

## **Fleshing Out Faculty Expectations When Flipping the Classroom Design**

Excellent course design is the hallmark of a good educator, and “flipped” learning represents a theoretically sound innovation in classroom learning. Flipping moves reading, videos, podcasts and technology enhanced lecturing *before* class while *in-class* activities focus on interaction and comprehension. Integrating active learning and new learning technologies increases student engagement, but rewards for the educator are not as straightforward. In this presentation I will help participants explore some issues that may arise when a faculty member assesses a flipped course. There are lessons that administrators, funding agencies and others need to understand so they can credit the faculty member for teaching well.

Flipped learning or inverted learning takes Blooms taxonomy and flips it on it’s head. While traditional classrooms teach the stages as remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and then creating, with the first of these stages done in-class until designing, publishing, inventing,

producing or planning is done out-of-class in a final assignment, the lessons are flipped in this new approach. In-class exercises help with the creating phase, with evaluating that includes critiquing, testing, judging or defending coming after that as an exercise debrief. Final homework or reflection assignments help guide student's understanding and remembering. In flipped learning the majority of critical thinking is done in-class (Flip It Consulting, 2012 ). Another visual that helps understand the basics of flipped learning is a timeline in Dereck Bruffs blog (2012). Rather than first exposure to material being in class, first exposure of content is experienced via videos or readings by a student *before* class; deeper learning via activities done *in class* lead to some additional homework or preparation for next class to assist students in increasing their confidence in using the content in other contexts.

Whether you consider flipped learning to be a disruptive innovation (e.g., Christensen, 1997; Christensen and Raynor, 2002) or not, assessment of this innovation cannot simply be only concerned with the end result: student learning. Like other innovations, assessment needs to be multifaceted. Using an engineering assessment framework (Hang, Chen & Yu, 2011) as inspiration, I will construct faculty interview questions that measure four

areas: Student Learning, Department Positioning, Technology Use, and Other Favorable Faculty Drivers. The areas should help us get faculty gains from flipped learning to match student gains.

Student engagement and student learning increases are already under study by several scholarship of teaching and learning (SOTL) researchers (e.g., Mazur, 2009) with initial promising results. By reviewing initial interviews of faculty who are flipping their courses and an initial sample of student perceptions of fairness after they have been part of a flipped design, I learned which perceptions may help guide student satisfaction with the learning, and with positive evaluations of the course and faculty member. The suggestions in each of the four assessment areas will comprise the majority of this virtual presentation.