3 | 4 |
| Hispanic | 11 | 3.45 | .688 | 2 | 4 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total* | Caucasian | 43 | 3.78 | .470 | 2 |

a. Totals include values from the "Other" race/ethnicity categories.

A one-way ANOVA test and measurement of the effect size is presented in Table 14. With p-values of 0.027 and 0.026 , respectively, the relationship between race/ethnicity and the two select statements is considered to be statistically significant meaning that any response to the select statements is in some way connected to a respondent's race/ethnicity. The relationship in this case is not causal, however. Due to the anonymity of the respondents, it is not possible to identify the relationship between the two variables. Additionally, with effect size values of 1.01 and .92 , respectively, the effect size is considered large meaning approximately $83 \%$ of responses by Hispanic respondents were lower than the average response by a Caucasian respondent to the same statement.

Table 14: Analysis of the variance and effect size between race/ethnicity and responses to select questions

|  | Caucasian |  |  |  | Hispanic |  |  | Effect Size |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Mean | Std. <br> Dev. | N | Mean | Std. <br> Dev. | ES | Lower <br> Bound | Upper <br> Bound | p-value |  |
| The instructor demonstrated <br> knowledge of course subject <br> matter. | 41 | 3.88 | .331 | 11 | 3.45 | .688 | 1.010 | 0.300 | 1.684 | 0.027 |  |
| The instructor used explanations <br> that were clear and <br> understandable. | 40 | 3.73 | .452 | 11 | 3.18 | .982 | 0.917 | 0.213 | 1.593 | 0.026 |  |

Finally, 32 respondents ( $37 \%$ ) provided additional comments in the four following themes: generally favorable of the instructor, favorable of the class or online structure, general course or instructional difficulties, and difficulties due to online structure. Respondents were most likely to provide praise about their instructor and course followed by comments regarding benefits of online classes for busy schedules. Finally, a small number of respondents commented on specific difficulties they faced with online learning.

## Generally favorable of instructor $(n=18)$ :

- As much as I am on the computer at work, I never have to do the type of formatting in documents that I have learned in this class with various [Microsoft O]ffice products. I do use databases but had not learned the "internal" workings of one. I love this course and recommend it for anyone who types on a computer. I have been sharing information with my high school son for his school assignments. I will be looking forward to taking the next step in this course with Professor [Name].
- Because I work a lot I have taken many online courses at both CHC and Valley. I have to say, [Name] was the best online instructor I have ever had! She is VERY easy to communicate with and is more than happy to help. Always offered to either meet in person or discuss the class via email/phone call if anyone needed help. She was very helpful when returning graded papers. She would go over what could be improved and allowed me to revise my essays. You can tell she cares and wants us to not only do well but also ensures we are learning the material. I despise [subject name] and have attempted to take it 2 other times with different instructors (one online and one on campus). I never thought I would enjoy a [subject name] class but I did. I also learned a lot more about writing effective essays. I wish there were more teachers like her! --My only criticism is that the syllabus needed to be updated and proofed, there were some old dates from previous semesters that kind of confused some students early on, but I see that in almost ALL my classes. She did make sure to post the correct deadlines in Blackboard each week so most people didn't even look at the syllabus for due dates anyway.
- [Name] is one of the best teachers I have had in all my years of schooling. He is highly knowledgeable on the subject matter and you can tell he has a passion for what he teaches, which makes his course exciting and insightful. I have learned more in [Name]'s courses than I have learned in almost every other class I've taken at Crafton.
- Even though I have been using Microsoft Office for years, I have learned so much about it in this course. The instructor is amazing and is very quick to respond to anything I ask her. The only recommendation I would make is that the exams are just a little lengthy. I think the proper amount of information could be covered in 20-25 questions as opposed to 40 . But I really enjoy the class.
- I am very glad that I chose [Name] for this course. She is absolutely a great teacher, has a strong commitment to help student to make great success in her subject. Always responds in time, very understandable person and always willing to help students. I wish all professors in our college would be like her. Five thumbs up!
- I have been trying to spread the word about your class(es), [Name]
- I have taken two online classes from [Name] and I have to say that out of all of the online classes that I have so far attended, she has been my most favorable instructor yet. I say this because she is extremely, and I must emphasize the extremely, responsive and considerate that we may lack the benefits of having face-toface interaction, communication is still a number one priority for her to connect with her students. In addition to, the fact that [subject name] is available online is also beneficial to students who have full time jobs and must commute to class (and cannot make many of the night classes.) Therefore having such an important subject accessible in a variety of hours, days, and now online is an intelligent move on the college's part. I do believe that [Name] has successfully educated myself and my peers in the past two semesters regarding [subject name], and has given us the tools in taking one more step into becoming a part of the well-educated students we are destined to be! [Name] also has a structured syllabus that is easy to comprehend, and even provides tools for those who may not be as technologically adapted (and teaches them how to become so). Even her coursework that is given throughout the semester is challenging enough to expand the knowledge of a student, but is simple enough to comprehend and complete in the amount of time that she provides to her students. I would not be surprised if much of her student's passing rate is of B
or higher, because she truly does make a deeply rooted and compassionate educational relationship to each and every one of her students. I believe she truly is an exceptional instructor and deserves every bit of credibility for her remarkable teaching technique.
- Loved this class. [Name] was fantastic.
- [Name] is an awesome instructor. The class is very organized and it is easy to catch on to what is expected of us. The work that we do is very effective and the books we read are easy to understand. Compared to other online courses I have taken, hers is the best one. I especially like the [assignments] because they help us connect the material to the real world. I would recommend her class to anyone! Even a new student. My only critique is that I would love a discussion board in order to connect with other students. BUT! [Name] is such a great teacher that I was able to connect with other students in her class just because we happened to be talking about taking such a good online course. That being said, I wish there were more online courses like [Name].
- [Name] is a good instructor...the only thing is that I wish that we the students had access to our quizzes and the answers after a quiz. As it is now, we do not see what questions that we missed so therefore it is hard to make any mental corrections so that we have a better understanding of the material.
- Overall, the course is well plotted out and the instructions are very clear. Along the way when I have had questions the instructor responded very quickly and answered all of my question. I really have enjoyed the professor and the class. Highly recommend!
- [Name] is pretty cool! Give her a bonus! Or a Raise!
- [Name] is amazing! This has been the best online course I have taken thus far. It was a lot of work but the grading was completely fair!
- [Name] is awesome! She is very helpful and goes out of her way to help her student succeed. She replies back to student emails in a timely manner and truly wants her students to succeed.
- Teacher was very respondent to my emails and very clear. Very helpful and willing to help students
- The instructor is honestly fantastic; she is accepting of other viewpoints and open to frank and honest discussion about the subject matter at hand. I am far more compelled to do the work for this class than any other class because it is a lot less pressure to perform- others are not openly judging you for your thoughts or ideas. Online courses should become a much bigger component in this school, because this is one of the best courses I have taken.
- This professor knows how to prepare, and instruct an online course. I have taken many online courses, and this was one of the best.


## Favorable of class or online structure ( $\mathrm{n}=8$ ):

- [Name] has a simple and straight forward teaching method that is easy to understand through online schooling. Quite honestly, I believe this course would have been more difficult for me to understand in a classroom setting because I would not have been able to take the time I needed on my own to understand the material. Naturally this class may be dry to some, and I believe that when having your own time to evaluate the assignments and quizzes, it makes it less intimidating to complete coursework. I do have to say that as an extreme advocate for online schooling, [Name] has a teaching technique that is ideal for any online student - teacher interaction. I say this because she is prompt with her emails and communicates to the best of her ability to make sure that her students are receiving her undivided and full attention as she would give in a regular class setting. I would like to see more courses provided by this Professor. I am extremely impressed with the class and $100 \%$ satisfied. Zero complaints.
- Great course, allows me to keep taking more classes as deal with busy schedule
- Great course, allows students to have some flexibility with busy lifestyles. I learned got things done when I had time; I just needed to turn it in before due date and time.
- Great so far. I have yet to encounter any issues.
- I learned a lot from this course. Glad that I took this class, which I believe I will benefit from it in future.
- I like this class so far.
- I truly enjoyed this class, very informative.
- Very informative, really inspires deep thought.


## General course or instructional difficulties (n=3):

- I feel like a lot of the instruction and lecture is above my head. I know I'm in college, but I'm not at Harvard. There was just too much for me to take in as far as following the instructions and using the discussion board. In interpreting the content of some quotes, I felt slighted because MY interpretations were not correct. Well, if it's an interpretation, it was correct to me.
- I was hoping this class would cover the [additional breadth]; this is primarily [limited subject scope].
- The syllabus had deadlines in it for last fall; it was not updated for the spring. It was difficult to keep track of which assignments were due, and the professor was slow to respond to student inquiries. I am still waiting to see the grades on over $2 / 3$ rds of the assignments I have submitted. I have no idea if the quality of my work is appropriate because I have had zero feedback since the second week of this term.


## Difficulties due to online structure ( $\mathrm{n}=3$ ):

- First and foremost, the material covered in this section is adequate to how [Name] describes it in her syllabus. She has provided a structured layout of what assignments and quizzes would be reviewed, and even allows extra credit opportunity. However I would have to request a clearer syllabus for how the instructor would like the students to complete the application piece and discussion board assignments as I think many students including myself had to find our footing in the midst of the semester (which unfortunately affected our grades when we did not fully comprehend the requirements of the assignments covered.) I also believe that communication was delayed in comparison to the previous online classes I have taken. I understand Professors have a multitude of students to cover and communicate with, and communication is not always easy, however, I did not feel as though it was as much of a priority as it has been displayed in other courses. This is also to understand that lack of communication is a risk that many students must consider that can occur in online classes---but regardless, communication should not be delayed when discussing grades or clarity of an assignment. Perhaps [Name] would consider trying video podcasts or using a YouTube channel in relationship to Crafton Hills, and doing a Q and A for her course. This might alleviate some of the misunderstandings that I felt that some students experienced in the course. Otherwise, I believe she is thoroughly educated in the field of [subject name], and not once did I ever question her knowledge of the material covered. (Not that I have ever had that problem before in the past) I just believe that the only complaints I would have are to be more thorough in what she expects from her students when covering assignments and if possible, to be more prompt in executing a form of communication. She provides the justified amount of time for any student to complete their work, and I believe that any students who turn their work in late is solely a responsibility issue within their own selves----there is no excuse to have late work in this course (especially it being a thirteen week class.) Despite these flaws, I believe she is an excellent instructor and I would sincerely recommend this course to other students.
- Taking this [subject] online was very convenient for me because of the time aspect but I did found it intimidating to present [an assignment] every other week to students that I did not have the chance to get to
know on a personal level. Meeting so few times did not give me the opportunity to become comfortable with my classmates.
- This class is very unorganized! I would hate for anyone to have to go through what I am going through. It is almost May and my instructor hasn't graded anything since January! How am I supposed to improve if I do not know what I am doing wrong? Also, the Blackboard site is a mess! There are two different folders under the assignment tab sometimes that say to do different things for one week. The group project was the worst!!! No one knew what to do! My biggest complaint is that I have emailed and called and called her and she has NEVER responded. Ever! From January until now I have waited for a response. She provided us with her assistants information, USELESS. She stated that she had no idea about online classes. What am I paying for? I would not recommend her for anyone.


## Conclusion

The Spring 2013 DE course evaluations demonstrate an overall strong satisfaction with Crafton Hills College's DE courses in spite of a fairly low overall response rate. There was a statistically significant and substantial relationship between Hispanic/Latino respondents and their responses to two select statements, which should be examined further. Comments from respondents identifying themselves as Hispanic/Latino were isolated; however, no negative comments were made in correlation with the lower response values. In order to further study this potential relationship, open ended questions could be added to future DE course evaluations allowing students to state their opinions on how the instructor demonstrated their knowledge of the course subject matter and used explanations that were clear and understandable.

Any questions regarding this report can be directed to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning at (909) 389-3390 or you may send an email to bgamboa@,craftonhills.edu: 13SP_DE_Course Eval_Report.docx; snDECourseEvaluationSP2013.sav.

