Evidence-based teaching: how do we all get there?
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There are compelling reasons to shift our pedagogy toward evidence-based active learning methods that substantially improve student success, and now plenty of resources to aid in that shift. These include the recent CBMS Statement on Active Learning, MAA Instructional Practices Guide (IPG), and MIT Electronic Seminar on Mathematics Education (see also Resources below). But implementation is neither quick nor easy. There are still plenty of individual, institutional, cultural, and professional obstacles, along with wonderful opportunities.

At the 2019 Joint Mathematics Meetings we co-organized a guided discussion – an “un-panel” – sponsored by the American Mathematical Society’s Committee on Education in order to stimulate the process of our community moving toward active learning in our teaching pedagogy. Seventy participants with fifteen discussion leaders expanded an initial list of issues, and considered questions around both challenges and opportunities. Here we summarize from these discussions, suggesting areas for collaborative efforts ranging from local colleagues and educational institutions to national and global professional societies.

Fourteen issues were identified, and although there is overlap between them, we summarize participant comments separately for each, mostly direct quotes from notes taken by discussion leaders (more quotes are available in our report[1]):

1. Training graduate students and early career mathematicians: Feelings in a word: “Isolated.” There is a need for mentors, encouragement, community, local discussion, concrete practices. “Need for a ramp on - how do you start learning to do this and how do you feel supported in the learning?”

2. Developing departmental experts who can lead and mentor: “More people need to rise as leaders - not be appointed necessarily - but gather groups together to talk about and try active learning.” There is a “lack of expertise, a lack of confidence, and a lack of time. If there were a visible group of people doing active learning at the institution, a person could be mentored,” but without such a group we won’t see progress.

3. Offering wide-scale programming for department chairs: Making “recommendations to administrators giving active learning pedagogies the imprimatur of the mathematics professional organizations (in addition to the marvelous CBMS statement on active learning) would help nationally.” “Engage the department faculty in discussions on the case for adopting active learning pedagogy and the consequent need for the faculty who are not currently using it to give it consideration.” Have “chairs/leadership encourage an MAA IPG-reading club.” “Highlight active learning pedagogy as the gold standard for effective methods of instruction.”

4. Updating inventory tools of teaching practices for observations and training: “We need an inventory tool building on the MAA IPG. This is an area where our professional societies can make a big contribution by supplying this for the community.”

5. Shifting program evaluation towards active learning and deeper, more authentic learning outcomes: “Active learning goes hand-in-hand with a shift from low-level recall expectations of students to more valuable outcomes. We should be going from assessments which just test whether one can recall and perform appropriate techniques of integration to instead asking for some proofs (even at entry level) or authentic applications (given only a context one has to see how an integral would apply, discuss assumptions and accuracy, etc.) or even say historical development. If one shifts attention to these kinds of outcomes, then classrooms obviously need to put more emphasis on students practicing these, which means a shift to active learning.”

6. Large lectures, and the challenges they present for interaction, including individual feedback, group work, and whole-class discussion: A good, proven strategy is having “undergraduate learning assistants (see Resources below) and graduate teaching assistants in the active learning classroom.”

7. Dissemination of teaching materials currently biased towards lecture format: We should “gather/curate materials that have been developed for specific courses, but are not in wide circulation, to help minimize the amount of work and effort required to adopt and implement active learning pedagogies.” Or think more broadly about “new publishing models and systems for pedagogical materials including worksheets, think-pair-share questions, applets, discussion of areas of difficulty and common student responses and plans for addressing them, and other materials which support active learning, along with textbooks, which combine features of the arXiv, MathReviews, MathOverflow, Curated Courses & UTMOST, Weblab, CoMInDS training materials site. Financed by course fees, with AMS/MAA as fiscal intermediary (new financial model), keeping more money in the community and saving students money. In the meantime... perhaps have more robust, high-profile blog networks (#MTBoS) where people share key experiences and favorite materials and approaches.”

8. Culture, inertia, and incentives: Institutions and the community should “create incentives for trying new pedagogical strategies (including $$ for professional development).” We should have “discussions about changing the reward system so that the faculty who adopt active learning pedagogies get credit for doing so.” There should be
a “shift in the institutional culture from one in which the traditional lecture method is accepted as the default/standard method of instruction to one in which active learning methods become the preferred method of instruction.” “Internal grants for research can be used to model novel programs that include internal grants for teaching skills development.” “We have lots of challenges, including many structural ones (physical spaces, cultural inertia, incentive structures, lack of professional development built into the higher education model, large number of adjunct and term instructor positions) - much of this is, at its core, really about the R1 business model.” “Institutional change is essential for wide scale adoption of active learning pedagogies.” We should be “creating department-level statements (like the CBMS statement) about active learning.” “Change the standards used for evaluating faculty to place greater value on active learning.” Institutions should adopt “student evaluations that address active learning, and are less biased against it.” “For teaching evaluation: SALG and IDEA” “At conferences, MAA/AMS should have pedagogy sessions/component tied to each math course area. Don’t schedule against the research sessions.” “When we go to give a talk and work on research, ask to sit in on classes.” We should be “normalizing education talks at seminars/colloquia; lists of visiting lecturers to give these talks.” We should create “small, working communities of practice in both research and teaching. On the research side, looks like Women In... model of collaborative work on an expert-chosen problem and/or REUF. But also have pedagogy leader(s) to focus on producing some materials (worksheets, texts, applets, discussions of practice) addressing a problem of pedagogical practice as well. In the meantime ... let’s make it a common practice to have a pedagogical session as part of research conferences, especially graduate training conferences.”

9. Facilities: Need facilities that are compatible with “group work and board work (group tables, boards on walls).”

10. Informed support as resource: “Offer/provide professional development to any faculty member who is interested in adopting active learning instructional methods in their classes.” “The institutional center for excellence in teaching and learning is a good resource for active learning pedagogies.” “Academy of Inquiry Based Learning (IBL) website is a terrific resource. The IBL Video Series are phenomenal and showcase models for novices to use. The site also features textbooks, links, and course materials developed by IBL experts.” “A teaching seminar for faculty?” “Focus more on what students do, rather than faculty.” “Information on which universities have changed their reward structure to allow active learning pedagogies to count as a valued activity for purposes of tenure and promotion.” “A ‘kit’ that goes to departments to show how to get things started.” “A department seminar on educational practices; AMS Committee on Education could create a list of expert speakers who would be willing to come speak at such seminars, lending professional credence to issues of teaching.” “RUME folks could do more interpreting of math ed research for mathematicians, e.g., what does this mean for me when I go into my calculus class?” “Formalizing via workshops and conferences, book club groups to learn more (e.g., MAA IPG), MAA section meetings, NExT sections, virtual resources (MIT seminar).”
11. Finding resources and the time involved: “Start small; identify colleagues; find allies.” “Use a Reading Group to focus on the MAA IP Guide.” Cultivate “institutional support for class setup.” “People need to see lots of examples of what can be done.”

12. Collaborating with peers, seeing classrooms: “Give common tests (write together), collaborate on grants, attend IBL workshops together, start with those who are open and willing, ask to come sit in their class, start with just 10%, start with a colleague’s materials, then tweak and make it your own.” “Critical mass of folks interested in interactive, engaged teaching.” Unfortunately, “we are not open about what we do in our own classes.” “Why do people refuse to be observed by you? Fear of being judged?” “Be more open about sharing what goes on in the classroom.” “Sit in on each other’s classes.” “Collaborate on making teaching public.” “Create incentives to making teaching public.”

13. What to do to bring in colleagues?: “It isn’t all or nothing.” “Talk about what students do and need; this is less threatening.” “Compile and share data showing that active learning pedagogy is more effective than other pedagogies. The more local the data the better.” “Pure mathematicians are sometimes not convinced by mathematics education research.”

14. Leading from below, e.g., grad student or faculty member: “Support leading from below (grad students, postdocs, early career).” Think about “CV building.” “Lack of influence (grad students/postdocs).” The general feeling is that one is “not expected/invited to contribute as a grad. student.” Still predominantly hear “advice from mentors that too much emphasis on teaching makes one look like a less valuable researcher.” “Being valued, being part of the conversation.”

Clearly there are many factors influencing pedagogical change, and many scales at which they may occur. Change can happen at the wholly individual level, or as part of an institutional team, or through collaboration with like-minded colleagues at other institutions, or at the broader scale in which our professional societies should exert key leadership. We end with a point made recently to us by Uri Treisman, that changing structures is a key step in widespread reform. The participant discussions quoted above reveal that there are many structures for us to change at the departmental, institutional, and more global levels in order to achieve the goal of evidence-based active learning pedagogy in our teaching.

We encourage everyone to continue such conversations and find their next step in this process, and to share their experience with the authors of this article so that we may further disseminate progress.

Resources

- NSF press release [Enough with the lecturing](2014)
- CBMS statement [Active Learning in Post-Secondary Mathematics Education](2016)
• Guidelines for Assessment and Instruction in Statistics Education (GAISE) (2016)
• MIT Electronic Seminar on Mathematics Education
• AMS Blog on Teaching and Learning Mathematics
• College Mathematics Instructor Development Source (CoMInDS), MAA
• Project NExT (New Experiences in Teaching), MAA; & Project ACCCESS, AMATYC
• Undergraduate STEM Education Initiative, AAU
• Student Engagement in Mathematics through an Institutional Network for Active Learning (SEMINAL), APLU
• Academy of Inquiry Based Learning
• Journal of Inquiry-Based Learning in Mathematics
• Initiative for Mathematics Learning by Inquiry (MLI)
• IBL Special Interest Group of the MAA
• Transforming Post-Secondary Education in Mathematics (TPSE Math)
• Process Oriented Guided Inquiry Learning (POGIL)
• Innovative Teaching Exchange, MAA
• Innovations in College-Level Mathematics Teaching, AMS
• Learning Assistant Alliance, & Learning Assistant Program (UC Boulder)
• Accelerating Systemic Change Network (ASCN)
• NSF Division of Undergraduate Education
• MAA Progress Through Calculus studies
• AMATYC Webinar series
• Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning
• Active learning resources from David Pengelley: https://web.nmsu.edu/~davidp/
• Active learning resources from Robin Pemantle, including pedagogical tips, and materials for calculus and teacher preparation courses: https://www.math.upenn.edu/~pemantle/Active-resources.html
Active learning course materials from Matt Boelkins, Steve Schlicker, and Ted Sundstrom, for courses in

Active Calculus (single and multivariable): [https://activecalculus.org/](https://activecalculus.org/)

Active Preparation for Calculus: [https://gvsu.edu/s/0Ui](https://gvsu.edu/s/0Ui)

Mathematical Reasoning: Writing and Proof: [https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/books/9/](https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/books/9/)