# X-PIPS-M DATA SUMMARY

Progress through Calculus: 2017-19

#### Abstract

A compilation of descriptive statistics of responses to the X-PIPS-M suite of surveys for students, student instructors, and faculty instructors of introductory mathematics courses. Data were obtained from Precalculus, Calculus 1, and Calculus 2 courses at 12 universities during the 2017-18 and 2018-19 academic years, as part of the Progress through Calculus research project (NSF DUE IUSE #1430540).

Ciera Street, Naneh Apkarian, Jessica Gehrtz, Rachel Tremaine, Victoria Barron, Matthew Voigt, & Jessica Ellis Hagman on behalf of the Progress through Calculus Research Team.

# **Table of Contents**

Overview / Introduction	3
Project Overview	3
Survey Design & Development	3
Data Collection & Participants	3
Reading this Report	4
S-PIPS-M: Student Survey Results	5
Student Identity & Individual Context	5
Gender	
Race and Ethnicity	
Sexual Orientation	
Additional Context / Identity Markers	e
FAFSA and Pell Grants	
Work Hours Per Week	7
Class Standing	7
STEM Intention	7
Math Preparation	8
Student Experiences	g
Percentages of Class Time	
Percentages of Recitation/Lab Time	10
Overall Experience	10
Technology Use	12
Classroom Experience	13
Helpful Course Elements	18
Lab/Recitation Experience	19
Class Comparisons	23
Lab/Recitation Comparisons	25
Classroom Climate	26
Malleability of Math Ability	27
Mathematical Attitudes	27
U-GPIPS: Student Instructor Survey	29
Student Instructor Identity & Individual Context	29
Degree and Career Aspirations	29
Gender	30
Race and Ethnicity	30
Sexual Orientation	31
Additional Context / Identity Markers	31
Course Specific Information	32
Course Role	32
Decisions about the course	32

Percentages of Class Time	35
Classroom Experience	
Comparisons	
PIPS: Instructor Survey	43
Instructor Identity & Personal Context	43
Gender	
Race and Ethnicity	
Sexual Orientation	
Additional Context / Identity Markers	44
Course-Specific Information	46
Course Decisions	46
Percentages of Class Time	
Classroom Experience	
Comparisons	
Acknowledgement & References	57
Acknowledgements	57
References	57

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DUE IUSE #1430540. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and project team and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

### Overview / Introduction

### **Project Overview**

Data for this report come from the *Progress through Calculus* (PtC) project (maa.org/PtC), which was sponsored by the National Science Foundation (DUE IUSE #1430540) and run with support from the Mathematical Association of America. The project focused on the Precalculus to Calculus 2 (P2C2) course sequence, which is the course sequence generally required of undergraduate STEM majors. This multiyear project, begun in 2015, consisted of two phases. Phase 1 involved a survey of all university mathematics departments in the United States. The aim of this phase was to catalogue common practices, and in particular, to document the prevalence of program characteristics previously shown to support student success in Calculus 1 (Bressoud, Mesa, & Rasmussen, 2015). Results of this first phase have been published as a journal article (Rasmussen et al., 2019) and in a technical report like this one (Apkarian & Kirin, 2017). Phase 2 of the PtC project consisted of multi-year case studies of 12 selected mathematics programs. This report summarizes responses to surveys collected as part of Phase 2.

### Survey Design & Development

The surveys reported on here were co-developed with members of the SEMINAL project (aplu.org/SEMINAL), and the text of these questions, along with a report of the development process, is available as a white paper (Apkarian et al., 2019). Given this availability, we omit a lengthy discussion of the survey development in this technical summary report. In brief, the X-PIPS-M refers to a suite of instruments created from postsecondary instructional practice surveys (PIPS) about mathematics (the M) for different stakeholders (the X). The core of these surveys draws on the Postsecondary Instructional Practices Survey for STEM instructors which was developed elsewhere (Walter et al., 2016). Our version amended the original items slightly for the mathematical context and contributed additional questions about context and attitudes. We also developed versions specifically for students, faculty instructors, and student instructors to capture different aspects of introductory mathematics education. Surveys generally consisted of (1) questions about the participant, including demographic and contextual questions; and (2) questions about course delivery and experience.

### Data Collection & Participants

Data were collected at 12 universities in each term of the 2017-18 academic year and the Fall term of 2019. Surveys were distributed to all instructors of, student instructors of, and students enrolled in mainstream P2C2 courses. Graduate students and undergraduate students who served as either instructor of record or teaching assistant were considered to be student instructors. For our purposes, "Precalculus" refers to courses which function as immediate prerequisites for single-variable calculus regardless of their official title; "Calculus 1" refers to a first course in single-variable calculus, and "Calculus 2" refers to subsequent courses in single variable calculus. The term "mainstream" indicates that a course functions as part of the prerequisite sequence for

additional upper-division mathematics courses; terminal courses that incorporate similar content were not included. Surveys were appropriately tailored to each context: students saw the exact name of their course throughout (indicated in this document as [course]) and students enrolled in courses without an accompanying lab/recitation component were not presented with questions about labs/recitations. Select items were presented based on responses to a previous question; this is indicated where relevant.

Surveys were distributed via email to all participants and the survey was completed electronically using Qualtrics. The research team contacted instructors and student instructors directly, while students were contacted by their instructors; this distribution was facilitated by course coordinators and program liaisons as fit the local context. Instructors were encouraged to offer extra credit to their students for accessing the survey, but this was not required and not all instructors offered such incentives.

Due to the study design and the nature of P2C2 programs, many participants appear more than once in the data. People are double counted if they responded multiple times, which might occur for (1) students across multiple terms; (2) instructors teaching more than one P2C2 course in a single term; (3) instructors teaching any P2C2 course across multiple terms in the study. For instructors who reported on more than one course they were teaching in a particular term, their demographic/contextual information is reported only once while each course-related response is reported separately. For people who responded to the survey multiple times for the same course in the same term, we marked these as duplicates and only report the responses from the most complete survey attempt for each participant.

### Reading this Report

This report proceeds in three parts. The student survey (S-PIPS) is presented first, starting on page 5; student instructor survey (U-GPIPS) results begin on page 29; faculty instructors (PIPS) results begin on page 43. Within each, we report first on participant characteristics (demographics, identity, and context) and then on responses to the questions about course delivery and experiences. Participant characteristics are aggregated, while course specific responses are separated into responses pertaining to Precalculus, Calculus 1, and Calculus 2.

Some response options and Likert statements have been abbreviated in tables for readability. This is made clear in the text describing the survey item, and when questions or statements have been abbreviated, they are indicated with an asterisk (\*). Exact wording of all items is available in the aforementioned white paper (Apkarian et al., 2019).

Depending on the survey question, tabulated data are reported in one of two ways to show both the numeric count and the proportion of respondents who selected particular choices. In condensed tables, responses are shown as *number (proportion)*; in extended tables a row of counts appears directly above a row of proportions. Proportions are either out of the total who responded to a particular question (single-response items) or out of the grand total (multiple-response items); any deviations from this are noted in the text.

# S-PIPS-M: Student Survey Results

The S-PIPS data contain responses from 19,191 undergraduate students from 12 universities across the nation. We first present the self-identified demographic and contextual information of these students, followed by students' reports of their experiences in their P2C2 courses.

### Student Identity & Individual Context

These questions asked about students' identity, including demographic information and academic context. Questions about Gender, Race and Ethnicity, and Sexual Orientation were presented as "select all that apply" items with the option to self-identify descriptors not on our lists. We intentionally provided more nuanced options than are generally used in demographic reports (e.g., the US census) as we value the complex nature of identity. Responses to these items were recoded for interpretability in this report; details are provided alongside each item.

#### Gender

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Cisgender	Cisgender	Gender	Transgender	Transgender	Transgender	Not
Man	Woman	Non-Binary	Transgenuer	Man	Woman	reported
10045	7972	39	48	14	9	1064
0.523	0.415	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.000	0.055

Survey response options: Man, Transgender, Woman, Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Selections of only Man, only Woman, or only Transgender are coded as Cisgender Man, Cisgender Woman, and Transgender respectively; selections of Transgender and Man or Transgender and Woman are coded as Transgender Man and Transgender Woman, respectively; selections of Man and Woman (with or without additional selections) or self-described non-binary gender identities (e.g., genderfluid, agender) are coded as Gender Non-Binary; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection were coded as Not reported.

### Race and Ethnicity

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Asian	1449 (0.076)
Alaska Native or Native American	70 (0.004)
Black or African American	1474 (0.077)
Hispanic or Latinx	2137 (0.111)
Middle Eastern or North African	648 (0.034)
Multiple Race/Ethnicity	2044 (0.107)

Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	42 (0.002)
White	9962 (0.519)
Not reported	1365 (0.071)

Survey response options: Alaskan Native or Native American, Black or African American, Central Asian, East Asian, Hispanic or Latinx, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Southeast Asian, South Asian, White, Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Selections of more than one of Central Asian, East Asian, Southeast Asian, South Asian without any other choices are coded as Asian; selections of multiple responses (aside from the previous) are coded as Multiple Race/Ethnicity; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection are coded as Not reported.

#### Sexual Orientation

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Straight	Gay	Lesbian	Bisexual	Asexual	Queer	Queer+	Straight+	Not reported
15618	234	109	698	495	73	169	115	1680
0.814	0.012	0.006	0.036	0.026	0.004	0.009	0.006	0.088

Survey response options: Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Queer, Straight (Heterosexual), Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Categories are based on research from Voigt (2020) where selections of exactly one listed option are not recoded; selections of Straight (Heterosexual) and one or more additional options are coded as Straight+; selections of more than one option but not Straight (Heterosexual) are coded as Queer+; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection are coded as Not reported.

### Additional Context / Identity Markers

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

International Student	1507 (0.079)
First-generation college student	4963 (0.259)
Commuter student	3234 (0.169)
Transfer student	1927 (0.1)
Student with a disability	558 (0.029)
Student athlete	973 (0.051)
Current or former English language learner	1003 (0.052)
Parent or guardian	135 (0.007)

### FAFSA and Pell Grants

Did you use FAFSA to apply for financial aid?

Yes	No	Not reported
13,164 (0.686)	4102 (0.214)	1925 (0.1)

Did you receive a free grant (e.g., Pell Grant)? [Shown only to the 13,164 who responded "Yes" to the previous].

Yes	No	I don't know	Not reported
5600 (0.425)	4933 (0.375)	2086 (0.159)	545 (0.041)

### Work Hours Per Week

Approximately how many hours per week did you work at a job this term?

0	1 - 5	6 - 10	11 - 15	16 - 20	21 - 30	>30	Not reported
9943	1067	1417	1224	1516	1309	1013	884
0.541	0.058	0.077	0.067	0.083	0.071	0.055	0.048

## **Class Standing**

What is your class standing?

First Year	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Other	Not reported
10359	4885	2113	678	209	176
0.562	0.265	0.115	0.037	0.011	0.01

### STEM Intention

Have you declared, or do you intend to declare, a STEM (science, technology, engineering, or mathematics) major?

Yes	No	Unsure	Not reported
13121	3386	1520	364
0.713	0.184	0.083	0.02

# Math Preparation

Do you think your previous math courses adequately prepared you for [current course]?

Yes	No
15010	3352
0.817	0.183

## **Student Experiences**

These questions of the survey relate to the students' reports of their experiences in their Precalculus, Calculus I, and Calculus II courses. The respondents totaled 7136 in Precalculus, 6888 in Calculus I, and 7136 in Calculus II.

# Percentages of Class Time

What percent of regular class time, over the whole term, did you spend... [must total 100]

	n	mean	sd	median
All Students				
Working on tasks individually	19063	23.22	23.08	17
Working on tasks in small groups	19063	11.77	16.25	5
Engaging in whole class discussion	19063	14.49	16.26	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	19063	50.52	28.25	50
Precalculus Students				
Working on tasks individually	7085	28.51	25.55	24
Working on tasks in small groups	7085	13.13	18.46	5
Engaging in whole class discussion	7085	15.46	16.88	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	7085	42.9	27.33	41
Calculus 1 Students				
Working on tasks individually	6819	21.41	21.96	15
Working on tasks in small groups	6819	9.963	14.55	3
Engaging in whole class discussion	6819	13.56	15.74	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	6819	55.07	28.13	52
Calculus 2 Students				
Working on tasks individually	5159	18.36	19.19	13
Working on tasks in small groups	5159	12.27	14.87	8
Engaging in whole class discussion	5159	14.4	16	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	5159	54.97	27.41	52

# Percentages of Recitation/Lab Time

What percent of regular **recitation/lab time**, over the whole term, did you spend... [must total 100]

	n	mean	sd	median
All Students				
Working on tasks individually	7040	29.94	28.84	24
Working on tasks in small groups	7040	41.19	32.82	40
Engaging in whole class discussion	7040	9.82	14.11	2
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	7040	19.05	23.07	10
Precalculus Students				
Working on tasks individually	1583	33.55	32.61	25
Working on tasks in small groups	1583	48.95	32.21	50
Engaging in whole class discussion	1583	7.196	12.43	0
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	1583	10.3	16.21	0
Calculus 1 Students				
Working on tasks individually	3929	30.11	27.7	25
Working on tasks in small groups	3929	38.57	32.22	35
Engaging in whole class discussion	3929	10.51	14.3	5
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	3929	20.81	23.26	13
Calculus 2 Students				
Working on tasks individually	1528	25.8	26.98	20
Working on tasks in small groups	1528	39.87	33.76	35
Engaging in whole class discussion	1528	10.76	14.91	4.5
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	1528	23.57	26.09	15

# Overall Experience

Indicate the degree to which the following statements describe your experience in [course]:

		Never	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
The test PO questions focus on important	DC	267	562	1517	2346	2399
	rc	0.038	0.079	0.214	0.331	0.338
	C1	135	541	1438	2623	2121
facts and	CI	0.02	0.079	0.21	0.382	0.309
definitions from the course.	C9.	102	337	973	1854	1876
the course.	e. C2	0.02	0.066	0.189	0.361	0.365

		Never	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
The test questions require	PC	783	1256	2013	1814	1231
	PC	0.11	0.177	0.284	0.256	0.173
me to apply	C1	443	1092	1896	1997	1433
course concepts	CI	0.065	0.159	0.276	0.291	0.209
to unfamiliar situations.	C2	402	897	1466	1430	947
Situations.	C2	0.078	0.174	0.285	0.278	0.184
	DC	259	422	1086	1862	3476
I use technology	PC	0.036	0.059	0.153	0.262	0.489
or online	O1	276	534	1171	2015	2872
resources in relation to this	C1	0.04	0.078	0.171	0.293	0.418
course.	<b>C</b> O	226	418	903	1509	2088
	C2	0.044	0.081	0.176	0.293	0.406
I make connections	PC	402	714	2020	2281	1688
		0.057	0.1	0.284	0.321	0.238
between related	C1	236	733	1977	2497	1424
ideas or concepts		0.034	0.107	0.288	0.364	0.207
when completing assignments.	C2	128	465	1480	1925	1148
assignments.		0.025	0.09	0.288	0.374	0.223
	DC	2540	1473	1500	873	712
I receive feedback on my	PC	0.358	0.208	0.211	0.123	0.1
assignments	O1	2675	1635	1372	736	444
without being	C1	0.39	0.238	0.2	0.107	0.065
assigned a formal grade.		1948	1292	1044	542	319
iormar grade.	C2	0.379	0.251	0.203	0.105	0.062
	DC	3208	1563	1150	593	591
I see my	PC	0.452	0.22	0.162	0.083	0.083
instructor(s)	O1	2757	1751	1106	612	630
outside of class	C1	0.402	0.255	0.161	0.089	0.092
for help.	CO.	1759	1330	929	591	531
	C2	0.342	0.259	0.181	0.115	0.103

		Never	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	PC	2168	1211	1367	1186	1172
I work with peers	PC .	0.305	0.17	0.192	0.167	0.165
outside of class	C1	1527	1258	1456	1288	1340
on math	CI	0.222	0.183	0.212	0.188	0.195
problems.	C2	1055	962	1066	1011	1049
		0.205	0.187	0.207	0.197	0.204
	PC	3030	1260	1091	754	972
	PC	0.426	0.177	0.154	0.106	0.137
I attend tutoring sessions outside		2838	1291	1071	759	904
of class time.	C1	0.414	0.188	0.156	0.111	0.132
or crass time.	C2	2043	1014	805	623	661
		0.397	0.197	0.156	0.121	0.128

# Technology Use

Which technologies and/or online resources do you use? Mark all that apply.

	PC	3511 (0.492)
Graphing Calculator	C1	3491 (0.507)
	C2	2376 (0.46)
	PC	324 (0.045)
Clickers or other polling devices	C1	210 (0.03)
	C2	188 (0.036)
Computer algebra software	PC	1965 (0.275)
(e.g. Maple, Matlab,	C1	1371 (0.199)
Mathematica)	C2	1129 (0.219)
	PC	3698 (0.518)
Online search engines (e.g. Google)	C1	4066 (0.59)
3.008-07	C2	3090 (0.598)
	PC	3059 (0.429)
Online textbooks	C1	2893 (0.42)
	C2	1992 (0.386)

	PC	4575 (0.641)
Online tutorials (e.g. Khan Academy, YouTube videos)	C1	4740 (0.688)
	C2	3633 (0.703)
Online computational or	PC	2593 (0.363)
graphing tools (e.g. Wolfram	C1	3420 (0.497)
Alpha, Geogebra, Desmos)	C2	2972 (0.575)
Online homework (e.g.	PC	5072 (0.711)
WebAssign, MyMathLab,	C1	4344 (0.631)
WebWork)	C2	2551 (0.494)
	PC	892 (0.125)
Online forums (e.g. Chegg, StackExchange, Slader)	C1	1623 (0.236)
[ [ [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]	C2	1480 (0.286)
Learning management systems	PC	1873 (0.262)
(e.g. Blackboard, Canvas,	C1	1798 (0.261)
Piazza)	C2	1419 (0.275)

# Classroom Experience

Indicate the degree to which the following statements describe your experience in regular course meetings of [course]:

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
I listen as the	PC	169	262	919	2123	3558
	PC	0.024	0.037	0.131	0.302	0.506
instructor guides	C1	114	202	871	2129	3486
me through	CI	0.017	0.03	0.128	0.313	0.512
major topics.	C2	36	119	434	1578	2925
		0.007	0.023	0.085	0.31	0.574
	DC	1495	1458	1875	1265	939
The class	PC	0.213	0.207	0.267	0.18	0.134
activities connect	C1	1107	1535	1961	1331	861
course content to my life and future work.	C1	0.163	0.226	0.289	0.196	0.127
	Co	734	1078	1465	1118	699
	C2	0.144	0.212	0.288	0.219	0.137

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
I receive	PC	2017	1183	1392	1203	1243
	PC	0.287	0.168	0.198	0.171	0.177
feedback on my	C1	2504	1291	1296	956	757
work during	CI	0.368	0.19	0.19	0.141	0.111
class (e.g., clickers).	C2	1662	975	953	853	645
chekers).	C2	0.327	0.192	0.187	0.168	0.127
	PC	1357	1280	1710	1432	1257
I am asked to	PC	0.193	0.182	0.243	0.204	0.179
respond to	O1	1525	1485	1676	1271	839
questions during	C1	0.224	0.219	0.247	0.187	0.123
class time.	Co	857	1089	1294	1077	775
	C2	0.168	0.214	0.254	0.212	0.152
*In my class a variety of means (graphs, symbols,	PC	356	683	1645	2038	2314
		0.051	0.097	0.234	0.29	0.329
tables, etc.) are	C1	269	707	1655	2161	2008
used to represent		0.04	0.104	0.243	0.318	0.295
course topics and/or solve	C2	210	547	1223	1615	1505
problems.		0.041	0.107	0.24	0.317	0.295
	PC	1302	1190	1586	1566	1383
I talk with other	PC	0.185	0.169	0.226	0.223	0.197
students about	C1	1297	1309	1665	1496	1018
course topics	CI	0.191	0.193	0.245	0.22	0.15
during class.	C2	858	961	1174	1171	931
	C2	0.168	0.189	0.23	0.23	0.183
	PC	3388	1424	1172	615	426
I constructively	rU	0.482	0.203	0.167	0.088	0.061
criticize other	C1	3351	1579	1009	545	318
students' ideas	UI	0.493	0.232	0.148	0.08	0.047
during class.	Co	2233	1258	846	501	258
	C2	0.438	0.247	0.166	0.098	0.051

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
I discuss the	DC	1340	1114	1573	1501	1506
	PC	0.191	0.158	0.224	0.213	0.214
difficulties I have with math with	C1	1265	1281	1574	1492	1188
other students	CI	0.186	0.188	0.231	0.219	0.175
during class.	CO.	902	901	1182	1186	921
	C2	0.177	0.177	0.232	0.233	0.181
	PC	629	1090	1882	1735	1700
I work on	PC	0.089	0.155	0.267	0.247	0.242
problems	C1	821	1486	1830	1496	1165
individually during class	C1	0.121	0.219	0.269	0.22	0.171
time.	Go.	634	1169	1434	1098	754
	C2	0.125	0.23	0.282	0.216	0.148
I work with other	PC	2112	1248	1272	1084	1320
		0.3	0.177	0.181	0.154	0.188
students in a	C1	2314	1427	1163	942	948
small group		0.341	0.21	0.171	0.139	0.14
during class.	C2	1439	942	975	834	899
		0.283	0.185	0.192	0.164	0.177
	DC	429	820	1713	2061	2001
Multiple approaches to	PC	0.061	0.117	0.244	0.293	0.285
solving a	C1	359	902	1845	2113	1565
problem are	C1	0.053	0.133	0.272	0.311	0.231
discussed in class.	CO.	170	501	1247	1681	1494
ciass.	C2	0.033	0.098	0.245	0.33	0.293
	DC	715	1176	1873	1815	1455
I have enough time during class	PC	0.102	0.167	0.266	0.258	0.207
to reflect about	O1	706	1344	1852	1797	1099
the processes I	C1	0.104	0.198	0.272	0.264	0.162
use to solve problems.	Clo.	484	995	1358	1355	903
problems.	C2	0.095	0.195	0.267	0.266	0.177

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	DC	674	1600	2134	1552	1070
A wide range of students respond	PC	0.096	0.228	0.304	0.221	0.152
to the	C1	758	1954	2104	1274	709
instructor's	CI	0.111	0.287	0.309	0.187	0.104
questions in class.	Co	384	1261	1525	1141	781
ciass.	C2	0.075	0.248	0.299	0.224	0.153
	DC	1225	976	1212	1033	2577
	PC	0.174	0.139	0.173	0.147	0.367
The instructor	O1	1462	981	1023	896	2429
knows my name.	C1	0.215	0.144	0.151	0.132	0.358
	Co	668	521	625	715	2563
	C2	0.131	0.102	0.123	0.14	0.503
	PC	1223	1167	1561	1446	1639
*Class is		0.174	0.166	0.222	0.206	0.233
structured to	C1	1354	1470	1584	1306	1085
encourage peer- to-peer support		0.199	0.216	0.233	0.192	0.16
among students.	C2	898	965	1162	985	1091
		0.176	0.189	0.228	0.193	0.214
	PC	1110	1476	1856	1405	1181
There is a sense		0.158	0.21	0.264	0.2	0.168
of community	O1	1033	1495	1957	1380	930
among the students in my	C1	0.152	0.22	0.288	0.203	0.137
class.	Clo.	636	1010	1333	1132	979
	C2	0.125	0.198	0.262	0.222	0.192
The instructor	DO	762	736	1429	1810	2299
adjusts teaching	PC	0.108	0.105	0.203	0.257	0.327
based upon what	01	725	961	1546	1833	1730
the class understands and	C1	0.107	0.141	0.228	0.27	0.255
does not	CO	359	576	1043	1511	1600
understand.	C2	0.071	0.113	0.205	0.297	0.314

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	DC	457	844	1548	1930	2256
The instructor	PC	0.065	0.12	0.22	0.274	0.321
explains concepts	C1	420	959	1583	2031	1810
in this class in a	CI	0.062	0.141	0.233	0.299	0.266
variety of ways.	Co	206	527	1111	1621	1633
	C2	0.04	0.103	0.218	0.318	0.32
_	PC	1006	1013	1514	1539	1957
I receive feedback from	PC	0.143	0.144	0.215	0.219	0.278
my instructor on	O1	612	1025	1544	1785	1838
homework,	C1	0.09	0.151	0.227	0.262	0.27
exams, quizzes, etc.	CO.	249	514	953	1422	1958
etc.	C2	0.049	0.101	0.187	0.279	0.384
	DC	2297	1485	1455	1011	782
I share my ideas	PC	0.327	0.211	0.207	0.144	0.111
(or my group's	C1	2373	1638	1405	843	537
ideas) during whole class		0.349	0.241	0.207	0.124	0.079
discussions.	CO.	1484	1273	1073	757	506
	C2	0.291	0.25	0.211	0.149	0.099
	DC	681	1596	2205	1504	1045
A wide range of	PC	0.097	0.227	0.314	0.214	0.149
students	O1	763	1986	2035	1279	736
participate in	C1	0.112	0.292	0.299	0.188	0.108
class.	Co	399	1286	1485	1136	794
	C2	0.078	0.252	0.291	0.223	0.156
My instructor	PC	755	1006	1652	1785	1839
uses strategies to	PU	0.107	0.143	0.235	0.254	0.261
encourage	O1	917	1315	1791	1532	1248
participation from a wide	C1	0.135	0.193	0.263	0.225	0.183
range of	CO.	521	853	1240	1198	1286
students.	C2	0.102	0.167	0.243	0.235	0.252

Helpful Course Elements

To what extent are the following course elements helpful to your learning in [course]?

		Not applicable	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Very helpful
	PC	376	906	2177	3560
	PC	0.054	0.129	0.31	0.507
Online homework:	C1	1327	771	2054	2629
Online nomework:	CI	0.196	0.114	0.303	0.388
	C2	1301	536	1504	1734
	02	0.256	0.106	0.296	0.342
Written homework:	PC	1551	822	2181	2438
	rc	0.222	0.118	0.312	0.349
	C1	1176	572	2313	2720
	CI	0.173	0.084	0.341	0.401
	C2	673	363	1608	2442
	02	0.132	0.071	0.316	0.48
	PC	101	1319	2969	2613
	rc	0.014	0.188	0.424	0.373
Exams:	C1	51	1146	3027	2563
Exams.	CI	0.008	0.169	0.446	0.378
	C2	29	724	2237	2099
	02	0.006	0.142	0.44	0.412
	PC	1270	537	1895	3308
	PC	0.181	0.077	0.27	0.472
Worksheets or	O1	1508	363	1929	2982
handouts in class:	C1	0.222	0.054	0.284	0.44
	Co	1055	239	1279	2514
	C2	0.207	0.047	0.251	0.494

Lab/Recitation Experience

Indicate the degree to which the following statements describe your experience in **recitation/lab sections** of [course]:

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	DC	196	124	313	401	515
I listen as the	PC	0.127	0.08	0.202	0.259	0.332
instructor guides	O1	234	239	580	993	1793
me through	C1	0.061	0.062	0.151	0.259	0.467
major topics.	Co	185	126	217	340	618
	C2	0.124	0.085	0.146	0.229	0.416
	DC	329	289	442	266	219
The lab/recitation	PC	0.213	0.187	0.286	0.172	0.142
activities connect	O1	568	692	1095	795	688
course content to	C1	0.148	0.18	0.285	0.207	0.179
my life and future work.	C2	322	258	384	286	238
iuture work.		0.216	0.173	0.258	0.192	0.16
	PC	355	221	314	324	337
*I receive immediate	rc	0.229	0.142	0.202	0.209	0.217
feedback on my	C1	883	489	794	793	885
work during		0.23	0.127	0.207	0.206	0.23
lab/recitation (e.g., clickers)	C2	444	188	275	282	301
(e.g., chekers)		0.298	0.126	0.185	0.189	0.202
	PC	437	230	326	280	270
I am asked to	rc	0.283	0.149	0.211	0.181	0.175
respond to questions during	C1	735	643	835	834	796
lab/recitation	CI	0.191	0.167	0.217	0.217	0.207
time.	C2	356	231	307	295	303
		0.239	0.155	0.206	0.198	0.203
In my	PC	164	189	381	425	389
lab/recitation a variety of means	rc	0.106	0.122	0.246	0.275	0.251
(graphs, symbols,	C1	241	420	912	1105	1163
tables, etc.) are	O1	0.063	0.109	0.237	0.288	0.303
used to represent course topics		236	201	341	324	389
and/or solve problems.	C2	0.158	0.135	0.229	0.217	0.261

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	PC	159	155	322	397	516
I talk with other	PC	0.103	0.1	0.208	0.256	0.333
students about	C1	410	353	691	955	1425
course topics during	CI	0.107	0.092	0.18	0.249	0.372
lab/recitation.	Co	226	128	252	344	536
	C2	0.152	0.086	0.17	0.231	0.361
	PC	519	290	328	236	175
I constructively	PC	0.335	0.187	0.212	0.152	0.113
criticize other	O.	1122	727	861	641	487
students' ideas during	C1	0.292	0.189	0.224	0.167	0.127
lab/recitation.	Go.	477	258	312	252	190
	C2	0.32	0.173	0.21	0.169	0.128
	PC	174	179	337	392	466
I discuss the difficulties I have		0.112	0.116	0.218	0.253	0.301
with math with	C1	473	430	767	946	1228
other students		0.123	0.112	0.2	0.246	0.319
during lab/recitation.	C2	259	148	272	355	458
iab/recitation.	C2	0.174	0.099	0.182	0.238	0.307
_ ,	PC	153	231	424	349	388
I work on problems	PC	0.099	0.15	0.274	0.226	0.251
individually	C1	222	494	985	966	1171
during	CI	0.058	0.129	0.257	0.252	0.305
lab/recitation time.	C2	203	185	359	359	384
time.	C2	0.136	0.124	0.241	0.241	0.258
	PC	196	151	242	290	666
I work with other	PU	0.127	0.098	0.157	0.188	0.431
students in small	C1	502	375	544	645	1771
groups during	U1	0.131	0.098	0.142	0.168	0.462
lab/recitation.	Co	281	134	156	222	695
	C2	0.189	0.09	0.105	0.149	0.467

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	PC	231	206	383	380	344
Multiple approaches to	PC	0.15	0.133	0.248	0.246	0.223
solving a	C1	309	415	936	1091	1083
problem are	CI	0.081	0.108	0.244	0.285	0.282
discussed in lab/recitation.	C2	230	164	320	388	387
iab/recitation.	C2	0.154	0.11	0.215	0.261	0.26
T	PC	150	239	391	430	335
I have enough time during	PC	0.097	0.155	0.253	0.278	0.217
lab/recitation to	C1	235	437	923	1111	1131
reflect about the	CI	0.061	0.114	0.241	0.29	0.295
processes I use to solve problems.	G0.	212	174	343	395	366
sorve problems.	C2	0.142	0.117	0.23	0.265	0.246
	PC	333	266	373	308	262
A wide range of students respond		0.216	0.173	0.242	0.2	0.17
to the	C1	468	601	994	938	837
instructor's		0.122	0.157	0.259	0.244	0.218
questions in lab/recitation.	C2	266	241	358	335	291
iab/iccitation.	C2	0.178	0.162	0.24	0.225	0.195
	DC	521	222	251	181	369
	PC	0.337	0.144	0.163	0.117	0.239
The instructor	C1	644	406	571	630	1587
knows my name.	CI	0.168	0.106	0.149	0.164	0.413
	C2	271	179	188	194	660
	CZ	0.182	0.12	0.126	0.13	0.442
	PC	151	171	293	386	546
Lab/recitation is	гС	0.098	0.111	0.189	0.25	0.353
structured to	O1	355	352	696	901	1541
encourage peer- to-peer support	C1	0.092	0.092	0.181	0.234	0.401
among students.	Co	229	134	245	314	569
	C2	0.154	0.09	0.164	0.211	0.382

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	DC	258	247	393	340	309
There is a sense	PC	0.167	0.16	0.254	0.22	0.2
of community	C1	387	487	958	948	1056
among the students in my	CI	0.101	0.127	0.25	0.247	0.275
lab/recitation.	Co	240	165	351	361	373
	C2	0.161	0.111	0.236	0.242	0.25
The instructor	PC	289	209	335	336	375
adjusts teaching	PC	0.187	0.135	0.217	0.218	0.243
based on what	O1	385	364	706	1052	1333
the class understands and	C1	0.1	0.095	0.184	0.274	0.347
does not	CO.	253	149	279	370	440
understand.	C2	0.17	0.1	0.187	0.248	0.295
	DC	249	217	368	363	348
The instructor	PC	0.161	0.14	0.238	0.235	0.225
explains concepts	C1	313	424	866	1062	1175
in this lab/recitation in	C1	0.082	0.11	0.226	0.277	0.306
a variety of ways.	CO.	233	190	324	376	366
	C2	0.156	0.128	0.218	0.253	0.246
_	DC	260	210	306	376	397
I receive feedback from	PC	0.168	0.136	0.198	0.243	0.256
my instructor on	O1	322	407	774	1045	1293
homework,	C1	0.084	0.106	0.202	0.272	0.337
exams, quizzes, etc.	Co	217	143	261	338	530
etc.	C2	0.146	0.096	0.175	0.227	0.356
	DC	457	251	286	290	261
I share my ideas (or my group's	PC	0.296	0.162	0.185	0.188	0.169
ideas) during	O1	849	653	858	722	756
whole	C1	0.221	0.17	0.224	0.188	0.197
lab/recitation discussions.	O0	396	228	322	276	267
discussions.	C2	0.266	0.153	0.216	0.185	0.179

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
	DC	200	269	358	357	358
A wide range of	PC	0.13	0.174	0.232	0.232	0.232
students	C1	313	551	938	994	1041
participate in	CI	0.082	0.144	0.244	0.259	0.271
lab/recitation.	C2	213	195	354	371	358
		0.143	0.131	0.237	0.249	0.24
My instructor	PC	265	220	392	337	334
uses strategies to	rc	0.171	0.142	0.253	0.218	0.216
encourage	C1	448	499	922	945	1017
participation from a wide	CI	0.117	0.13	0.241	0.247	0.265
range of		282	205	337	299	369
students.	C2	0.189	0.137	0.226	0.2	0.247

# Class Comparisons

Consider your regular course meetings and primary instructor of [course]. As compared to other students in class...

		A lot less	Somewhat less	The same	Somewhat more	A lot more
	PC	516	478	5366	371	218
How much	rc	0.074	0.069	0.772	0.053	0.031
opportunity do	C1	459	428	5370	331	128
you get to answer questions	CI	0.068	0.064	0.8	0.049	0.019
in class?	C2	252	297	4118	303	90
		0.05	0.059	0.814	0.06	0.018
	PC	346	330	5812	301	148
How much	rc	0.05	0.048	0.838	0.043	0.021
attention does the instructor	C1	279	316	5793	225	92
give to your	CI	0.042	0.047	0.864	0.034	0.014
questions?	Co	145	213	4417	214	68
	C2	0.029	0.042	0.873	0.042	0.013

		A lot less	Somewhat less	The same	Somewhat more	A lot more
	PC	492	648	5133	462	204
	rc	0.071	0.093	0.74	0.067	0.029
How much help	C1	446	664	5024	471	92
do you get from the instructor?	CI	0.067	0.099	0.75	0.07	0.014
	C2	235	466	3823	438	93
	02	0.046	0.092	0.756	0.087	0.018
	PC	416	447	5402	460	207
How much	rc	0.06	0.064	0.779	0.066	0.03
encouragement	C1	382	388	5424	402	103
do you receive from the		0.057	0.058	0.81	0.06	0.015
instructor?	C2	168	264	4164	351	103
		0.033	0.052	0.825	0.07	0.02
	PC	409	401	5575	359	189
How much opportunity do	rc	0.059	0.058	0.804	0.052	0.027
you get to	C1	360	382	5545	320	99
contribute to	CI	0.054	0.057	0.827	0.048	0.015
class discussions?	C2	181	295	4216	274	86
discussions.	C2	0.036	0.058	0.835	0.054	0.017
	PC	513	445	5467	354	144
	PC	0.074	0.064	0.79	0.051	0.021
How much praise	O1	446	457	5414	306	72
does your work receive?	C1	0.067	0.068	0.809	0.046	0.011
	CO.	217	327	4174	263	65
	C2	0.043	0.065	0.827	0.052	0.013

# Lab/Recitation Comparisons

Consider your **recitation/lab section and recitation/lab instructor**. As compared to other students in class...

		A lot less	Somewhat less	The same	Somewhat more	A lot more
	DC	85	90	1256	80	28
How much	PC	0.055	0.058	0.816	0.052	0.018
opportunity do	C1	138	164	3204	281	45
you get to answer questions		0.036	0.043	0.836	0.073	0.012
in lab/recitation?	Go.	50	54	1272	84	25
	C2	0.034	0.036	0.857	0.057	0.017
	DC	69	93	1259	91	27
How much	PC	0.045	0.06	0.818	0.059	0.018
attention does	Q1	99	162	3251	272	45
the instructor give your	C1	0.026	0.042	0.849	0.071	0.012
questions?	-	50	50	1274	82	26
	C2	0.034	0.034	0.86	0.055	0.018
	PC	81	118	1174	123	42
		0.053	0.077	0.763	0.08	0.027
How much help	C1	141	247	2983	369	87
do you get from the instructor?		0.037	0.065	0.779	0.096	0.023
one mon deton.	G a	62	88	1180	121	32
	C2	0.042	0.059	0.796	0.082	0.022
	DC	75	99	1214	109	37
How much	PC	0.049	0.065	0.791	0.071	0.024
encouragement	0.1	112	166	3194	280	69
do you receive from the	C1	0.029	0.043	0.836	0.073	0.018
instructor?	G o	53	61	1253	83	30
	C2	0.036	0.041	0.847	0.056	0.02
	D.C.	74	91	1268	75	26
How much	PC	0.048	0.059	0.827	0.049	0.017
opportunity do you get to	0.	129	149	3295	195	57
contribute to	C1	0.034	0.039	0.861	0.051	0.015
lab/recitation discussion?	O.	52	49	1288	70	22
uiscussion:	C2	0.035	0.033	0.87	0.047	0.015

		A lot less	Somewhat less	The same	Somewhat more	A lot more
	DC	97	84	1227	83	29
How much praise	PC	0.064	0.055	0.807	0.055	0.019
	<b>Q</b> 4	144	179	3215	215	54
does your work receive?	C1	0.038	0.047	0.844	0.056	0.014
10001101		56	69	1256	69	25
	C2	0.038	0.047	0.852	0.047	0.017

# Classroom Climate

How would you describe the overall climate in [course]?

	(1) Excluding and Hostile	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) Including and Friendly
PC	171	337	1140	1759	3509
PC	0.025	0.049	0.165	0.254	0.507
C1	139	348	1223	2014	2979
	0.021	0.052	0.182	0.3	0.444
C2	90	223	791	1379	2567
02	0.018	0.044	0.157	0.273	0.508
	(1) Intellectually Boring	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) Intellectually Engaging
PC	631	903	1743	1779	1860
PC	0.091	0.131	0.252	0.257	0.269
C1	536	886	1598	1951	1731
	0.08	0.132	0.238	0.291	0.258
C2	236	477	1044	1580	1711
02	0.047	0.094	0.207	0.313	0.339
	(1) Academically Easy	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5) Academically Rigorous
PC	272	717	2190	2017	1711
I C	0.039	0.104	0.317	0.292	0.248
C1	192	457	1592	2211	2253
	0.029	0.068	0.237	0.33	0.336
C2	72	180	835	1737	2222
02	0.014	0.036	0.165	0.344	0.44

## Malleability of Math Ability

I believe that my math ability can be improved through dedication and hard work.

Response options: Strongly agree (1) to Strongly disagree (6).

		1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)
I believe that	PC	3993	2002	612	133	44	129
my math	PC	0.578	0.29	0.089	0.019	0.006	0.019
ability can be	<b>C</b> 1	3711	2202	520	103	46	97
improved through	C1	0.556	0.33	0.078	0.015	0.007	0.015
dedication and	CO.	3026	1482	366	68	24	68
hard work	C2	0.601	0.294	0.073	0.014	0.005	0.014

### Mathematical Attitudes

Please indicate your level of agreement for the following statements from the beginning of the course and now.

Response options: Strongly agree (1) to Strongly disagree (6).

I an	I am interested in mathematics:											
	Attitude at the beginning of the course						Current attitude in the course					
	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)
PC	1352	1752	1396	678	972	797	1240	1722	1437	733	768	821
PC	0.195	0.252	0.201	0.098	0.14	0.115	0.184	0.256	0.214	0.109	0.114	0.122
C1	1640	2117	1472	506	607	372	1378	2018	1434	618	575	527
CI	0.244	0.315	0.219	0.075	0.09	0.055	0.21	0.308	0.219	0.094	0.088	0.08
C2	1507	1840	1005	309	265	144	1359	1693	1017	381	299	228
02	0.297	0.363	0.198	0.061	0.052	0.028	0.273	0.34	0.204	0.077	0.06	0.046
I en	joy doi:	ng mat	hemati	cs:								
	Atti	tude at	the beg	inning c	of the co	urse	Current attitude in the course					
	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)
PC	1161	1639	1365	773	970	1029	1061	1606	1470	808	806	949
	0.167	0.236	0.197	0.111	0.14	0.148	0.158	0.24	0.219	0.121	0.12	0.142
C1	1452	1987	1504	696	597	467	1154	1815	1554	782	638	587
	0.217	0.296	0.224	0.104	0.089	0.07	0.177	0.278	0.238	0.12	0.098	0.09
C2	1357	1692	1068	446	306	196	1103	1515	1172	514	364	304
<u>C</u> 2	0.268	0.334	0.211	0.088	0.06	0.039	0.222	0.305	0.236	0.103	0.073	0.061

I an	I am confident in my mathematical abilities:											
	Attitude at the beginning of the course						Current attitude in the course					
	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)
PC	1068	1859	1717	845	755	668	1090	2009	1654	755	541	553
PC	0.155	0.269	0.248	0.122	0.109	0.097	0.165	0.304	0.251	0.114	0.082	0.084
O1	1408	2134	1561	724	491	354	1062	1883	1654	802	566	450
C1	0.211	0.32	0.234	0.109	0.074	0.053	0.165	0.293	0.258	0.125	0.088	0.07
C2	1216	1801	1150	451	264	166	858	1586	1289	510	385	277
02	0.241	0.357	0.228	0.089	0.052	0.033	0.175	0.323	0.263	0.104	0.078	0.056
I an	able to	o learn	mathe	matics	:							
	Atti	tude at	the beg	inning o	of the co	urse	Current attitude in the course					
	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)	1 (SA)	2	3	4	5	6 (SD)
PC	2004	2654	1165	386	280	217	2292	2527	951	314	209	238
	0.299	0.396	0.174	0.058	0.042	0.032	0.351	0.387	0.146	0.048	0.032	0.036
C1	2167	2769	1039	271	137	99	2112	2499	1069	341	176	163
	0.334	0.427	0.16	0.042	0.021	0.015	0.332	0.393	0.168	0.054	0.028	0.026
C2	1918	2073	671	159	72	43	1848	1866	724	224	114	88
02	0.389	0.42	0.136	0.032	0.015	0.009	0.38	0.384	0.149	0.046	0.023	0.018

# **U-GPIPS: Student Instructor Survey**

The U-GPIPS data contain 331 responses from undergraduate and graduate student instructors from twelve universities across the United States. Of these responses, 294 come from graduate student instructors, 34 from undergraduate student instructors, and 3 from student instructors who did not report their current degree program. We first present the self-identified demographic information of these students.

As noted in the introduction to this report, instructors responded for each course they were teaching in a particular term. In the identity and context portion of this report, instructors are counted only once per term; in the course-specific information their responses are reported separately for each *course* they were teaching at the time they completed the survey.

### Student Instructor Identity & Individual Context

These questions asked about student instructors' identity, including demographic information and academic context. Questions about Gender, Race and Ethnicity, and Sexual Orientation were presented as "select all that apply" items with the option to self-identify descriptors not on our lists. We intentionally provided more nuanced options than are generally use in demographic reports (e.g., the US census) as we value the complex nature of identity. Responses to these items were recoded for interpretability in this report; details are provided alongside each item.

### Degree and Career Aspirations

What degree(s) or certifications do you intend to obtain from [your institution]? Mark all that apply.

B.A./B.S.	50 (0.151)
Teaching certification/credential	8 (0.024)
M.A./M.S. in mathematics	81 (0.245)
M.A./M.S. in mathematics education	6 (0.018)
Ph.D. in mathematics	203 (0.613)
Ph.D. in mathematics education	30 (0.091)
Ed.D.	1 (0.003)
Other	11 (0.033)

### What is your intended career trajectory?

Academic position at a 4-year college or university – teaching focused	93 (0.347)
Academic position at a 4-year college or university – research focused	112 (0.418)
Academic position at a 2-year college	5 (0.019)

Non-academic position (industry, government, etc.)	34 (0.127)
Other (please explain)	24 (0.09)

#### Gender

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Cisgender Man	Cisgender Woman	Gender Non-binary	Transgender	Transgender Man	Transgender Woman	Not reported
165	113	1	2	0	0	50
0.498	0.341	0.003	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.151

Survey response options: Man, Transgender, Woman, Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Selections of only Man, only Woman, or only Transgender are coded as Cisgender Man, Cisgender Woman, and Transgender respectively; selections of Transgender and Man or Transgender and Woman are coded as Transgender Man and Transgender Woman, respectively; selections of Man and Woman (with or without additional selections) or self-described non-binary gender identities (e.g., genderfluid, agender) are coded as Gender Non-Binary; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection were coded as Not reported.

### Race and Ethnicity

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Asian	62 (0.187)
Alaska Native or Native American	0 (0.000)
Black or African American	8 (0.024)
Hispanic or Latinx	8 (0.024)
Middle Eastern or North African	5 (0.015)
Multiple Race	16 (0.048)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (0.000)
White	180 (0.544)
Not reported	52 (0.157)

Survey response options: Alaskan Native or Native American, Black or African American, Central Asian, East Asian, Hispanic or Latinx, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Southeast Asian, South Asian, White, Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Selections of more than one of Central Asian, East Asian, Southeast Asian, South Asian without any other choices are coded as Asian; selections of multiple responses (aside from

the previous) are coded as Multiple Race/Ethnicity; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection are coded as Not reported.

#### Sexual Orientation

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Straight	Gay	Lesbian	Bisexual	Asexual	Queer	Queer+	Straight+	Not reported
205	7	0	19	5	1	3	2	89
0.619	0.021	0.000	0.057	0.015	0.003	0.009	0.006	0.269

Survey response options: Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Queer, Straight (Heterosexual), Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Categories are based on research from Voigt (2020) where selections of exactly one listed option are not recoded; selections of Straight (Heterosexual) and one or more additional options are coded as Straight+; selections of more than one option but not Straight (Heterosexual) are coded as Queer+; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection are coded as Not reported.

### Additional Context / Identity Markers

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

International Student	80 (0.242)
First-generation college student	72 (0.218)
First-generation higher education	87 (0.263)
Student with a disability	6 (0.018)
English language learner	45 (0.136)
Parent or guardian	14 (0.042)

### Course Specific Information

This section describes the participants' perceptions of their role in Precalculus, Calculus I, and/or Calculus II (it may be the case that one participant taught more than one of the above courses during the semester). Each result will be shown in the order Precalculus, Calculus I, Calculus II.

### Course Role

What is your official role with regards to [course]?

	Instructor of record/ primary instructor	Recitation/discussion/lab section leader	Other
PC	44	12	3
I FC	0.746	0.203	0.051
C1	77	82	1
	0.481	0.512	0.006
C2	56	37	0
C2	0.602	0.398	0.000

### Decisions about the course

How are most decisions about course content (e.g. syllabi, exams, homework, pacing, grading) made for [course]? Clarify if you wish.

	I make most decisions	I am part of a team that makes most decisions	Someone else makes most decisions
PC	1	25	32
PC	0.017	0.431	0.552
O1	17	40	103
C1	0.106	0.25	0.644
Co	21	22	50
C2	0.226	0.237	0.538

How are most decisions about instructional approach (e.g., use of clickers, group work, active learning) made for [course]? Clarify if you wish.

	I make most decisions	I am part of a team that makes most decisions	Someone else makes most decisions
DC	21	16	22
PC	0.356	0.271	0.373
O1	71	37	50
C1	0.449	0.234	0.316
Co	55	15	24
C2	0.585	0.16	0.255

# Percentages of Class Time

When you are teaching [course], what percent of that time do students spend... [must total 100]

	n	mean	sd	median
All Student Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	314	10.98	12.67	10
Working on tasks in small groups	314	29.81	27.82	20
Engaging in whole class discussion	314	12.46	13.49	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	314	46.75	27.79	50
Precalculus Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	59	13.2	18.77	10
Working on tasks in small groups	59	25.39	21.89	23
Engaging in whole class discussion	59	18.31	17.05	15
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	59	43.1	22.56	41
Calculus 1 Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	161	11.3	11.1	10
Working on tasks in small groups	161	31.29	27.98	24
Engaging in whole class discussion	161	12.4	13.51	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	161	45	28.16	45
Calculus 2 Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	94	9.043	10.07	6
Working on tasks in small groups	94	30.03	30.71	20
Engaging in whole class discussion	94	8.883	9.065	6
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	94	52.04	29.58	60

# Classroom Experience

Please indicate the degree to which the following statements are descriptive of your teaching.

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	PC	3	7	8	27	12
		0.053	0.123	0.14	0.474	0.211
I guide students	C1	1	9	32	58	52
through major topics as they listen:		0.007	0.059	0.211	0.382	0.342
	C2	1	7	15	36	31
		0.011	0.078	0.167	0.4	0.344

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	PC	6	16	18	7	10
I provide activities that		0.105	0.281	0.316	0.123	0.175
connect course content to my students' lives	C1	24	37	48	31	15
		0.155	0.239	0.31	0.2	0.097
and future work:	C2	11	21	32	19	8
_		0.121	0.231	0.352	0.209	0.088
	DC	8	9	7	9	23
My syllabus contains	PC	0.143	0.161	0.125	0.161	0.411
the specific topics that	C1	18	16	17	37	60
will be covered in every	CI	0.122	0.108	0.115	0.25	0.405
class session:	C2	12	9	13	21	36
_	<u> </u>	0.132	0.099	0.143	0.231	0.396
	PC	14	4	13	20	6
I provide students with	PC	0.246	0.07	0.228	0.351	0.105
immediate feedback on their word during class	C1	23	29	30	34	38
(e.g., student response		0.149	0.188	0.195	0.221	0.247
systems; short quizzes):	C2	15	22	11	23	20
_		0.165	0.242	0.121	0.253	0.22
<b>T</b>	PC	2	7	16	17	14
I structure my course with the assumption		0.036	0.125	0.286	0.304	0.25
that most of the	C1	2	17	43	56	35
students have little		0.013	0.111	0.281	0.366	0.229
useful knowledge of the topics:	C2	2	13	21	31	22
		0.022	0.146	0.236	0.348	0.247
	PC	6	8	12	16	15
I use student		0.105	0.14	0.211	0.281	0.263
assessment results to guide the direction of	etion of C1	16	18	39	41	38
my instruction during		0.105	0.118	0.257	0.27	0.25
the semester:		12	13	20	24	22
		0.132	0.143	0.22	0.264	0.242

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	PC	1	5	13	38	1
		0.018	0.088	0.228	0.667	0.018
I ask students to	C1	5	21	42	89	5
respond to questions during class time:		0.032	0.134	0.268	0.567	0.032
	C2	1	5	10	25	50
		0.011	0.055	0.11	0.275	0.549
_	D.C.	2	7	13	21	14
I use student questions	PC	0.035	0.123	0.228	0.368	0.246
and comments to determine the focus and	C1	6	13	37	56	42
direction of classroom	CI	0.039	0.084	0.24	0.364	0.273
lessons:	C2	2	5	27	36	21
_	02	0.022	0.055	0.297	0.396	0.231
In my class a variety of	PC	1	3	12	23	18
means (models,		0.018	0.053	0.211	0.404	0.316
drawings, graphs, symbols, simulations,	C1	4	13	35	47	58
tables, etc.) are used to		0.025	0.083	0.223	0.299	0.369
represent course topics	C2	6	3	27	30	25
and/or solve problems:		0.066	0.033	0.297	0.33	0.275
	PC	8	22	13	11	3
I structure class so that students explore or		0.14	0.386	0.228	0.193	0.053
discuss their	C1	24	35	45	31	20
understanding of		0.155	0.226	0.29	0.2	0.129
concepts before direct instruction:	C2	20	18	25	21	7
	C2	0.22	0.198	0.275	0.231	0.077
	PC	4	5	7	21	20
My class sessions are	PC	0.07	0.088	0.123	0.368	0.351
structured to give students a	o give C1	16	15	31	41	50
clear/structured set of	O1	0.105	0.098	0.203	0.268	0.327
notes:	C2	5	9	16	34	27
		0.055	0.099	0.176	0.374	0.297

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	DC	2	10	12	18	14
I structure class so that	PC	0.036	0.179	0.214	0.321	0.25
students talk with one	<i>C</i> 1	11	21	36	37	52
another about course	C1	0.07	0.134	0.229	0.236	0.331
topics:	Co	7	9	26	30	19
	C2	0.077	0.099	0.286	0.33	0.209
_	DC	10	13	23	8	3
I structure class so that	PC	0.175	0.228	0.404	0.14	0.053
students constructively	<i>O</i> 1	42	41	43	22	9
criticize one another's	C1	0.268	0.261	0.274	0.14	0.057
ideas:	CO.	19	25	24	17	6
	C2	0.209	0.275	0.264	0.187	0.066
_		7	7	17	19	8
I structure class so that		0.121	0.121	0.293	0.328	0.138
students discuss their	C1	20	21	48	33	34
mathematical difficulties with other		0.128	0.135	0.308	0.212	0.218
students:	Co	10	15	27	27	12
	C2	0.11	0.165	0.297	0.297	0.132
_	D.C.	13	9	20	11	4
I structure class so that	PC	0.228	0.158	0.351	0.193	0.07
students work on	<i>C</i> 1	29	45	48	19	15
problems individually	C1	0.186	0.288	0.308	0.122	0.096
during class:	Co	18	27	17	18	11
	C2	0.198	0.297	0.187	0.198	0.121
	DC	4	7	11	16	20
	PC	0.069	0.121	0.19	0.276	0.345
I structure class so that	C1	13	18	30	34	62
students work together in pairs or small groups:	C1	0.083	0.115	0.191	0.217	0.395
1 1 1 8-1 P-1	Co	9	15	17	18	32
	C2	0.099	0.165	0.187	0.198	0.352

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	DC	2	2	11	25	17
I structure class so that	PC	0.035	0.035	0.193	0.439	0.298
more than one approach	C1	1	12	42	57	43
to solving a problem is	O1	0.006	0.077	0.271	0.368	0.277
discussed:	C2	1	3	19	43	24
	C2	0.011	0.033	0.211	0.478	0.267
	PC	1	5	12	28	11
I provide time for	rc	0.018	0.088	0.211	0.491	0.193
students to reflect about	C1	8	12	59	43	33
the processes they use	CI	0.052	0.077	0.381	0.277	0.213
to solve problems:	C2	2	16	29	30	14
	<u>C2</u>	0.022	0.176	0.319	0.33	0.154
	PC	6	2	8	15	25
I give students frequent		0.107	0.036	0.143	0.268	0.446
assignments worth a	C1	15	14	36	44	46
small portion of their		0.097	0.09	0.232	0.284	0.297
grade:	C2	11	8	12	24	36
	02	0.121	0.088	0.132	0.264	0.396
T	PC	1	3	13	22	18
I expect students to make connections	rc	0.018	0.053	0.228	0.386	0.316
between related ideas or	C1	1	13	32	68	41
concepts when	CI	0.006	0.084	0.206	0.439	0.265
completing assignments:	C2	0	2	15	46	28
	02	0	0.022	0.165	0.505	0.308
	PC	21	18	12	5	1
I provide feedback on	10	0.368	0.316	0.211	0.088	0.018
student assignments	C1	53	45	25	19	11
without assigning a	OI	0.346	0.294	0.163	0.124	0.072
formal grade:	C2	30	24	14	13	10
	02	0.33	0.264	0.154	0.143	0.11

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	DC	3	7	9	18	20
Test questions focus on	PC	0.053	0.123	0.158	0.316	0.351
important facts and	C1	3	16	24	57	49
definitions from the	CI	0.02	0.107	0.161	0.383	0.329
course:	C2	2	6	25	32	25
	02	0.022	0.067	0.278	0.356	0.278
	PC	7	18	17	8	6
Test questions require	PC	0.125	0.321	0.304	0.143	0.107
students to apply course	C1	14	28	44	34	30
concepts to unfamiliar	C1	0.093	0.187	0.293	0.227	0.2
situations:	C2	5	18	26	22	19
_	02	0.056	0.2	0.289	0.244	0.211
	PC	4	3	10	14	27
Test questions contain		0.069	0.052	0.172	0.241	0.466
well-defined problems	C1	2	3	25	56	64
with one correct		0.013	0.02	0.167	0.373	0.427
solution:	C2	1	2	24	32	30
_	02	0.011	0.022	0.27	0.36	0.337
	PC	23	11	10	9	4
	PC	0.404	0.193	0.175	0.158	0.07
I use a grading curve as	C1	54	22	30	19	25
needed to adjust student scores:	CI	0.36	0.147	0.2	0.127	0.167
	C2	25	14	21	14	16
	02	0.278	0.156	0.233	0.156	0.178
	PC	2	16	23	11	6
	PC	0.034	0.276	0.397	0.19	0.103
A wide range of	C1	7	29	61	42	17
students respond to my questions in class:	C1	0.045	0.186	0.391	0.269	0.109
1	Co	1	13	36	29	12
	C2	0.011	0.143	0.396	0.319	0.132

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	DC	3	5	6	11	32
	PC	0.053	0.088	0.105	0.193	0.561
I know most of my	<i>O</i> 1	4	7	14	15	116
students by name:	C1	0.026	0.045	0.09	0.096	0.744
	CO.	0	3	8	14	66
	C2	0	0.033	0.088	0.154	0.725
	DC	34	12	7	2	3
When calling on	PC	0.586	0.207	0.121	0.034	0.052
students in class, I use	O1	92	27	19	11	7
randomized response strategies (e.g., picking	C1	0.59	0.173	0.122	0.071	0.045
names from a hat):	Go.	53	15	11	8	4
	C2	0.582	0.165	0.121	0.088	0.044
	PC	4	9	12	18	13
		0.071	0.161	0.214	0.321	0.232
I structure class to	C1	17	27	36	30	46
encourage peer-to-peer support among students		0.109	0.173	0.231	0.192	0.295
support among statement	G Q	9	15	25	23	19
	C2	0.099	0.165	0.275	0.253	0.209
	DC	2	10	18	19	7
	PC	0.036	0.179	0.321	0.339	0.125
There is a sense of	<i>O</i> 1	6	11	45	61	34
community among the students in my class:	C1	0.038	0.07	0.287	0.389	0.217
sociation in my crass.	CO.	0	5	36	27	23
	C2	0	0.055	0.396	0.297	0.253
	DC	22	6	9	7	13
	PC	0.386	0.105	0.158	0.123	0.228
I require students to	<i>C</i> 1	38	30	26	27	34
work in predetermined or randomized groups:	C1	0.245	0.194	0.168	0.174	0.219
	Co	32	15	12	11	21
	C2	0.352	0.165	0.132	0.121	0.231

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	DC	11	16	14	9	7
I use strategies that	PC	0.193	0.281	0.246	0.158	0.123
have been shown to	C1	36	35	44	26	8
support students from underrepresented		0.242	0.235	0.295	0.174	0.054
groups:	C2	20	25	22	10	8
_	C2	0.235	0.294	0.259	0.118	0.094
	PC	2	2	5	25	23
	rc	0.035	0.035	0.088	0.439	0.404
I consider students' thinking/understanding	C1	3	12	21	51	68
when planning lessons:	CI	0.019	0.077	0.135	0.329	0.439
1 0	C2	3	0	12	30	46
_		0.033	0	0.132	0.33	0.505
I use a variety of	PC ssion.	2	1	12	21	21
approaches (e.g., questioning, discussion,		0.035	0.018	0.211	0.368	0.368
formal/informal	C1 C2	5	17	35	50	48
assessments) to gauge		0.032	0.11	0.226	0.323	0.31
where my students are in their understanding		1	8	33	25	24
of concepts:	<u> </u>	0.011	0.088	0.363	0.275	0.264
	PC	1	5	19	23	10
I understand students'	10	0.017	0.086	0.328	0.397	0.172
previous conceptions, skills, knowledge, and	C1	6	16	50	61	23
interests related to a	O1	0.038	0.103	0.321	0.391	0.147
particular topic:	C2	2	8	27	39	15
	<u> </u>	0.022	0.088	0.297	0.429	0.165
	PC	1	0	11	28	18
	10	0.017	0	0.19	0.483	0.31
I explain concepts in this class in a variety of	C1	1	4	34	69	48
ways:	O1	0.006	0.026	0.218	0.442	0.308
•	C2	0	2	15	39	34
		0	0.022	0.167	0.433	0.378

		Not at all	Minimally	Somewhat	Mostly	Very
_	DC	2	3	13	17	22
I adjust my teaching	PC	0.035	0.053	0.228	0.298	0.386
based upon what	C1	0	6	29	54	67
students currently do or	O1	0	0.038	0.186	0.346	0.429
do not understand:	C2	1	3	14	39	34
_	C2	0.011	0.033	0.154	0.429	0.374
_	PC	3	3	7	22	23
	rc	0.052	0.052	0.121	0.379	0.397
I give feedback on homework, exams,	C1	4	10	21	40	80
quizzes, etc.:	CI	0.026	0.065	0.135	0.258	0.516
•	C2	4	2	9	26	50
_	C2	0.044	0.022	0.099	0.286	0.549
	PC hat	5	5	18	17	12
I structure class so that		0.088	0.088	0.316	0.298	0.211
students share their ideas (or their group's	C1	15	33	40	47	21
ideas) during whole		0.096	0.212	0.256	0.301	0.135
class discussions:	C2	6	21	21	32	10
_		0.067	0.233	0.233	0.356	0.111
	PC	2	2	20	24	9
I use strategies to	rc	0.035	0.035	0.351	0.421	0.158
encourage participation	C1	4	22	49	47	30
from a wide range of	CI	0.026	0.145	0.322	0.309	0.197
students:	C2	3	11	26	33	18
_	02	0.033	0.121	0.286	0.363	0.198
	PC	2	6	25	13	11
	10	0.035	0.105	0.439	0.228	0.193
A wide range of students participate in	C1	6	22	53	43	33
class:	O1	0.038	0.14	0.338	0.274	0.21
	C2	0	7	22	42	20
	02	0	0.077	0.242	0.462	0.22

# Comparisons

Generally speaking, do other people in your role for [course] use a teaching style similar to yours?

	Yes	No	Too varied to choose	I don't know
DC	28	4	6	20
PC	0.483	0.069	0.103	0.345
C1	74	4	27	55
CI	0.462	0.025	0.169	0.344
Co	43	4	10	36
C2	0.462	0.043	0.108	0.387

How do you feel about the instructional approach(es) being used to teach [course] at [your institution]?

	Very unhappy	Somewhat unhappy	Neutral	Somewhat happy	Нарру
DC	3	1	12	26	17
PC	0.051	0.017	0.203	0.441	0.288
C1	6	10	29	73	42
CI	0.038	0.062	0.181	0.456	0.262
Co.	2	6	21	36	27
02	0.022	0.065	0.228	0.391	0.293

# PIPS: Instructor Survey

The PIPS data contain 457 responses from instructors from twelve universities across the United States. Of those instructors, 186 taught Precalculus, 164 taught Calculus 1, and 107 taught Calculus 2. We first present the self-identified demographic information of these instructors.

As noted in the introduction to this report, instructors responded for each course they were teaching in a particular term. In the identity and context portion of this report, instructors are counted only once per term; in the course-specific information their responses are reported separately for each *course* they were teaching at the time they completed the survey.

### Instructor Identity & Personal Context

These questions asked about instructors' identity, including demographic information and academic context. Questions about Gender, Race and Ethnicity, and Sexual Orientation were presented as "select all that apply" items with the option to self-identify descriptors not on our lists. We intentionally provided more nuanced options than are generally use in demographic reports (e.g., the US census) as we value the complex nature of identity. Responses to these items were recoded for interpretability in this report; details are provided alongside each item.

### Gender

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Cisgender Man	Cisgender Woman	Gender Non-binary	Transgender	Transgender Man	Transgender Women	Not reported
228	166	5	0	0	0	57
0.5	0.364	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.125

Survey response options: Man, Transgender, Woman, Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Selections of only Man, only Woman, or only Transgender are coded as Cisgender Man, Cisgender Woman, and Transgender respectively; selections of Transgender and Man or Transgender and Woman are coded as Transgender Man and Transgender Woman, respectively; selections of Man and Woman (with or without additional selections) or self-described non-binary gender identities (e.g., genderfluid, agender) are coded as Gender Non-Binary; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection were coded as Not reported.

### Race and Ethnicity

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Asian	37 (0.081)
-------	------------

Alaska Native or Native American	4 (0.009)
Black or African American	43 (0.094)
Hispanic or Latinx	17 (0.037)
Middle Eastern or North African	0 (0.000)
Multiple Race	11 (0.024)
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0 (0.000)
White	265 (0.58)
Not reported	80 (0.175)

Survey response options: Alaskan Native or Native American, Black or African American, Central Asian, East Asian, Hispanic or Latinx, Middle Eastern or North African, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Southeast Asian, South Asian, White, Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Selections of more than one of Central Asian, East Asian, Southeast Asian, South Asian without any other choices are coded as Asian; selections of multiple responses (aside from the previous) are coded as Multiple Race/Ethnicity; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection are coded as Not reported.

#### Sexual Orientation

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

Straight	Gay	Lesbian	Bisexual	Asexual	Queer	Queer+	Straight+	Not reported
321	1	0	2	10	1	1	0	121
0.702	0.002	0.000	0.004	0.022	0.002	0.002	0.000	0.265

Survey response options: Asexual, Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian, Queer, Straight (Heterosexual), Not listed (please specify), Prefer not to disclose.

Categories are based on research from Voigt (2020) where selections of exactly one listed option are not recoded; selections of Straight (Heterosexual) and one or more additional options are coded as Straight+; selections of more than one option but not Straight (Heterosexual) are coded as Queer+; selections of Prefer not to disclose and no selection are coded as Not reported.

### Additional Context / Identity Markers

Do you consider yourself to be (Select all that apply):

International Student	113 (0.247)
First-generation college student	105 (0.23)
First-generation higher education	173 (0.379)
Person with a disability	9 (0.02)

English language learner	77 (0.168)
Parent or guardian	160 (0.35)

### Course-Specific Information

This section describes the participants perceptions of their role in Precalculus, Calculus I, and/or Calculus II (it may be the case that one participant taught more than one of the above courses during the semester). Each result will be shown in the order Precalculus, Calculus I, Calculus II.

#### Course Decisions

How are most decisions about course content (e.g., syllabi, exams, homework, pacing, grading) made for [course]? Clarify if you wish.

	I make most decisions	I am part of a team that makes most decisions	Someone else makes most decisions
PC	68	83	33
PC	0.37	0.451	0.179
C1	71	53	34
C1	0.449	0.335	0.215
G G	50	35	14
C2	0.505	0.354	0.141

How are most decisions about instructional approach (e.g., use of clickers, group work, active learning) made for [course]? Clarify if you wish.

	I make most decisions	I am part of a team that makes most decisions	Someone else makes most decisions
D.G.	123	51	11
PC	0.665	0.276	0.059
01	116	30	14
C1	0.725	0.188	0.088
Co	89	9	1
C2	0.899	0.091	0.01

# Percentages of Class Time

What percent of regular class time in [course], over the whole term, did your students spend... [must total 100]

	n	mean	sd	median
All Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	449	12.65	14.41	10
Working on tasks in small groups	449	15.65	16.50	11
Engaging in whole class discussion	449	13.00	13.30	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	449	58.69	22.57	60
Precalculus Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	185	16.78	17.94	11
Working on tasks in small groups	185	15.85	17.55	10
Engaging in whole class discussion	185	12.91	12.76	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	185	54.46	22.15	54
Calculus 1 Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	161	9.83	10.68	8
Working on tasks in small groups	161	17.03	16.61	15
Engaging in whole class discussion	161	11.87	12.13	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	161	61.27	21.77	64
Calculus 2 Instructors				
Working on tasks individually	103	9.63	10.01	8
Working on tasks in small groups	103	13.15	14.09	10
Engaging in whole class discussion	103	14.95	15.69	10
Listening to the instructor lecture or solve problems	103	62.27	23.51	66

# Classroom Experience

Please indicate the degree to which the following statements are descriptive of your teaching in [course]:

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
-	DC	2	11	45	64	61
	PC	0.011	0.06	0.246	0.35	0.333
I guide students	<b>.</b>	1	12	32	60	53
through major topics as they listen:	C1	0.006	0.076	0.203	0.38	0.335
	Q	2	4	23	43	29
	C2	0.02	0.04	0.228	0.426	0.287

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
-	D.C.	17	<b>5</b> 3	58	28	27
Tanassida astissitias that	PC	0.093	0.29	0.317	0.153	0.148
I provide activities that connect course content	Q.	26	41	51	23	18
to my students' lives and future work:	C1	0.164	0.258	0.321	0.145	0.113
	G a	19	26	34	16	5
	C2	0.19	0.26	0.34	0.16	0.05
<del>-</del>	D.C.	16	11	22	40	94
Mr. grillahus santains	PC	0.087	0.06	0.12	0.219	0.514
My syllabus contains the specific topics that	<b>C</b> 1	27	10	31	33	59
will be covered in every	C1	0.169	0.062	0.194	0.206	0.369
class session:	G a	20	9	11	20	42
	C2	0.196	0.088	0.108	0.196	0.412
<del>-</del>	PC	20	26	33	54	50
I provide students with		0.109	0.142	0.18	0.295	0.273
immediate feedback on	C1	40	40	26	26	28
their word during class (e.g., student response		0.25	0.25	0.162	0.162	0.175
systems; short quizzes):	C2	22	23	21	18	16
		0.22	0.23	0.21	0.18	0.16
_	D.C.	13	31	42	58	40
I structure my course with the assumption	PC	0.071	0.168	0.228	0.315	0.217
that most of the	O1	9	24	45	41	39
students have little	C1	0.057	0.152	0.285	0.259	0.247
useful knowledge of the	Co	6	18	28	35	15
topics:	C2	0.059	0.176	0.275	0.343	0.147
<del>-</del>	DC	15	24	50	49	43
I use student	PC	0.083	0.133	0.276	0.271	0.238
assessment results to	C1	12	22	56	40	29
guide the direction of my instruction during	C1	0.075	0.138	0.352	0.252	0.182
the semester:	CO.	5	19	30	24	22
	C2	0.05	0.19	0.3	0.24	0.22

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
_	DC	6	3	5	63	104
	PC	0.033	0.017	0.028	0.348	0.575
I ask students to	0.1	2	2	23	45	88
respond to questions during class time:	C1	0.013	0.013	0.144	0.281	0.55
during class time:	C2	1	0	12	27	59
	02	0.01	0	0.121	0.273	0.596
_	DC	10	15	58	60	41
I use student questions	PC	0.054	0.082	0.315	0.326	0.223
and comments to	O1	7	21	51	51	30
determine the focus and direction of classroom	C1	0.044	0.131	0.319	0.319	0.188
lessons:	Q o	1	14	28	40	19
	C2	0.01	0.137	0.275	0.392	0.186
In my class a variety of	PC	6	32	98	138	172
means (models,		0.013	0.072	0.22	0.309	0.386
drawings, graphs,	C1	1	11	37	46	65
symbols, simulations, tables, etc.) are used to		0.006	0.069	0.231	0.288	0.406
represent course topics	C2	0	11	28	29	34
and/or solve problems:		0	0.108	0.275	0.284	0.333
	D.C.	42	42	43	33	22
I structure class so that	PC	0.231	0.231	0.236	0.181	0.121
students explore or discuss their	Q.	35	53	32	18	21
understanding of	C1	0.22	0.333	0.201	0.113	0.132
concepts before direct instruction:	Go.	28	31	23	8	8
instruction.	C2	0.286	0.316	0.235	0.082	0.082
	DC	1	10	20	52	102
My class sessions are	PC	0.005	0.054	0.108	0.281	0.551
structured to give	G-	3	17	15	50	74
students a clear/structured set of	C1	0.019	0.107	0.094	0.314	0.465
notes:	C c	1	7	17	29	48
	C2	0.01	0.069	0.167	0.284	0.471

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
_	PC	14	38	57	43	29
I structure class so that	PC	0.077	0.21	0.315	0.238	0.16
students talk with one	O.	18	24	48	38	32
students talk with one another about course topics:	C1	0.112	0.15	0.3	0.238	0.2
	G a	10	21	27	18	24
	C2	0.1	0.21	0.27	0.18	0.24
_	DC	62	43	47	18	11
I structure class so that	PC	0.343	0.238	0.26	0.099	0.061
students constructively	01	55	43	30	20	11
criticize one another's	C1	0.346	0.27	0.189	0.126	0.069
ideas:	G a	31	29	21	12	6
	C2	0.313	0.293	0.212	0.121	0.061
_	PC	24	37	60	40	23
I structure class so that		0.13	0.201	0.326	0.217	0.125
students discuss their	C1	27	27	51	36	18
mathematical difficulties with other		0.17	0.17	0.321	0.226	0.113
students:	Q =	20	14	33	19	14
	C2	0.2	0.14	0.33	0.19	0.14
_	DC	10	39	53	44	37
I structure class so that	PC	0.055	0.213	0.29	0.24	0.202
students work on	01	27	44	42	23	24
problems individually	C1	0.169	0.275	0.262	0.144	0.15
during class:	Co	19	28	28	13	14
	C2	0.186	0.275	0.275	0.127	0.137
	DC	29	35	35	47	37
	PC	0.158	0.191	0.191	0.257	0.202
I structure class so that	C1	29	30	37	30	34
students work together in pairs or small groups:	C1	0.181	0.188	0.231	0.188	0.212
in pairs or sman groups.	CO	25	23	23	8	22
	C2	0.248	0.228	0.228	0.079	0.218

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
_	PC	1	7	37	74	61
I structure class so that	PC	0.006	0.039	0.206	0.411	0.339
more than one approach	C1	1	13	43	70	33
to solving a problem is	C1	0.006	0.081	0.269	0.438	0.206
discussed:	Go.	4	9	28	31	28
	C2	0.04	0.09	0.28	0.31	0.28
	D.C.	7	24	60	66	27
I provide time for	PC	0.038	0.13	0.326	0.359	0.147
students to reflect about	C1	12	26	54	38	29
the processes they use	C1	0.075	0.164	0.34	0.239	0.182
to solve problems:	Go.	4	23	33	26	15
	C2	0.04	0.228	0.327	0.257	0.149
	PC	3	11	28	65	78
I give students frequent		0.016	0.059	0.151	0.351	0.422
assignments worth a	C1	10	8	26	52	63
small portion of their		0.063	0.05	0.164	0.327	0.396
grade:	Go.	2	10	17	29	43
	C2	0.02	0.099	0.168	0.287	0.426
_	DC	1	4	33	79	67
I expect students to	PC	0.005	0.022	0.179	0.429	0.364
make connections	C1	3	12	38	71	36
between related ideas or concepts when	C1	0.019	0.075	0.238	0.444	0.225
completing assignments:	CO	1	7	23	38	31
	C2	0.01	0.07	0.23	0.38	0.31
_	D.C.	65	42	45	18	12
I provide feedback on	PC	0.357	0.231	0.247	0.099	0.066
student assignments	C1	61	39	38	6	15
without assigning a	C1	0.384	0.245	0.239	0.038	0.094
formal grade:	Co	41	22	20	8	7
	C2	0.418	0.224	0.204	0.082	0.071

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
_	PC	5	19	33	44	82
Test questions focus on	PC	0.027	0.104	0.18	0.24	0.448
Test questions focus on important facts and	α.	2	12	38	44	63
important facts and definitions from the course:	C1	0.013	0.075	0.239	0.277	0.396
	G o	0	6	24	31	37
	C2	0	0.061	0.245	0.316	0.378
_	D.C.	22	50	70	29	14
Test questions require	PC	0.119	0.27	0.378	0.157	0.076
Test questions require students to apply course	<b>~</b> .	21	37	56	22	21
concepts to unfamiliar	C1	0.134	0.236	0.357	0.14	0.134
situations:		15	21	39	16	7
	C2	0.153	0.214	0.398	0.163	0.071
_	PC	0	3	17	64	99
m		0	0.016	0.093	0.35	0.541
Test questions contain well-defined problems	C1	1	4	17	60	76
with one correct		0.006	0.025	0.108	0.38	0.481
solution:	C2	2	3	19	41	38
		0.019	0.029	0.184	0.398	0.369
_	D. C.	69	53	33	14	15
	PC	0.375	0.288	0.179	0.076	0.082
I use a grading curve as	<b>.</b>	45	40	27	19	28
needed to adjust student scores:	C1	0.283	0.252	0.17	0.119	0.176
scores.	Q -	22	22	23	12	20
	C2	0.222	0.222	0.232	0.121	0.202
		12	22	61	62	27
	PC	0.065	0.12	0.332	0.337	0.147
A wide range of	<b>~</b> :	5	26	68	39	22
students respond to my questions in class:	C1	0.031	0.162	0.425	0.244	0.138
questions in class.	~ :	3	13	46	23	17
	C2	0.029	0.127	0.451	0.225	0.167

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
_	DC	9	23	27	29	95
	PC	0.049	0.126	0.148	0.158	0.519
I know most of my	<b>Q</b> 1	16	29	20	20	75
students by name:	C1	0.1	0.181	0.125	0.125	0.469
statems by name.	G a	5	14	12	14	56
	C2	0.05	0.139	0.119	0.139	0.554
_	DG	105	32	26	8	11
When calling on	PC	0.577	0.176	0.143	0.044	0.06
students in class, I use	<b>Q</b> 4	94	27	19	11	9
randomized response strategies (e.g., picking	C1	0.588	0.169	0.119	0.069	0.056
names from a hat):	G a	58	15	12	8	5
,	C2	0.592	0.153	0.122	0.082	0.051
I structure class to	PC	20	50	37	44	32
encourage peer-to-peer		0.109	0.273	0.202	0.24	0.175
support among students (e.g., ask peer before you	C1	23	35	42	31	29
ask me, having group		0.144	0.219	0.262	0.194	0.181
roles, developing a	C2	21	22	23	18	16
group solution to share, etc.):		0.21	0.22	0.23	0.18	0.16
_		4	16	64	62	37
	PC	0.022	0.087	0.35	0.339	0.202
There is a sense of	<b>Q</b> 4	4	15	39	66	35
community among the students in my class:	C1	0.025	0.094	0.245	0.415	0.22
students in my class.	G o	1	12	34	30	25
	C2	0.01	0.118	0.333	0.294	0.245
_	D.C.	75	27	32	23	23
	PC	0.417	0.15	0.178	0.128	0.128
I require students to	C-1	81	16	20	13	30
work in predetermined or randomized groups:	C1	0.506	0.1	0.125	0.081	0.188
or randomized groups.	C a	56	18	13	7	6
	C2	0.56	0.18	0.13	0.07	0.06

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
I use strategies that have been shown to support students from underrepresented groups:	PC	34	35	54	36	18
		0.192	0.198	0.305	0.203	0.102
	C1	33	38	39	20	23
		0.216	0.248	0.255	0.131	0.15
	C2	24	29	21	10	11
		0.253	0.305	0.221	0.105	0.116
<del>-</del>	PC	6	6	20	84	67
		0.033	0.033	0.109	0.459	0.366
I consider students'	C1	0	1	27	64	65
thinking/understanding when planning lessons:		0	0.006	0.172	0.408	0.414
when planning lessons.	C2	0	0	16	36	49
		0	0	0.158	0.356	0.485
I use a variety of	PC	2	9	45	71	56
approaches (e.g., questioning, discussion, formal/informal assessments) to gauge where my students are in their understanding of concepts:		0.011	0.049	0.246	0.388	0.306
	C1	3	17	52	46	42
		0.019	0.106	0.325	0.288	0.262
	C2	1	12	28	35	25
		0.01	0.119	0.277	0.347	0.248
I understand students' previous conceptions, skills, knowledge, and interests related to a	PC	4	18	51	63	48
		0.022	0.098	0.277	0.342	0.261
	C1	2	16	61	54	27
		0.013	0.1	0.381	0.338	0.169
particular topic:	C2	1	10	33	33	25
		0.01	0.098	0.324	0.324	0.245
I explain concepts in this class in a variety of ways:	PC	2	3	17	83	77
		0.011	0.016	0.093	0.456	0.423
	C1	1	5	34	65	54
		0.006	0.031	0.214	0.409	0.34
ma <sub>1</sub> 0.	C2	1	4	18	44	34
		0.01	0.04	0.178	0.436	0.337

		Not at all descriptive	Minimally descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Mostly descriptive	Very descriptive
I adjust my teaching based upon what students currently do or do not understand:	PC	4	9	41	64	65
		0.022	0.049	0.224	0.35	0.355
	C1	0	7	39	63	51
		0	0.044	0.244	0.394	0.319
	C2	0	4	28	36	34
		0	0.039	0.275	0.353	0.333
	PC	4	8	26	59	87
		0.022	0.043	0.141	0.321	0.473
I give feedback on	C1	7	10	28	41	73
homework, exams, quizzes, etc.:		0.044	0.063	0.176	0.258	0.459
quizzes, etc	C2	4	4	9	30	55
		0.039	0.039	0.088	0.294	0.539
I structure class so that	PC	17	45	50	46	26
		0.092	0.245	0.272	0.25	0.141
students share their	C1	26	32	47	29	26
ideas (or their group's ideas) during whole class discussions:		0.162	0.2	0.294	0.181	0.162
	C2	10	26	32	20	13
		0.099	0.257	0.317	0.198	0.129
_	PC	7	11	48	69	50
Tura atuatanias ta		0.038	0.059	0.259	0.373	0.27
I use strategies to encourage participation	C1	8	28	38	44	41
from a wide range of students:		0.05	0.176	0.239	0.277	0.258
	C2	5	21	28	28	17
		0.051	0.212	0.283	0.283	0.172
A wide range of students participate in class:	PC	7	13	58	72	33
		0.038	0.071	0.317	0.393	0.18
	C1	4	15	60	49	32
		0.025	0.094	0.375	0.306	0.2
CIADO.	C2	1	15	33	35	18
		0.01	0.147	0.324	0.343	0.176

# Comparisons

Generally speaking, do other [course] instructors use a teaching style similar to yours?

		Yes	No	Too varied to choose	I don't know
Do other [course] instructors use a teaching style similar to yours?	PC	72	13	22	77
		0.391	0.071	0.12	0.418
	C1	57	18	18	64
		0.363	0.115	0.115	0.408
		30	14	12	45
	C2	0.297	0.139	0.119	0.446

How do you feel about the instructional approach(es) being used to teach [course] at [your institution]?

		Very unhappy	Somewhat unhappy	Neutral	Somewhat happy	Нарру
How do you feel about the instructional approach(es) being used to teach [course] at [your institution]?	PC	2	15	40	70	56
		0.011	0.082	0.219	0.383	0.306
	C1	1	26	33	65	34
		0.006	0.164	0.208	0.409	0.214
	C2	0	13	28	34	25
		0	0.13	0.28	0.34	0.25

## Acknowledgement & References

## Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the students and instructors across all twelve universities who provided us with descriptions of themselves and their mathematics course experiences.

The authors of this manuscript are a subset of the Progress through Calculus research team. This work would not be possible without the contributions of the PI team (David Bressoud, Jessica Ellis Hagman, Sean Larsen, Chris Rasmussen), the Mathematical Association of America, and a long list of senior personnel and graduate students, including: Estrella Johnson, Naneh Apkarian, Jessica Gehrtz, Kristen Vroom, Dana Kirin, Matthew Voigt, Tenchita Alzaga Elizondo, Brittney Ellis, Antonio Martinez, Rachel Tremaine, Ciera Street, Tyler Sullivan, Jason Guglielmo, Victoria Barron, Colin McGrane, and Kate Yang.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DUE IUSE #1430540. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and project team and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

### References

- Apkarian, N., & Kirin, D. (2017). Progress through calculus: Census survey technical report. Mathematical Association of America. <a href="http://bit.ly/PtC\_Reporting">http://bit.ly/PtC\_Reporting</a>
- Apkarian, N., Smith, W. M., Vroom, K., Voigt, M., Gehrtz, J., PtC Project Team, & SEMINAL Project Team. (2019). X-PIPS-M Survey Suite. <a href="https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/XPIPSM%20Summary%20Document.pdf">https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/XPIPSM%20Summary%20Document.pdf</a>
- Bressoud, D., Mesa, V., & Rasmussen, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Insights and recommendations* from the MAA national study of college calculus. MAA Press.
- Rasmussen, C., Apkarian, N., Hagman, J. E., Johnson, E., Larsen, S., Bressoud, D., & Progress through Calculus Team. (2019). Characteristics of Precalculus through Calculus 2 programs: Insights from a national census survey. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 50(1), 98–112.
- Voigt, M. (2020). Queer-Spectrum Student Experiences and Resources in Undergraduate Mathematics [Doctoral dissertation, UC San Diego]. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7g54x6c7
- Walter, E. M., Henderson, C. R., Beach, A. L., & Williams, C. T. (2016). Introducing the Postsecondary Instructional Practices Survey (PIPS): A concise, interdisciplinary, and easy-to-score survey. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 15(4), ar53. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.15-09-0193">https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.15-09-0193</a>