

**Proceedings of the
23rd Annual Conference on
Research in Undergraduate
Mathematics Education**

Editors:

Shiv Smith Karunakaran

Zackery Reed

Abigail Higgins

Boston, Massachusetts

February 27 - February 29, 2020

Presented by

The Special Interest Group of the Mathematical Association of America
(SIGMAA) for Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education

Copyright ©2020 left to authors. All rights reserved.

CITATION: Karunakaran, S. S., Reed, Z., & Higgins, A. (Eds.). (2020). *Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Conference on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education*. Boston, MA.

Preface

As part of its on-going activities to foster research in undergraduate mathematics education and the dissemination of such research, the Special Interest Group of the Mathematics Association of America on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education (SIGMAA on RUME) held its twenty-third annual Conference on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education in Boston, Massachusetts from February 27 - February 29, 2020.

The program included plenary addresses by Dr. Gregory Larnell, Dr. Eric Knuth, and Dr. Elise Lockwood, and the presentation of 148 contributed, preliminary, and theoretical research reports and 74 posters.

The conference was organized around the following themes: results of current research, contemporary theoretical perspectives and research paradigms, and innovative methodologies and analytic approaches as they pertain to the study of undergraduate mathematics education.

The proceedings include several types of papers that represent current work in the field of undergraduate mathematics education, each of which underwent a rigorous review by two or more reviewers:

- Contributed Research Reports describe completed research studies
- Preliminary Research Reports describe ongoing research projects in early stages of analysis
- Theoretical Research Reports describe new theoretical perspectives for research
- Posters are 1-page summaries of work that was presented in poster format

The conference was hosted by the Wheelock College at Boston University.

Many members of the RUME community volunteered to review submissions before the conference and during the review of the conference papers. We sincerely appreciate all of their hard work by the 165 reviewers.

We wish to acknowledge the conference program committee for their substantial contributions to RUME and our institutions. Without their support, the conference would not exist.

Finally, we wish to express our deep appreciation for Wheelock College and Boston University. Their support enabled us to have our conference and continually support our community.

Shiv Smith Karunakaran, RUME Organizational Director
Sam Cook, RUME Conference Local Organizer

Program Committee

Chairperson

Shiv Smith Karunakaran	Michigan State University
------------------------	---------------------------

Committee Members

John Paul Cook	Oklahoma State University
Paul Dawkins	Texas State University
Allison Dorko	Oklahoma State University
William Hall	Washington State University
Shandy Hauk	San Francisco State University
Yvonne Lai	University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Kristen Lew	Texas State University
Luis Leyva	Vanderbilt University
Jason Martin	University of Central Arkansas
Kevin Moore	University of Georgia
Jason Samuels	City University of New York
Hortensia Soto	Colorado State University
Natasha Speer	University of Maine
April Strom	Scottsdale Community College
Nick Wasserman	Columbia University
Megan Wawro	Virginia Tech
Michelle Zandieh	Arizona State University

Local Organizers

Boston University

Greg Benoit
Aaron Brakonietcki
Leslie Dietiker
Ellen Faszewski
Elyssa Miller
Hector Nievas
Andrew Richman
Meghan Riling
Rashmi Singh
Rae Starks

Rutgers University

Brittany Marshall
Christian Woods

Pine Manor College

Rebecca Mitchell

Temple University

Sue Kelley

Tufts University

Eric Henry

University of New Hampshire

David Fifty
Cammie Gray

Reviewers

Aditya Adiredja	William Hall	Erica Miller
Sara Ahrens	Leigh Harrell-Williams	Alison Mirin
James Alvarez	Neil Hatfield	Thembinkosi Mkhathswa
Tenchita Alzaga Elizondo	Shandy Hauk	Kevin Moore
Naneh Apkarian	Jia He	Deborah Moore-Russo
Spencer Bagley	Meredith Hegg	Brooke Mullins
Janessa Beach	Mary Heid	Eileen Murray
Sybilla Beckmann	Michael Hicks	Kedar Nepal
Ashley Berger	Cody Hood	Alan O'Bryan
Anna Marie Bergman	Jihye Hwang	Lori Ogden
Matthew Black	Andrew Izsak	Gary Olson
Heather Bolles	Haley Jeppson	Teo Paoletti
Stacy Brown	Carolyn Johns	Erika Parr
Kelly Bulp	Estrella Johnson	Mary Pilgrim
Orly Buchbinder	Steven Jones	Branwen Purdy
Linda Burks	Eun Jung	Farzad Radmehr
Cameron Byerley	Avijit Kar	Zackery Reed
Gunhan Caglayan	Gulden Karakok	Paul Regier
Marilyn Carlson	Karen Keene	Jon-Marc Rodriguez
Darryl Chamberlain Jr.	Rachel Keller	Kimberly Rogers
Ahsan Chowdhury	Aubrey Kemp	Svitlana Rogovchenko
John Paul Cook	Andrew Kercher	Yuriy Rogovchenko
Samuel Cook	Minsu Kim	Kyeong Hah Roh
Doug Corey	Yi-Yin Ko	Rachel Rupnow
Jennifer Czoher	Vladislav Kokushkin	Megan Ryals
Paul Dawkins	Igor Kontorovich	Jason Samuels
Jessica Deshler	George Kuster	V. Rani Satyam
Allison Dorko	Yvonne Lai	Milos Savic
Gregory Downing	Jessica Lajos	Benjamin Schermerhorn
Irene Duranczyk	Inyoung Lee	Vicki Sealey
Amy Ellis	Younhee Lee	Megan Selbach-Allen
Brittney Ellis	Tamara Lefcourt	Benjamin Sencindiver
Nicole Engelke Infante	Mariana Levin	Kaitlyn Serbin
Ander Erickson	Kristen Lew	Ariel Setniker
Sarah Erickson	Luis Leyva	Mollee Shultz
Joshua Fagan	Biyao Liang	John Smith
David Fifty	Elise Lockwood	Trevor Smith
Kelly Findley	Michael Loverude	Hortensia Soto
Rocky Flint	Martha Makowski	Natasha Speer
Nicholas Fortune	Ofer Marmur	Julia St. Goar
Tim Fukawa-Connelly	Jason Martin	Cynthia Stenger
Edgar Fuller	Antonio Martinez	Sepideh Stewart
Keith Gallagher	Matthew Mauntel	April Straum
Jessica Gehrtz	Kathleen Melhuish	Jenna Tague
Sayonita Ghosh Hajra	Caroline Merighi	Michael Tallman
Simon Goodchild	Vilma Mesa	Gail Tang
Jessica Hagman	David Miller	Halil Tasova

Michael Tepper
Dawn Teuscher
John Thompson
Karina Uhing
Madhavi Vishnubhotla
Matthew Voigt
Kristen Vroom
Aaron Wangberg

Nicholas Wasserman
Laura Watkins
Megan Wawro
Keith Weber
Aaron Weinberg
Derek Williams
Molly Williams
Claire Wladis

Xiaoheng (Kitty) Yan
Sean Yee
Franklin Yu
Yusuf Zakariya
Michelle Zandieh
Charlotte Zimmerman

Table of Contents

Contributed Reports

Undergraduate students' perspectives on what makes problem contexts engaging	1
<i>Tamara Stark and Steven R. Jones</i>	
Undergraduates' perceptions of the benefits of working tasks focused on analyzing student thinking as an application for teaching in abstract algebra	10
<i>James A. Mendoza Álvarez, Andrew Kercher, Kyle Turner</i>	
Assessing the uptake of research based instructional strategies by postsecondary mathematics instructors	18
<i>Naneh Apkarian, Estrella Johnson, Jeffrey R. Raker, Marilynne Stains, Charles Henderson, Melissa H. Dancy</i>	
University calculus students' use and understanding of slope conceptualizations	28
<i>Susan M. Bateman, Deborah Moore-Russo, Courtney R. Nagle, Michael Pawlikowski</i>	
A preservice teacher's Emerging concept image of function: The case of Sofia	37
<i>Janessa Beach, James A. Mendoza, Álvarez</i>	
A local instructional theory for the guided reinvention of a classification algorithm for chemically important symmetry groups	45
<i>Anna Marie Bergman</i>	
Changing the script: How teaching calculus using team-based learning misaligns with students' views of how learning mathematics occurs	53
<i>Heather A. Bolles, Kari N. Jurgenson, Amanda R. Baker</i>	
Secondary prospective teachers' strategies to determine equivalence of conditional statements	62
<i>Orly Buchbinder, Sharon McCrone</i>	
Characteristics and evaluation of ten mathematics tutoring centers	70
<i>Cameron Byerley, Carolyn James, Deborah Moore-Russo, Brian Rickard, Melissa Mills, William Heasom, Janet Oien, Cynthia Farthing, Linda Burks, Melissa Ferreira, Behailu Mammo, Daniel Moritz</i>	
Exploring the knowledge base for college mathematics teaching	79
<i>Douglas Lyman Corey, Linlea West, Kamalani Kaluhiokalani</i>	
Coordinating two meanings of variables in proofs that apply definitions repeatedly	87
<i>Paul Christian Dawkins, Kyeong Hah Roh</i>	
Student verification practices for combinatorics problems in a computational environment	96
<i>Adaline De Chenne, Elise Lockwood</i>	
Teaching Statistics with a Critical Pedagogy	104
<i>Toni DiMella</i>	
Influence of curriculum on college students' understanding and reasoning about limits	115
<i>Navy Dixon, Erin Carroll, Dawn Teuscher</i>	
How do students engage with 'practice another version' in online homework	124
<i>Allison Dorko</i>	

Investigating the effects of culturally relevant pedagogy on college algebra students' attitudes towards mathematics	133
<i>Gregory A. Downing</i>	
Measuring the effectiveness of social justice pedagogy on K-8 preservice teachers	142
<i>Gregory A. Downing, Brittney L. Black</i>	
Departmental change in reaction to the threat of losing calculus: Three cases	151
<i>Tenchita Alzaga Elizondo, Brittney Ellis, Nanah Apkarian, Brigitte Sánchez Robayo, Claire K. Robbins, Estrella Johnson</i>	
Empirical re-conceptualization: Bridging from empirical patterns to insight and understanding	159
<i>Amy Ellis, Elise Lockwood, Alison Lynch</i>	
Every mathematics class is online: Students' use of internet resources for self-directed learning	168
<i>Ander Erickson</i>	
Investigating combinatorial provers' cognitive models of multiplication	176
<i>Sarah A. Erickson, Elise Lockwood</i>	
A model for assessing ITP students' ability to validate mathematical arguments	184
<i>Joshua B. Fagan</i>	
Characterizing student engagement in a post-secondary precalculus class	193
<i>David Fifty, Orly Buchbinder, Sharon McCrone</i>	
Chavrusa-style learning in mathematics classrooms: Instructor and student perspectives.....	201
<i>Rochy Flint, Baldwin Mei</i>	
What comes to mind? A case study of concept images in topology.....	210
<i>Keith Gallagher, Nicole Engelke Infante</i>	
An investigation of an effective mathematical reader and his interactions and beliefs about mathematics and mathematics textbooks: The case of Shawn	218
<i>Julia Judson-Garcia, Barbara Villatoro, Inyoung Lee</i>	
Investigating instructors' perceptions of IBL: A systemic functional linguistic approach	227
<i>Saba Gerami, Vilma Mesa</i>	
An analysis of opportunities for reasoning-and-proving in a university precalculus textbook.....	234
<i>Joash M. Geteregechi, Anne N. Waswa</i>	
An investigation of a students' constructed meanings for animations in construction of a hypothetical learning trajectory	243
<i>Aysia M. Guy</i>	
Ask me once, ask me twice: An initial psychometric analysis of pre-service mathematics teachers' responses on a retrospective pre-post format of the self-efficacy to teach statistics (SETS-HS) Instrument	252
<i>Leigh Harrell-Williams, Christina Azmy, Hollylynne Lee, Shelby Roberts, Jessica Webb</i>	
Students' interpretations of the prompts for proving tasks: "Prove" and "Show"	260
<i>Jihye Hwang, Shiv Smith Karunakaran</i>	

Future teachers' use of multiplication and division to formulate linear equations	268
<i>Andrew Izsák, Sybilla Beckmann</i>	
Exploring the genetic decomposition of interior and exterior angles of polygons with the use of computer programming and GeoGebra	277
<i>Jay L. Jackson, Janet T. Jenkins, James A. Jerkins, Cynthia L. Stenger, Mark G. Terwilliger</i>	
A comprehensive hypothetical learning trajectory for the chain rule, implicit differentiation and related rates: Part II, a small-scale teaching experiment	285
<i>Haley Jeppson, Steven R. Jones</i>	
Tutoring beyond show and tell: An existence proof	294
<i>Carolyn Johns</i>	
Student self-and simulated peer-evaluation of proof comprehension: Tina	303
<i>Aubrey Kemp, Darryl Chamberlain Jr., Laurel Cooley, Valerie Miller, Draga Vidakovic</i>	
A calculus student's thinking about the idea of constant rate of change	311
<i>Ishtesa Khan</i>	
The role of gestures in teaching and learning proof by mathematical induction	320
<i>Vladislav Kokushkin</i>	
One mathematician's epistemology of proof and its implications for her comments and marks on students' proof	329
<i>Igor' Kontorovich</i>	
Minding the gaps: Algebra skills of university students	338
<i>Keri Kornelson, Deborah Moore-Russon, Stacy Reeder</i>	
Construction of a mathematics learning assistant's fragile mathematics identity	348
<i>Nancy Emerson Kress</i>	
Framework for characterizing students' reorganization of school mathematics understandings in their collegiate mathematics learning	358
<i>Younhee Lee</i>	
Math and moral reasoning in the age of the internet: Undergraduate students' perspectives on the line between acceptable use of resources and cheating	366
<i>Mariana Levin, John P. Smith III, Shiv S. Karunakaran, Valentin A. B. Küchle, Sarah Castle, Jihye Hwang, Robert Elmore, Younggon Bae</i>	
A conceptual analysis for optimizing two-variable functions in linear programming	374
<i>Biyao Liang, Yufeng Ying, Kevin C. Moore</i>	
Making sense of irrational exponents: University students explore	382
<i>Ofer Marmur, Rina Zazkis</i>	
Promoting instructor growth and providing resources: Course coordinator orientations toward their work	390
<i>Antonio Martinez, Jessica Gehrtz, Chris Rasmussen, Talia LaTona-Tequida, Kristen Vroom</i>	
Get that basket! Deciphering student strategies in the linear algebra game vector unknown	398
<i>Matthew Mauntel, Benjamin Levine, David Plaxco, Michelle Zandieh</i>	

Calculus students' epistemologies of mathematics: The case for a dynamic interpretation	407
<i>Caroline J. Merighi</i>	
A confirmatory factor analysis of EQUIPM, a video coding protocol to assess the quality of community college algebra instruction	415
<i>Vilma Mesa, Rik Lamm, Laura Watkins, Irene Duranczyk, April Ström Nidhi Kohli</i>	
Analyzing collegiate mathematics observation protocols: Attending to the instructional triangle and inquiry-based mathematics education practices	422
<i>Erica R. Miller, Kimberly C. Rogers, Sean P. Yee</i>	
Students' understanding of partial derivatives	430
<i>Theminkosi P. Mkhathshwa</i>	
Using RME to support PSTs' meanings for quadratic relationships	440
<i>Mustafa M. Mohamed, Madhavi Vishnubhotla, Alfred Limbere, Abiodun Banner, Teo Paoletti</i>	
Quantitative reasoning and symbolization activity: Do individuals expect calculations and expressions to have quantitative significance?	449
<i>Alan E. O'Bryan</i>	
Development of students' shared understanding in guided reinvention of a formal definition of the limit - from commognitive perspective	458
<i>Jungeun Park, Jason Martin, Michael Oehrtman</i>	
Students' interpretations of expressions from calculus statements in the graphical register	466
<i>Erika David Parr</i>	
Folding back in the Arzelà-Ascoli theorem	475
<i>Zackery Reed, Michael Oehrtman</i>	
How problem posing can impact student motivation: A case study	485
<i>Paul Regier</i>	
Varieties of sameness: Instructors' descriptions for themselves and students	494
<i>Rachel Rupnow</i>	
Metacognition in college algebra: An analysis of "simple" mistakes	502
<i>Megan Ryals, Sloan Hill-Lindsay, Linda Burks, Mary E. Pilgrim</i>	
Affective pathways of undergraduate students while engaged in proof construction tasks	511
<i>V. Rani Satyam</i>	
A tale of two sides: Students' feedback preferences and professor's feedback provisions	520
<i>Nurul Schraeder, David Miller</i>	
Students' language about basis and change of basis in a quantum mechanics problem	529
<i>Kaitlyn Stephens Serbin, Rebecah Storms, Megan Wawro</i>	
The decision to use inquiry-oriented instruction: Why don't beliefs align with practice?	538
<i>Mollee Shultz, Patricio Herbst</i>	
"What happened to the vector?" Felix's emerging conception of translations	547
<i>Janet G. Sipes</i>	

Linear algebra thinking in the embodied, symbolic and formal worlds: Students' reasoning behind preferring certain worlds	555
<i>Sepidah Stewart, Jonathan Epstein</i>	
Reasoning covariationally about constant rate of change: The case of Samantha	563
<i>Michael Tallman, John Weaver</i>	
The role of lines and points in the construction of emergent shape thinking	571
<i>Halil I. Tasova, Biyao Liang, Kevin C. Moore</i>	
You don't want to come into a broken system: Critical and dominant perspectives for increasing diversity in STEM among undergraduate mathematics program stakeholders	580
<i>Rachel Tremaine, Jessica Hagman, Matthew Voigt, Jessica Gehrtz</i>	
Tasks to foster mathematical creativity in calculus I	588
<i>Houssein El Turkey, Gülden Karakök, Gail Tang, Paul Regier, Milos Savić, Emily Cilli-Turner</i>	
Factors that influence graduate student instructors' pedagogical empathy	598
<i>Karina Uhing</i>	
Dimensions of variations in group work within the "same" multi-section undergraduate course	606
<i>John P. Smith III, Valentin Küchle, Sarah Castle, Shiv S. Karunakaran, Younggon Bae, Jihye Hwang, Mariana Levin, Robert Elmore</i>	
Differentiating between quadratic and exponential change via covariational reasoning: A case study ..	614
<i>Madhavi Vishnubhotla, Teo Paoletti</i>	
A case of learning how to use and order quantified variables by way of defining	623
<i>Kristen Vroom</i>	
Student reasoning with graphs, contour maps, and rate of change for multivariable functions	631
<i>Aaron Wangberg</i>	
Student meanings for eigenequations in mathematics and in quantum mechanics	638
<i>Megan Wawro, John Thompson, Kevin Watson</i>	
In the driver's seat: course coordinators as change agents for active learning in university precalculus to calculus 2	646
<i>Molly Williams, Nanah Apkarian, Karina Uhing, Rachel Funk, Wendy Smith, Nathan Wakefield, Antonio Martinez, Chris Rasmussen</i>	
Interactions between student engagement and collective mathematical activity	655
<i>Derek A. Williams, Jonathan López Torres, Emmanuel Barton Odro</i>	
Calculus for teachers: Vision and considerations of mathematicians	664
<i>Xiaoheng Yan, Ofer Marmur, Rina Zazkis</i>	
Interpreting undergraduate student complaints about graduate student instructors through the lens of the instructional practices guide	673
<i>Sean P. Yee, Jessica Deshler, Kimberly Cervello Rogers, Nicholas Papalia, Alicia Lamarche</i>	
Students' meanings for the derivative at a point	681
<i>Franklin Yu</i>	

Theoretical Reports

A comprehensive hypothetical learning trajectory for the chain rule, implicit differentiation, and related rates: Part I, the development of the HLT	690
<i>Haley P. Jeppson, Steven R. Jones</i>	
Mathematicians' proof repertoires: The case of proof by contradiction	699
<i>Stacy Brown</i>	
The theory of quantitative systems: Deconstructing "symbolic algebra" to understand challenges in linear algebra courses	707
<i>Janet Sipes</i>	
Working towards a unifying framework for knowledge for teaching mathematics	716
<i>Jessica Nuzzi, Eileen Murray, Amir Golnabi</i>	
A meanings-based framework for textbook analysis	725
<i>Neil J. Hatfield</i>	
A potential foundation for trigonometry and calculus: The variable-parts perspective on proportional relationships and geometric similarity	734
<i>Sybilla Beckmann, Andrew Izsák</i>	
Theorizing teachers' mathematical learning in the context of student-teacher interaction: A lens of decentering.....	742
<i>Biyao Liang</i>	
A quantitative reasoning framing of concept construction	752
<i>Kevin Moore, Biayo Liano, Irma E. Stevens, Halil I Tasova, Teo Paoletti, Yufeng Ying</i>	
A proposed framework of student thinking around substitution equivalence: Structural versus operational views	762
<i>Claire Wladis, Kathleen Offenholley, Magdalena Beiting, Niharika Thakkar</i>	
The modeling space: An analytical tool for documenting students' modeling activities	769
<i>Jennifer A. Czocher, Hamilton Hardison</i>	
What is encompassed by responsiveness to student thinking?	777
<i>Jessica Gehrtz</i>	
A theorization of learning environments to support the design of intellectual need-provoking tasks in introductory calculus.....	787
<i>Aaron Weinburg, Steven R. Jones</i>	
Knowledge for teaching at the undergraduate level: Insights from a STEM-wide literature review....	796
<i>Natasha Speer, Ginger Shultz, Tessa C. Andrews</i>	
Operational meanings for the equals sign.....	805
<i>Alison Mirin</i>	
Mathematical limitations as opportunities for creativity: An anti-deficit perspective	814
<i>Aditya P. Adiredja, Michelle Zandieh</i>	
A tour of cognitive transformations of semiotic representations in advanced mathematical thinking ..	820
<i>Jessica E. Lajos, Sepideh Stewart</i>	

Metacognition: An overlooked dimension in connecting undergraduate mathematics to secondary teaching	829
<i>Tamara Lefcourt</i>	

Preliminary Reports

How mathematicians attend to learning goals for teachers	837
<i>Sally Ahrens, Yvonne Lai</i>	
Linking terms to physical significance as an evaluation strategy	843
<i>Abolaji Akinyemi, John R. Thompson, Michael E. Loverude</i>	
Adapting the norm for instruction: How novice instructors of introductory mathematics courses align an active learning approach with the demands of teaching	850
<i>Amy Been Bennett</i>	
Examining the qualities of schema in topology	857
<i>Ashley Berger, Sepideh Stewart</i>	
A conceptual blend analysis of physics quantitative literacy reasoning inventory items	862
<i>Suzanne White Brahmia, Alexis Olsho, Andrew Boudreaux, Trevor Smith, Charlotte Zimmermann</i>	
Would you take another inquiry-based learning mathematics course? Links to students' final exam grades and reported learning gains	868
<i>Kelly Bupp, Allyson Hallman-Thrasher, Otto Shaw, Harman Aryal, Deependra Budhathoki</i>	
Active learning approaches and student self-confidence in calculus: A preliminary report	874
<i>Adam Castillo, Charity Watson, Pablo Duran, Edgar Fuller, Geoff Potvin, Laird Kramer</i>	
Defining key developmental understandings in congruence proofs from a transformation approach ...	880
<i>Julia St. Goar, Yvonne Lai</i>	
Attending mathematics conferences as a means for professional development: A preservice teacher's evolving identity	886
<i>William Hall, Ashley Whitehead</i>	
Multivariate functions, physical representations, and real world connections	892
<i>M. Kathleen Heid, Matthew Black</i>	
Novice and expert evaluation of generic proofs	897
<i>George Kuster, Neville Fogarty, Adam Bradie</i>	
Proving activities of abstract algebra students in a group task-based interview	903
<i>Kristen Lew, Kathleen Melhuish, Paul Christian Dawkins</i>	
Student responses to an unfamiliar graphical representation of motion	909
<i>Michael Loverude, Henry Taylor</i>	
Adapting K-12 teaching routines to the advanced mathematics classroom	915
<i>Kathleen Melhuish, Kristen Lew, Taylor Baumgard, Brittney Ellis</i>	
When covariational reasoning does not "work": Applying coordination class theory to model students' reasoning related to the varied population schema and distribution graphs	922
<i>Jon-Marc G. Rodriguez, Avery Stricker, Nicole M. Becker</i>	

Undergraduate learning assistants and mathematical discourse in an active-learning precalculus setting	930
<i>Milos Savic, Katherine Simmons, Deborah Moore-Russo, Candace Andrews</i>	
Exploring and supporting physics students' understanding of basis and projection	935
<i>Benjamin Schermerhorn, Homeyra Sadaghiani, Giaco Corsiglia, Gina Passante, Steve Polluck</i>	
Getting back to our cognitive roots: Calculus students' understandings of graphical representation of functions	942
<i>Ben Sencindiver</i>	
Physics students' implicit connections between mathematical ideas	949
<i>Trevor I. Smith, Suzanne White Brahmia, Alexis Olsho, Andrew Boudreaux</i>	
Supporting underrepresented students in an undergraduate mathematics program	956
<i>Jenna Tague</i>	
Comparison of a pre-requisite to co-requisite model of remedial mathematics	962
<i>Jenna Tague, Dahlia Nunez, Jennifer A. Czoche</i>	
Shifting pedagogical beliefs into action through teaching for mathematical creativity	968
<i>Gail Tang, Milos Savic, Emily Cili-Turner, Paul Regier, Gülden Karakök, Houssein El Turkey</i>	
Students' understanding of infinite iterative processes	975
<i>Marcie Tiraphatna</i>	
" $f(x)$ means y ": Students' meanings for function notation	981
<i>Fern Van Vliet, Alison Mirin</i>	
Identifying covariational reasoning behaviors in expert physicists in graphing tasks	985
<i>Charlotte Zimmerman, Alexis Olsho, Michael Loverude, Suzanne White Brahmia</i>	
Self-efficacy in a flipped calculus II classroom	991
<i>John A. Kerrigan, Geraldin L. Cochran, Antonio Silva, Jillian Mellen, Lydia Prendergast</i>	
Implementing an open educational platform in blended learning	998
<i>Minsu Kim</i>	
Singular and combined effects of learning approaches, self-efficacy and prior knowledge on university students' performance in mathematics	1003
<i>Yusuf F. Zakariya, Hans Kristian Nilsen, Kirsten Bjøkestøl, Simon Goodchild</i>	
Student mathematical activity during analogical reasoning in abstract algebra	1010
<i>Michael D. Hicks</i>	
How different is different? Examining institutional differences prior to scaling up a graduate teacher training program to improve undergraduate mathematics outcomes	1016
<i>Leigh M. Harrel-Williams, Gary A. Olson, Jessica Webb, Scotty Houston, Josias Gomez</i>	
An example of computational thinking in mathematics	1022
<i>Branwen Purdy, Elise Lockwood</i>	
The motivations and perceived success of different calculus course variations	1028
<i>Tenchita Alzaga Elizondo, Kristin Vroom, Matthew K. Voigt</i>	
Math outreach - A learning opportunity for university students	1034
<i>Sayonita Ghosh Hajra</i>	

Analyzing the beliefs and practices of graduate and undergraduate mathematics tutors	1039
<i>Mary E. Pilgrim, Erica R. Miller, Sloan Hill-Lindsay, Rebecca Segal</i>	
University students' defining conceptions of linearity	1046
<i>Jason Samuels</i>	
How mathematicians assign homework problems in advanced mathematics courses	1053
<i>Tim Fukawa-Connelly, Estrella Johnson, Meredith Hegg, Keith Weber, Rachel L. Rupnow</i>	
Relational interactions in inquiry-oriented undergraduate mathematics classes	1060
<i>Sara Brooke Mullins, Kaitlyn S. Serbin, Estrella Johnson</i>	
A prospective teacher's mathematical knowledge for teaching of inverse functions	1066
<i>Kaitlyn S. Serbin</i>	
Supporting students' construction of dynamic imagery: An analysis of the usage of animations in a calculus course	1072
<i>Alison Mirin, Franklin Yu, Ishtesa Kha</i>	
Links between engagement in self-regulation and performance	1079
<i>Mary E. Pilgrim, Linda Burks, Sloan Hill-Lindsay, Megan Ryals</i>	
Developing a framework for the facilitation of online working groups to support instructional change	1086
<i>Nicholas Fortune, Ralph E. Chikhany, William Hall, Karen Keene</i>	
For women in lecture, how they feel matters – a lot	1093
<i>Rachel K. Keller, Estrella Johnson, Karen Keene, Christine Andrews-Larson, Nicholas Fortune</i>	
Assessing the disciplinary perspectives of introductory statistics students	1099
<i>Kelly P. Findley, Florian Berens</i>	
Students' approaches to solving first law problems following calculation-intensive thermodynamics coursework	1105
<i>Alexander P. Parobek, Marcy Towns</i>	
Mathematical modeling competitions from the participants' perspective	1111
<i>Elizabeth A. Roan, Jennifer A. Czocher</i>	
Communication and community: GTA perceptions on a professional development program	1117
<i>Anne M. Ho, Mary E. Pilgrim</i>	
Content-specific confidence in entry-level college mathematics courses: Relationships and patterns ...	1123
<i>Martha Makowski</i>	
Features of discourses regarding linear independence concept	1129
<i>Hamide Dogan</i>	
Exploring the relationship between textbook format and student outcomes in undergraduate mathematics courses	1135
<i>Vilma Mesa, Saba Gerami, Yannis Liakos</i>	
The use of nonstandard problems in an ordinary differential equations course for engineering students reveals commognitive conflicts	1141
<i>Svitlana Rogovchenko, Yuriy V. Rogovchenko, Stephanie Treffert-Thomas</i>	

The role of mathematical meanings for teaching and decentering actions in productive student-teacher interactions	1146
<i>Abby E. Rocha, Marilyn Carlson</i>	

Poster Reports

I'm still confused in the most basic way: How responsibilities impact mathematics learning while video watching	1154
<i>Suzanne Kelley</i>	
Comics as pedagogical tools in first-year linear algebra	1156
<i>Amanda Garcia, Giuseppe Sellaroli, Dan Wolczuk</i>	
The implications of attitudes and beliefs on interactive learning in statistics education	1158
<i>Florian Berens, Sebastian Hobert</i>	
Exploring mathematical connections between abstract algebra and secondary mathematics from the perspectives of mathematics faculty and practicing teachers	1160
<i>Cammie Gray</i>	
Mathematics stretch courses: Implementation and assessment	1162
<i>Natalie Hobson, Martha Byrne</i>	
Student engagement and gender identity in undergraduate Introduction to Proof	1164
<i>Emmanuel Barton Odro</i>	
Racial differences and the need for post-secondary mathematics remediation	1166
<i>Scotty Houston, Leigh M. Harrell-Williams, Yonghong Xu</i>	
The Connection between Perception of Utility in Careers with Math and STEM Career Interest	1168
<i>Elizabeth Howell</i>	
Undergraduates' geometric reasoning of complex integration	1170
<i>Hortensia Soto, Michael Oehrtman</i>	
Investigating the influence of gender identity and sexual orientation in small group work	1173
<i>Jeremy R. Bernier</i>	
Exploring student understanding of implicit differentiation	1175
<i>Connor Chu</i>	
Student interpretation of Cartesian points and trends of a chemical reaction coordinate diagram with abstracted physical dimensions	1177
<i>Alexander P. Parobek, Patrick Chaffin, Marcy Towns</i>	
Investigating student reasoning about the Cauchy-Riemann equations and the amplitwist	1179
<i>Jonathan D. Troup</i>	
"Meaning making with math": A mathematical modeling approach to supporting conceptual reasoning in undergraduate chemistry	1181
<i>Katherine Lazenby, Jon-Marc G. Rodriguez, Nicole Becker</i>	
The mathematical inquiry project: Effecting widespread, sustainable instructional change	1183
<i>Josiah G. Ireland, John Paul Cook, Allison Dorko, William Jaco, Michael Oehrtman, April Richardson, Michael A. Tallman</i>	

Pre-service mathematics teachers' engagement with cognitive demand of mathematics tasks	1185
<i>Zareen Rahman</i>	
An overview of the Orchestrating Discussion Around Proof (ODAP) Project	1187
<i>Michael D. Hicks, Lino Guajardo, Kathleen Melhuish, Kristen M. Lew, Paul Dawkins</i>	
Informing the community about advancing students' proof practices in mathematics through inquiry, reinvention, and engagement	1189
<i>David Brown, Tenchita Alzaga Elizondo, Kristen Vroom</i>	
Logical implication as an object and proficiency in proof by mathematical induction	1191
<i>Vladislav Kokushkin, Rachel Arnold, Anderson Norton</i>	
Multiplication by sunlight: How can a geometric definition be realized in a physical tool?	1193
<i>Justin Dimmel, Eric Pandiscio, Adam Godet</i>	
Calculus Students' Visualization of Volume	1195
<i>Roser Gine, Tara Davis</i>	
Exploring the development of mathematical problem solving strategies in the transition from novice to experienced mathematicians	1197
<i>Andrew C. Kercher, James A. Mendoza Álvarez</i>	
A framework for meaning in mathematics	1199
<i>Ahsan Chowdhury</i>	
Conflicts during mathematical modeling	1201
<i>Sindura Subanemy Kandasamy</i>	
Aligning assessment with instruction in a creativity in mathematics course	1203
<i>Ceire H. Monahan, Mika Munakata, Ashwin Vaidya</i>	
Student thinking about the graphs of functions of two variables via software visualization	1205
<i>Zachary S. Bettersworth</i>	
Myriad issues in teaching college geometry	1207
<i>Priya Prasad, Steven Boyce</i>	
Building GTAs' knowledge & motivation to promote equity in undergraduate mathematics	1209
<i>Jessica J. Webb, RaKissa Manzanares, Scotty Houston, Josias Gomez, Leigh M. Harrell-Williams</i>	
How can regional RUME conferences support inclusion into the larger RUME community?	1212
<i>Zareen Rahman, Erica R. Miller, V. Rani Satyam</i>	
GTAs' conceptualization of active learning in undergraduate mathematical sciences courses	1214
<i>Scotty Houston, Josias Gomez, Leigh M. Harrell-Williams, Jessica Webb</i>	
Using successful affective measures among native populations in the U.S.	1216
<i>Danny Luecke</i>	
Using the learning cycle and mathematical models to engage students in sensemaking Involving metamodeling knowledge in chemistry	1218
<i>Jon-Marc G. Rodriguez, Katherine Lazenby, Nicole Becker</i>	
Examining academic performance and student experiences in an emerging scholars program	1220
<i>Jennifer R. McNeilly</i>	

The ant farm task - The case of Ginny	1222
<i>Sindura Subanemy Kandasamy, Hwa Young Lee, Lino Guajardo</i>	
Group testing in calculus - How do students in groups work together equitably?	1224
<i>Candice M. Quinn</i>	
Quantitative reasoning skills for successfully working with real-world data	1226
<i>Franziska Peterson</i>	
Reconceptualizing mathematics teacher knowledge in domain specific terms	1228
<i>Eric M. Wilmot</i>	
Perspective outside and within spatial diagrams: Pre-service elementary teachers' investigations of shearing	1230
<i>Camden G. Bock, Justin Dimmel</i>	
Characterizing undergraduate students' proving processes out of their "stuck points"	1232
<i>Yaomingxin Lu</i>	
Coordinating two levels of units in calculus: The story of Rick	1234
<i>Jeffrey Grabhorn, Steven Boyce</i>	
Using activity theory to understand tensions in an extra-curricular mathematical modeling project with biology undergraduates	1236
<i>Yuriy V. Rogovchenko</i>	
Investigation of affective factors which may influence women's performance in mathematics	1238
<i>Judy I. Benjamin</i>	
Reforming introductory math courses to support success for underserved students who place in developmental math	1240
<i>Rebecca Matz, Teena Gerhardt, Jane Zimmerman</i>	
Analysis of collaborative curriculum adaptation	1242
<i>Josh Brummer, Nathan Wakefield, Sean P. Yee</i>	
Engaging students in reflective thinking in precalculus	1244
<i>Marcela Chiorescu</i>	
The interaction between instructor and students in community college algebra classrooms	1246
<i>Dexter Lim, Irene Duranczyk, Bismark Akoto</i>	
Justifying and reconstructing in the generalizing process: The case of Jolene	1248
<i>Duane Graysay</i>	
College mathematics instructors learning to teach future elementary school teachers	1250
<i>Shandy Hawk, Jenq-Jong Tsay, Billy Jackson</i>	
Replacing remedial algebra with a credit bearing math education course	1252
<i>Michael Tepper, Rachael E. Brown, Michael Bernstein</i>	
A comparison of students' quantitative reasoning skills in STEM and non-STEM math pathways	1254
<i>Emily Elrod, Joo Young Park</i>	
Using commognition to study student routines performed in the context of ring theory	1256
<i>Valentin Küchle</i>	

An analysis of racialized and gendered logics in black women's interpretations of instructional events in undergraduate pre-calculus and calculus classrooms	1258
<i>Brittany L. Marshall, Taylor McNeill, Luis Leyva, Dan Battey</i>	
Relationships between Lisa's units coordination and interpretations of integration	1260
<i>Steven Boyce, Jeffrey Grabhorn</i>	
Chase that rabbit! Designing vector unknown: A linear algebra game	1262
<i>Benjamin Levine, Matthew Mauntel, Michelle Zandieh, David Plaxco</i>	
Designing proof comprehension tests in real analysis	1264
<i>Kristen Amman, Brooke Athey, Lino Guajardo, Joseph Olsen, Christian Orr-Woods, Juan Pablo Mejia-Ramos</i>	
Influence of university teachers' meanings on their interpretation of student meanings	1266
<i>Ian Thackray, Bruce Birkett</i>	
What meanings of concavity might students construct in a dynamic online environment?	1268
<i>Ian Thackray</i>	
Prospective and in-service mathematics teachers' knowledge in the teaching of statistics	1270
<i>Abigail Erskine, Rexford Amoanoo Mensah, Gifta Serwaa</i>	
A framework of covariational reasoning in introductory physics	1272
<i>Alexis Olsho, Charlotte M. Zimmerman, Suzanne White Brahmia</i>	
A tale of two approaches: Comparison of evaluation strategies in physics problem solving between first- and third-year students	1274
<i>Abolaji R. Akinyemi, John Thompson, Michael Loverude</i>	
Student use of Dirac notation to express probability concepts in quantum mechanics	1276
<i>William Riihiluoma, John-Thompson</i>	
Using morphemes to understand vocabulary in college algebra	1278
<i>Anedra W. Jones</i>	
Defining and measuring sense-making and procedural flexibility in community college algebra classrooms	1279
<i>Dexter Lim, Bismark Akoto</i>	
Using didactical engineering to teach mathematical induction	1281
<i>Valentina Postelnicu, Mario A. Gonzalez</i>	
Using diagnostic testing to challenge barriers to access and inform instruction in calculus 1	1283
<i>Kimberly Seashore, Alexandra Aguilar</i>	
Navigating college algebra in 2019: A case of internet resources as a guide	1285
<i>Abigail L. Higgins, Jessamyn Minners</i>	
Elementary school geometry to university level calculus: Building upon learning trajectories rooted in covariational reasoning with area contexts to support covariational reasoning related to implicit differentiation	1287
<i>Irma E. Stevens</i>	

Is research in a lower-level mathematics class RUME?	1289
<i>Geillan D. Aly</i>	
Using primary sources to improve classroom climate and promote shared responsibility	1291
<i>Anil Venkatesh, Spencer Bagley</i>	

Tasks to Foster Mathematical Creativity in Calculus I

Houssein El Turkey
University of New Haven

Gülden Karakök
University of Northern Colorado

Gail Tang
University of La Verne

Paul Regier
University of Oklahoma

Miloš Savić
University of Oklahoma

Emily Cilli-Turner
University of La Verne

Fostering students' mathematical creativity necessitates certain instructional actions - one of which is designing and implementing tasks that foster creativity. Drawing on the literature on mathematical creativity, we describe existing research-based features of tasks for eliciting student creativity, or creativity-based tasks, and provide suggestions for implementation of such tasks. Based on these features, we analyzed two instructors' first experiences designing and implementing creativity-based tasks in Calculus I. Both instructors' frequent use of the multiple-solutions feature suggests that this feature could be an entry-point for designing and implementing creativity-based tasks for other instructors seeking to foster creativity.

Keywords: Calculus, creativity-based tasks, mathematical creativity, task design

The importance of mathematical creativity in mathematics and mathematics courses is documented in numerous research studies, policy and curriculum-standard documents (e.g., Borwein, Liljedahl, & Zhai, 2014; CUPM, 2015; Levenson, 2013; Moore-Russo & Demler, 2018; NSB, 2010; Silver, 1997; Sriraman, 2009; Tang et al., 2017; Zazkis, & Holton, 2009). Askew (2013) points out that “[c]alls for creativity within mathematics and science teaching and learning are not new, but having them enshrined in mandated curricula is relatively recent” (p. 169). For example, in its latest guidelines for majors in mathematical sciences, the Mathematical Association of America's Committee on the Undergraduate Program in Mathematics (CUPM) states that “these major programs should include activities designed to promote students' progress in learning to approach mathematical problems with curiosity and *creativity* [emphasis added] and persist in the face of difficulties” (Schumacher & Siegel, 2015, p. 10). In this paper, we focus on mathematical creativity in Calculus I, a course that is commonly offered for majors in these mathematical sciences programs.

Students' experiences in Calculus I play a critical role in their persistence in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) programs (Rasmussen et al., 2019). The lack of or limited exposure to class materials (e.g., tasks, homework problems, exam questions) that promote conceptual discussions is one of the reasons reported by Calculus I students for switching out of a STEM major (Johnson, Ellis, & Rasmussen, 2014). In fact, a textbook analysis (Lithner, 2004) concluding that 70% of Calculus exercises at the end of the section were about mimicking previously done examples of the same section is one indication to students' limited exposure to conceptual ideas. Though there are Calculus reform projects that address this particular issue by advocating for new curriculum materials for more conceptual discussions (see Bressoud et al., n.d.), we believe it is still a priority to explicitly value and foster students' mathematical creativity in Calculus I classes. In particular, we argue for the creation and implementation of tasks that are designed not only for conceptual understanding but also for enhancing students' mathematical creativity. In this paper, we discuss research-based features of tasks that promote mathematical creativity and their potential implementation. Additionally, we

share analysis of two instructors' uses of these features in the design and implementation of the tasks in their Calculus I classes.

Theoretical Perspective and Background Literature

In our work, we define mathematical creativity as a process of offering new solutions or insights that are unexpected for the student with respect to their mathematics background or the problems they have seen before (Liljedahl & Sriraman, 2006; Savic et al., 2017). This process-oriented definition (Pelczer & Rodriguez, 2011), in contrast to examining final products (Runco & Jaeger, 2012) of those processes, provides a dynamic view of creativity rather than a static one. We focus on valued mathematical actions (Cuoco, Goldenberg, & Mark, 1996; Schoenfeld, 1992) such as taking risks and making connections that can lead to creativity in mathematics (Karakok et al., 2015; Leikin, 2009). Our definition also encompasses creativity relative to the student versus creativity relative to the field of mathematics (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2013; Leikin, 2009). Finally, this particular definition identifies creativity specific to the domain of mathematics rather than domain-general creativity (Baer, 1998).

Fostering students' mathematical creativity, as we define it, necessitates certain instructional actions that are encapsulated by Sriraman's (2005) five theoretical principles. The *Gestalt principle* discusses the importance of giving time to allow incubation to occur (Hadamard, 1945). The *Aesthetic principle* highlights explicitly valuing the beauty and uniqueness of solutions or methods. The *Free-market* and *Scholarly principles* emphasize creating a safe environment where students can present and defend their work, and allowing students to build off one another's work, respectively. The fifth principle, *Uncertainty*, focuses on tolerating ambiguity and knowing that it is acceptable to not know a solution. Levenson (2011) provides empirical support for these principles and adds "choosing appropriate tasks" (Levenson, 2013, p. 273) as one of the roles of teachers for the promotion of creativity.

We conjecture that intentionally implemented tasks designed to align with Sriraman's principles have the potential to enhance mathematical creativity. For example, a task that is aligned with the Gestalt principle needs to be challenging enough for students that they would need time to incubate. An intentional implementation of such a task that demonstrates the Scholarly principle would include an instructor giving students the opportunities to discuss their approaches and build off of one another's work; all the while, students' mathematical creativity is at the forefront of such discussions.

Task design

We adopt Henningsen and Stein's (1997) definition of a mathematical task as "a classroom activity, the purpose of which is to focus students' attention on a particular mathematical concept, idea, or skill" (p. 528). For a task to promote creativity, it needs to have additional features that provide students opportunities to push their mathematical processes toward new solutions or insights that are unexpected for them. For practical reasons, we use the term *creativity-based tasks* to describe such tasks.

We situate our discussion of creativity-based tasks and task design within two perspectives of creativity: *Developmental* and *Problem Solving and Expertise-Based* perspectives (Kozbelt, Beghetto, & Runco, 2010). The *Developmental* perspective posits that creativity develops over time (i.e., process-orientation) in an environment where students are provided authentic tasks and opportunities to interact with others. The *Problem Solving and Expertise-Based* perspective emphasizes problem-solving processes, heuristics, and tasks, underscoring the use of tasks to challenge students' thinking processes and provide opportunities to solve problems in various

ways. A key component of our work is developing tasks that would allow such processes. We base these tasks on Skemp's (1976) relational understanding framework and Lithner's (2008) creative mathematically-founded reasoning. As relational understanding relates to students' development of conceptual structures, a creativity-based task promotes both making connections between concepts and taking risks by students to become independent thinkers. Additionally, creative mathematically-founded reasoning involves novel (with respect to students) mathematical arguments. It is noted by Boesen, Lithner, and Plam (2010) that students use creative mathematically-founded reasoning to solve unfamiliar, nonroutine tasks. In this sense, creativity-based tasks can be viewed as unfamiliar and non-routine.

Features of Creativity-Based Tasks

"Recall and apply" tasks are important in developing procedural fluency in Calculus I, but to foster mathematical creativity, instructors need to design tasks that require "evaluating mathematical statements; example generation (constructing an instance); analyzing reasoning; conjecturing; generalizing; visualization; using definitions" (Breen & O'Shea, 2011, p.87). Tasks with these features can promote conceptual discussions and making connections between seemingly different ideas and concepts.

Silver (1997) discusses the importance of the interplay between problem posing and problem solving to creativity and states "[i]t is in this interplay of formulating, attempting to solve, reformulating, and eventually solving a problem that one sees creative activity" (p. 76). We believe it is important for tasks to engage students in problem posing and problem solving not only in order to promote creativity but also to enable "teachers and students to become subjects of the educational process by overcoming authoritarianism and an alienating intellectualism" (Freire, 1999, p. 8). The need for posing problems can be facilitated by assigning tasks that are ill-defined, ambiguous, or open-ended. Kwon et al. (2006) define an incomplete or an open-ended problem as "a problem which does not define clearly what the question asks for, therefore allowing many possible solutions" (p. 52). Thus, another feature of a creativity-based task is providing opportunities for students to pose problems and questions, then to seek answers to these problems and questions (Haylock, 1997; Silver 1997). Experts describe the ability to identify key research questions as part of their creative work (e.g., Hadamard, 1945; Mansfield & Busse, 1981).

Relating to many possible solutions, Leikin (2013) defines a multiple-solution task as one that "explicitly requires students to solve a mathematical problem in different ways" (p. 388) where different solutions are determined by: "(a) different representations of some mathematical concepts involved in the task, (b) different properties (definitions or theorems) of mathematical objects within a particular field, or (c) different properties of a mathematical object in different fields" (Leikin, 2013, p. 388). Thus, multiple-solution tasks can also promote utilizing other representations (verbal, symbolic, gestures) as well as connecting certain aspects of different representations in a way that fosters deeper mathematical thinking. Multiple-solution tasks not only value students' individual approaches, but they also allow for originality and novelty in using certain standard or less standard tricks.

Examples

One of the tasks that we designed for Calculus I, the *Circle Task* poses the questions "Is there anything in real-life that is a perfect circle? How do you know if you have a perfect circle?" This task involves the mathematical concepts of infinitesimals, (possibly) limits, integrals, and arc length. As a creativity-based task, its open-ended nature provides opportunities for students to

take risks in exploring novel ideas and to make conceptual connections to fundamental aspects of Calculus.

As another example, we modified a typical “find the limit” question to “Consider the limit $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{\sqrt{x}-1}{x-1}$. Evaluate the limit in as many ways as possible.” We designed this *Limit Task* as a creativity-based task that involves the mathematical concepts of limits and derivatives. By asking students to evaluate the limit in more than one way, students are pushed to think of a solution beyond one that they are mathematically inclined to provide. As the question did not specify how students are to approach the problem (algebraically, graphically, using a table, etc), the task carries the open-ended feature. The task fosters making connections between various concepts as students could view this limit as a slope of the tangent line, which could be computed by the derivative at 1.

Task Implementation

Stein, Grover and Henningsen (1996) noticed that tasks that were designed to be cognitively demanding (e.g., involving conjecturing, justifying, generalizing) became less demanding because they “became routinized, either through students’ pressing the teacher to reduce task ambiguity and complexity by specifying explicit procedures or steps to perform or by teachers’ taking over the challenging aspects of the task” (p. 479). That is to say, the implementation of a task plays a crucial role in fostering creativity.

To mitigate the possibility of a reduction in cognitive demand, we suggest using Sriraman’s (2005) five principles as guidelines for implementing creativity-based tasks. To bridge theory and practice, the authors (Cilli-Turner et al., 2019) investigated one teacher’s actions with the five principles and suggested numerous teacher actions stemming from these principles to potentially foster students’ mathematical creativity. Building on the results from (Cilli-Turner et al., 2019), we suggest that when implementing an open-ended task such as the Circle Task, instructors could assuage students’ discomfort in task ambiguity (Uncertainty) by assuring students that multiple solutions exist. The instructors can also provide additional time for students to incubate (Gestalt) on what it means to have a perfect circle and a real-life circle. Following this incubation, instructors can give students opportunities to present their findings (Free Market and Scholarly). Similarly, the Limit Task affords different possible implementations because it has a “call-back” feature where instructors can use it progressively at various points throughout the semester as new material is covered, deepening students’ incubation period (Gestalt). Aside from (re)using this task while covering graphs, limits, and derivatives, the task can be revisited after covering L’Hospital’s Rule by asking students to find the limit in four different ways and giving students opportunities to share (Free Market and Scholarly) these different ways. Instructors can facilitate the Aesthetic principle by valuing the novelty of using the trick of factoring linear terms in this limit.

Research Methods

As part of a larger research study that explores mathematical creativity in Calculus I classes, our research team designed the two creativity-based tasks: the Circle Task and Limit Task. These two tasks and their features were shared with two instructors, Jo Parker and Juniper Travers (pseudonymous), at a South-Midwest regional university who participated in the larger study. Prior to the start of the ‘research’ semester, we had 2 two-hour online professional development (PD) sessions with a two-day break between the sessions. At these sessions, we introduced some goals of the research project, features of creativity-based tasks, and the Limit Task. The sessions

also included discussions on various ways to explicitly value and foster mathematical creativity and implement creativity-based tasks. The two instructors designed a task or modified an existing one to include some creativity-fostering features. To provide extended support, the online PD continued on a weekly basis throughout the semester for an hour to support participants' instructional practices that explicitly foster mathematical creativity and task design. We facilitated open-ended discussions concerning how to assess student work on creativity-based tasks. Both instructors were asked to implement the Limit and Circle tasks in their Calculus I classes and also to develop and implement at least four other creativity-based tasks.

In this paper, we share results from our preliminary analysis of collected data to address the research question: What features do instructors use in their creativity-based task design and implementation processes? We collected instructors' creativity-based tasks, their journal entries for the PD in which they reflected on their design and implementation processes, their classroom video-recording of the days on which these tasks were used in class, and their Calculus I material from previous teaching experiences. At the end of the semester, we conducted semi-structured interviews that included questions regarding their tasks and task design processes. Instructors' tasks, journal entries, and interview transcripts were analyzed with a deductive approach using task features as codes (Patton, 2002).

These codes or features (in *italic*) were: *open-ended*; allows *multiple solutions*, *multiple representations*, *different approaches leading to one answer*, *posing problems and questions*; promotes *making connections between different concepts*, *evaluation/justification*, *generalization making*, *incubation*; allows for *originality/novelty*, *conjecturing*, *use of a trick or a less standard algorithm*, and *uncertainty*.

Analysis

We analyzed the tasks that instructors used as creativity-based tasks in their courses. Some of these tasks were only one problem in a longer activity sheet or an assignment set. The implementation of these tasks varied from task to task and instructor to instructor. We observed that both instructors most frequently used the “multiple solutions” feature in their tasks. These multiple-solution tasks also afforded multiple representations (algebraic, symbolic, graphical). For example, Juniper developed this extrema task:

- (a) Sketch or write the equation of a function for which the 2nd derivative test is inconclusive at $x = 1$. Provide justification as to how you know the 2nd derivative test fails.
- (b) What would be a next step for finding extrema if the 2nd derivative fails?

We coded this task as a *multiple-solution* task that could afford *multiple representations* (algebraic and/or graphical). This task also included features such as requiring students' *originality* in creating such a function, promoting *uncertainty* as students might need to try few possibilities before they find a function that works. We coded the task as one that fosters students' *evaluation* skills as it required them to justify if the test fails. We coded Part (b) of the task as an *open-ended* question where the instructor did not provide specific directions to students.

Similarly, Jo's task on integration “Find a non-trigonometric function f and domain $[a, b]$ such that $\int_a^b f(x)dx = 0$ ” was coded as a task that has *multiple solutions* and *multiple representations* (algebraic and/or graphical). It was also coded as a task requiring students' *originality* in creating such a function and promoting *uncertainty* as students might need to try a few possibilities before they find a function that works. As a contrast to the extrema task, we did not code this task as an open-ended one because the question instructed students to find such a

function, and hence students knew, before tackling the task, that there will be at least one. If the task was phrased “Is there a non-trigonometric function...? If so, find at least one (or two)” then it would have carried the open-ended feature.

In many of Jo’s creativity-based tasks, she asked for creation of a function that satisfies (or does not satisfy) certain criteria. With this structure, the most common feature Jo utilized was *multiple solutions* affording *multiple representations*. The *open-ended* feature was utilized on fewer occasions. The feature of *different approaches leading to one answer* was also utilized but minimally. Most of Jo’s tasks fostered *making connections between different ideas and concepts* and promoted Sriraman’s *uncertainty* principle.

One of the most noticeable changes between materials from her previous Calculus teaching to the ‘research’ semester was the adaptation of creativity-based tasks on her final exam review sheet. On the final review sheet in the previous semester, we coded 15 questions as “*routine*” exercises in Calculus I as they resembled the typical exercises. On the other hand, the final review sheet for the research semester had five “non-routine” creativity-based tasks with the following combination of features: *multiple solutions* and *representations*, *open-ended*, and *different approaches*. The tasks also fostered *making connections between different concepts* and aligned with the *uncertainty* principle. She also added a creativity-based task on her final exam.

Juniper’s creativity-based tasks were developed for each of the following content areas: limits, continuity, relative extrema, absolute extrema, and integration. Many of these tasks asked to create a function that satisfies (or does not satisfy) certain criteria, which were similar to tasks developed by Jo. With this structure, we noticed that Juniper utilized *multiple-solution* tasks affording *multiple representations* most frequently. The *open-ended* feature was also used frequently. Juniper included tasks that required students to *pose problems and questions*. There were questions on tasks that explicitly asked students to *evaluate* or justify their answers or approaches. It was noticeable that her final exam did not include any of her creativity-based tasks and it was very similar to her final exams from previous semesters. However, she did use a creativity-based task on Exam 2.

Participants’ journal entries were also coded for features of tasks. For example, Jo Parker implemented the Circle task as a writing assignment. In her teaching reflection journal, she stated that she wanted to “provide students with the opportunity to practice written communication skills while also gaining experience in answering a more open-ended mathematical question. I told the students that there was not a single correct answer to the prompt...” In this reflection, it seems that Jo Parker embraces the *open-ended* feature of this task to facilitate an additional mathematical process, written mathematical communication skill. Juniper’s reflections hinted that she wanted to emphasize *incubation* in her implementation of tasks. She assigned students to work on some of the tasks outside of class and asked them to bring their work to the next class for discussion.

We also triangulated our coding of participants’ tasks and journal entries with their interview transcripts. When asked “was there any particular feature that was most important to you when you were designing or thinking about these tasks,” Jo referred to the features of *multiple solutions* and *posing questions*. In her implementation of her task in which she asked students to explore the conditions for which Rolle’s theorem holds, she was happily surprised that even after students submitted their answers, they were posing questions and discussing ideas with each other in class. Referring to the Limit task, she said, “I love the fact that you can approach it in many different ways...I think the traditional way that students think of it is multiply by the

conjugate. But, I mean they can factor in it. I mean it's just a little trick...I think it's cute. It's a little bit outside the box but it's still within their realm of knowledge.”

On the other hand, Juniper referred to the extrema task as a memorable task, stating that “[it] sticks out in my mind because that's where I actually saw [students] construct another concept that we haven't gotten to yet. So that it's like a huge leap where creativity had taken them further in mathematics content.” The most common task feature she stated was justification because, “[it] is always important in my mind. They can come up with an answer, but they have to be able to explain... I think underlying all of it was ‘do these questions really highlight the underlying mathematical concepts?’” Although this was coded for *evaluation/justification* elsewhere in her tasks, the *multiple solutions* feature was coded most often in Juniper’s tasks. It could be that in her implementation of these tasks, she provided additional questions during discussions that facilitated this feature of evaluating and justifying.

Discussion

Raising instructors’ awareness of mathematical creativity and advocating for change in our pedagogies to promote creativity are the driving purposes of this project. This change can be initiated with small adjustments in task design. The results of our initial analysis of data demonstrate these adjustments made by two instructors. As noted in the analysis, the multiple solutions feature was most commonly used in tasks designed by the instructors. This result mirrors Levenson’s (2013) findings that many of her participants advocated for the use of multi-solution tasks. Levenson further noted that the collection of tasks that were chosen by five instructors who thought these tasks fostered mathematical creativity had fewer open-ended tasks and no problem-posing tasks. Our results indicate a similarity, which we believe is due to the fact that this project was the first time for our participants to set out to explicitly value creativity in their classroom; hence there seems to be a limited attempt to having open-ended and problem-posing tasks. Though Levenson (2013) highlights the importance of open-ended tasks and problem-posing tasks claiming that they “may afford additional opportunities for developing students’ mathematical creativity and it is important to raise teachers’ awareness to the variety of tasks which may serve this purpose” (p. 288).

An intentional selection or creation of tasks that have multiple solutions or that can be approached in different ways seem to be a feasible entry point into fostering mathematical creativity. Allowing students to pose problems, generate examples, make conjectures, and so forth, are other ways to direct students’ thought processes towards creative mathematically-founded reasoning (Lithner, 2008). According to Beghetto (2017), instructors can alter their tasks slightly, such as asking students to come up with their own approaches, or substantially by asking students pose their own problems and ways of solving those problems.

According to Sriraman, teaching practices that are aligned with the five principles have the potential of fostering students’ creativity. In our analysis of creativity-based tasks, we noticed that the Gestalt and Uncertainty principles can be viewed as features of such tasks. However, we claim that the Free Market, Scholarly, and Aesthetic principles are important aspects of the implementation of such tasks that can further promote students’ creativity. In fact, these aspects of implementations differentiate creativity-based tasks from non-routine tasks. We plan to investigate this claim in future research to study potential implementations that complement creativity-based tasks in fostering students’ creativity.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Numbers 1836369/1836371.

References

- Cilli-Turner, E., Savic, M., El Turkey, H., & Karakok, G. (2019). An Initial Investigation into Teacher Actions that Specifically Foster Mathematical Creativity. In: M. Nolte, editor, *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Mathematical Creativity and Giftedness*, Hamburg, Germany, pp. 130-135.
- Askew, M. (2013). Issues in teaching for and assessment of creativity in mathematics and science. In D. Corrigan, R.F. Gunstone, & A. Jones (Eds.), *Valuing assessment in science education: Pedagogy, curriculum, policy* (pp. 169-182). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Baer, J. (1998). The case for domain specificity of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11 (2), 173-177.
- Becker, J. P., & Shimada, S. (1997). *The Open-Ended Approach: A New Proposal for Teaching Mathematics*. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1906 Association Drive, Reston, VA 20191-1593.
- Beghetto, R. A. (2017). Lesson unplanning: toward transforming routine tasks into non-routine problems. *ZDM*, 49(7), 987-993.
- Beghetto, R. A., & Kaufman, J. C. (2013). Fundamentals of creativity. *Educational Leadership*, 70(5), 10-15.
- Boesen, J., Lithner, J., & Pahn, T. (2010). The relation between types of assessment tasks and the mathematical reasoning students use. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 75, 89-105.
- Borwein, P., Liljedahl, P., & Zhai, H. (Eds.). (2014). *Mathematicians on creativity*. The Mathematical Association of America.
- Breen, S. & O'Shea, A. (2011). The use of mathematical tasks to develop mathematical thinking skills in undergraduate calculus courses - a pilot study. In Smith, C. (Ed) *Proceedings of the British Society for Research into Learning Mathematics*, 31(1), 43-48.
- Breen, S. & O'Shea, A. (2011). Designing rich sets of tasks for undergraduate calculus courses. In: *Proceedings: Fourth Conference on Research in Mathematics Education MEI 4*. St. Patrick's College, Drumcondra, pp. 82-92.
- Bressoud, D., Johnston, E., Murpy, C., Rhea, K., Williams, J., & Zorn, P. (n.d.). *The Calculus Sequence* [CUPM guide Calculus CASG report document]. Retrieved from <https://www.maa.org/sites/default/files/CalculusCASGReportFinal.pdf>
- Committee on the Undergraduate Programs in Mathematics. (2015). *Curriculum guide to majors in the mathematical sciences*. Washington DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Cuoco, A., Goldenberg, E. P., & Mark, J. (1996). Habits of mind: An organizing principle for mathematics curricula. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 15(4), 375-402.
- El Turkey, H., Tang, G., Savic, M., Karakok, G., Cilli-Turner, E., & Plaxco, D. (2018). The Creativity-in-Progress Rubric on Proving: Two Teaching Implementations and Students' Reported Usage. *Primus*, 28(1), 57-79.
- Ervynck, G. 1991. Mathematical creativity. In D. Tall (Ed.), *Advanced Mathematical Thinking* (pp. 42-53). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Freire, P. (1999) The "banking" concept of education. In D. Bartholomae & A. Petrosky. (Eds.), *Ways of Reading: An Anthology for Writers*. Fifth Edition. New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Hadamard, J. (1945). *The mathematician's mind*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Haylock, D. W. (1987). A framework for assessing mathematical creativity in school children. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 18, 59-74.

- Henningsen, M., & Stein, M. K. (1997). Mathematical tasks and student cognition: Classroom-based factors that support and inhibit high-level mathematical thinking and reasoning. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 28(5), 524–549.
- Johnson, E., Ellis, J., & Rasmussen, C. (2014). How to make time: The relationships between concerns about coverage, material covered, instructional practices, and student success in college calculus. In T. Fukawa-Connelly, G. Karakok, K. Keene, and M. Zandieh (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education* (pp. 722-729). Denver, Colorado.
- Karakok, G., Savic, M., Tang, G. & El Turkey, H. (2015). Mathematicians' views on undergraduate student creativity. In K. Krainer and N. Vondrová (Eds.), *CERME 9-Ninth Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education* (pp. 1003-1009). Prague, Czech Republic. Available online at http://www.mathematik.uni-dortmund.de/ieem/erme_temp/CERME9.pdf.
- Kozbelt, A., Beghetto, R. A., & Runco, M. A. (2010). Theories of creativity. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 20-47). New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Kwon, O. N., Park, J. S., & Park, J. H. (2006). Cultivating divergent thinking in mathematics through an open-ended approach. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(1), 51–61.
- Leikin, R. (2009). Exploring mathematical creativity using multiple solution tasks. In R. Leikin, A. Berman, & B. Koichu (Eds.), *Creativity in mathematics and the education of gifted students* (pp. 129-145). Haifa, Israel: Sense Publishers.
- Leikin, R. (2013). Evaluating mathematical creativity: The interplay between multiplicity and insight. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling*, 55(4), 385-400.
- Leikin, R. (2014). Challenging mathematics with multiple solution tasks and mathematical investigations in geometry. In Y. Li, E. A. Silver, & S. Li, *Transforming mathematics instruction: Multiple approaches and practices* (pp. 59-80). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Levenson, E. (2011). Exploring collective mathematical creativity in elementary school. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 45(3), 215-234.
- Levenson, E. (2013). Tasks that may occasion mathematical creativity: teachers' choices. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, 16(4), 269-291.
- Lithner, J. (2004). Mathematical reasoning in calculus textbook exercises. *The Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 23(4), 405-427.
- Lithner, J. (2008). A research framework for creative and imitative reasoning. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 67, 255–276.
- Mann, E. (2006). Creativity: The essence of mathematics. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(2), 236-260.
- Mansfield, R. S., & Busse, T. V. (1981). *The psychology of creativity and discovery: Scientists and their work*. Burnham.
- Moore-Russo, D. & Demler, E. L. (2018). Mathematical creativity: Views from the field. To appear in N. Amado, S. Carreira, & K. Jones (Eds.) *Broadening the Scope of Research on Mathematical Problem Solving: A focus on technology, creativity and affect*. New York: Springer.
- National Science Board. (2010). *Preparing the next generation of STEM innovators: Identifying and developing our nation's human capital* (NSB-10-33). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

- Omar, M., Karakok, G., Savic, M., & El Turkey, H. (in press). "I felt like a mathematician": Homework problems to promote creative effort and metacognition. *Problems, Resources, and Issues in Mathematics Undergraduate Studies (PRIMUS)*.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pelczer, I., & Rodríguez, F. G. (2011). Creativity assessment in school settings through problem posing tasks. *The Mathematics Enthusiast*, 8(1), 383-398.
- Rasmussen, C., Apkarian, N., Hagman, J. E., Johnson, E., Larsen, S., & Bressoud, D. (2019). Characteristics of Precalculus Through Calculus 2 Programs: Insights From a National Census Survey. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 50(1), 98-112.
- Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. G. (2012). The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24 (1), 92-96.
- Savic, M., Karakok, G., Tang, G., El Turkey, H., & Naccarato, E. (2017). Formative assessment of creativity in undergraduate mathematics: using a creativity-in-progress rubric (CPR) on proving. In R. Leikin & B. Sriraman (Eds.), *Creativity and Giftedness: Interdisciplinary perspectives from mathematics and beyond* (pp. 23-46). New York, NY: Springer.
- Schoenfeld, A. (1992). Learning to think mathematically: Problem solving, metacognition, and sense making in mathematics. In D. Grouws (Ed.), *Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 334-370). New York: Macmillan.
- Schumacher, C. S., & Siegel, M. J. (2015). *2015 CUPM Curriculum Guide to Majors in the Mathematical Sciences*. Washington, DC: Mathematical Association of America.
- Silver, E. A. (1997). Fostering creativity through instruction rich in mathematical problem solving and problem posing. *ZDM*, 3, 75-80.
- Skemp, R. R. (1976). Relational understanding and instrumental understanding. *Mathematics teaching*, 77(1), 20-26.
- Sriraman, B. (2005). Are giftedness and creativity synonyms in mathematics? *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 17(1), 20-36.
- Sriraman, B. (2009). The characteristics of mathematical creativity. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 41, 13-27.
- Stein, M. K., Grover, B. W., & Henningsen, M. (1996). Building student capacity for mathematical thinking and reasoning: An analysis of mathematical tasks used in reform classrooms. *American educational research journal*, 33(2), 455-488.
- Tang, G., El Turkey, H., Savic, M., & Karakok, G. (2015). Exploration of undergraduate students' and mathematicians' perspectives on creativity. In T. Fukawa-Connelly, N. Infante, K. Keene, & M. Zandieh (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 18th Annual Conference on Research in Undergraduate Mathematics Education* (pp. 993-1000). Pittsburgh, PA. Available online at <http://sigmaa.maa.org/rume/RUME18v2.pdf>.
- Tang, G., El Turkey, H., Cilli-Turner, E., Savic, M., Karakok, G., & Plaxco, D. (2017). Inquiry as an entry point to equity in the classroom. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 48(sup1), S4-S15.
- Yoshinobu, S., & Jones, M. G. (2012). The coverage issue. *PRIMUS*, 22(4), 303-316.
- Zazkis, R., & Holton, D. (2009). Snapshots of creativity in undergraduate mathematics education. In R. Leikin, A. Berman, & B. Koichu (Eds.), *Creativity in mathematics and the education of gifted students* (pp. 345-365). Haifa, Israel: Sense Publishers.