STUDENT-CENTERED ACTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT WITH UPSIDE-DOWN PEDAGOGIES: STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND COURSE EVALUATIONS IN A FLIPPED BIOLOGY CLASSROOM

> KEVIN CURRY JR | KIMBERLY PIGFORD | DR. MIRIAM FERZLI | DR. TRAVIS PARK NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY





#### Introduction

- Despite a focus on investigating new ways to teach large undergraduate courses, lecture is still the predominate method.
- SCALE-UP facilitates hands-on, interactive, highly collaborative environments for large undergraduate courses.
- SCALE-UP flips the classroom focus into collaboration/working through material rather than learning it for the first time.

#### Methods

- Between-group comparison study
- Analyzed differences between SCALE-UP program students to those in a modified traditional lecture classroom (control)

Course evaluations

- Performance on a final exam
  - Short answer
  - Multiple choice
- Overall course grade
- Class size for the "control" is 240 students, and 96 for the SCALE-UP section

#### Methods

Course Evaluation Analysis (response rate between 51%-62%)

- ► Five sections of Biology 181 (n=501)
- Four sections of Biology 183 (n=312)
- All sections taught be the same professor between 2012-2014
- Performance Measure Analysis
  - ► Four sections of Biology 181 (n= 659)
  - Four sections of Biology 183 (n= 618)
  - All sections taught by the same instructor between 2013 and 2014
- One-way ANOVA's to determine any differences within section over time.
- T-tests to detect any differences between the SCALE-UP and traditional sections on all measures.
- The alpha level was set a priori at .05.

## **Course Evaluation Items**

#### Course Evaluations BIO 181 & BIO 183

|   | Section             | Ν          | Μ            | SD          | t     | р     |
|---|---------------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------|-------|
| 1.Instructor stated course objectives               | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 614<br>199 | 4.48<br>4.60 | .71<br>.60  | -2.08 | .038* |
| 2. Instructor receptive to students out-class       | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 598<br>192 | 4.33<br>4.52 | .82<br>.68  | -2.82 | .005* |
| 3. Instructor explained material well               | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 609<br>199 | 4.15<br>4.37 | 1.02<br>.78 | -2.87 | .004* |
| 4. Instructor was enthusiastic about teaching       | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 612<br>199 | 4.72<br>4.87 | .58<br>.34  | -3.45 | .001* |
| 5. Instructor was prepared for class                | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 609<br>198 | 4.65<br>4.65 | .60<br>.63  | 126   | .90   |
| 6. Instructor gave useful feedback                  | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 608<br>199 | 4.20<br>4.40 | 1.00<br>.82 | -2.53 | .012* |
| 7. Instructor treated students with respect         | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 611<br>199 | 4.58<br>4.72 | .62<br>.50  | -2.85 | .005* |
| 8. Overall, the instructor was an effective teacher | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 607<br>199 | 4.27<br>4.51 | .98<br>.72  | -3.23 | .001* |

## Course Evaluations...

| Course Eva   | luations Bl         | 0 181 &    | BIO 1        | 83           |       |       |
|--|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|
|  | Section             | Ν          | Μ            | SD           | t     | p     |
| 9. Course readings were valuable aids to learning          | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 601<br>197 | 3.93<br>4.20 | 1.10<br>.93  | -2.97 | .003* |
| 10. Course assignments were valuable aids to learning      | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 607<br>199 | 4.16<br>4.25 | .92<br>.88   | -1.19 | .235  |
| 11. Course improved my knowledge of the subject            | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 612<br>199 | 4.40<br>4.57 | .84<br>.69   | -2.56 | .011* |
| 12. Overall this course was excellent                      | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 611<br>199 | 4.02<br>4.26 | 1.08<br>.86  | .2.83 | .005* |
| 13. Lab sessions contributed to mastery of course concepts | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 606<br>197 | 3.78<br>3.99 | .99<br>.96   | -2.58 | .010* |
| 14. Lab facilities. equipment, supplies were adequate      | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 606<br>197 | 4.30<br>4.33 | .66<br>.67   | 51    | .606  |
| 15. Degree of lab difficulty was appropriate               | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 606<br>197 | 3.71<br>3.81 | 1.06<br>1.05 | -1.22 | .221  |
| 16. Overall, labs were effective learning experiences      | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 609<br>196 | 3.79<br>3.99 | .99<br>.94   | -2.43 | .015* |
| Overall Mean   | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 614<br>199 | 4.19<br>4.37 | .85<br>.70   | -2.63 | .009* |

## **ANOVA- Student Evaluations Across Time**

| One Way           | y ANOVA -B        | IO 181 C | Control- 20    | 013-2014 |      | One Way           | y ANOVA -B        | IO 183 ( | Control- 2     | 013-2014 |      |
|-------------------|-------------------|----------|----------------|----------|------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|----------------|----------|------|
|                   | Sum of<br>Squares | df       | Mean<br>Square | F        | Sig. |                   | Sum of<br>Squares | df       | Mean<br>Square | F        | Sig. |
| Between<br>Groups | .914              | 2        | .457           | .664     | .516 | Between<br>Groups | .075              | 1        | .075           | .097     | .756 |
| Within<br>Groups  | 265.634           | 386      | .688           |          |      | Within<br>Groups  | 172.379           | 223      | .773           |          |      |
| Total             | 266.548           | 388      |                |          |      | Total             | 172.454           | 224      |                |          |      |

| One Way ANOVA -BIO 181 Scale-UP- 2013-2014 |                   |     |                |      | One Way | y ANOVA -B        | O 183 S           | cale-UP- | 2013-201       | 4    |      |
|--|-------------------|-----|----------------|------|---------|-------------------|-------------------|----------|----------------|------|------|
|  | Sum of<br>Squares | df  | Mean<br>Square | F    | Sig.    |                   | Sum of<br>Squares | df       | Mean<br>Square | F    | Sig. |
| Between<br>Groups                          | .043              | 1   | .043           | .084 | .773    | Between<br>Groups | .055              | 1        | .055           | .119 | .731 |
| Within<br>Groups                           | 56.602            | 110 | .515           |      |         | Within<br>Groups  | 39.409            | 85       | .464           |      |      |
| Total                                      | 56.645            | 111 |                |      |         | Total             | 39.464            | 86       |                |      |      |

## Course Grades BIO 181

| Performance Measures BIO 181 |                     |            |                |                |     |      |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|-----|------|--|--|--|--|
|                              | Section             | Ν          | Μ              | SD             | t   | р    |  |  |  |  |
| Exam Short Answer            | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 471<br>187 | 55.38<br>56.25 | 17.24<br>16.16 | 592 | .554 |  |  |  |  |
| Exam Multiple Choice         | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 471<br>187 | 52.89<br>53.61 | 11.80<br>10.02 | 738 | .461 |  |  |  |  |
| Final Grade                  | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 472<br>187 | 80.80<br>81.44 | 12.93<br>11.31 | 598 | .550 |  |  |  |  |

## **Course Grades BIO 183**

| Performance Measures BIO 183 |                     |            |                |                |        |      |  |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------|----------------|--------|------|--|--|--|--|
|                              | Section             | Ν          | Μ              | SD             | t      | р    |  |  |  |  |
| Exam Short Answer            | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 432<br>184 | 55.82<br>57.71 | 18.26<br>12.96 | -1.274 | .203 |  |  |  |  |
| Exam Multiple Choice         | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 432<br>185 | 50.77<br>50.90 | 14.42<br>10.73 | 106    | .915 |  |  |  |  |
| Final Grade                  | Control<br>SCALE-UP | 432<br>186 | 77.98<br>79.44 | 17.71<br>11.44 | -1.034 | .302 |  |  |  |  |

# **Student Comments- BIO 181 SCALE-UP**

- "The course was well planned out. I enjoyed the Scale-Up because of the interactions and discussions. This was my favorite course for the semester."

Fall 2012

"I unknowingly signed up for the SCALE-UP section of Bio 181, and it was one of my best mistakes! I really like the group dynamic and feel that I got more out of the class than I would have from the normal lecture."

Fall 2014

"The flipped course that I was part of is an amazing thing! I loved getting to be so interactive with my peers and it really helped in learning the material"

Fall 2014

# Student Comments- BIO 183 SCALE-UP

I really liked the scale up course as opposed to the traditional lecture hall. It allows you to develop relationships with your peers, TA's, and the professor."

Spring 2013

"The classroom setting is a good way for students to easily access assistance from TA's or the instructor. Placing students in groups also helps them build the necessary social skills of cooperation and communication"

Spring 2013

"I really enjoyed the scale-up version of this course. Personally, I learn a lot better with hands-on activities and out of class assignments."

Spring 2014

# Summary of Results

- No significant differences between SCALE-UP and traditional students on any of the performance measures.
- One-way ANOVA's confirmed no differences within section over time.
- T-tests indicated a significant difference on overall course evaluations scores between SCALE-UP (4.37) and traditional groups (4.19) (t -2.6, p.009), and several significant differences on ratings of the instructor in favor of the SCALE-UP section.

#### Implications/Recommendations

- The SCALE-UP program can be implemented with similar marks for student performance outcomes while being a more enjoyable experience for students.
- This study controlled for teaching bias by analyzing the data of one instructor. At least for this professor, students in a flipped SCALE-UP section rate the course (and professor) higher on end of course evaluations than those in a similar yet larger lecture section.
- Further research should examine this relationship with different professors and from SCALE-UP sections in different science content areas.

# Thank You!

What questions do you have?