Our Approach

Why C3?
The C3 model for course redesign leverages active learning to impact student learning outcomes by maximizing student and faculty engagement. It is a viable solution for merging the current need for sustainable teaching methods with a more interactive learning experience for millennial students.

Strategy
The Three C’s are the underlying principles that guide the process needed to transform a university’s campus culture, teaching practices, and the disposition of each student from being knowledge consumers to contributors. Each C represents a level in the process. When all three levels converge through active participation, the Power of C is maximized through an enhanced educational experience for quality teaching and learning.

CONNECT
We connect the educational community to best practices in active learning through student-centered approaches.

COMMUNICATE
We communicate with subject matter experts, universities and other partners across the United States to provide interdisciplinary and sustainable active learning solutions.

COLLABORATE
We collaborate using best practices for teaching and learning innovations that seamlessly integrate academic technology with course content and learning space development.
Our Process

7 STEPS to Course Redesign

STEP 1 Needs Assessment
IAIP works with subject matter experts—academic deans, department chairs, and faculty—to discuss benchmarks for effective practice.

STEP 2 Identify Course
Identify one course you would like to redesign and submit the syllabus for that course for review by IAIP instructional designers.

STEP 3 Innovation Workshops
Faculty attend Educate 2 Innovate™ (E2i) Workshops to learn best practices in active learning beginning with a summer series for course redesign.

STEP 4 Course Syllabus Conversion
Faculty submit a redesigned course syllabus to IAIP for review.

STEP 5 Fall/Spring Course Observations
IAIP research team conduct 12-week course observations to ensure training fidelity.

STEP 6 Course Modification
IAIP works with faculty members during one-to-one consultations to capture course modifications made during the semester and to provide recommendations for continuing practice.

STEP 7 Evaluation
IAIP provides comprehensive evaluation services that include both formative and summative assessments.

Visit [www.famu.edu/IAIP](http://www.famu.edu/IAIP) to watch the “Get Active” video.
Student Centered
Faculty Driven

Timeline

YEAR 1 & 2
- Revised Academic Learning Outcomes and Course Syllabi
- Common Exam Repository
- Short-term Outcomes a
  Improved Student Performance

YEAR 3
- Active Teaching Repository of In-class and Out-of-Class Activities
- Active Learning Repository of Formative and Summative Assessments
- Mid-Term Outcomes a
  Improved Progression and Retention Rates

YEAR 4 – 6
- Communities of Practice
- Scholarly Disseminations
- Long-Term Outcomes b
  Improved Graduation Rates

Enhanced Educational Experience

Florida Board of Governors PERFORMANCE METRICS

a Academic Progress Rate (2nd Year Retention with GPA above 2.0)
b Six Year Graduation Rate (Full-time and Part-time FTIC Students)

Source: www.flbog.edu, Board of Governors Performance Funding Model Overview, April 2015
How do we measure results?

The program evaluation plan consists of five areas: Faculty Development, Faculty Disposition, C3 Learning Spaces®, Student Performance, and Student Disposition. These five areas include comprehensive evaluation tools for both formative and summative assessments with a minimum of overlap. They are presented here in summary form to provide a workable guide and clear picture of the evaluation plan.

**Faculty Development**

*Kirkpatrick New World Order Model*

- Level 1: Reaction
- Level 2: Learning
- Level 3: Behavior
- Level 4: Results

Source: www.kirkpatrickpartners.com

**Faculty Disposition**

Provides qualitative analysis of the faculty perception, attitudes and beliefs through focus group discussions and surveys.

**C3 Learning Spaces**

*Learning Space Rating System*

Assesses how well classroom design supports and enables active learning activities.

Source: www.educause.edu/eli/initiatives/learning-space-rating-system

*Post-Occupancy Evaluations*

Assesses how well redesigned learning spaces match the needs of the college or school.

**Student Performance**

*Historical Classroom Performance*

Provides contextual comparative analyses of student performance pre- and post-intervention.

*Learning Gains Assessment*

Provides comparative analyses for acquisition of content knowledge as measured by common exams in traditional learning and revised courses.

*Retention/Progression/Graduation/Pass-Fail/Withdrawal Rates*

Comparative analyses of the intervention versus traditional learning courses in core metrics.

**Student Disposition**

Provides qualitative analysis of the student perception, attitudes and beliefs through focus group discussion, Learning and Study Strategies Inventory and student surveys.
What are students saying about active learning?

“The best feature of the active learning classroom for me was the group interaction. By working together in groups and with the professor, I was able to learn what not to do immediately and that made my work more efficient. You also learn more and retain the information better, rather than remembering something to pass a test. I wish all of my courses were taught in this type of classroom.”

—Jasmine Vanderhorst, FAMU Alumna, Industrial Engineering

What are faculty saying about our Course Redesign Workshop?

“The active learning training has provided me with a plethora of activities to engage the students from the moment they walk into the class until they complete their work and leave. I already had quite a bit of materials, but now have a very organized plan to get the most out of the class time. I am very grateful the university provided this opportunity.”

—Carol Scarlett, Ph.D., FAMU Associate Professor, Physics
Preliminary Indicators

Preliminary data show positive trends in student outcomes for biology, chemistry, and physics courses that are taught inside of active learning classrooms—unique learning spaces known as C3 Learning Spaces®. A five-year review of classroom performance data beginning the fall 2009 through fall 2013 demonstrates the following positive trends in student outcomes (grades) for introductory biology, chemistry and physics courses taught inside of the active learning classrooms.

9% Average Increase

Grades C or Better

- 5% increase for Biology I (BSC 1010)
- 9% increase for Biology II (BSC 1011)
- 5% increase for Chemistry I (CHM 1046)
- 16% increase for Physics I (PHY 2048)

10% Average Decrease

Grades D, F, or W

- 5% decrease for Biology I (BSC 1010)
- 8% decrease for Biology II (BSC 1011)
- 11% decrease for Chemistry I (CHM 1046)
- 17% decrease for Physics I (PHY 2048)
Next Steps

Partnership Agreement
IAIP is a Title III supported activity.