Tracking the Impacts of First Term Experience

Darragh McNally Ouanessa Boubsil Adam Flanders

Neil Lund

Allison Patch



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GLOBAL CAMPUS



# UMGC and PACE 111



#### History

- Founded in 1947, UMGC has maintained a singular focus on the needs of adult and military students for whom a traditional education is impractical or impossible
- In 1949, answered U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) call to teach American troops stationed in post-WWII Europe; in 1956, in Asia; in 2005, in the Middle East
- Taught in war zones including Vietnam, Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan
- Today, UMGC operates on U.S. military installations in more than 20 countries under three DoD contracts: Europe, Asia, and Middle East
- In 1970, became independently accredited
- Among first universities in U.S. and the world to develop and offer degrees fully online
- Today, UMGC is America's largest online public university



#### Institutional Data

- Today, almost 86 percent of UMGC enrollments are online and more than 95 percent are either online or in a hybrid format
- FY2019 total enrollments: 91,385
- In FY2019, 13,527 degrees and certificates awarded
- In FY2019, 342,629 online course enrollments worldwide





### A New First Term Experience

- Built around theories of learning and persistence
- High engagement between faculty and students
- Focus on understanding the resources available
- Focus on career exploration
- Groups students in meta-majors
- Complementary new faculty training course
  - Mentorship and high faculty presence



#### Program and Career Exploration 111

- PACE 111 Learning Goals
  - Have improved academic readiness
  - Have developed a growth mindset
  - Practice self-reflection to set and maintain personal academic and career goals
  - Feel confident they belong at the university and can succeed
  - Feel connected and significant to the university, faculty, and other students
  - Understand the requirements of their chosen degree programs and connect with the career paths they hope to pursue.



#### Faculty Student Interaction

- Students have two (virtual) face to face meetings with faculty
  - Discuss the course material
  - Discuss career goals
  - Discuss any issues or worries related to online learning
  - Discuss any issues with school-work-life balance



#### PACE 111 Success Rates



Data shown are for Fall 2019 and Spring 2020



#### **Course Evaluation**



Data shown are for Fall 2019



#### Preparedness and Confidence



Data shown are for Fall 2019



### Do the effects persist over time?

 Are students who have taken PACE more likely to contact their instructors in subsequent courses?



#### Research Design





#### Research questions

- Did students who completed the PACE First Term Experience (FTE) course contact the instructor more often in subsequent courses than students who did not?
- What are the motivating factors for contacting the instructor?
- Hypothesis
  - Null Hypothesis: Students who completed the FTE course contacted the instructor more often than students who did not
  - Alternative Hypothesis: Students who completed the FTE course did not contact the instructor more often than students who did not



#### • Method used to test the hypothesis

- Questionnaire : the standard End-of-Course Evaluation Survey with additional questions:
  - Quantitative single response questions

"When I think about my own engagement in this course, I contacted the instructor  $\_X\_$  times during the course."

Responses Choices (select one) X= 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, or More than 10



#### • Qualitative open-ended questions

- 'What would cause you to contact faculty during a course?'
- 'What topics if any did you contact the faculty about during this course?'
- 'What prevented you from contacting the faculty during this course?'
- Control Students Data Points:
  - GPA
  - Course credit data
  - Semester course completion rate
  - Student Demographic data (age, race, and gender)



### Sample and Data Collection

13528 Fall 2019 students identified as potential participants in the study

- Treatment group: 4073 students new to UMGC and who took PACE (FTE) in fall 2019
- Control group: 9455 students new to UMGC but who did not take PACE (FTE) in fall 2019

In spring 2020, 3055 students from the study group and 4614 students from the control group were sent the survey with the additional questions in each class they were taking.



### Data Collection and Response Rates

Number of surveys sent in spring 2020	All FTE Students	FTE Students New to UMGC Fall 2019	Students New to UMGC Fall 2019 (Not FTE)
Number of surveys sent	8760	7265	10045



#### Data Collection and Response Rates

Spring 2020 Questionnaire Response rates	All FTE Students	FTE Students New to UMGC Fall 2019	Students New to UMGC Fall 2019 (Not FTE)	All New to UMGC Fall 2019
Overall Standard Course Evaluation Survey Responses	44.16%	44.31%	38.20%	40.76%
What would cause you to contact faculty during a course?	28.29%	28.52%	5 24.19%	26.01%
What topics if any did you contact the faculty about during this course?	26.51%	26.69%	22.48%	24.25%
What prevented you from contacting the faculty during this course?	25.59%	25.75%	5 21.45%	23.26%
		- U	NIVERSITY OF	MARYLAND

**GLOBAL CAMPUS** 

#### Statistical Analysis Plan

- Quantitative Statistical Analysis
  - Comparative statistical analysis of central tendency between responses of the New to UMGC FTE group and responses of the New to UMGC (no FTE) control group to the question about the number of times the student contacted the instructor.
- Qualitative Statistical Analysis
  - Thematic analysis using different tools (BTA, the text analytics module from Blue, SPSS text Analytics for surveys and Topic Model) for the 3 open-ended-questions responses (FTE vs NoFTE groups)



### Making It Happen In Blue





# Blue Project Setup

- Private Survey
- Flexible Confidentiality
- Automatic Update for:
  - Subject (Course)
  - Student Form Fill Out
  - Teacher Report Viewing
- Data is loaded Daily from our Data Warehouse
- Courses and Relationship Data Sources are populated in the project when the course has reached 65% using filters



# **Additional Demographics**

1	Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	
1	OriginalID	FullEmail	FirstName	LastName	Blue_Role	opridName	pace_course_first_terms	new_to_umgc_terms	
2	Student1	•••••	John	Student	3	Student1.John.Student	2205	2125	
3	Student2	•••••	Student	Sample	3	Student2.Student.Sample	2198	2198	
4	Student3	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Anon	Ymous	3	Student3.Anon.Ymous	2202	2202	
5	Student4	•••••	John	Doe	3	Student4.John.Doe	2198	2198	
6									

- Added to the User Data Source
  - Pace\_Course\_First\_Terms
  - New\_to\_UMGC\_Terms

These were added to target students that met certain requirements since they were not all in the same classes



### Additional Questions

- 3 Hidden Questions were added to the Course Evaluation
  - •What would cause you to contact faculty during a course?
  - •What topics if any did you contact the faculty about during the course?
  - •What prevented you from contacting the faculty during the course?
- These were triggered when the student had 2198 (Fall 2019) in either of the User demographic



# Difficulties

- Adding additional demographics to previous term for reporting purposes
- Flexible confidentiality
  - •Adding the Student demographics for reporting and exporting of data
  - Identifying the students for reporting
  - •Bringing in additional information and matching it with students
    - Age
    - Gender
    - Grade
    - Career GPA
    - Total Career Credits
    - Course Completion Rate



#### **Reporting Issues**

- Reporting was done using a Group By report for Pace\_Course\_First\_Terms: 2198\* for both Fall 2019 and Spring 2020
- Could not use Project Mapping to compare data in 1 report
- Work Arounds
  - •Run an identical report for each term to compare values for the common questions
  - •Export data for more in-depth analysis



26

#### **Blue BTA Limitations**

- We needed to run 2 reports to view the data for the Spring 2020 term.
- The first was a Group by Pace\_Course\_First\_Terms and the only value which reports were generated for was 2198 (Fall 2019).
- The second was a Group by New\_to\_UMGC\_Terms and the only value which reports were generated for was 2198 (Fall 2019).
- We were unable to create reports that were based on the New\_to\_UMGC\_Terms and excluded students that also had a Pace\_Course\_First\_Terms value of 2198 (Fall 2019).





#### Results



### Analysis

- DV: number of times student reports contacting instructor for a course
- IV: whether student has taken or is taking their first PACE course
- Standard OLS model with controls for: demographics, credits, GPA, course completion rate
  - Standard errors clustered by student



### Analysis: OLS results

	Dependent variable:
	# times r contacted instructor
PACE	$0.152^{***}$
	(0.031)
cumulative GPA	$0.077^{***}$
	(0.015)
cumulative credit	$-0.201^{***}$
	(0.011)
course completion rate	-0.018
	(0.012)
student age	$0.264^{***}$
	(0.011)
female	$0.074^{***}$
	(0.023)
Constant	$3.589^{***}$
	(0.017)
Observations	94,962
Log Likelihood	$-218,\!275.200$
Akaike Inf. Crit.	$436{,}568{.}500$
Bayesian Inf. Crit.	436,653.600
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01



#### Analysis: all course evals

Reflecting on my overall experience		
I accomplished my goals for taking this course.		
the knowledge/skills I gained are relevant for my career.		
I knew what was expected of me.		
The instructor for this course		
helped me to understand the course content.		
provided effective feedback that helped me improve.		
was available and responsive.		
The learning environment was one in which		
I learned what I needed to successfully master the course objectives.		
diverse opinions, perspectives, and backgrounds were valued.		
expectations for the quality of my work were high.		
The readings, assignments, instructional materials, and other course content		
gave me a chance to apply what I learned.		
helped me achieve the course outcomes.		
were well organized and easy to navigate.		
When I think about my own engagement in this course		
I contacted the instructor times during the course.		
I spent hours per week on average on coursework outside of class.		
I read of the assigned course materials.		
-0.75 -0.50 -0.25 0.00	0.2	



#### Issues

- Students are self-selecting into PACE courses
- The decision to take the class probably reflects some underlying differences in student characteristics/behavior that may confound analysis



#### Student comparison





#### Hypothetical students

#### Student 1 (PACE)

- Recent high school graduate
- Minimal transfer credit
- Unsure about which courses to take

Student 2 (non-PACE)

- 2 years since high school
- Transfer student
- Confident about coursework

NB: thought experiment not based on actual data



#### Hypothetical students



NB: thought experiment not based on

Students will differ on both:

- Initial responses
- Trajectory of responses across semesters



actual data

### Analysis

- Confounding addressed by combining two methods
  - Account for constant differences using Differencein-differences model (DiD)
  - Account for differences in trajectory using coursened exact matching (King 2012)



### DiD model

- Limit analysis to students who:
  - Started at UMGC on or before Fall 2019
  - Took PACE in Spring 2020 (treatment group) OR
  - Did not take PACE by that point (control group)
- Compare trends for students who take PACE to students who don't



#### DiD model assumptions

Approximates a randomized experiment if:

- 1.Intervention is not assigned based on outcome in pre-treatment stage
- 2. Composition of treatment and control groups are stable in both time periods.
- 3. Treatment and control groups would have parallel trend lines without intervention.
  - 3 is the most difficult assumption to meet, and is likely violated here.











### DiD model

#### $Y_i = \alpha + \beta T_i + \gamma S_i + \delta (T_i \cdot S_i) + ... \varepsilon_i$

- T = treatment group indicator
- S = time period indicator
- $\beta = {\rm difference}$  between treatment and control groups
- $\gamma = {\rm common\ time\ trend\ for\ both\ groups}$
- $\delta = {\rm difference}$  in difference estimate



### **Coarsened Exact Matching**

- Same goals as propensity score matching: create treatment and control groups that are "balanced" on covariates.
  - Approximates block randomization rather than full randomization
- Matched students should have similar trajectories



### CEM process

- Temporarily "coarsen" pre-treatment characteristics (e.g: use deciles of student age, or replace numeric GPA with a letter grade)
- "Exactly" match based on coursened dataset
- Weight observations and conduct analysis using un-coarsened data



### Analysis

- 3,384 observations (of 1,011 students) remain after filtering and matching
- IV of interest is now the interaction between semester and whether a student takes PACE in Spring 2020
- Same controls for demographics and student characteristics used in initial model



#### Regression results

	Dependent variable:
	# times <b>r</b> contacted instructor
PACE * Spring 2020	$0.435^{**}$
	(0.212)
PACE	-0.034
	(0.137)
Spring 2020	0.405***
	(0.121)
cumulative GPA	-0.011
	(0.126)
cumulative credit	$-0.003^{*}$
	(0.002)
student age	0.009
	(0.008)
female	-0.055
	(0.113)
cohort	-0.009
	(0.031)
Constant	0.391
	(0.562)
Observations	3.384
Log Likelihood	-1,830.658
Akaike Inf. Crit.	$3,\!685.316$
Bayesian Inf. Crit.	3,743.234
Note:	*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01



#### Regression results





#### Regression results

Reflecting on my overall experience	
I knew what was expected of me.	
the knowledge/skills I gained are relevant for my career.	
accomplished my goals for taking this course.	
The instructor for this course	
was available and responsive.	
provided effective feedback that helped me improve.	
beined me to understand the course content	
The learning environment was one in which	
expectations for the quality of my work were high.	
diverse opinions, perspectives, and backgrounds were valued.	
I learned what I needed to successfully master the course objectives.	
The readings, assignments, instructional materials, and other course of	content
were well organized and easy to navigate.	
helped me achieve the course outcomes	
gave me a chance to apply what I learned.	
When I think about my own engagement in this course	
I read of the assigned course materials	
I spent hours per week on average on coursework outside of class.	
I contacted the instructor times during the course.	
-1	

marginal effect of PACE



#### Next steps

- Further improving matching using additional demographic data
- Continue tracking students through 2020 to see if effects persist
- Comparing multiple methods for qualitative responses





### Qualitative Analysis Results



#### Blue BTA Text Analytics



# BTA Analysis for Q1

Pace Students (Spring 2020)

#### New To UMGC Students (Spring 2020)





# BTA Analysis for Q2

#### Pace Students (Spring 2020)

PA Q2 - What topics if any did you contact the faculty about during this course?



#### guest lecturers interactions group projects students comprehension

tutorials/workshops classes technology content/materials textbooks labs instructions professors/instructors office hours

#### attendance concepts/topics questions course/subject

lesson plans feedback skills explanations placement presentations discussion assignments/exams

examples lectures assistance assessment/grading practical aspects field trips meetings readings expectations/objectives teaching methods in-class work learning atmosphere

advisors/counselors

Elements mentioned [No. of comments]	Overall [2319]
ASSIGNMENTS/EXAMS	28.33 %
QUESTIONS	9.66 %
PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS	8.54 %
COURSE/SUBJECT	6.51 %
ASSESSMENT/GRADING	6.30 %

#### New To UMGC Students (Spring 2020)

PA Q2 - What topics if any did you contact the faculty about during this course?





Elements mentioned [No. of comments]	Overall [4204]
ASSIGNMENTS/EXAMS	28.59 %
QUESTIONS	8.80 %
PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS	8.09 %
COURSE/SUBJECT	6.71 %
ASSESSMENT/GRADING	5.33 %



# BTA Analysis for Q3

#### Pace Students (Spring 2020)

PA Q3 - What prevented you from contacting the faculty during this course?





Elements mentioned [No. of comments]	Overall [2239]
PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS	10.41 %
COURSE/SUBJECT	5.45 %
QUESTIONS	3.93 %
ASSIGNMENTS/EXAMS	3.44 %
TECHNOLOGY	2.55 %

#### New To UMGC Students (Spring 2020)

PA Q3 - What prevented you from contacting the faculty during this course?





Elements mentioned [No. of comments]	Overall [4032]
PROFESSORS/INSTRUCTORS	10.34 %
COURSE/SUBJECT	4.76 %
QUESTIONS	4.32 %
ASSIGNMENTS/EXAMS	3.37 %
TECHNOLOGY	3.00 %



#### SPSS Text Analytics



#### Q1: What would cause you to contact faculty during a course-PACE 2198 N=2350













#### Q2: What topics if any did you contact the faculty about during this course-NoPACE New 2198 N=1695 Exams 3% 3% Paper Project 6% Technical issues 10% Assignments 16% N/A 35% 0% 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 30% 35% 40%



#### Q3: What prevented you from contacting the faculty during this course—PACE 2198 N=2404









#### Topic Models



#### Text analysis

- Texts were cleaned and lemmatized using the Stanford CORE-NLP program
- Analyses were conducted using a biterm topic model (variation on normal LDA designed for short texts)
- Because of lower response rates, it was not possible to effectively match on pre-treatment characteristics



### Text analysis

- PACE Q1 "What would cause you to contact faculty during this course?"
- PACE Q2 "What topics did you contact faculty about during this course?"
  - Q1 and Q2 generated similar responses and so were combined for the following analyses
- PACE Q3 "What prevented you from contacting faculty during this course?"



#### Topics from Q1 & Q2





### Topics from Q1 & Q2





#### Topics from Q3





### Topics from Q3





#### Thematic Analysis of openended questions

Using SPSS Text Analytics



# Appendix

#### Blue Project settings

Defi	inition	Details
------	---------	---------

- Subject (Course)
- Secondary Subject (Teacher)

#### Groups

- Level 1 (RV)
- Level 2 (RV)
- Level 3 (RV)
- Level 4 (RV)
- Level 5 (RV)
- Level 6 (RV)
- Level 7 (RV)
- Student FO (FO)
- Instructor Report View (RV)
- Instructor Response Rate
- (RV)
- Admin Response Rate (SV)
- Project Audience
- Private O Public

#### Confidentiality

- Make this project confidential
  - Flexible confidentiality
  - Anonymization
  - Strict confidentiality

#### Field Synchronization

Copy Field Management synchronization settings



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GLOBAL CAMPUS

#### talls

#### Automatic Update

Allow secondary subject optional

### Appendix (Question Settings)

	Questionnaire	Definition	Subjects	Members	Triggers	Access		
List	Options	Print Forms	Virtual Question	Question Ba	ank Mapping	Deleted Ques		
Com	ments	~	Select					
Id Q T D D C	entitier PACEQ1 uestion about Cour ags ed. isplayed On Both C	Online & Paper For	J~9,A~∠) ms	✓ On Pa	per Form As 〇	image 💿 Text		
Mandatory Question Hidden by Default (visible when trigger activated) Keep Response If Hidden								



### Appendix (Question triggers)

#### **My Projects**

C Editing: UMGC 2202 Spring 2020 Course Evaluation

info	Questionna	ire Definiti	on Subjects	Members	Triggers	Access
Internal Trigger	rs Externa	I Triggers				
Trigger Creation						
Trigger (						
Trigger Nam	e Pace and	New Student F	ilter			*
Trigger Cont	dition Type	Rater Field	d New Filter	) And Or	Not	
						Filter Conditions
0	Stu	ident FO.pace_cour	se_first_terms Contains 2	198		
0	Or					
0	Stu	ident FO.new_to_ur	ngc_terms Contains 2198	4		

