

Distance Education and Educational Technology Committee
AGENDA

Tuesday, December 1, 12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m., 18-206

Committee Membership: Tania Beliz, Diana Bennett, Yoseph Demissie, Steven Lehigh, Jaime Marron, Theresa Martin, Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza, Lee Miller, Rosemary Nurre, Annette Perrot, Chris Smith, Jasmine Witham, Jing Wu, Jielin Yu (student representative)

Guests: John Sewart, Sandra Stefani Comerford

Co-chairs: Jasmine Witham and Jennifer Taylor-Mendoza

Note-Taker: TBD

1. Review Agenda

2. Review Meeting Summary (November 3, 2015)

3. Agenda Items

- DEETC Withdraw Questions - Milla McConnell-Tuite (See Attached)
- Success Ranking: Online Coursework vs. Face-to-Face Mode Coursework Differential Fall 2012, Fall 2013, Fall 2014 - John Sewart
- District Distance Education Programming and Professional Development Proposal Update - Diana
 - District Academic Senate Recommendation
 - Canvas Update
 - OEI Resources
- Instructional Designer Position Update - Sandra
- Third-Party Products - Jennifer
 - Survey to determine which products faculty members are currently using.
- Review Annual Goals for 2015-2016 - Jasmine and Jennifer
 - Institutional Planning Committee's interest in ensuring that the work of all CSM committees aligns with the College's Mission Statement and Institutional Priorities.

4. Agenda Items for Next Meeting

5. Date of Next Meeting

Q#1. What is the proportion of international students enrolled in DE courses as compared to the general population?

All students	International student		General		Total	
	Head-count	%	Head-count	%	Head-count	%
Online	267	44.3	5741	28.9	6008	39.4
Not online	336	55.7	14108	71.1	14444	70.6
Total	603	100.0	19849	100.0	20452	100.0

Table 1

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015.

International students enroll in DE courses at higher rates than domestic (non-international) students—44.3% vs. 28.9%. (Table 1)

Question: Do international students withdraw from online courses at a higher rate than domestic students? Some have speculated that non-native speakers struggle with language in an online environment, resulting in withdraw rates higher than for native speakers. The data, however, indicate otherwise: the withdraw rate of international students (7.0%) is less than half that of domestic students (18.2%). (Table 2)

Students who enrolled in an online course	International student		General		Total	
	Head-count	%	Head-count	%	Head-count	%
Withdrew	29	7.0	1685	18.2	1714	17.7
Did not withdraw	386	93.0	7577	81.8	7963	82.3
Total	415	100.0	9262	100.0	9677	100.0

Table 2

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015.

Q #2. What is the proportion of non-native speakers?

All enrollments	Online enrollment		Face-to-face	
	Enroll count	%	Enroll count	%
English spoken at home	8157	87.5	60910	86.9
English not spoken at home	1163	12.5	9184	13.1
Total	9320	100.0	70094	100.0

Table 3

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015.

The available demographic identifier of non-native speakers draws from a CCCApply question which asks for the primary language spoken at home, and which has a problematically high response rate. In general, the proportion of self-identified non-native speaker enrollments in online courses is similar to that for face-to-face enrollments—87.5% vs, 86.9%. (Table 3)

Question: Do non-native speakers withdraw from online courses at rates disproportionately higher than for face-to-face courses? This question arises again from the speculation that non-native speakers struggle with language in an online environment. In general, the data show that non-native speakers withdraw at rates are slightly higher than those for English speakers—13.8% vs, 11.8%. (Table 4). Variations by language spoken at home are also displayed.

All enrollments	Online enrollment		Face-to-face	
	N	Withdraw Rate	N	Withdraw Rate
English	8157	18.4	60910	13.6
Not English	1163	13.8	9184	11.8
Chinese	352	11.1	2605	9.9
Not English	172	15.7	1297	12.7
Spanish	230	18.7	2216	15.3
Tagalog	50	26.0	363	11.8
Other	359	10.9	2703	10.2
Total	9320	100.0	70094	100.0

Table 4

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015.

Q#3. What is the unit-taking pattern of DE students as compared to the general population?

Student total units enrolled in a term	Online students		Face-to-face students	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
3 or less	3563	45.1	9355	31.4
3.5 to 6	1579	20.0	8025	26.9
6.5 to 12	1819	23.0	7993	26.8
12.5 to 16	696	8.8	3467	11.6
More than 16	246	3.1	960	3.2
Total	7903	100.0	29800	100.0

Table 5

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015.

Students who take an online course generally take a lighter unit load than those who enroll in face-to-face courses only. (Table 5) Nearly half of online students (45.1%) take up to 3 units, or the equivalent of one course, and roughly two-thirds of online students (65.1%) attend part-time (6 or fewer units). In comparison, less than one third of face-to-face students (31.4%) take up to 3 units, while just over one half (58.3%) attend part-time.

Unit load data reveal that online students are no more likely to enroll in more than 16 units--3.1% vs. 3.2% and less likely to be enrolled full-time--11.9% vs. 14.8%.

Student total units enrolled in a term	Online students		Face-to-face students	
	N	Withdraw Rate	N	Withdraw Rate
3 or less	3563	17.5	9355	12.8
3.5 to 6	1579	25.6	8025	19.2
6.5 to 12	1819	34.5	7993	31.2
12.5 to 16	696	37.6	3467	35.4
More than 16	246	43.1	960	26.9
Total	7903		29800	

Table 6

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015. Duplicated count.

The extent to which a student's unit load impacts their withdrawal behavior is complex. In general, unit load has minimal impact on W rates of online students vs. fact-to-face enrolled students: +2% - +6%. (Table 6) An exception, however, is online students with high unit loads (>16 units), whose withdraw rate is 43.1% compared to 26.9% for comparable face-to-face students. It is important to note, however, that although the withdraw rate of high-unit students is notably high, its overall impact upon the total number of online withdraws is small, owing to the small population size--246, or 3.1% of total duplicated count of students over 5 terms. (See Table 7)

Student total units enrolled in a term	Online students				Face-to-face (fff) students			
	N	Pct of online students	Withdraw Count	Pct of online withdraws	N	Pct of fff students	Withdraw Count	Pct of fff withdraws
3 or less	3563	45.1	624	30.8	9355	31.4	1194	17.8
3.5 to 6	1579	20.0	405	20.0	8025	26.9	1541	22.9
6.5 to 12	1819	23.0	627	31.0	7993	26.8	2494	37.1
12.5 to 16	696	8.8	262	12.9	3467	11.6	1229	18.3
More than 16	246	3.1	10	5.2	960	3.2	258	3.8
Total	7903	100.0	2024	100.0	29800	100.0	6716	100.0

Table 7

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015. Duplicated count.

A side-by-side comparison of the frequency distributions of online students and their withdraws, reveals at least two points. (Table 7)

- Although online part-time students (6 or fewer units) have lower withdraw rates than online students carrying more units, because of their large numbers they account for half (50.8%) of all online withdraws, and single-course takers (3 or fewer units) account for nearly one-third (30.8%).
- Online students enrolling between 6.5 and 12 units have a disproportionate share of withdraws. Although this group comprises 23.0% of online students in the study period, it accounts for 31.0% of withdraws. At the same time, face-to-face students with the same unit load also account for a disproportionate share of withdraws (37.1%), indicating that a high number of withdraws is not unique to the online mode.

Q#4. What proportion of courses that students drop are CTE?

Total enrollments by course CTE status	Online enrollments			Face-to-face enrollments			Difference, Online vs. Face-to-Face Withdraw Rates
	N	Withdraw Count	Withdraw Rate	N	Withdraw Count	Withdraw Rate	
Clearly CTE	1979	391	19.8	8941	1011	11.3	+8.5 pts
Possibly CTE	2799	391	14.0	2974	315	10.6	+4.6 pts
Not CTE	4899	932	19.0	60616	8305	13.7	+5.3 pts
Total	9677	1714	17.7	72531	9631	13.3	+4.4 pts

Table 8

Note: “Clearly CTE” courses are “generally...taken by students in the middle stages of their programs,” while “Possibly CTE” courses are “taken by students in the beginning stages of their occupational programs.”

Source: SMCCCD student database, current courses and section fte tables, Summer 2014 – Fall 2015. Duplicated count.

The withdrawal rates of CTE online courses in comparison to comparable CTE face-to-face courses are relatively comparable. (Table 8) While the overall ‘not CTE’ online vs. face-to-face course withdrawal rate for is +5.3%, the CTE specific comparison rates are: +8.5% and 4.6%.