2022 SAAL MOOC Executive Summary
from Joe Levy

Enrollment
This year, we saw 1047 participants enroll in the course, with 153 of them successfully completing the course. This 14.61% completion rate is just shy of the 15% completion rate from 2021 when the written assignments did not have a specific score required to earn the course badge. Seeing how close the scores were to last year helped ease my concern the graded assignments would limit our completers.

Welcome Survey/User Profile
Participants are largely hearing about the course from friends of colleagues, from SAAL, or through social media. They take the course because they enjoy learning about topics that interest them and hope to gain skills for a promotion or new career. While they have online experience from school or through other MOOC providers, course takers identify almost split as passive and active participants for this course and they anticipate spending 1-2 hours per week on the course.

Course takers have 40% or less of their jobs dedicated to assessment and identify as intermediate or beginners with respect to their assessment competency. They hold all sorts of roles at institutions, primarily staff and managers/directors. They attend from all types of institutions, but the largest concentration are in public 4-year over 10,000 and private 4-year under 10,000. While we have course takers from all over the world, the vast majority are from North America and the vast majority of participants speak English as their native language.

Course participants typically have master’s degrees, the next largest group has terminal degrees. The course welcomed all ages of participants, but the highest populated age groups were 25-34, 35-44, and 45-54. Course participants are mostly female and primarily identify as women. While many races and ethnicities are represented, the majority of participants identified as White.

Because course completers had a near identical demographic distribution/profile as the initial sample of survey respondents, the above narrative profile holds true for them, too.
Quiz Results
Overall, quiz results are very positive with respect to demonstrated student learning. The mode quiz scores were the max values (100% correct score) per respective quiz, so average quiz scores are shown here to offer a bit more variability with respect to student performance in each quiz. Even with the averages, each quiz average is 93% correct or higher. These average scores were slightly down compared to last year’s data with two scores as the same, three lower than last year, and two higher than last year. Last year’s details compared to this year’s, respectively, include: 2021 Quiz 1 was higher with 97.5%, 2021 Quiz 2 higher with 96.6%, 2021 Quiz 3 was higher with 99.2%, 2021 Quiz 4 was the same, 2021 Quiz 5 was slightly lower with 99%, 2021 Quiz 6 was the same, and 2021 Quiz 7 was lower with 96.8%.

Data Disaggregation
Overall quiz results were disaggregated by completer demographics. As such, results are filtered from all course participants (1047) to those who completed the course (153). Then, the results are further filtered to remove course participants who did not consent to their data being used for reporting purposes, bringing the sample to 150. Finally, results per demographic question may vary in sample size due to consenting course completers who may not have answered specific demographic questions or taken the Welcome Survey at all (where demographic data is gathered) – a maximum possible sample size of 136 based on completers taking the Welcome Survey.

Across quiz scores and demographics, there are some interesting results when disaggregating data by demographic groups. Looking across a given demographic’s scores (i.e., across all groups within a given demographic), the most participants with overall quiz scores of 95% or higher was viewing scores by geographic location (73%), followed by native English speakers and sex (both 71%), and education level...
The least participants with overall quiz scores of 95% or more was viewing by institutional type (61%), followed by role (63%) and online learner type (64%).

**Assignment Results**

Overall, participants who completed the course did pretty well on assignments. Participants needed a score of 75% or better on each assignment to count toward earning the course badge. The mode score for the Module 3 assignment was 30 out of 30 overall, with the following mode scores per rubric dimensions: Outcomes 5/5, Method 5/5, Relationship 5/5, Complete 5/5, References 5/5, and Flow 5/5. More detail on descriptive stats are above. Last year, the mode score was 28 out of 30 and the mode score for the References dimension was 3/5.

The mode score for the Module 5 assignment was 25 out of 25 overall, with the following mode scores per rubric dimension: Connection 5/5, Critical lens 5/5, Complete 5/5, References 5/5, and Flow 5/5. More detail on descriptive stats are above. Last year, the mode score was 23 out of 25 and the mode score for the References dimension was 3/5.

Overall, course participants performed very well on the assignments. It is worth mentioning these data were not filtered for course completers; aside from people who did not want their data to be used for analysis purposes, these data reflect all submitted assignments by course participants. The next section of the report helps get into more detailed performance of participants per assignment rubric.

**Data Disaggregation**

In looking to analyze the results, responses were filtered for only participants who consented to using their data for assessment or report-related purposes. This resulted in a sample of 179 participant artifacts for the Module 3 assignment and 160 participant artifacts for the Module 5 assignment. It is worth noting these resulting samples of 179 and 160 differ from overall course completers (153) since successful course completion requires scoring 75% or better on each quiz and on each written assignment.

Across module scores and demographics, there are some interesting results when disaggregating data by demographic groups. Looking across a given demographic's scores (i.e., across all groups within a given demographic), the most participants with a passing score for module 3 was viewing scores by geographic location (100%), while the lowest was by gender (67%). The participants with the most perfect scores was by assessment competency (36%), while the lowest was by native English speakers.

Similarly, the most participants with a passing score for module 5 was viewing scores by assessment competency and geographic location (both 100%), while the lowest was by gender and role (both 80%). The participants with the most perfect scores was by geographic location (70%), while the lowest was by sex (25%).

Viewing scores by assessment competency resulted in the most perfect module 3 scores and the most participants with a module 5 passing score, similar to geographic location resulting in the most participants with a module 3 and module 5 passing score, as well as the most perfect module 5 scores. Conversely, viewing scores by gender resulted in the least amount of participants scoring passing module 3 and module 5 scores. Native English speakers had the least perfect module 3 scores, role had
the least amount of participants scoring a passing module 5 score, and sex had the least amount of module 5 perfect scores.

**User Experience Survey/End of Course Evaluation Results**

End of course evaluation occurs by way of a user experience survey offered to all participants. There was an initial sample of 165 respondents was filtered for only participants who consented to using their data for assessment or report-related purposes. For comparison purposes with other course data sets, respondents were further filtered by participants who successfully completed the course and earned the course badge. This resulted in a sample of 132 responses.

- **95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to positive impact of course materials (videos, lecture material, readings) and course activities (quizzes, assignments, discussion boards).** These results are the same as last year.
- **95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to positive impact of course activities (quizzes, assignments, discussion boards).** These results are the better from last year (86%).
- **75% of respondents indicated they spent 2 hours or less on the course each week** (up from 71% last year), with another 18% spending 3-4 hours per week (down from 20% last year).
- **66% of respondents indicated likelihood to recommend course as a 9 or 10** (up from 58% last year), with another 25% responding with an 8 (up from 19% last year).
- **94% of respondents rated course quality as 4 or 5 out of 5 stars.** This year's data is a slight improvement from last year's result of 93% responding with 4 or 5 stars.
- **67% of respondents indicated instructor involvement should be a variety** (up from 63% last year), while 27% indicated they like to learn on their own (same as last year). Peer to peer learning was the same as last year, while interacting only with instructor dropped three percentage points (5%) and no instructor interaction increased one percentage point compared to last year (0%).
- **51% of respondents indicated a course length preference of 7-8 weeks,** 35% indicated a preference of 5-6 weeks. The question last year had some overlapping scale points, but results were very similar (51% said 6-8 weeks, 29% said 4-6 weeks). Less people think the course should be longer than 8 weeks this year; last year there were 10% of folks in that camp.

**Data Disaggregation**

The disaggregated data by demographic focused on two end-of-course questions: actual hours spent each week on the course and overall quality of the course.

Overall, time spent on course results across and within demographic groups largely mirror the aggregate results (75%). It was interesting to see how some results for 2 hours or less vary from disaggregation by one demographic to another. It was fun to review the initial anticipated hours as a population in relation to actual hours spent on the course. Drawing from Welcome Survey results, 69% of all respondents indicated they anticipated spending 2 hours or less on the course - not far off from end results here.

Course quality ratings across and within demographic groups largely mirror the aggregate results (94%).

This year’s data disaggregation (across course data sets) looked a little different from last year. More detail is provided in the respective data set reports. While we commit to doing some form of data
disaggregation next year, it is a long-term goal to conduct further analyses to dig deeper than the descriptive statistics reported in order to truly examine relationships between variables.

**Qualitative Analyses**

When looking at the user experience survey, the majority (62%) of comments were positive, with 25% comments as suggestions for improvement and 12% comments of a negative sentiment. Below is a summary of the positive feedback:

### Positive Themes from Participant Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deepened understanding/refreshed me on assessment process</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plethora of tools/resources added to my toolbox</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave me confidence/competence</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical tips on how to do this work</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(re)energizing/developmental environment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational knowledge for assessment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciated the assignments/activities</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great PD activity</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting me curious</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired complementary work on campus</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking through the suggestions for improvements, as well as the negative feedback, the instructors will reflect on ways to address the following as possible course changes in 2023:

- Contextualize module 3/assessment consulting as it can be intimidating so early in the course
- Consider content tracks for people engaging in assessment vs those leading assessment
- Consider requiring discussion board interactions
- Add more content in module 6; existing information felt rushed
- Incorporate more practical application/case studies beyond reflection in discussion boards
- Offer more live sessions; perhaps sessions dedicated to working through case studies
- Promote live sessions and resources early and often to participants

It is exciting to see we did not receive negative or constructive feedback this year about dated content, broken links, too much text, or lacking depth in course content (themes from last year). Seems our course improvements in the off-season helped resolve those issues. We still have some concerns or suggestions for improvement similar to last year (e.g., more live discussions, meaningful discussion boards, keep integrating universal design components).

All of this information is useful as direction, guidance, and direct feedback for what is working well, what to improve, and what participants are looking for with respect to experience in the course. The course instructors take these data very seriously and work to have the participant voice reflected in the many improvements and enhancements made to the course.
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Report Orientation

This report analyzes and visualizes respondent data from the course Welcome Survey, which gathers some marketing, expectations, and demographic information of course participants. This document first presents overall data, then filters responses for just those who completed the course to demonstrate a completer profile.

Overall Results

In looking to analyze the results, responses were filtered for only students who consented to using their data for assessment or report-related purposes. This resulted in a sample of 549 responses for the Welcome Survey.

Course Marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend or colleague</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the sponsoring institution</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the instructors</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Canvas</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a web search</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a news story mentioning course or Canvas</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clicked on an ad</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Responses
The top/most common responses for how people heard of the course were: Friend or colleague (55%), From the sponsoring institution (18%), Through social media (8%). These numbers largely mirror those from last year (55%, 18%, and 13%, respectively). **NOTE:** Be aware the course marketing data is made up of from a check-all-that-apply question.

The top/most common responses for reasons taking the course this year match what they were last year: I enjoy learning about topics that interest me (40%), I hope to gain skills for a new career (19%), and I hope to gain skills for a promotion at work (17%). These numbers largely mirror those from last year (42%, 17%, and 19%, respectively).
The top/most common responses for experience with online courses for this year were: At school (44%), Coursera (14%), and a tie of Canvas Network (13%) and Other (13%). These numbers largely mirror those from last year (44%, 12%, and 12%, respectively). **NOTE:** The experience with online courses data is made up from a check-all-that-apply question.
Online Learner Type

- Passive participant: 53%
- Active participant: 38%
- Observer: 5%
- Drop in: 3%

The top/most common two online learner types from this year match last year: passive participant (53%) and active participant (38%). These numbers are largely the same as last year (56% and 35%, respectively).
The top/most common responses for anticipated hours to spend on course from this year match last year: 1-2 hrs (63%), 3-4 hrs (27%), and less than 1 hr (6%). These numbers are largely the same as last year (60%, 27%, 5%, respectively).
The top/most common responses for amount of job dedicated to assessment from this year were similar to top responses last year: 0-20% (49%), 21-40% (25%), and 81-100% (12%). Last year, the top responses were: 0-20% (47%), 21-40% (23%), 41-60% (12%). Compared to last year, it seems this year’s course attracted folks with slightly more overall amount of their jobs dedicated to assessment.
With only 9% of respondents self-reporting their assessment competency as Advanced, the course is serving a split of Beginners (46%) and Intermediate (45%). There are slightly less Beginners and slightly more Advanced folks engaging in the course this year compared to last year, whose respondents were 48% Beginner, 45% Intermediate, and 7% Advanced.
Most participants are coming from the following institutional types: Public 4-year over 10,000 students (37%), Private 4-year under 10,000 students (16%), and Public 4-year under 10,000 students (14%). Last year, the top responses were: Public 4-year over 10,000 students (38%), Private 4-year under 10,000 students (19%), and Community college under 10,000 students (11%).
The top/most common responses for role from this year were: Staff (35%), Manager/Director (23%), and Administrator (13%). Student Affairs assessment professionals were the fourth most common response at 8%. This question was not previously asked, so there is no past data to compare with these results.
Geographically, these are the top places where participants are taking the course: North America (95%), Asia/Pacific (2%), and a tie of Middle East/North Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Europe all with 1%. Last year, the most common locations were in the same order, just with different amounts (91%, 6%, tie at 1%, respectively). Generally, the course is pulling from the same geographic regions year after year, though there were more Asia/Pacific participants represented.
With location in mind, 94% of participants speak English as their native language. This number is similar to last year (90%).
The most common responses for highest level of education this year were: Master’s Degree (60%), Terminal/doctoral degree (23%), and Completed 4-year degree (8%). This year’s results largely mirror last year’s results (59%, 20%, 9%, respectively). This year’s course seems to have attracted participants with a bit more advanced degrees.
Most common ages of participants this year were: 25-34 years (32%), 35-44 years (28%), and 45-54 years (22%). This year’s results largely mirror last year’s results (34%, 31%, 18%, respectively).
Reported sex from participants this year were as follows: Female (71%), Male (24%), Prefer not to disclose (5%). These numbers are similar to last year’s results (71%, 27%, 2%, respectively).
Gender identification reporting from participants this year were as follows: Woman (70%), Male (22%), Prefer not to disclose (4%), and a tie of Genderqueer, Non-Binary, and Agender at 1%. Last year’s data largely mirror this year’s data (71%, 25%, 3%, and 1%, respectively).
The top/most common responses for race/ethnicity were: White (62%); Hispanic/Latinx (11%); African-American/Black (11%); Not listed (5%); with South Asian, Asian-American, East Asian, and African all tied at 2%; as well as Southeast Asian, Middle Eastern, and Indigenous American/First Nations tied at 1%. This question was not previously asked, so there is no past data to compare with these results.
Demographic Disaggregation

Data reporting will now shift away from the aggregate to filter responses for respondents who completed the course, contrasting a completer profile with the overall respondent profile. In filtering for course completers who responded to the Welcome Survey, the overall sample of 549 survey respondents filters down to 136.

![Course Marketing – Completers](chart)

The top three ways people heard of the course are largely the same: friend or colleague is the same at 55%, from sponsoring institution is similar (17% with completers, 18% with all), and through social media (14% with completers, 8% with all). These were the same top three ways with completers last year, too.
The top three reasons for taking the course are the same and nearly the same distribution between the overall population and the completers. The top reason is the same at 40%, gain skills for a new career had 19% for all but 17% for completers, and gain skills for a promotion at work had 17% for all but 16% for completers. These were similar top reasons and distributions as last year’s completers.
The top four experience options were the same for overall participants and completers, with just slightly different distributions. Overall data had At School (44%), Coursera (14%), and Canvas (13%) tied with Other (13%), whereas completers (data above) had Canvas at 14%. Completer results and distribution mirror last year’s results.
The overall population was 53% passive, 38% active, 5% observer, and 3% drop-in. Our completers had fewer passive participants (49%), more active participants (46%), and fewer observer (3%) and drop-ins (2%). It makes sense active participation would jump to the top, given these are completers, but it is interesting that passive participants is nearly as high - this also occurred with last year’s completer results.
Anticipated hours were about the same, with 96% of overall respondents expecting to spend 4 hours or less on the course per week and completers with 97% expecting the same. Furthermore, 69% overall respondents anticipated spending 2 hours or less on the course per week, 70% of completers. These results are largely the same as what was reported last year. Borrowing from the end-of-course/User Experience Survey results, we know respondents were not far off in their predictions: 93% of all User Experience respondents reported spending 4 hours or less on the course each week and 75% of all respondents reported spending 2 hours or less each week.
The completer profile mirrors the overall profile with respect to percent of job dedicated to assessment, with over 70% with 40% or less of their job dedicated to assessment for both. These results/trends were mirrored with last year’s results.
The overall population was 46% Beginner, 45% Intermediate, and 9% Advanced. Our completers represent slightly less Beginner folks (40%), slightly more Intermediate (49%), and slightly more Advanced (12%). These results mirror last year’s data. It is worth considering this competency data in relation to amount of job dedicated to assessment, where majority of folks (70%+ for overall and completers) had 0-20% and 21-40% of their jobs dedicated to assessment.
The institutional types have a similar distribution among completer and the overall profile, with top three options being in the same order but values for overall folks being slightly lower here (37% at Public 4-year over 10,000, 16% at Private 4-year under 10,000, and 14% at Public 4-year under 10,000 students), more distributed with the community college options. The alignment of overall and completer profiles here mirrors last year’s results.
The top/most common responses for role are similar between overall and completers: Staff (35% overall, 32% completer), Manager/Director (23% overall, 22% completer), and Administrator (13% overall, 11% completer). This question was not previously asked, so there is no past data to compare with these results.
As far as location is concerned, both the overall and completer profiles are over 90% from North America. The completers were one percentage point more from North America and Asia/Pacific; the same with Middle East/North Africa, Latin America, and Sub-Saharan Africa; and one percentage point less/no completers from Europe. These trends mirror last year’s results.
Overall respondents and completers had the same distribution of English as their native language - 94%. This similar profile outcome mirrors last year’s results.
The distribution of responses for highest level of education is relatively the same for overall and completer profiles. Completers had slightly less master’s degree and slightly more doctorate/terminal degree folks compared to the overall profile (60% and 23%, respectively). The similarity between completer and overall respondent profiles here mirrors last year’s results.
Despite the completer profile presenting slightly higher levels of education attained compared to the overall profile, the overall and completer age profiles are relatively the same. It was the same distribution of 35-44 years and 55-64 years (28% and 11%); completers were less in the 25-34 years (32% for overall), 19-24 yrs (6% overall), and 65+ years (1% overall); but completers had one percentage point more 45-54 years (22% overall). Similar completer and overall respondent profiles was the same in last year’s results.
The completer profile is pretty similar to the overall profile with respect to sex, with completers slightly more male (29% compared to 24%) and less female (68% compared to 71%). The similarity of profiles mirrors last year’s results.
The completer profile is pretty similar to the overall profile with respect to gender, with slightly more completers identifying as men (27% compared to 22%) and less as women (67% compared to 70%). The completer profile and overall profile being similar mirrors last year’s results.
It is exciting to see our completer profile is slightly more diverse of race/ethnicity makeup compared to the overall profile. The top/most common responses for race/ethnicity were: White (66% completers, 62% overall); African-American/Black (9% completers, 11% overall), Hispanic/Latinx (7% completers, 11% overall); Not listed (5% completer and overall); Asian-American (4% completer, 2% overall), South Asian (3% completer, 2% overall), African (2% completer and overall); and Southeast Asian, East Asian, and Middle Eastern all at 1% (completer and overall), but lost the representation of Indigenous American/First Nations (0% completer, 1% overall). This question was not previously asked, so there is no past data to compare with these results.
Overall Completer and Demographics Reflection

The following is a narrative profile summary of the course participants looking across the majority responses for demographics.

Participants are largely hearing about the course from friends of colleagues, from SAAL, or through social media. They take the course because they enjoy learning about topics that interest them and hope to gain skills for a promotion or new career. While they have online experience from school or through other MOOC providers, course takers identify almost split as passive and active participants for this course and they anticipate spending 1-2 hours per week on the course.

Course takers have 40% or less of their jobs dedicated to assessment and identify as intermediate or beginners with respect to their assessment competency. They hold all sorts of roles at institutions, primarily staff and managers/directors. They attend from all types of institutions, but the largest concentration are in public 4-year over 10,000 and private 4-year under 10,000. While we have course takers from all over the world, the vast majority are from North America and the vast majority of participants speak English as their native language.

Course participants typically have master’s degrees, the next largest group has terminal degrees. The course welcomed all ages of participants, but the highest populated age groups were 25-243, 35-44, and 45-54. Course participants are mostly female and primarily identify as women. While many races and ethnicities are represented, the majority of participants identified as White.

Because course completers had a near identical demographic distribution/profile as the initial sample of survey respondents, the above narrative profile holds true for them, too.

Thank you for your interest in the results of our welcome survey!
Report Orientation

Quizzes were part of seven of the eight modules of the course. This report provides overall grade results per quiz, as well as results per question of each quiz. Data and visualizations are presented in aggregate and per quiz, as well as overall quiz results disaggregated by participant demographics. These demographics were reported in the Welcome Survey - non-required questions in a non-required survey - leaving room for sample size to differ. Total sample size per demographic per question will be reported, accordingly.

Overall Results

In order to have a consistent sample size across quizzes (as many students attempted some quizzes but not others), quiz responses were filtered to contain students who consented to have their data used for analysis, as well as including quiz responses to earn course completion. This resulted in a sample of 176 course participants. It is worth noting this resulting sample of 176 differs from overall course completers (153) since successful course completion requires scoring 75% or better on each quiz and on each written assignment. This section of the report focuses on quiz data, so the 176 sample represents course participants who scored 75% on each quiz and consented for their data to be reported.
Overall, quiz results are very positive with respect to demonstrated student learning. The mode quiz scores were the max values (100% correct score) per respective quiz, so average quiz scores are shown here to offer a bit more variability with respect to student performance in each quiz. Even with the averages, each quiz average is 93% correct or higher. These average scores were slightly down compared to last year’s data with two scores as the same, three lower than last year, and two higher than last year. Last year’s details compared to this year’s, respectively, include: 2021 Quiz 1 was higher with 97.5%, 2021 Quiz 2 higher with 96.6%, 2021 Quiz 3 was higher with 99.2%, 2021 Quiz 4 was the same, 2021 Quiz 5 was slightly lower with 99%, 2021 Quiz 6 was the same, and 2021 Quiz 7 was lower with 96.8%.

**Individual Quiz Results**

It is helpful to look at individual quiz results, especially to see if certain questions were more difficult for students than others. Such situations can be a sign that either the course content did not appropriately prepare the student or that the question may not be appropriately designed. Again, after filtering quiz responses for just course completers to have a valid and consistent sample size, below are plots per quiz showing the percent of students answering each question correct.

As one might infer from the overall results, individual quiz scores are fairly high. As such, pay attention to the scale for each quiz. With such high scoring results (mostly 90% or above), the scales are usually just showing 10 percentage points.
Correct Quiz 1 Questions

Percent Correct Quiz 1 Questions
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Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7

0.97
96.6%
0.98
99.4%
1.00
100%
0.99
99.4%
0.98
99.4%
0.97
98.3%
0.98
97.2%
Correct Quiz 6 Questions

Quiz 6 Questions

Percent Correct Quiz 6 Questions
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Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Q5 Q6 Q7 Q8
Overall, individual question scores were high across quizzes. With Quiz 1 having the lowest overall average quiz score, it is not too surprising to see Q5 in Quiz 1 average 85.8% as the lowest overall quiz question score across all quizzes. This is a bit surprising since the rest of the Quiz 1 questions averaged 92% or higher. Interestingly enough, Quiz 1 had the second lowest question score, 89.1% for Q5 - this gives reason for the instructors to look at the question structure and Module 1 course content related to Q5 for Quiz 1.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, it is now three years running that Quizzes 3 and 5 have the highest overall average grades - this year with no individual average question scores below 96%. 
Demographic Disaggregation

This section disaggregates the overall quiz results by completer demographics. As such, results are filtered from all course participants (1047) to those who completed the course (153). Then, the results are further filtered to remove course participants who did not consent to their data being used for reporting purposes, bringing the sample to 150. Finally, results per demographic question may vary in sample size due to consenting course completers who may not have answered specific demographic questions or taken the Welcome Survey at all (where demographic data is gathered). Know the maximum possible sample size of completers who took the Welcome Survey is 136.

Online Learner Type

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online_Learner_Type</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participant</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive participant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

Figure 1: Online Learner Type by Overall Quiz Grades

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around online learner type, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Active Participant folks scored:

- 35% with grades of 100%
- 6% with grades of 99%
- 19% with grades of 98%
- 0% with grades of 97%
• 10% with grades of 96%
• 10% with grades of 95%
• 3% with grades of 94%
• 1% with grades of 93%
• 6% with grades of 92%
• 4% with grades of 91%
• 3% with grades of 90%
• 2% with grades of 89%
• 0% with grades of 88%

Except for Drop-in folks, the majority of participants (64% or more) regardless of online learner type had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the Drop in folks (33%), followed by the Passive participant folks (12%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from the Observer folks followed by Active participant folks.
Anticipated Hours Spent on Course

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Anticipated</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 hr</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

![Figure 2: Hours Anticipated by Overall Quiz Grades](image)

In the above dot plot, **data are oriented around anticipated hours**, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the 1-2 hours folks scored:

- 26% with grades of 100%
- 6% with grades of 99%
- 16% with grades of 98%
- 3% with grades of 97%
- 12% with grades of 96%
- 8% with grades of 95%
- 2% with grades of 94%
- 3% with grades of 93%
- 2% with grades of 92%
- 7% with grades of 91%
- 4% with grades of 90%
- 2% with grades of 89%
• 3% with grades of 88%
• 0% with grades of 87%
• 1% with grades of 86%
• 1% with grades of 85%

The majority of participants (67% or more) regardless of anticipated hours had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the 1-2 hours folks (9%), followed by the 3-4 hours folks (3%). Interestingly, the most perfect scores across all quizzes also came from the 1-2 hours folks followed by 3-4 hours folks.
Percent of Job Dedicated to Assessment

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent_Role_Assessment</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around percent of job dedicated to assessment, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the 81-100% of job dedicated to assessment folks scored:

- 29% with grades of 100%
- 6% with grades of 99%
- 12% with grades of 98%
- 6% with grades of 97%
- 24% with grades of 96%
- 6% with grades of 95%
- 6% with grades of 94%
- 6% with grades of 93%
- 6% with grades of 92%
• 0% with grades of 91%-85%

The majority of participants (66% or more) regardless of percent of job dedicated to assessment had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the 41-60% folks (16%), followed by 0-20% folks (9%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from the 41-60% folks and the 21-40% folks.
Self-Reported Assessment Competency

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Competency</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

![Assessment Competency by Overall Quiz Grades](image)

Figure 4: Assessment Competency by Overall Quiz Grades

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around self-reported assessment competency, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Advanced folks scored:

- 43% with grades of 100%
- 0% with grades of 99%
- 7% with grades of 98%
- 0% with grades of 97%
- 29% with grades of 96%
- 7% with grades of 95%
- 0% with grades of 94%
- 0% with grades of 93%
- 0% with grades of 92%
- 7% with grades of 91%
- 0% with grades of 90%
• 0% with grades of 89%
• 7% with grades of 88%
• 0% with grades of 87%-85%

The majority of participants (65% or more) regardless of assessment competency had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the Beginner folks (10%), followed by Intermediate folks (9%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from the Advanced folks followed by Intermediate folks.
Institutional Type

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional_Type</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year(+) over 10,000</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year(+) under 10,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college over 10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year(+) under 10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college under 10,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year(+) over 10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around institutional type, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Community College under 10,000 folks scored:

- 46% with grades of 100%
- 0% with grades of 99%
- 23% with grades of 98%
- 0% with grades of 97%
- 0% with grades of 96%
- 8% with grades of 95%
- 0% with grades of 94%
- 0% with grades of 93%

Figure 5: Institutional Type by Overall Quiz Grades
• 8% with grades of 92%
• 0% with grades of 91%
• 0% with grades of 90%
• 8% with grades of 89%
• 0% with grades of 88%
• 8% with grades of 87%
• 0% with grades of 86%-85%

Except for Community Colleges over 10,000 and Private 4-year over 10,000 folks, the majority of participants (61% or more) regardless of institutional type had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the Private 4-year over 10,000 folks (25%), followed by Community College under 10,000 folks (16%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from the Community College under 10,000 folks and the Other folks.
Role

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Director</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - Academic Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - Student Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student - Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - General</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

Figure 6: Role by Overall Quiz Grades

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around role, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Assessment Professional - General folks scored:

- 50% with grades of 100%
- 12% with grades of 99%
- 12% with grades of 98%
- 0% with grades of 97%
- 12% with grades of 96%
- 0% with grades of 95%
- 12% with grades of 94%
- 0% with grades of 93%-85%
The majority of participants (63% or more) regardless of role had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by Manager/Director folks (13%), followed by Student-Graduate folks (10%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from Assessment Professional - General folks followed by Administrator folks.
Geographic Location

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/North Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

![Figure 7: Location by Overall Quiz Grades](image)

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around geographic location, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the North America folks scored:

- 23% with grades of 100%
- 5% with grades of 99%
- 18% with grades of 98%
- 3% with grades of 97%
- 15% with grades of 96%
- 9% with grades of 95%
- 3% with grades of 94%
- 3% with grades of 93%
- 4% with grades of 92%
- 6% with grades of 91%
- 3% with grades of 90%
- 2% with grades of 89%
- 2% with grades of 88%
- 1% with grades of 87%
- 1% with grades of 86%
- 2% with grades of 85%
With the exception of Asia/Pacific folks, the majority of participants (73% or more) regardless of location had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the North America folks (8%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from Middle East/North Africa and Latin America folks.
**English as Native Language**

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native_English</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

![Figure 8: Native English by Overall Quiz Grades](image)

In the above dot plot, **data are oriented around English as native language**, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Yes folks scored:

- 21% with grades of 100%
- 6% with grades of 99%
- 18% with grades of 98%
- 3% with grades of 97%
- 14% with grades of 96%
- 9% with grades of 95%
- 4% with grades of 94%
- 3% with grades of 93%
- 3% with grades of 92%
- 7% with grades of 91%
- 3% with grades of 90%
- 2% with grades of 89%
- 2% with grades of 88%
- 1% with grades of 87%
- 1% with grades of 86%
- 2% with grades of 85%
The majority of participants (71% or more) regardless of English as native language had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the Yes folks (8%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from No folks followed by Yes folks.
**Education Level**

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree (or equivalent)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., or M.D. (or equivalent)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 4-year college degree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 2-year college degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

![Education Level by Overall Quiz Grades](image)

**Figure 9: Education Level by Overall Quiz Grades**

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around education level, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Terminal Degree (PhD, EdD, JD, MD or equivalent) folks scored:

- 33% with grades of 100%
- 6% with grades of 99%
- 15% with grades of 98%
- 3% with grades of 97%
- 18% with grades of 96%
- 0% with grades of 95%
- 6% with grades of 94%
- 0% with grades of 93%
- 9% with grades of 92%
- 3% with grades of 91%
- 0% with grades of 90%
- 0% with grades of 89%
- 0% with grades of 88%
- 3% with grades of 87%
- 0% with grades of 86%
• 3% with grades of 85%

The majority of participants (70% or more) regardless of education level had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by the Completed 4-year college degree folks (18%), followed by the Terminal Degree folks (6%) and Master’s Degree or equivalent folks (6%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from the Completed 2-year college degree folks followed by Terminal Degree folks.
Age

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

In the above dot plot, **data are oriented around age**, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the 55-64yr old folks scored:

- 31% with grades of 100%
- 8% with grades of 99%
- 8% with grades of 98%
- 0% with grades of 97%
- 8% with grades of 96%
- 0% with grades of 95%
- 8% with grades of 94%
- 0% with grades of 93%
- 0% with grades of 92%
- 23% with grades of 91%
- 0% with grades of 90%
- 0% with grades of 89%
- 0% with grades of 88%
- 0% with grades of 87%
- 8% with grades of 86%

Figure 10: Age by Overall Quiz Grades
• 8% with grades of 85%

Except for 55-64yr olds, the majority of participants (66% or more) regardless of age had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by 55-64yr old folks (16%), followed by 45-54yr old folks (12%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from 55-64yr old folks followed by 35-44yr old folks.
Sex

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around sex, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Females scored:

- 26% with grades of 100%
- 5% with grades of 99%
- 18% with grades of 98%
- 3% with grades of 97%
- 12% with grades of 96%
- 7% with grades of 95%
- 5% with grades of 94%
- 2% with grades of 93%
- 4% with grades of 92%
- 7% with grades of 91%
- 2% with grades of 90%
- 1% with grades of 89%
- 3% with grades of 88%
- 1% with grades of 87%
- 0% with grades of 86%
• 3% with grades of 85%

The majority of participants (71% or more) regardless of sex had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by Females (8%), followed by Males (6%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from Females followed by Males.
Gender

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

Figure 12: Gender by Overall Quiz Grades

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around gender, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, Women scored:

- 24% with grades of 100%
- 6% with grades of 99%
- 19% with grades of 98%
- 3% with grades of 97%
- 12% with grades of 96%
- 7% with grades of 95%
- 6% with grades of 94%
- 2% with grades of 93%
- 4% with grades of 92%
- 6% with grades of 91%
- 2% with grades of 90%
- 1% with grades of 89%
- 3% with grades of 88%
- 1% with grades of 87%
- 0% with grades of 86%
- 3% with grades of 85%
The majority of participants (67% or more) regardless of gender had overall average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by Women (8%), followed by Men (6%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from Agender folks followed by Prefer not to disclose folks.
Race and Ethnicity

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for quiz results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

In the above dot plot, data are oriented around race and ethnicity, giving the percent of responses for overall quiz grades. As an example, the Asian-American folks scored:

- 60% with grades of 100%
- 0% with grades of 99%
- 20% with grades of 98%
- 0% with grades of 97%
- 0% with grades of 96%
- 0% with grades of 95%
- 0% with grades of 94%
- 0% with grades of 93%
- 0% with grades of 92%
• 0% with grades of 91%
• 0% with grades of 90%
• 0% with grades of 89%
• 20% with grades of 88%
• 0% with grades of 87%-85%

Half of the race and ethnicity groups (Asian-American, Middle Eastern, Hispanic/Latinx, African, and White) had 75% or more average quiz grades of 95% or higher, with the most scores below 90% reported by Southeast Asian folks (100%), followed by Asian-American folks (20%). Most perfect scores across all quizzes came from Middle Eastern folks followed by Asian-American folks.

Overall Demographic Reflection

Across quiz scores and demographics, there are some interesting results when disaggregating data by demographic groups. Looking across a given demographic’s scores (i.e., across all groups within a given demographic), the most participants with overall quiz scores of 95% or higher was viewing scores by geographic location (73%), followed by native English speakers and sex (both 71%), and education level (70%). The least participants with overall quiz scores of 95% or more was viewing by institutional type (61%), followed by role (63%) and online learner type (64%).

Borrowing from the rubric results, it is worth sharing geographic location was a view of high scores across modules 3 and 5, while native English speakers, sex, and role were all views of low scores across modules 3 and 5.

The following demographics noted in overall quiz results had lopsided distribution of 50% or more of participants within the groups’ options for being the same response: geographic location, native English speaker and sex (all noted as higher scores, respectively), as well as online learner type (noted as a lower score). There were other demographic groups with lopsided distribution but didn’t have high or low scores, respectively (anticipated hours spent on course, education level, and race and ethnicity). I also looked at whether questions with less than a certain number of answer options yielded any interesting insights with respect to high and low scores: one demographic with low scores (online learner type), two with high scores (sex and native English speakers).

Within each demographic and its options, groups did fairly well overall (which makes sense considering all quiz scores averaged 93% or higher). We will plan to do this similar disaggregation next year to see how results may or may not look different within and across demographics. Future analyses could dig deeper than these descriptives to truly examine relationships between variables. There’s plenty of data to explore, but we’ll end here given this report is already quite lengthy!

Thank you for your interest in the results of our quizzes. Know this data will be reviewed by instructors for course changes and improvements.
Assignment Rubric Results SP2022

Joe Levy

7/8/2022

Report Orientation

Module 3 and Module 5 both had assignments scored by rubrics (30 points and 25 points, respectively). Participants needed to score a 75% or better on each assignment as one of the conditions to earn the course badge (score 23 or better for Module 3 assignment and score 19 or better for Module 5 assignment). This document first presents overall data for each assignment, then disaggregates scores according to participant demographics.

Overall Results

In looking to analyze the results, responses were filtered for only participants who consented to using their data for assessment or report-related purposes. This resulted in a sample of 179 participant artifacts for the Module 3 assignment and 160 participant artifacts for the Module 5 assignment. It is worth noting these resulting samples of 179 and 160 differ from overall course completers (153) since successful course completion requires scoring 75% or better on each quiz and on each written assignment.
### Descriptive Statistics per Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total_paper_grade</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Complete</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ncol</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
<td>179.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol_null</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.na</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.min</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.max</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.range</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.median</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.mean</td>
<td>26.98</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>4.737</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.SE.mean</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.CI.mean</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.var</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.std.dev</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ncol.coef.var</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mode</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table contains the descriptive statistics for the Module 3 assignment scores. Of note, the mode score was 30 out of 30 overall, with the following mode scores per rubric dimensions: Outcomes 5/5, Method 5/5, Relationship 5/5, Complete 5/5, References 5/5, and Flow 5/5. More detail on descriptive stats are above. Last year, the mode score was 28 out of 30 and the mode score for the References dimension was 3/5.
The above table contains the descriptive statistics for the Module 5 assignment scores. Of note, the mode score was 25 out of 25 overall, with the following mode scores per rubric dimension: Connection 5/5, Critical lens 5/5, Complete 5/5, References 5/5, and Flow 5/5. More detail on descriptive stats are above. Last year, the mode score was 23 out of 25 and the mode score for the References dimension was 3/5.

Overall, course participants performed very well on the assignments. It is worth repeating, these data were not filtered for course completers; aside from people who did not want their data to be used for analysis purposes, these data reflect all submitted assignments by course participants. The next section of the report helps get into more detailed performance of participants per assignment rubric.
The visualization above showcases the average score from participants in order to portray the variability in scores for each dimension of the Module 3 assignment rubric. The areas participants scored the highest was assignment flow and addressing relationship in the prompt (both averaging 99%), whereas the areas participants scored the lowest were accounting for references informing their response (75%) and responding to the appropriateness of learning outcomes in the prompt (79%). Last year, flow and completeness of response were the top score areas (98% and 96%, respectively), with the same lowest scoring areas with lower values (70% and 72%, respectively).
The visualization above showcases the average score from respondents in relation to each dimension of the Module 5 assignment rubric. The areas participants scored the highest were assignment flow and applying a critical lens to the assignment (both averaging 99%), whereas the areas participants scored the lowest were accounting for references informing their response (79%) and making a personal or professional connection to the prompt in light of mental models (92%). Last year, flow and completeness of response were the top score areas (both 98%), with the same lowest scoring areas with lower values (73% and 89%, respectively).

Last year, there was a large amount of course participants who wanted more examples/case studies, as well as further clarification and instruction to introduce the assignments and explain the rubrics. While there were a few comments saying the assignments were intimidating, and several calling for more case studies since they were helpful, we believe the improvements made to the course since last year largely addressed these concerns and the higher scores reflect better learning.

The reference item in both assignments represent interesting data to consider. One might assume the reference results in the Module 5 assignment would be better than the results in Module 3, especially given feedback participants receive. While the score is four percentage points higher, it could be even higher if a) participants worked through the course in order and b) instructors provided more immediate assignment feedback. In practice, a good majority of course participants complete all the course quizzes and then go back to complete the assignments - often submitting both on the same day. And even if they complete the assignments one at a time, the sheer volume of assignments to be graded which are coming in at any given time given the asynchronous and self-paced nature of the course make timely grade responses a challenge. With course participants typically spending 2 or less hours per module, someone might submit their module 3 assignment one day, work through module 4 the same or next day, then submit their module 5 assignment the next day. As such, even if grading feedback was provided, they may not have checked it before working on or submitting the module 5 assignment. The instructors added more examples and instructions to exemplify expectations for this rubric point - which seems like it should be relatively easy to achieve - but it seems there is more work to be done for sake of clarity here.
To that end, while data are better than last year’s results and objectively high for each rubric point on both assignments where 75% overall score is needed for the badge, the instructors will still carefully consider course improvements to be made with respect to the assignments. They will review these data, discussion board information, user experience feedback, and module content (including instructions and videos) to see where changes could be made in hopes of increasing learning and enhancing participant experience.
Demographic Disaggregation

Data reporting will now shift away from the aggregate to report on participant performance in relation to rubric scores of each assignment in relation to student demographics. These data were further filtered for completers only, as well as respondents who answered demographic questions in the Welcome Survey. Total sample size per demographic may vary and will be reported accordingly, but the max sample would be 136 participants from the 179 of module 3 and 160 of module 5.

Module 3 Scores by Demographic

Online Learner Type

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner_Type</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participant</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive participant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.
Rubric 3 Scores by Learner Type

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around online learner type to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Active participants were distributed as:

- 46% with a perfect score of 30
- 30% with a score of 28
- 12% with a score of 26
- 1% with a score of 25
- 4% with a score of 24
- 1% with a score of 23
- 1% with a score of 22
- 3% with a score of 21
- 0% with a score of 18

Nearly all of folks (97% or better across groups), regardless of online learner type, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 67% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 33% or more folks per learning type who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. Active participants had the most perfect assignment scores among online learner types.
Anticipated Hours Spent On Course

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Hours</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 hr</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

Rubric 3 Scores by Anticipated Hours Spent on Course

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around anticipated hours spent on course to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for 1-2 hours folks were distributed as:
- 42% with a perfect score of 30
- 27% with a score of 28
• 16% with a score of 26
• 3% with a score of 25
• 4% with a score of 24
• 7% with a score of 23
• 0% with a score of 22
• 0% with a score of 21
• 1% with a score of 18

Vast majority of folks (91% or better across groups), regardless of anticipated hours spent on course, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 72% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 33% or more folks per anticipated hours groups who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The >9 hours and 7-8 hours folks had the most perfect assignment scores among anticipated hours spent on course. As that’s a combined sample of 2 people, it is worth noting the 50% of the 1-2 hour folks (44 people) were next highest group with perfect scores.
Percent of Job Dedicated to Assessment

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment_Percent_of_Job</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around percent of job dedicated to assessment to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the 0-20% folks were distributed as:

- 46% with a perfect score of 30
- 14% with a score of 28
- 18% with a score of 26
• 9% with a score of 25
• 4% with a score of 24
• 9% with a score of 23
• 0% with a score of 22
• 0% with a score of 21
• 0% with a score of 18

A vast majority of folks (88% or better across groups), regardless of percent of job dedicated to assessment, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 66% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 33% or more folks per percents of job dedicated to assessment who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The 81-100% folks had the most perfect assignment scores among percents of job dedicated to assessment, followed closely by the 0-20% folks.
Self-Reported Assessment Competency

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Competency</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around self-reported assessment competency to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the Beginner folks were distributed as:

- 45% with a perfect score of 30
- 21% with a score of 28
- 14% with a score of 26
- 5% with a score of 25
- 4% with a score of 24
• 11% with a score of 23
• 0% with a score of 22
• 0% with a score of 21
• 0% with a score of 18

A vast majority of folks (93% or better across groups), regardless of percent of job dedicated to assessment, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 80% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 36% or more folks per percents of job dedicated to assessment who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The Beginner folks had the most perfect assignment scores among percents of job dedicated to assessment.
Institutional Type

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community college over 10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college under 10,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year(+) over 10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year(+) under 10,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year(+) over 10,000</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year(+) under 10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around institutional type to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the Public 4-year over 10,000 folks were distributed as:

- 42% with a perfect score of 30
- 18% with a score of 28
- 14% with a score of 26
- 5% with a score of 25
- 9% with a score of 24
- 9% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 22
- 4% with a score of 21
- 0% with a score of 18

A vast majority of folks (90% or better across groups), regardless of institutional type, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 75% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment,
which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 30% or more folks per institutional type who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The Private 4-year under 10,000 folks had the most perfect assignment scores among institutional types.
Role

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - Academic Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - General</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - Student Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Director</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student - Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around **role** to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the Staff folks were distributed as:

- 33% with a perfect score of 30
- 23% with a score of 28
- 17% with a score of 26
- 8% with a score of 25
- 4% with a score of 24
- 8% with a score of 23
- 2% with a score of 22
- 2% with a score of 21
- 2% with a score of 18

A vast majority of folks (90% or better across groups), regardless of role, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 74% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts
to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 20% or more folks per role who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The Consultant role (1 person) had the most perfect assignment scores among roles (100%), with Assessment Professional - General following at 63%.
Geographic Location

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/North Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around geographic location to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the North America folks were distributed as:

- 41% with a perfect score of 30
- 25% with a score of 28
- 15% with a score of 26
- 5% with a score of 25
- 5% with a score of 24
- 6% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 22
- 2% with a score of 21
- 1% with a score of 18

All of the folks (100% across groups), regardless of location, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 79% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 25% or more folks per location who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. Latin America and Sub-Saharan Africa locations (1 person each) had the most perfect assignment scores among locations (100%), with North America following at 41%.
**English as Native Language**

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native_English</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around **English as native language** to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for native English speakers were distributed as:

- 42% with a perfect score of 30
- 25% with a score of 28
- 15% with a score of 26
- 5% with a score of 25
- 5% with a score of 24
- 6% with a score of 23
• 1% with a score of 22
• 1% with a score of 21
• 1% with a score of 18

The vast majority of folks (88% or better across groups), regardless of English as native language, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 64% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 12% of non-native English and 42% native English speakers scoring perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. Of the groups, Native English speakers had the most perfect assignment scores.
Education Level

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed 2-year college degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 4-year college degree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree (or equivalent)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., or M.D. (or equivalent)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around education level to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the Master’s Degree folks were distributed as:

- 38% with a perfect score of 30
- 27% with a score of 28
- 20% with a score of 26
- 6% with a score of 25
- 4% with a score of 24
- 4% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 22
- 0% with a score of 21
- 1% with a score of 18

A vast majority of folks (91% or better across groups), regardless of education level, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 73% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 27% or more folks per education level who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The Completed 2-year college and Some graduate school folks had the most perfect assignment scores among education levels.
Age

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around age to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for the 25-34yr folks were distributed as:

- 41% with a perfect score of 30
- 32% with a score of 28
- 18% with a score of 26
- 5% with a score of 25
• 0% with a score of 24
• 5% with a score of 23
• 0% with a score of 22
• 0% with a score of 21
• 0% with a score of 18

A vast majority of folks (92% or better across groups), regardless of age, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 72% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 33% or more folks per age who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The 55-64yr folks had the most perfect assignment scores among ages.
Sex

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around sex to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Females were distributed as:

- 42% with a perfect score of 30
- 27% with a score of 28
- 15% with a score of 26
- 2% with a score of 25
- 3% with a score of 24
- 7% with a score of 23
A vast majority of folks (97% or better across groups), regardless of sex, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 72% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 33% or more folks per sex who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The Prefer not to disclose folks had the most perfect assignment scores among sexes.
Gender

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot represents 135 participants, where module 3 assignment data are oriented around gender to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Women were distributed as:

- 44% with a perfect score of 30
- 26% with a score of 28
- 16% with a score of 26
• 2% with a score of 25
• 3% with a score of 24
• 7% with a score of 23
• 0% with a score of 22
• 2% with a score of 21
• 0% with a score of 18

A majority of folks (67% or better across groups), regardless of gender, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 67% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. There was also 20% or more folks per gender who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The Agender folks had the most perfect assignment scores among genders.
Race and Ethnicity

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 3 assignment data oriented around race and ethnicity to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for White folks were distributed as:

- 45% with a perfect score of 30
- 24% with a score of 28
- 16% with a score of 26
- 7% with a score of 25
- 3% with a score of 24
- 3% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 22
- 1% with a score of 21
- 0% with a score of 18
A majority of folks (74% or better across groups), regardless of race and ethnicity, had results equal to or above the passing score of 23, with 42% or more of all learners scoring a 26 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 87% or better on the assignment. With the exception of Middle Eastern and Southeast Asian (both samples of 1), there was also 22% or more folks per race and ethnicity who scored perfect 30/30 (100%) on the assignment. The East Asian folks had the most perfect assignment scores among races and ethnicities.

Across module scores and demographics, there are some interesting results when disaggregating data by demographic groups. Looking across a given demographic’s scores (i.e., across all groups within a given demographic), the most participants with a passing score for module 3 was viewing scores by geographic location (100%), while the lowest was by gender (67%). The participants with the most perfect scores was by assessment competency (36%), while the lowest was by native English speakers.

Similar cross-demographic insight is offered after module 5 information, in addition to some overall reflection of module scores in relation to demographics.
Module 5 Scores by Demographic

Online Learner Type

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner_Type</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active participant</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop in</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive participant</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around online learner type to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Active participants were distributed as:

- 74% with a perfect score of 25
- 12% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 21
- 13% with a score of 20
- 1% with a score of 18

Nearly all of folks (99% or better across groups), regardless of online learner type, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 67% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 33% or more folks per learning type
who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. Active participants had the most perfect assignment scores among online learner types.
Anticipated Hours Spent on Course

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated_Hours</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 hr</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;9 hrs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 hours</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-6 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around anticipated hours spent on course to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for 1-2 hour folks were distributed as:

- 70% with a perfect score of 25
- 12% with a score of 23
- 1% with a score of 21
- 16% with a score of 20
- 1% with a score of 18

Nearly all of folks (99% or better across groups), regardless of anticipated hours spent on course, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19. With the exception of the 7-8 hour group (1 person), 75% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. Again, except for the one 7-8 hour person, there was also 33% or more folks per anticipated hours who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The >9 hours group had the most perfect assignment scores among anticipated hours spent on course. Because that’s a sample of 1, it is worth noting the 75% of the 3-4 hour folks (27 people) had perfect scores.
Percent of Job Dedicated to Assessment

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment_Percent_of_Job</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-80%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-100%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around percent of job dedicated to assessment to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for 0-20% folks were distributed as:

- 64% with a perfect score of 25
- 14% with a score of 23
- 2% with a score of 21
- 18% with a score of 20
- 2% with a score of 18

Nearly all of folks (98% or better across groups), regardless of percent of job dedicated to assessment, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 80% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 64% or more folks per percents of job dedicated to assessment who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The 41-60% folks had the most perfect assignment scores among percents of job dedicated to assessment.
Self-Reported Assessment Competency

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment_Competency</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around self-reported assessment competency to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Beginner folks were distributed as:

- 79% with a perfect score of 25
- 14% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 21
- 7% with a score of 20
- 0% with a score of 18
All of folks (100% across groups), regardless of percent of job dedicated to assessment, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 64% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 57% or more folks per percents of job dedicated to assessment who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The Beginner folks had the most perfect assignment scores among percents of job dedicated to assessment.
Institutional Type

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional_Type</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community college over 10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community college under 10,000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year(+) over 10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private 4-year(+) under 10,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year(+) over 10,000</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public 4-year(+) under 10,000</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around institutional type to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Public 4-year over 10,000 folks were distributed as:

- 68% with a perfect score of 25
- 16% with a score of 23
- 2% with a score of 21
- 14% with a score of 20
- 0% with a score of 18

The vast majority of folks (93% or better across groups), regardless of institutional type, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 60% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 46% or more folks per institutional types who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The Private 4-year over 10,000 folks had the most perfect assignment scores among institutional types.
Role

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - Academic Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - General</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Professional - Student Affairs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager/Director</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student - Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot represents 135 participants, where module 5 assignment data are oriented around role to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 5 rubric scores for Staff folks were distributed as:

- 69% with a perfect score of 25
- 13% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 21
- 19% with a score of 20
- 0% with a score of 18

The majority of folks (80% or better across groups), regardless of role, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 40% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 40% or more folks per role who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The Consultant role (1 person) had the most perfect assignment scores among roles (100%), with Administrators following at 85%.
Geographic Location

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East/North Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around location to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 5 rubric scores for North American folks were distributed as:

- 70% with a perfect score of 25
- 12% with a score of 23
- 2% with a score of 21
- 16% with a score of 20
- 0% with a score of 18

All of folks (100% across groups), regardless of location, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 72% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment (except for Middle East/North Africa), which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. Again expecting Middle East/North Africa (1 person), there was also 70% or more folks per location who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. Asia/Pacific and Sub-Saharan Africa locations (1 person each) had the most perfect assignment scores among locations (100%), with North America following at 70%.
**English as Native Language**

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 134 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native_English</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 134 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around **English as native language** to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for native English speakers were distributed as:

- 70% with a perfect score of 25
- 12% with a score of 23
- 2% with a score of 21
- 16% with a score of 20
- 1% with a score of 18
A vast majority of folks (99% or better across groups), regardless of English as native language, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 75% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 62% of non-native English and 70% native English speakers scoring perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. Of the groups, Native English speakers had the most perfect assignment scores.
Education Level

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed 2-year college degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed 4-year college degree</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree (or equivalent)</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., Ed.D., J.D., or M.D. (or equivalent)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate school</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around education level to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Master’s Degree folks were distributed as:

- 70% with a perfect score of 25
- 10% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 21
- 19% with a score of 20
- 1% with a score of 18

The vast majority of folks (99% or better across groups), regardless of education level, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 50% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 50% or more folks per education level who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The Some graduate school folks had the most perfect assignment scores among education levels.
Age

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around age to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for 25-34yr folks were distributed as:

- 68% with a perfect score of 25
- 14% with a score of 23
- 0% with a score of 21
- 18% with a score of 20
• 0% with a score of 18

The vast majority of folks (97% or better across groups), regardless of age, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 75% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 62% or more folks per age who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. The 55-64yr folks had the most perfect assignment scores among ages.
Sex

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around sex to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Females were distributed as:

- 72% with a perfect score of 25
- 10% with a score of 23
- 2% with a score of 21
- 16% with a score of 20
- 0% with a score of 18
The vast majority of folks (97% or better across groups), regardless of sex, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19, with 75% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. There was also 25% or more folks per sex who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. Females had the most perfect assignment scores among sexes.
Gender

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-binary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to disclose</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around gender to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for Women were distributed as:

- 73% with a perfect score of 25
- 10% with a score of 23
- 1% with a score of 21
- 16% with a score of 20
• 0% with a score of 18

The majority of folks (80% or better across groups), regardless of gender, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19. And, with the exception of Prefer not to disclose folks, 84% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. Except for Prefer not to disclose, there was also 67% or more folks per gender who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. Women and Men tied for having the most perfect assignment scores among genders.
Race and Ethnicity

Across the aggregate 136 consenting completer participants, 135 answered this question. Here is the demographic breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race_Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sample_Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American/Black</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Listed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following visual for module assignment results by this demographic represent these 135 participants.

The above dot plot is module 5 assignment data oriented around race and ethnicity to give the percent of responses in relation to rubric score. As an example, Module 3 rubric scores for White folks were distributed as:

- 68% with a perfect score of 25
- 12% with a score of 23
- 1% with a score of 21
- 18% with a score of 20
- 1% with a score of 18
Nearly all folks (99% or better across groups), regardless of race and ethnicity, had results equal to or above the passing score of 19. Except for Middle Eastern folks, 67% or more of all learners scoring a 23 or better on the assignment, which amounts to an 92% or better on the assignment. Again except for Middle Eastern folks, there was also 57% or more folks per race and ethnicity who scored perfect 25/25 (100%) on the assignment. East Asian and Southeast Asian folks had the most perfect assignment scores among races and ethnicities.

Across module scores and demographics, there are some interesting results when disaggregating data by demographic groups. Looking across a given demographic’s scores (i.e., across all groups within a given demographic), the most participants with a passing score for module 5 was viewing scores by assessment competency and geographic location (both 100%), while the lowest was by gender and role (both 80%). The participants with the most perfect scores was by geographic location (70%), while the lowest was by sex (25%).
Overall Demographics Reflection

Viewing scores by assessment competency resulted in the most perfect module 3 scores and the most participants with a module 5 passing score, similar to geographic location resulting in the most participants with a module 3 and module 5 passing score, as well as the most perfect module 5 scores. Conversely, viewing scores by gender resulted in the least amount of participants scoring passing module 3 and module 5 scores. Native English speakers had the least perfect module 3 scores, role had the least amount of participants scoring a passing module 5 score, and sex had the least amount of module 5 perfect scores.

Borrowing from the quiz results, it is worth sharing geographic location, native English speakers, and sex were views of high overall quiz scores; role was associated with low overall quiz scores across demographics.

The following demographics noted in module 3 and 5 results had lopsided distribution of 50% or more of participants within the groups’ options for being the same response: gender, native English speaker, and sex (all were noted as lower scores, respectively). There were other demographic groups with lopsided distribution: geographic location had high scores across the modules, but online learner type, anticipated hours spent on course, education level, and race and ethnicity didn’t have high or low scores.

I also looked at whether questions with less than a certain number of answer options yielded any interesting insights with respect to high and low scores: two demographics with low scores (sex and native English speakers), one with high scores (assessment competency).

Within each demographic and its options, groups did fairly well overall (which makes sense considering the mode score for module 3 was 30/30 and module 5 was 25/25). We will plan to do this similar disaggregation next year to see how results may or may not look different within and across demographics. Future analyses could dig deeper than these descriptives to truly examine relationships between variables. There’s plenty of data to explore, but we’ll end here given this report is already quite lengthy!

Thank you for your interest in the results of our assignment rubric data! Know this data will be reviewed by instructors for course changes and improvements.
Report Orientation

The User Experience survey is the equivalent of an end of course evaluation for students to complete. Anyone could take the User Experience survey (e.g., you did not have to earn the course badge to access it), though it was typically only completed by students who worked their way through the entire course. This report only represents analysis of closed-ended/quantitative data from the survey.

Data and visualizations are presented per survey question overall, then disaggregated by participant demographics of percent of job dedicated to assessment and institutional type. These demographics were reported in the Welcome Survey - non-required questions in a non-required survey - leaving room for sample size to differ. Total sample size per demographic per question will be reported, accordingly.

Overall Results

In looking to analyze the results, the initial sample of 165 respondents was filtered for only students who consented to using their data for assessment or report-related purposes. For comparison purposes with other course data sets, respondents were further filtered by students who successfully completed the course and earned the course badge. This resulted in a sample of 132 responses.
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents, 95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the positive impact of course materials (videos, lecture material, readings). This year’s data is exactly the same as last year’s result.
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents, 95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to positive impact of course activities (quizzes, assignments, discussion boards). This year’s data is an improvement from last year’s result of 86% agree or strongly agree.
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for hours spent on the course each week, 75% of respondents indicated they spent 2 hours or less (up from 71% last year), with another 18% spending 3-4 hours per week (down from 20% last year). Instructors have structured the course with the expectation the average student will spend approximately 1-2 hours with the material, so these results indicate student behavior is mostly aligned with instructor intent.
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for **likelihood to recommend course**, 66% of respondents indicated a 9 or 10 (up from 58% last year), with another 25% responding with an 8 (up from 19% last year). With these numbers, the course should continue to get strong referrals!
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for *overall course rating*, 94% of respondents responded with a 4 of 5 out of 5 stars. This year’s data is a slight improvement from last year’s result of 93% responding with 4 or 5 stars.
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for instructor involvement preference, 67% of respondents indicated they like a variety (up from 63% last year), while 27% indicated they like to learn on their own (same as last year). Peer to peer learning was the same as last year, while interacting only with instructor dropped three percentage points (5%) and no instructor interaction increased one percentage point compared to last year (0%).
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for course length preference, 51% of respondents indicated a preference of 7-8 weeks, 35% indicated a preference of 5-6 weeks. The question last year had some overlapping scale points, but results were very similar (51% said 6-8 weeks, 29% said 4-6 weeks). Less people think the course should be longer than 8 weeks this year; last year there were 10% of folks in that camp.
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for positive smartphone experience, 86% of respondents indicated they didn’t use a smart phone to access the course, while 9% agreed or strongly agreed it was a positive experience, with 5% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing it was a positive experience. Last year’s survey had a neutral option which had 7% of respondents, but generally results were the same (80% did not use a smartphone, 10% strongly/agree, 4% strongly/disagree).
Looking across the survey sample of 132 respondents for positive tablet experience, 88% of respondents indicated they did not use a tablet to access the course, while 11% agreed or strongly agreed it was a positive experience, with 2% disagreeing or strongly disagreeing it was a positive experience. Last year’s survey had a neutral option which had 4% of respondents, but generally results were the same (77% did not use a tablet, 18% strongly/agree, 1% strongly/disagree).

A summary of results across these questions will be presented along with demographic reflection at the end of this report.
Demographic Disaggregation

Data reporting will now shift away from the aggregate to report on survey responses per question in relation to student demographics. These data were further filtered for completers only, as well as respondents who did not answer demographic questions. Total sample size per demographic will be reported, accordingly.

The disaggregated data by demographic will focus on two end-of-course questions: actual hours spent each week on the course and overall quality of the course. While there are other questions to disaggregate, we are choosing to present these results to see if there are marked differences in amount of time spent on the course by demographic, as well as the extent to which differences exist by demographic in rating the course’s overall quality.

Actual Hours

This section disaggregates the actual hours spent on the course per week by different demographics as reported in the Welcome Survey.

In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported online learner type. As an example, the passive participant responded:
• 11% <1 hr per week
• 65% 1-2 hours per week
• 17% 3-4 hours per week
• 6% 5-6 hours per week
• 2% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of online learner types spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. Nearly all course completers were active (50%) or passive participants (45%), each having 76% of their respondents spending 2 hours or less per week on the course.
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported anticipated hours spent per week. We’re checking initial assumptions/plans for the course against reality as reported by completers! As an example, the 1-2 hours folks responded:

- 9% <1 hr per week
- 74% 1–2 hours per week
- 12% 3–4 hours per week
- 5% 5–6 hours per week
- 0% >9 hrs per week

Again, the vast majority of completers across initial anticipated hour responses spent 4 hours or less per week on the course. Nearly all course completers indicated they would spend 1-2 hours per week (68%) or 3-4 hours per week on the course (26%), each having majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (83% and 61%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported percent of job dedicated to assessment. As an example, the 0-20% folks responded:

- 8% <1 hr per week
- 69% 1-2 hours per week
- 15% 3-4 hours per week
- 8% 5-6 hours per week
- 0% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks - regardless of amount of job dedicated to assessment - spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. A majority of course completers have 0-20% (43%) or 21-40% of their job dedicated to assessment (30%), each having majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (77% and 72%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported assessment competency. As an example, the Intermediate folks responded:

- 7% < 1 hr per week
- 68% 1-2 hours per week
- 18% 3-4 hours per week
- 5% 5-6 hours per week
- 2% > 9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks across assessment competency levels spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. A majority of course completers were Intermediate (50%) or Beginner (39%), each having each having majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (77% and 75%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported institutional type. As an example, the Public 4-year over 10,000 folks responded:

- 2% <1 hr per week
- 68% 1-2 hours per week
- 21% 3-4 hours per week
- 9% 5-6 hours per week
- 0% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks across institutional types spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. Respondents were really split by institutional type, with the largest majority from Public 4-year over 10,000 (39%) and second majority from Private 4-year under 10,000 (16%); in both cases their majority of folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (70% and 79%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported role. As an example, the Staff folks responded:

- 11% <1 hr per week
- 66% 1-2 hours per week
- 16% 3-4 hours per week
- 7% 5-6 hours per week
- 0% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks across roles spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. Respondents were really split by role, with the largest majority from Staff (37%) and second majority from Manager/Director (21%); in both cases their majority of folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (77% and 72%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported location. As an example, the North American folks responded:

- 8% <1 hr per week
- 68% 1-2 hours per week
- 17% 3-4 hours per week
- 6% 5-6 hours per week
- 0% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks across locations spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. The majority of course completers were from North America (95%), having a majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (76%).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported **Native English Speakers**. As an example, the North American folks responded:

- 8% <1 hr per week
- 69% 1-2 hours per week
- 16% 3-4 hours per week
- 5% 5-6 hours per week
- 1% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks regardless of English as native language spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. The majority of course completers were are Native English Speakers (93%), having a majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (77%). Nice to know non-native English Speakers were not far behind with 75% of their respondents spending 4 hours or less per week on the course.
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported education level. As an example, the Master’s Degree folks responded:

- 9% <1 hr per week
- 70% 1-2 hours per week
- 18% 3-4 hours per week
- 1% 5-6 hours per week
- 1% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks across education levels spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. The majority of course completers were had Master’s Degrees (62%) or Terminal Degrees with Ph.D., Ed.D, J.D., or M.D. (23%), each having a majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (79% and 75%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported age. As an example, the 25-34yr folks responded:

- 8% <1 hr per week
- 71% 1-2 hours per week
- 16% 3-4 hours per week
- 0% 5-6 hours per week
- 5% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks across age groups spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. Age groups were fairly split, with the largest majority as 25-34yr olds (32%) followed by 35-44yr olds (28%), having a majority of folks in both groups spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (79% and 76%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported sex. As an example, Females responded:

- 9% <1 hr per week
- 65% 1-2 hours per week
- 19% 3-4 hours per week
- 6% 5-6 hours per week
- 1% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks regardless of sex spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. The majority of course completers were female (67%), having a majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (74%).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported gender. As an example, Women responded:

- 9% <1 hr per week
- 65% 1-2 hours per week
- 18% 3-4 hours per week
- 6% 5-6 hours per week
- 1% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks regardless of gender spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. The majority of course completers were Women (64%), having a majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (74%).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around actual hours spent on course each week, giving the percent of responses by self-reported race and ethnicity. As an example, White respondents indicated:

- 9% <1 hr per week
- 70% 1-2 hours per week
- 16% 3-4 hours per week
- 4% 5-6 hours per week
- 1% >9 hrs per week

The vast majority of folks regardless of race and ethnicity spent less 4 hours or less per week on the course. The majority of course completers were White (66%), having a majority of their folks spending 2 hours or less per week on the course (79%).
Overall Rating

This section disaggregates the overall course rating by different demographics as reported in the Welcome Survey.

In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported online learner type. As an example, the passive participant rated the course overall as:

- 44% 5 stars
- 48% 4 stars
- 7% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of online learner types rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. Nearly all course completers were active (50%) or passive participants (45%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (97% and 92%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported anticipated hours spent per week. As an example, the 1-2 hour respondents rated the course overall as:

- 53% 5 stars
- 41% 4 stars
- 6% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of anticipated hours spent per week rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. Nearly all course completers indicated they would spend 1-2 hours per week (68%) or 3-4 hours per week on the course (26%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (94% and 93%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported percent of job dedicated to assessment. As an example, the 0-20% of job dedicated to assessment respondents rated the course overall as:

- 49% 5 stars
- 43% 4 stars
- 8% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of amount of job dedicated to assessment rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. A majority of course completers have 0-20% (43%) or 21-40% of their job dedicated to assessment (30%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (92% and 97%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported assessment competency. As an example, the Intermediate respondents rated the course overall as:

- 60% 5 stars
- 37% 4 stars
- 3% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of assessment competency rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. A majority of course completers were Intermediate (50%) or Beginner (39%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (97% and 89%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported institutional type. As an example, the Public 4-year over 10,000 respondents rated the course overall as:

- 49% 5 stars
- 43% 4 stars
- 9% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless institutional type rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. Respondents were really split by institutional type, with the largest majority from Public 4-year over 10,000 (39%) and second majority from Private 4-year under 10,000 (16%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (92% and 95%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported role. As an example, the Staff respondents rated the course overall as:

- 47% 5 stars
- 44% 4 stars
- 9% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless role rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. Respondents were really split by role, with the largest majority from Staff (37%) and second majority from Manager/Director (21%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (91% and 92%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported location. As an example, North American respondents rated the course overall as:

- 53% 5 stars
- 41% 4 stars
- 6% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of location rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. The majority of course completers were from North America (95%), with the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (94%).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported **Native English Speakers**. As an example, the Yes/Native English speaking respondents rated the course overall as:

- 53% 5 stars
- 41% 4 stars
- 6% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of whether they are Native English speaking rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. A majority of course completers were Native English speakers (93%), with the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (94%).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported education level. As an example, the Master’s Degree respondents rated the course overall as:

- 55% 5 stars
- 40% 4 stars
- 5% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of education level rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. The majority of course completers were had Master’s Degrees (62%) or Terminal Degrees with Ph.D., Ed.D, J.D., or M.D. (23%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (95% and 100%, respectively).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported age. As an example, the 25-34 year old respondents rated the course overall as:

- 46% 5 stars
- 46% 4 stars
- 8% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of age rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. Age groups were fairly split, with the largest majority as 25-34yr olds (32%) followed by 35-44yr olds (28%), each having the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (92% and 94%, respectively).
Sex by Overall Rating of Course

In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported sex. As an example, Female respondents rated the course overall as:

- 56% 5 stars
- 38% 4 stars
- 6% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of sex rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. The majority of course completers were female (67%), with the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (94%).
In the above dot plot of 120 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported gender. As an example, the Women respondents rated the course overall as:

- 55% 5 stars
- 38% 4 stars
- 7% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

The vast majority of folks regardless of gender rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. The majority of course completers were Women (64%), with the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (93%).
In the above dot plot of 119 respondents, data are oriented around overall rating of quality for the course, giving the percent of responses by self-reported race and ethnicity. As an example, the White respondents rated the course overall as:

- 50% 5 stars
- 44% 4 stars
- 6% 3 stars
- 0% 2 or 1 stars

Except for Southeast Asian (1 respondent), the vast majority of folks regardless of race and ethnicity rated the overall course as 4 or 5 stars. The majority of course completers were White (66%), with the majority of their respondents rating the course 4 or 5 stars (94%).
Overall Reflection

95% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed to positive impact of course materials (videos, lecture material, readings) and course activities (quizzes, assignments, discussion boards). These results are the same or better from last year, in respective order.

75% of respondents indicated they spent 2 hours or less (up from 71% last year), with another 18% spending 3-4 hours per week (down from 20% last year).

66% of respondents indicated likelihood to recommend course as a 9 or 10 (up from 58% last year), with another 25% responding with an 8 (up from 19% last year).

94% of respondents rated course quality as 4 or 5 out of 5 stars. This year’s data is a slight improvement from last year’s result of 93% responding with 4 or 5 stars.

67% of respondents indicated instructor involvement should be a variety (up from 63% last year), while 27% indicated they like to learn on their own (same as last year). Peer to peer learning was the same as last year, while interacting only with instructor dropped three percentage points (5%) and no instructor interaction increased one percentage point compared to last year (0%).

51% of respondents indicated a course length preference of 7-8 weeks, 35% indicated a preference of 5-6 weeks. The question last year had some overlapping scale points, but results were very similar (51% said 6-8 weeks, 29% said 4-6 weeks). Less people think the course should be longer than 8 weeks this year; last year there were 10% of folks in that camp.
Demographic Reflection

The disaggregated data by demographic focused on two end-of-course questions: actual hours spent each week on the course and overall quality of the course.

Actual Hours

Overall, time spent on course results largely mirror the aggregate results (75%). Below are the summaries for the most populous option per demographic reporting 2hrs or less:

- 76% of **online learner types*
- 83% of initial anticipated hours
- 76% of folks regardless of amount of job dedicated to assessment
- 75% of folks across assessment competency levels
- 70% of folks across institutional types
- 77% of folks across roles
- 75% of folks across locations
- 77% of folks regardless of English as native language
- 79% of folks across education levels
- 79% of folks across age groups
- 74% of folks regardless of sex
- 74% of folks regardless of gender
- 79% of folks regardless of race and ethnicity

It is interesting to see how some results for 2 hours or less vary from disaggregation by one demographic to another. It was fun to review the initial anticipated hours as a population in relation to actual hours spent on the course. Drawing from Welcome Survey results, 69% of all respondents indicated they anticipated spending 2 hours or less on the course - not far off from end results here.

Overall Course Rating

Overall, course quality ratings largely mirror the aggregate results (94%). Below are the summaries for the most populous option per demographic reporting 4 or 5 stars out of 5 stars:

- 92% of online learner types
- 94% of initial anticipated hours
- 92% of folks regardless of amount of job dedicated to assessment
- 97% of folks across assessment competency levels
- 92% of folks across institutional types
- 91% of folks across roles
- 94% of folks across locations
- 94% of folks regardless of English as native language
- 95% of folks across education levels
- 92% of folks across age groups
- 94% of folks regardless of sex
- 93% of folks regardless of gender
- 94% of folks regardless of race and ethnicity

Again, it is interesting to see how some results for 4 or 5 stars vary from disaggregation by one demographic to another.
As noted in the rubric and quiz results, there are multiple demographics with lopsided distribution of 50% or more participants within the groups’ options being the same response (online learner type, anticipated hours, geographic location, native English speaking, education level, sex, gender, and race and ethnicity). There were other demographic groups with less than five answer/group options (online learner type, percent of job dedicated to assessment, assessment competency, native English speaking, and sex). While there were some descriptive results with those groups having high or low scores, respectively, it may be worth digging deeper into possible relationships between these elements variables, in addition to looking for relationships with the demographics to the time spent and course rating questions in general.

We will plan to do this similar disaggregation next year to see how results may or may not look different within and across demographics. Future analyses could dig deeper than these descriptives to truly examine relationships between variables. There’s plenty of data to explore, but we’ll end here given this report is already quite lengthy!

Thank you for your interest in the results of our User Experience/End of Course Survey!