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Abstract
The online Supplemental Instruction (SI) scheduling surveys are available during the first week of the semester. This report summarizes semester outcomes based on student participation on the scheduling survey. This report duplicates an assessment completed for previous semesters, to again show that students who complete the scheduling survey:

- Are more likely to attend SI sessions,
- Attend more SI sessions than the students who do not complete the survey, and
- Earn a higher final grade in the course than the students who do not complete the survey.

Executive Summary
Purpose
The purpose of this report is to compare final grades and SI participation of students based on participation on the scheduling survey. These data also contribute to promotional information for SI and additional assessments of the SI program.

Methods
During the first week of classes for the semester, SI Leaders promote the SI program to students using a verbal presentation. During the presentation, Leaders announced the online scheduling survey and encouraged students to complete the survey.

The online scheduling survey has been in use since spring 2009. Scheduling survey data are now collected only through this web-based survey. An associated online program allowed the SI Leaders to determine the best days, times, and locations for SI sessions.

Results for this report are based on frequency data and comparison of means between two groups: participants and non-participants of the SI scheduling survey.

Findings

- Table 1 reports the frequencies of grades categories, based on response to the scheduling survey.
- Table 2 reports the frequencies of SI participation, based on response to the scheduling survey.

Two important findings:
- Scheduling survey participants earned at least a final grade of a C at a rate 8.7% higher than students who did not participate in the survey.
- Scheduling survey participants were more than twice as likely to attend SI sessions than students who did not participate in the survey.

Discussion and Recommendations
We continue to see a large percent of students not completing the scheduling survey, but similar to fall 2010:
1. Non-responders had significantly lower final grades, compared to responders.
2. Non-responders attended significantly fewer SI sessions, compared to responders.

Formal promotion of SI begins with the scheduling survey process each semester. Hence, we must emphasize the importance of this responsibility to SI Leaders, and request that instructors reinforce the importance of the program.
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Promotional strategies that take advantage of this data include:
- Scripting our promotions by SI Leaders,
- Requesting faculty/staff encourage students’ participation in our scheduling process, and
- Requiring a higher expectation for promotions by SI Leaders in-class and online throughout the semester.

### Table 1. Final Grade Categories, Based on Response to the SI Scheduling Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Responders</th>
<th>Survey Non-Responders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined A, B, C</td>
<td>2359 74.2%</td>
<td>6064 65.5%</td>
<td>8423 67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined C-, D, F, Drop</td>
<td>820 25.8%</td>
<td>3188 34.5%</td>
<td>4008 32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Final Course Grade</td>
<td>2.60***</td>
<td>2.42***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant difference of means at p<0.001.

### Table 2. Participation in SI Sessions, Based on Response to the SI Scheduling Survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey Responders</th>
<th>Survey Non-Responders</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI Participant</td>
<td>1394 43.9%</td>
<td>1740 19.4%</td>
<td>3134 25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participant</td>
<td>1785 56.1%</td>
<td>7238 80.6%</td>
<td>9023 74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean # of Sessions Attended</td>
<td>2.5***</td>
<td>0.7***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Significant difference of means at p<0.001.