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1. Narrative

For the narrative, please see a blog I posted about it several weeks ago on the project.

2. Quotes

"The writing assignments help me better my understanding of the textbook, and the assignments help me better my writing skills"

"Honestly, the best part of this course is being able to communicate with everyone else in it. Everyone’s peer review offers different perspective and help me understand the course even better"

"More readings from outside the book"

Three students also mentioned the grading process as “slow” and "in need of improvement" especially during the modules 1 and 2.

"Be unbiased in my reviews of papers and take my criticism well. Hopefully be able to give my professor good information that can help future students, too”

3. Quantitative and Qualitative Measures

3a. Uniform Measurements Questions

Student Opinion of Materials

Was the overall student opinion about the materials used in the course positive, neutral, or negative?

Total number of students affected in this project: 128
- Positive: 90 % of 63 number of respondents
- Neutral: 5 % of 63 number of respondents
- Negative: 5% of 63 number of respondents

These numbers are based on the Final Discussion discussed below.

Student Learning Outcomes and Grades

Was the overall comparative impact on student performance in terms of learning outcomes and grades in the semester(s) of implementation over previous semesters positive, neutral, or negative?

Choose One:
- Positive: Higher performance outcomes measured over previous semester(s)
- Neutral: Same performance outcomes over previous semester(s)
- Negative: Lower performance outcomes over previous semester(s)

Student Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) Rates
Was the overall comparative impact on Drop/Fail/Withdraw (DFW) rates in the semester(s) of implementation over previous semesters positive, neutral, or negative?

Drop/Fail/Withdraw Rate:
Depending on what you and your institution can measure, this may also be known as a drop/failure rate or a withdraw/failure rate.

33.6% of students, out of a total 130 students affected, dropped/failed/withdrew from the course in the final semester of implementation.

Choose One:
- **x** Positive: This is a lower percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)
- ___ Neutral: This is the same percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)
- ___ Negative: This is a higher percentage of students with D/F/W than previous semester(s)

3b. Measures Narrative

Both qualitative and quantitative measures were used to measure the effectiveness and effects of the course redesign. The two grantees and a T.A. will collaborate on data collection and analysis.

Quantitative Measures

Outcomes Attainment
Our main quantitative measures were pre- and post-module quizzes aligned to standards set at a success threshold of 75%. Using the American Sociological Association (ASA) standards-aligned course template, students will be required to take pretest and posttest surveys of the five designated lesson plans on Brightspace. The results of these pretest and posttest surveys were documented and analyzed by the Progress Tool in Brightspace to measure student learning outcomes. Another purpose for these pretest and posttest surveys were for students to assess their own progress of mastering course materials. While students weren’t be graded on these surveys, they were required to take them, in order to access the actual lesson plans. For instance, Module 1 components were locked - but visible - until the Module 1 pre-test was taken and Module 2 was completely locked until the Module 1 post-test was taken.
Students were highly successful in meeting this 75% threshold on the 8 identified learning objectives:
- 111 completed and mastered all 8 learning objectives
- 17 didn’t engage with all 8
- 10 completed but needed more remediation on at least one

Grades
Here are the Spring ‘18 vs Spring ‘17 Grades and DFW. There was a 78% improvement in student final grade under the new course design and a 14% reduction in DFWs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>CRN</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Average Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 16</td>
<td>20738</td>
<td>SOC 1100</td>
<td>Kim, Jung</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 17</td>
<td>10783</td>
<td>SOC 1100</td>
<td>Kim, Jung</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (90-100)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (80-89)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (70-79)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (60-69)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (0-59)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFW</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualitative Measures
We used two qualitative measures of the course: beginning and end of course discussion posts and a mid semester responsive evaluation.

Here is a description of each post:

**Welcome Module Discussion Post**
In the Welcome module of the course, students were required to respond to a discussion prompt focusing on expectations. The discussion prompt read: It was great reading your responses to the Welcome discussion - I’m so glad to have you in the class and really enjoyed learning about each of you. One of the most important skills to learn as a budding sociologist is self reflection. Throughout the course we’ll be working on our skills of reflection so let’s get started now. In this post, you’ll be reflecting on your expectations for the course. At the end of the course, we’ll do the same exercise and you’ll reflect on how your ideas have changed: What are your general expectations for yourself and your classmates this semester? In other words, how do you think your experience will be this semester? How do you predict that your experience this semester might affect your life after this semester is over? Although you have a textbook for this course, it is free. How do you think that not having to buy a textbook will affect your experience?

**Final Module Discussion Post**
In the Final module of the course, students were required to respond to a discussion prompt reflecting on how their expectations and thinking evolved during the semester. This discussion prompt read: Thank you all for participating in this course. Remember when we thought about your expectations early in the semester? Now it’s time to reflect on those expectations as well as looking towards the future. The goal of this activity is to help you reflect on your own thinking and how it has changed during the semester. To do this activity, you need to look back at what you wrote during the Welcome module. How did your experiences this semester match your expectations? How did they differ? How could you see yourself using your experiences this semester in the future? How did not having to buy a textbook affect your experience?

Qualitative data were analyzed using an iterative, thematic approach. First, a random sample of student pre/post-test discussions will be selected. We will then read through each pre-test discussion post, coding relevant sections. The same process will be carried out for the post-test discussion post. Codes will then be collapsed into themes.

Midterm Evaluation
A midterm GIFT (Group Instructional Feedback Technique) evaluation was carried out by the two PI’s on this project. We received 59 responses. The results were collated and themed and then shared with the students. Jung Ha made several small tweaks to the course based on this process:
4. Sustainability Plan

This course will be made freely available to all instructors teaching Sociology 1101 at all GSU campuses. Importantly, this course will be made available as a template to adjunct instructors teaching at the GPC campuses. Thus, this template will be open to critique and collaboration from other sociologists at all campuses. This includes those faculty that are full-time, adjunct, visiting, and GRA’s. We see this as a small, non-mandatory transformative step towards fostering a culture of sharing and collaboration between the different campus units of GSU. The course will be updated and supported each semester with the help of GSU’s Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. Human resources at the CETL include instructional designers, multimedia designers, learning technologists, and a data science/analytics team.
5. Future Plans

- The success of this project has already begun to affect the content selection choices of other Sociology professors. In addition, the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning is currently seeking other OER grant opportunities to infuse free, reusable content in as many of our courses as possible.
- We presented our project at the Teaching and Learning Conference in Spring 2018. We also published a blog on the finished product and process. We will continue to write and think about OER in future designs and as the online programs expand at GSU.
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