

***FITW Campus Lead Meeting 12/04/2020 – Minutes***  
**Meeting Information**

---

**Date:** December 4, 2020

**Time:** 11:00AM-12:00PM

**Location:** Zoom (Virtual meeting)

**Attendees:** Laura Sullivan-Green, Jane Dong, Nancy McQueen, Alison Baski, Shandy Hauk, and Tyler Stannard

---

**I. Grant Status Summary**

**i. APR**

- Budget – Over the project timeline, we have spent approx. \*\$2,992,900.35 out of the original \$3 million budget. (\*Pending final payments from partners)
- Campus Status Reports both submitted from LA and CPP.
- FITW Website act as final dissemination project.
- Currently have all FITW workshop materials and faculty submissions uploaded
- Received 90% of Core faculty lesson plans. (Robin Wilson from CPP, and Marion from SJSU remain)
- Lesson plans from mini-grants and Core faculty will be uploaded however will need to be requested accordingly.
- Will compile a master list of dissemination and articles for the website.
- To conclude grant goals, we are pulling overall retention data and graduation rates from each STEM college. Longevity data needs more time to be assessed to truly see final impact.
- Faculty survey from WestEd will be used to report the faculty impact at each campus.
- Grade reporting will be compared from submitted traditional and flipped classroom.
- Laura and Tyler are finalizing the FITW APR.
- APR will be reported by paper template and submitted to program officer.
- Besides the evaluation and dissemination, Flipped workshops listed on FITW website.
- Two hold offs on Core faculty – Robin Wilson (CPP) and Marion Campisi (SJSU). Will contact them for their lesson plans (materials). Shandy can help contact Marion
- Graduation rate data will be gathered overall in the coming years as data is not available
- Retention data being pulled from LA and SJSU. Victoria is assisting with CPP data sets with Tyler.
- Mention in APR, because of the timeline of the project and COVID project. Not feasible to make these comparisons of this project. Longevity data will need to be assessed over future years.
- Each campus experienced significant changes (120 units) in 2013. So, these data sets are uncomparable.

- The current data in Calc is available, however the other STEM majors were not assessed in detail.
- Tyler and Laura tying up all loose ends for the final report.
- Adv board meeting will be a bit short due to the final year with limited activities. Shandy will be taking majority of the time to provide content for the final Calc-Study evaluation with the project scope.
- Last data pull was Spring 2020, pulled data in subsequent data for Calc-Study.

## II. WestEd Report (Shandy)

- The comparison of the implementation of the flipped model shows again no dip with additional data sets when converting from Traditional to flipped.
- Shandy, unsure of the statistical data in historical. A campus-by-campus comparison the data will vary.
- Pell data, not statistically significant. The flipped classroom and traditional comparison is minimal, but the new activity based teaching that did not take a significant different in student outcome when shifting pedagogy.
- Student staying in the class that pass the class with a medium of 2.1 or higher.
- Advanced mathematics attempts and success, every 2 people attempted an additional class. Flipped groups should a 91% succeed and passed the course. Comparison students attempted more classes, however had less pass rate. Flipped attempted less, however pass more. Flipped students more cautious, however when taking another course, they passed it at a higher rate.
- Advanced Math attempts rate over all. Traditional students were likely more to enroll into math courses. Flipped students may take less, however succeed more. College B shows different results, where Flipped students have a less pass rate.
- CPP time entry of the data sets came in later, so that subsequent data sets are not available. Could do the first / two semesters. Calc I and Calc II and beyond (do it by campus).
- TRU dimension by condition, flipped classroom observations. The evidence is apparent in the flipped classrooms and absent in the traditional.
- Overall pass rate for each class – shows wide variety of pass rates between controls and treatment.
- Grade assessment may not be the true evaluation for the flipped classroom. Depending on instructor, institutional, dept assessment. A lot of variables in grade assessment, may need to consider another evaluation method.
- Flipped student survey, flipped students reported spending more time outside of class. Each other aspect has no strong significant difference.
- Lecture and belonging has high correlation. Groups and belonging.
- Some students feel the lecture and group work brought a sense of belonging.
- Response in APR, about longevity. Had some basic statistics, but all campuses moved to 120-unit program, we can't look farther back. Also, the switch to quarter to semester, this was likely impacted. Anything after Spring 2020, COVID.

- We knew when we made the proposal, could use historical data from previous 3 years. Delays, conversions to semester format to make comparison from campus. Comparison made possible was the delay in the conversion to not lapse to make comparison.
- Two positive outcomes – a similar pedagogical innovation across vastly different environments was positive. A similar support and system, it was successful. The performance in calculus was maintained in short turn (immediately)
- Consequential result, it appears that students that take the flipped course take consideration into their future course taking with a higher success rate. They enroll in less; however, they succeed better. This nuance had students learned more about themselves and their abilities in the college learning process.
- Interesting results outside of the original grant intentions.

### **III. Advisory Board Meeting (Dec 18<sup>th</sup> 10am)**

- Adv board – present the overall evaluation outcomes first, then go into the details of the comparison among the three participating campuses.
- 17 confirmed for the board meeting