



The information and statistical data contained in the document have been verified through the Offices of Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness.
March 17, 2015

ACCESS & AFFORDABILITY BOARD OF TRUSTEES MONITORING REPORT

Executive Summary

The Board of Trustees' ends statement #5 focuses on access and affordability: "The College will support and encourage the minimizing of barriers to provide more access and affordable opportunities." There are five sub-ends under Access/Affordability, addressing at-risk students, developmental students, academic advising & behavioral intervention, financial access, and online learning.

Sub-Ends

5a. Students at risk will be encouraged, monitored, and engaged to ensure similar outcomes toward completion as their counterparts.

5b. Developmental students are provided specific programming to increase their likelihood of progressing and completing their college goals.

5c. Academic advising and behavioral intervention will ensure student continuation in their program of study.

5d. Financial access is ensured to address affordability issues reflected in tuition and fees levels.

5e. Online learning provides a sound alternative to students in their learning journey.

Key Performance Indicators:

- Developmental student profile and success rates
- Identification of success points achieved compared to benchmark institutions
- Developmental programming defined with future focus on connections, entry, progress, and completion results
- Academic advising defined with results
- Behavioral intervention report
- Historical tuition rates, program, and general fees
- Financial aid student profile
- Online learning student profile and report

(Please note that either in table or narrative form, the key performance indicators listed above are addressed in this monitoring report.)

Access is often considered as a broad concept made up of several component types, to include: physical access (locations and associated services); psychological access (attractiveness, environmental appeal); financial access (affordability & payment assistance); and intellectual access (open enrollment with programs in place to help students who are not college-ready become college-ready).

Affordability consists of relative measures including cost compared to competitors and cohort institutions, participation in federal grant and loan programs, and financial aid budgets that include costs for indirect student costs such as housing, food, transportation and childcare. Affordability can also be measured and presented in multiple segments, including per course, per program, per semester, and per year.

As a community college, Edison has embraced the open enrollment, access-based mission, while being mindful to build structures and fail safes that help ensure success and completion. Well in advance of the state's move to performance based funding for SSI, Edison moved away from accepting students at any time prior to the start of courses. In doing so, the College embraced a more legitimate type of access than had been previously practiced, a type of access where the count on the 15th day was not the measure that mattered the most. Such a move has been likened to dis-adopting the 'false' access of the old headcount funding model and adopting instead a success focused accessibility model that looks at students as long-term investments.

This report finds Edison having performed well in a number of accessibility metrics, funding metrics, and affordability metrics. Consideration of student cost as weighed against the time taken to enter and complete academic goals is intrinsically tied to maintaining a competitive place with how and when students are encouraged and prevented from entering into enrollment and how Edison's cost to the students compares with other higher education competitors in the region and the state. It is in the determination of where Edison falls within these measures that position the College as strategically as possible to realize growth that not only brings students and associated revenue into the College for a semester or two, but for the duration of time necessary to ensure student success.

Sub-End 5a. Students at risk will be encouraged, monitored, and engaged to ensure similar outcomes toward completion as their counterparts.

Students are identified for a number of risks from the moment they express interest in attending Edison. Academically, they are identified through assessment of standardized test scores, and high school and college transcripts. Behaviorally, they are screened during intake meetings with enrollment managers, success advisors, and through questions asked and answered on the College's application for admission. Financial risks are identified typically through the FAFSA (Free Application for Federal Student Aid) or through documentation provided by the high school from which the student is or has graduated. In circumstances where the student's situation is more recent than the information on the FAFSA allows, Financial Aid staff invite students and their families to provide recent documentation so that the consideration of

professional judgment can be exercised on a case-by-case basis. Such professional judgments spiked during the years of the Great Recession and are less frequent today.

Students identified as academically at risk are placed into courses that are taught by nurturing faculty who are specifically trained to help this population improve to a level of demonstrated college readiness before being placed into college level math, reading, or writing. Writing samples are required when appropriate, feedback and coaching are provided, and the drafting process utilized to teach students that writing is a process, a concept foreign to some despite having attained graduation from high school or having earned a GED (General Education Diploma). Similarly, students are tested the first day of math courses, as a check against the placement process, and in those rare situations when need for re-placement is identified, the students are moved up or down into the newly determined as appropriate mathematics course.

Encouragement and monitoring are accomplished through wrap-around services integrated across the College. Students are introduced to staff in key areas, including librarians, career counselors, student affairs staff, and learning center tutors. These staff members compliment the faculty-based, in-classroom monitoring that takes place during delivery of formal coursework, and act as a placeholder and resource point for times of the semester or year when courses are not in session or faculty might not be otherwise available.

Of specific note for monitoring at-risk students is the College's academic alert system. Faculty, through the use of a convenient online form, can notify student affairs success advisors of students facing numerous kinds of difficulties, ranging from attendance and inattentiveness to failure to submit assignments. The window for these alerts is open throughout the beginning and middle of each term. Student Affairs Success Advisors or Success Coaches then follow up with the students individually, and when students respond, work to identify and remove barriers and mitigate whatever academic damage has occurred with whatever time remains in the term. This is an example of the partnership that exists between Academic and Student Affairs teams that create a tapestry of support and problem solving expertise for students facing any number of challenges, distractions, and life circumstances.

Engagement occurs through student programming channels, including athletics, student health, student government, clubs, activities, and programming. Engagement is always a particular challenge for commuter colleges. Given that the College does not yet have a 'common hour' for these opportunities to take place at a time that does not compete with classroom instruction, this is an area where Edison has made significant strides in the past year but will likely continue to face some logistical struggles. Students who are interested in participating are often relegated to meeting early in the morning or later in the afternoon or early evening, diminishing access to participation for many of them.

During research required for a recent Student Support Services (SSS) federal grant application, students identified as being at risk in three categories (financial, first generation, with documented disabilities) were compared against students without those risk factors. Tables 1-3

show how these students compare very favorably with each other, despite the very different starting places of their time at Edison.

| Table 1: Retention and Graduation Comparison | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-----|-------------------------|-----|
| Indicator | SSS-Eligible (At-Risk) | | Non-SSS-Eligible | |
| Retention Rates Fall 2010 Undergraduates | Total Count: 1,897 | | Total Count: 809 | |
| 1. First year retention (Fall 2011) | 950 | 50% | 323 | 40% |
| 2. Second year retention (Fall 2012) | 522 | 28% | 188 | 23% |
| 3. Third year retention (Fall 2013) | 273 | 14% | 81 | 10% |
| | | | | |
| Graduation within Four Years | 827 | 44% | 391 | 48% |
| Source: Institutional Research. 1/20/15 | | | | |

| Table 2: Grade Point Averages | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Indicator | SSS-Eligible (At Risk) | Non-SSS-Eligible |
| Fall 2010 Undergraduates | Total Count: 1,897 | Total Count: 809 |
| Grade Point Average | 2.82 | 2.97 |
| Source: Institutional Research. 1/20/15 | | |

| Table 3: Good Academic Standing | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| | SSS-Eligible (At Risk) | | Non-SSS-Eligible | |
| Identifier | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| Good Standing | 1,737 | 91.57% | 746 | 92.21% |
| Probation | 145 | 7.64% | 53 | 6.55% |
| Suspension | 15 | 0.79% | 10 | 1.24% |
| Total | 1,897 | | 809 | |
| Source: Institutional Research. 1/20/15 | | | | |

Sub-End 5b. Developmental students are provided specific programming to increase their likelihood of progressing and completing their college goals.

From a curricular standpoint, the work that takes place to provide specific programming to development students is a place where ongoing assessment, evaluation of best practices, and cross-departmental cooperation convene to provide a dynamic set of safety and success measures

that help students succeed. There are three types of developmental coursework: mathematics, writing, and reading.

For students placing into any one developmental course in any of those three areas, the GEN 101S First Year Experience course becomes a required piece of specific programming. Carefully selected faculty and staff teach this one credit hour course. Over the course of eight weeks of instruction, the students are exposed to college level expectation for time management, stress reduction, study skills, and life balance. Assignments are intended to help students identify the areas where they are in need support and to identify and implements those supports. The GEN 101S course is currently the subject of an AQIP Action Project, which is assessing its effectiveness and will recommend changes to improve delivery, content, and impact.

In mathematics, developmental students are provided with multiple supports. Streamlined course delivery allows students to progress through multiple courses worth of work at their own pace, saving them time and money on the way to college level math courses. Tutors are embedded in course sections. Faculty who teach developmental coursework are also versed in counseling students study skills, time management, work prioritization, etc. This echoes the concepts presented in the GEN 101S course and provides a real-course environment for students to apply concepts.

In all developmental courses, tutors from the learning center visit classrooms early each term. They provide a presentation about services offered in the Learning Center and also act as points of contacts for students and faculty. Once students begin receiving tutoring, improvement is typically near immediate. The hardest part is getting them to begin, and the presence of tutors doing these presentations in the classroom is intended to help bridge that very real and troubling gap.

AmeriCorps Success Coaches, contracted through a special arrangement with the OACC (Ohio Association of Community Colleges) are embedded in developmental education sections across the reading, writing, and mathematics realms. They provide an in-class support for non-academic concerns, and have a ready-set of solutions to help students navigate issues like transportation, food, social services, and childcare. These two Coaches serve one hundred students each, every semester, and fill a unique niche in the sphere of service provided.

Lastly, students in developmental English courses (reading and writing) are graded using a unique pass/fail/in progress system, allowing students near but not quite at attainment at the course end a chance to retake the course the following term without academic penalty.

Table 4: Fall 2014 Pass Rates in Development Ed Courses

| | Headcount | Pass Rate | % Continuing to College Level Course in Spring 2015 |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| College Language Development | 21 | 81% | |
| Basic Writing | 82 | 75% | 50% |
| College Preparatory Reading | 27 | 83% | |
| Basic Mathematics | 167 | 71% | |
| Beginning Algebra | 231 | 74% | 2% |
| Intermediate Algebra I | 187 | 78% | 10% |
| Intermediate Algebra II | 113 | 77% | 49% |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

Table 5: 15th Day Fall 2014 Profile of Developmental Students

| Headcount by Gender | Dev Ed Headcount | % of Dev Students |
|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Female | 319 | 68% |
| Male | 151 | 32% |
| Total | 470 | 100% |

| Headcount by Race | Dev Ed Headcount | Total Fall Headcount | % of Total Headcount |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| White, non-Hispanic | 378 | 2,483 | 15% |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 4 | 28 | 14% |
| Hispanic | 7 | 38 | 18% |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 49 | 101 | 49% |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 1 | 12 | 8% |
| Multiracial | 6 | 35 | 17% |
| Ethnicity/Race Unknown | 25 | 99 | 25% |

| Headcount by Age Range | Average Dev Ed credit hours | Dev Ed Headcount | Total Fall Headcount | % of Total Headcount |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Under 18 | 6.00 | 2 | 657 | 0% |
| 18-19 | 6.23 | 116 | 442 | 26% |
| 20-21 | 5.45 | 65 | 301 | 22% |
| 22-25 | 5.21 | 99 | 387 | 26% |
| 26-29 | 5.22 | 58 | 263 | 22% |
| 30-34 | 5.72 | 43 | 244 | 18% |
| 35-39 | 5.43 | 37 | 185 | 20% |
| 40-49 | 5.08 | 39 | 217 | 18% |
| Over 50 | 4.64 | 11 | 100 | 11% |
| Total | 5.54 | 470 | 2,796 | 17% |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

Sub-End 5c. Academic advising and behavioral intervention will ensure student continuation in their program of study.

Academic Advising consists of three components: Success Advisors (4 FTE) who provide advisement to new students at the point of assessment testing and orientation; Advising Resource Center (ARC) advisors (7 part-time, approximately 1.25 FTE) who work with students that do not yet have a faculty advisor; and faculty advisors, who are full-time faculty who typically provide advisement to students within their academic program. Significant work has been undertaken to move students away from ARC advisors earlier in their degree pursuit, to both enhance relationships with their faculty, provide earlier and more specific avenues for career counseling, and foster a culture of mentorship that supports progress and success in the student's course of study.

Advising appointments begin with preparatory work, where the advisor typically looks at the student's transcripts, advising notes from past appointments, educational plan (SEP), and declared major(s). The confirmation of this information begins most advising conversations. The advisor works with the student to help determine course load, and sometimes help with the selection of course sections once courses have been identified.

Advisors (in all three examples above) encourage students to maintain contact with them as needed throughout the semester, by phone, email or appointment. Advisors typically reach out to students during the pre-registration period to help encourage advising meetings and foster a culture of pre-registration. Success Advisors play special roles with different populations at this time, including athletes, veterans, CC+ (College Credit Plus), providing complimentary coverage and support that is given by the faculty advisors.

ARC advisors provide as-needed coverage for enrollment events and during times when faculty advisors are either not available or not on campus due to contracted time off. The flexibility of scheduling and expertise of this group is a microcosm of the full-time faculty, and the ARC advisors indeed can advise any student in any course of study at any point during degree/certification pursuit.

During the 2013-14 academic year, Success Advisors scheduled 914 appointments with new or transfer students; they provided targeted advising to 1,872 current students. ARC advisors also work with students on probation and academic alert status. During the academic year 2013-14, 164 students received academic alerts. In 2014, two programs were strengthened to better serve these students and improve success and retention. The Student Success Program requires students placed on probation to meet with a Success Advisor four times during the semester, with progress reports from instructors. An improved Academic Alert Program more closely monitors alerts and referrals to assist the student. As a result, we are receiving an increased number of alerts, with 103 reported fall 2014.

ARC advisors saw roughly 1,000 students (the actual number is harder to arrive at because this service is offered largely on a walk-in, non-appointment basis).

For the upcoming year, a new specialized population of students will require, by law, a new level of advising be provided by Edison, and that is the CC+ population. Current estimates indicate that around 800 high school students taking part in CC+ with Edison will each need to have academic advisement provided to them that looks different than what was provided before, placing an anticipated, significant strain on advising resources. Plans are being developed to address this, including partnering with high school counselors to provide advisement, providing group advising sessions as an option, and piloting a distributed model of advisement that can be accomplished utilizing technology that spare CC+ students from having to drive (or be driven) to campus just for advisement.

Edison’s BIT (Behavioral Intervention Team) plays a smaller but still impactful role in keeping students in their program of study. Students are referred to the team for displaying behaviors of concern that could impact their and other students’ abilities to be successful. By intervening with support, guidance, and networking with outside agencies, the BIT helps ensure that the learning environment is as prime a location as possible for learning to occur for all students. This is the smallest share of what the BIT does; however, as the largest portion of its work takes place during the enrollment process, the BIT ensures compliance with the College’s felon admissions policy. A snapshot of the BIT’s engagement with students for the 2013-14 academic year is below.

| Table 6: Behavioral Intervention Report 2013-2014 | | | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Felony Applications | Count | # Admitted | # Deferred | # Denied |
| | 119 | 107 | 8 | 4 |
| Behavioral Interventions | Count | Enrollments Retained | Enrollments Lost | Unknown |
| | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 |
| Source: BIT Team. 2/13/15 | | | | |

Sub-End 5d. Financial access is ensured to address affordability issues reflected in tuition and fees levels.

Financial access is driven by a number of factors, including the service-area economy, income levels, employment opportunities, and availability of funds that help to cover or offset the price of attendance, whether they be provided the College, employer tuition benefits, foundations, or other entities. The cost of attendance is composed of direct (tuition & fees) and indirect (housing, food, transportation, etc.) costs that are born by students in pursuit of credits, training, degrees and certificates.

Affordability, as viewed by student consumers, is relative to costs when compared to other local entities providing the same or comparable services, experiences, programs, and credentials. It is in discussing affordability that another major disconnect is identified, namely, that the amount typically described as the expected family contribution (EFC) as determined by the FAFSA is almost never a realistic depiction of a family’s ability to pay for attendance. Rather, the EFC remains a number that is typically much, much greater than a family’s contribution can actually be. When considering financial access and affordability, it is important to understand the profile of Edison’s students who receive financial aid.

| Table 7: Fall 2014 Financial Aid Students, by Gender & Age Type | | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| | Female | Male | Total |
| Edison Scholarships | 94 | 49 | 143 |
| Federal Grants | 801 | 300 | 1,101 |
| Federal Loans | 522 | 177 | 699 |
| Other Scholarships | 49 | 20 | 69 |
| State of Ohio | 2 | 4 | 6 |
| TAA/WIA | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| Veterans' Admin | 17 | 41 | 58 |
| Total | 1,494 | 596 | 2,090 |
| Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15 | | | |

Table 7 shows that aid distribution by gender is slightly more disproportionate than our overall student population, which regularly hovers at two females to every one male.

| Table 8: Fall 2014 Student Reporting 1st Generation Status, by Financial Aid Status | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------|--|
| | 1st Generation | Total | % Reported 1st Generation College Student |
| With Aid | 881 | 1,374 | 64% |
| Female | 652 | 983 | 66% |
| Male | 229 | 391 | 59% |
| No Aid | 404 | 477 | 85% |
| Female | 263 | 307 | 86% |
| Male | 141 | 170 | 83% |
| Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15 | | | |

Table 8 indicates the difficulty of educating first generation students and their families about the importance of seeking financial aid from a broad number of sources. So many do not seek any kind of aid at all.

Table 9: Fall 2014 Financial Aid Students, by Age and Aid Type

| Age Range → | <18 | 18-19 | 20-21 | 22-25 | 26-29 | 30-34 | 35-39 | 40-49 | >50 | Total |
|---------------------|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|
| Edison Scholarships | 1 | 52 | 20 | 18 | 16 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 143 |
| Federal Grants | 3 | 141 | 126 | 219 | 183 | 161 | 114 | 121 | 33 | 1,101 |
| Federal Loans | | 68 | 67 | 113 | 118 | 122 | 79 | 104 | 28 | 699 |
| Other Scholarships | 1 | 45 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | | 69 |
| State of Ohio | | 1 | | 3 | | 2 | | | | 6 |
| TAA/WIA | | | | | | 1 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 14 |
| Veterans' Admin | | 1 | 1 | 18 | 13 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 58 |
| Total | 5 | 308 | 223 | 375 | 332 | 314 | 213 | 250 | 70 | 2,090 |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

Table 9, distribution by age, shows that between different types of aid awarded, affordability is accomplished across the diversity of age present on campus.

Table 10: Fall 2014 Students Reporting Single Parent Status, by Financial Aid Status

| | Single Parent | Total | % Single Parent |
|------------------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------|
| Financial Aid Student | 426 | 1,423 | 30% |
| No Fin Aid | 28 | 1,365 | 2% |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

Table 10 shows that a large number of Edison students indicate that they are single parents and a large percentage of them seek financial aid. This is a large population to which the College tries to provide supplemental support through programming, networking, and community based information sharing.

The demographic insights provided in the charts above provide context against which affordability and financial access can be displayed. Edison has needed, when permitted, to increase tuition to help ensure the level of access, support, and quality students deserve and expect is maintained across their time on campus. Still, either through legislative mandate or student interest, the percentages of tuition increases when looked at year-to-year have been relatively small. Table 11 shows the changes in tuition costs at Edison over the recent past. Please note the percentage change in the far right column is based on total comparison to cost from the prior year, not the percentage of change in any of the three component costs that make up the College's tuition charges.

Table 11: FY 2002-FY 2015 Tuition History

| Fiscal Year | General | Technical | Activity | Instructional | Total | % Change |
|--------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 2002 | \$11.00 | \$3.00 | \$0.00 | \$70.00 | \$84.00 | NA |
| 2003 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$76.00 | \$92.00 | 9.52% |
| 2004 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$81.50 | \$97.50 | 5.98% |
| 2005 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$87.00 | \$103.00 | 5.64% |
| 2006 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$93.00 | \$109.00 | 5.83% |
| 2007 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$99.00 | \$115.00 | 5.50% |
| 2008 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$99.00 | \$115.00 | 0.00% |
| 2009 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$99.00 | \$115.00 | 0.00% |
| 2010 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$103.00 | \$119.00 | 3.48% |
| 2011 | \$11.00 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$107.00 | \$123.00 | 3.36% |
| 2012 | \$15.30 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$107.00 | \$127.30 | 3.50% |
| 2013 | \$15.30 | \$5.00 | \$0.00 | \$113.66 | \$133.96 | 5.23% |
| 2014 | \$14.30 | \$5.00 | \$1.00 | \$116.99 | \$137.29 | 2.49% |
| 2015 | \$14.30 | \$5.00 | \$1.00 | \$120.32 | \$140.62 | 2.43% |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

The need to increase tuition is typically driven by the need to offset College costs that change over time. Some examples include instructional supplies, contracted pay increases, and the cost of health insurance. If other funding sources, such as the SSI (State Share of Instruction) were ever to increase at a rate that is close to, matches, or exceeds normal inflationary need, the need to increase tuition would diminish. During the first year that the full amount of the SSI (State Share of Instruction) was awarded based on student performance rather than just on headcount, Edison realized the fourth largest increase in state funding for the year, which helped to offset an enormous increase in the cost of health insurance. If not for the increase in funding realized from success points, the need to increase tuition would have been even greater, and given the legislative constraint placed on Edison and other state colleges relative to the amount of tuition increases allowed, would have been impossible. This would have resulted in an even more pronounced need to balance the budget in other ways during the past fiscal year, from which the College was largely spared. Table 12 shows how Edison performed in earning performance points (and receiving associated funding) with the other cohort small state community colleges in the Ohio. While we have earned at least as many or more than our expected share of points in most areas, the table also helps us to identify an area where improvement would have the most immediate impact, and where competition for funding is likely to be very high, and that is in the area of developmental English success points.

Table 12: FY Performance Funding Success Points, Small State Community College Cohort for Fiscal Year 2014

| Success Factor → | 12 Hrs | 24 Hrs | 36 Hrs | DEV Engl Success | DEV Math Success | Total |
|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|------------------------|------------------------|--------|
| College Name | | | | | | |
| Clark State Community College | 1,496 | 903 | 687 | 402 | 329 | 3,817 |
| Edison State Community College | 876 | 628 | 527 | 101 | 262 | 2,394 |
| North Central State College | 766 | 549 | 445 | 139 | 143 | 2,042 |
| Northwest State Community College | 1,197 | 814 | 595 | 145 | 248 | 2,999 |
| Southern State Community College | 785 | 591 | 438 | 192 | 329 | 2,335 |
| Terra State Community College | 736 | 522 | 408 | 168 | 128 | 1,962 |
| Zane State College | 946 | 599 | 497 | 290 | 362 | 2,694 |
| Cohort Total | 6,802 | 4,606 | 3,597 | 1,437 | 1,801 | 18,243 |
| Edison's % of total points | 13% | 14% | 15% | 7% | 15% | 13% |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

It is also important to look at affordability again from the consumer/student perspective, this time with an eye towards comparison ‘shopping’. We know that the amounts of federal grants and loans are constrained across all institutions. This means that the lower a college’s cost to enroll, the farther those federal awards can be stretched toward completion. While not all students are savvy consumers in this way, the trend is certainly moving in that direction. Students who have seen the weight of student loan debt constrain their parents’ lifestyles are reticent to repeat their approach. So, it is of continuing importance that Edison maintain a competitive position relative to student cost while still working to balance the budgets and provide a high quality experience. Table 13 shows that among the small community colleges in the state, Edison has the second lowest overall cost per fifteen credit hours of instruction.

**Table 13: Average Cost Per 15 Credit Hours for Fiscal Year 2014
Small State Community College Cohort**

| Ohio Small State Community College Cohort | Instructional Cost per 15 Credit Hours | General/Other Costs Per 15 Credits | Total Cost per 15 Credit Hours |
|---|--|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Zane State College | \$1,920 | \$360 | \$2,280 |
| North Central State College | \$1,885 | \$359 | \$2,244 |
| Northwest State Community College | \$2,149 | \$90 | \$2,239 |
| Terra State Community College | \$1,999 | \$222 | \$2,221 |
| Southern State Community College | \$1,880 | \$236 | \$2,116 |
| Edison State Community College | \$1,805 | \$305 | \$2,110 |
| Clark State Community College | \$1,820 | \$270 | \$2,090 |

Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15

Sub-End 5e. Online learning provides a sound alternative to students in their learning journey.

Contrary to concerns once widely held during the onset of online course delivery, online classes share the same rigor as their terrestrial counterparts, meet the same course objectives, classes and utilize the same syllabus. To say nothing of the coursework, at Edison, online instructors receive additional training above the level of face-to-face instructors including Blackboard 2.0, which helps teach navigation of the online learning management system (LMS), and Teaching 2.0 which exposes online faculty to best practices in online course management, execution, and assessment. These “Teaching” classes are aligned with the Quality Matters standards which are also the foundation for Teaching 3.0 – course designing. This additional training helps to ensure that all online classes have the same rigor as the face-to-face classes.

All students must prove their ability to succeed in the online environment via course work or a proficiency exam, before they are permitted to take an online course. This helps to ensure that the difference in delivery will not negatively affect a student’s class performance. In fact, with great regularity, students who do not pass the online readiness assessment communicate gratefulness for having been able to learn that online courses were not a good fit for them in a way that prevents harm on their transcript and saves them significant time and money over failing a course to find out ‘the hard way’.

The flexibility that the online format provides allows those who encounter the barriers of childcare and transportation the opportunity to complete their educational goals. Online students have access to just as many resources as on campus students; we have e-tutoring online to review papers electronically, students learn to collaborate and communicate in a written environment with their classmates, librarians, career counselors and faculty advisors are always available through e-mail and/or Blackboard.

Over 30% of Edison courses are available at varying points in the academic calendar in online format, and online learning accounted for 16% of the hours delivered at Edison during the fall 2014 semester. Additionally, 25% of all students during fall 2014 were engaged in online, credit-bearing coursework of some kind. The flexibility that the online format provides is a key reason for its popularity with students. It allows those who encounter the barriers of childcare, transportation, and inflexible work schedules the opportunity to pursue their educational goals with a heretofore unavailable amount of flexibility.

The overall pass rate for online delivery rivals the standard, traditional lecture format and the overall pass rate across all delivery methods has remained almost the same despite the increase in online hours being attempted since 2009. This shows both an adaptation of the method and the students combining to make online delivery just another component of mainstream academia.

| Table 14: Course Pass Rates for Courses Sections Delivered by Multiple Methods | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| | Total 2014FR | Pass Rate | Total 2013FR | Pass Rate | Total 2012FR | Pass Rate |
| FLEX | 45 | 91% | 72 | 96% | 296 | 84% |
| LECTURE | 2,181 | 85% | 3,196 | 86% | 3,527 | 85% |
| ONLINE | 1,040 | 83% | 984 | 83% | 1,046 | 83% |
| WEBFLEX | 313 | 76% | 466 | 77% | 487 | 75% |
| Total | 3,579 | 84% | 4,718 | 85% | 5,356 | 84% |
| Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15 | | | | | | |

| Table 15: Age Range of Online Students as Percentage of Total Headcount and Online Headcount | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Age Range | Online Headcount | % Online | Total Headcount | % Headcount Online |
| Under 18 | 165 | 22% | 654 | 25% |
| 18-19 | 80 | 10% | 439 | 18% |
| 20-21 | 87 | 11% | 300 | 29% |
| 22-25 | 104 | 14% | 387 | 27% |
| 26-29 | 90 | 12% | 263 | 34% |
| 30-34 | 86 | 11% | 243 | 35% |
| 35-39 | 68 | 9% | 185 | 37% |
| 40-49 | 63 | 8% | 217 | 29% |
| Over 50 | 22 | 3% | 100 | 22% |
| Total | 765 | 100% | 2,788 | 27% |
| Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15 | | | | |

22% of online students, interestingly, are made up largely of CC+ students (those under age 18 are typically still in high school)

That small clumping aside, the distribution of the method utilized across ages 18-39 shows just how much broad appeal online learning has and how much it has come to be accepted as part of the College's scheduling mix of courses. It is also significant that the ages that utilize online to the largest extent (as a percentage of their total headcount online) are those between the ages of 26 and 49, years when the scheduling, personal, and professional complications of many lives ramp up. Consider that without online learning, Edison's ability to compete in this space would not exist, and this share of enrollment would likely choose to attend somewhere else where they could take courses online.

| Table 16: County Distribution of Online Learners for Fall 2014 | | |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Resident County | Online Headcount | % of Total Online |
| Miami | 304 | 40% |
| Shelby | 174 | 23% |
| Darke | 151 | 20% |
| Montgomery | 28 | 4% |
| Auglaize | 23 | 3% |
| Champaign | 21 | 3% |
| Logan | 14 | 2% |
| Mercer | 13 | 2% |
| Cuyahoga | 7 | 1% |
| Preble | 7 | 1% |
| Allen | 5 | 1% |
| Clark | 4 | 1% |
| All Others | 14 | 2% |
| Total | 765 | 100% |
| Source: Institutional Research. 3/13/15 | | |

83% of online learners live in our statutory three-county service district.

Ends Statement #5 – Access and Affordability
Monitoring Report Authored By:

Scott Burnam, Vice President of Student Affairs
Dr. Patti Ross, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs
John Shishoff, Vice President of Administration & Finance
Becky Telford, Director of Institutional Research