

# Faculty Inventory of Methods and Practices Associated with Competent Teaching (Faculty IMPACT)

*Adapted from the Teaching Practices Inventory for cross-disciplinary validity. Language was edited to reflect a wider variety of types of assignments and activities as well as to be inclusive of practices and methods in online courses. References to representative literature for each question are shown in [blue](#). Point values are shown in **bold**: one point is assigned to each practice for which there is evidence it supports student learning; two points are assigned to practices for which there is evidence of large and robust benefits. 63 total points are available in this version.*

The following is an inventory of teaching practices commonly used in both face-to-face and online courses across a wide variety of disciplines. We recognize that some of these practices are not applicable to every course and/or discipline, and any particular course would likely use only a subset of these practices. We have added places where you can make additions and comments and we welcome your feedback.

It should take only about 5 minutes to complete this survey.

## I. Course Information and Supporting Materials

Check all of the course information that you provided to students via hard copy or a course web page. ([Ambrose et al., 2010](#); [Froyd, 2008](#))

- List of topics to be covered **1**
- List of topic-specific competencies (skills, expertise, ...) students should achieve (what students should be able to do) **2**
- List of competencies that are not topic related (critical thinking, problem solving, ...) **1**
- Affective goals – changing students' attitudes and beliefs (interest, motivation, relevant beliefs about their competencies, how to master the material) **1**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

Check all of the supporting materials that you provided to students in this course. ([Ambrose et al., 2010](#); [Atkinson et al., 2000](#); [Black & Wiliam, 1998](#); [Froyd, 2008](#); [Hattie & Timperley, 2007](#); [Kiewra, 1985](#); [Pintrich, 2003](#))

- Student wikis or discussion boards with little or no contribution from you **0**
- Student wikis or discussion boards with significant contribution from you or a teaching assistant (undergraduate or graduate) **1**
- Solutions to homework assignments **1**
- Worked examples (text, podcast, or other format) **1**
- Practice exams, or previous year's exams **1**
- Videos, animations, or simulations related to course materials **1**
- Lecture notes or course PowerPoint presentations (partial/skeletal or complete) **1**
- Articles from related academic literature **1**
- Examples of exemplary papers, projects, or other assignments **1**

- Grading rubrics for papers, problem solutions, or large projects **1**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

## II. Assignments and Exams

Check all that applied to assignments in this course. ([Ambrose et al., 2010](#); [Cooper et al., 2006](#); [Kuh, 2008](#); [Walberg & Others, 1985](#))

- Homework was assigned or suggested, but did not contribute to course grade **0**
- Homework was assigned and contributed to course grade **2**
- Paper or project (an assignment taking longer than two weeks and involving some degree of student control in choice of topic or design) **1**
- Students encouraged to work collaboratively on their assignments **2**
- Explicit group assignments **1**
- Student presentations (verbal or poster, either live or through video) **1**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

How many tests or major assignments were assigned during the term (e.g. midterm exams, papers, projects)? ([Gibbs & Simpson, 2005](#))

- 0 **0**
- 1 **1**
- 2 **2**
- 3+ **2**

What was the approximate fraction of test questions or major assignment criteria that required students to explain their reasoning? ([Gibbs & Simpson, 2005](#))

- 0-5% **0**
- 6-10% **0**
- 11-15% **0**
- 16-25% **1**
- 25+% **1**

What percentage did a final exam, paper, or project contribute to the total course grade? ([Gibbs & Simpson, 2005](#))

- 70% or greater **0**
- 61-69% **0**
- 51-60% **1**
- 41-50% **1**
- 31-40% **1**
- 30% or less **1**
- No final exam, paper, or project **1**

### III. Feedback

How often did you explicitly solicit feedback about the course from students during the term? (Centra, 1973; Cohen, 1980; Diamond, 2004)

- Not including end of term course evaluations, student feedback about the course was not requested during the term. **0**
- One midterm course evaluation asking for student feedback about the course **1**
- Repeated student feedback about the course requested (more than once) **2**

Check all of the following feedback provided by you to students during the term. (Ambrose et al., 2010; Black & William, 1998; Froyd, 2008; Hattie & Timperley, 2007)

- Assignments with feedback from instructor, teaching assistant, or peer before grading or with opportunity to redo work to improve grade **2**
- Assignments graded within 1 week after submission **1**
- Students see graded assignments **1**
- Students see assignment answer key and/or grading rubric **1**
- Students see their graded midterm exam(s)/quizzes **1**
- Students see midterm exam(s)/quizzes answer key(s) and/or grading rubric **1**
- Students explicitly encouraged to meet individually with you **1**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

### IV. Instructional Features and Activities

Per week, how many times did you ask for student questions (in lectures, embedded prompts in videos/readings, posted discussion boards, or through other means)? (Ambrose et al., 2010; Froyd, 2008)

- 0 0**
- 1-2 0**
- 3-4 1**
- 5+ 1**

Per week, how many times did you have group student-student discussions or problem solving (includes online discussion boards)? (Ambrose et al., 2010; Froyd, 2008)

- 0 0**
- 1 1**
- 2 2**
- 3+ 2**

Per term, how many times did you have discussions on why the material is useful and/or interesting from students' perspective? (Ambrose et al., 2010; Froyd, 2008)

- 0-2 0**
- 3-5 1**
- 6-9 2**

- 9+ **2**

Considering the time spent on the major topics, approximately what fraction was spent on the process by which the theory/model/concept was developed, including the methods and results that support specific theories or ideas?

- 0-10%
- 11-25% **1**
- more than 25% **1**

What fraction of a typical class or online equivalent did students spend listening to lectures directly or through video (presentation of content, derivation of results/solutions, etc.)?

(Ambrose et al., 2010; Froyd, 2008)

- 0-20% **2**
- 20-40% **2**
- 40-60% **2**
- 60-80% **1**
- 80-100% **0**

A student response method is any means used to collect responses from all students in real time either during class (e.g. clickers, online polls, online chat) or embedded in the middle of readings or videos. Check all that occurred in your course. (Ambrose et al. 2010; Froyd 2008)

- More than one student response question is posed per class or online equivalent, not counted towards the course grade **0**
- More than one student response question is posed per class or online equivalent, counted towards the course grade **0**
- More than one student response question is posed per class or online equivalent, followed by student-student discussion (synchronous or asynchronous, such as via online discussion boards) **2**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

Check all that typically occurred both before and after class or online equivalent. (Ambrose et al., 2010; Froyd, 2008; Novak et al., 1999; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005)

- Students asked to read/view material for upcoming class or online equivalent **0**
- Students read/view material on upcoming class or online equivalent and complete assignments or quizzes on it shortly before the beginning of the class or online equivalent **2**
- Reflective activity at end of class or online equivalent (students briefly answering questions, reflecting on lecture and/or their learning, etc.) **1**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

## V. Course Assessment and Innovation

Check all that occurred in your course. ([Ambrose et al., 2010](#); [National Research Council et al., 2000](#); [Pintrich, 2003](#))

- Assessment given at beginning of course to assess background knowledge **1**
- Use of instructor-independent pre-post test (e.g. concept inventory) to measure learning **2**
- Use of pre-post test that is repeated in multiple offerings of the course to measure and compare learning **2**
- Use of pre-post survey of student interest and/or perceptions about the subject **1**
- Opportunities for students' self-evaluation of learning **1**
- Students provided with opportunities to have some control over their learning, such as choice of topics for course, paper, or project, choice of assessment methods, etc. **1**
- New teaching methods or materials were tried along with measurements to determine their impact on student learning **2**
- None of these
- Other (please specify)

## VI. Collaboration and Sharing in Teaching

How often do you discuss how to teach this course with colleague(s)? ([Gess-Newsome, 1999](#); [Sadler et al., 2013](#))

- Never **0**
- Sometimes **1**
- Often **1**

How often do you read literature about teaching and learning relevant to this course? ([Gess-Newsome, 1999](#); [Sadler et al., 2013](#))

- Never **0**
- Sometimes **1**
- Often **2**

How often do you observe a colleague's class (any class) to get/share ideas for teaching? ([Gess-Newsome, 1999](#); [Sadler et al., 2013](#))

- Never **0**
- Sometimes **1**
- Often **2**

## References

- Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Atkinson, R. K., Derry, S. J., Renkl, A., & Wortham, D. (2000). Learning from Examples: Instructional Principles from the Worked Examples Research. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(2), 181–214.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and Classroom Learning. In *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* (Vol. 5, Issue 1, pp. 7–74). <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Centra, J. A. (1973). Effectiveness of student feedback in modifying college instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 65*(3), 395–401.
- Cohen, P. A. (1980). Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. *Research in Higher Education, 13*(4), 321–341.
- Cooper, H., Robinson, J. C., & Patall, E. A. (2006). Does Homework Improve Academic Achievement? A Synthesis of Research, 1987–2003. *Review of Educational Research, 76*(1), 1–62.
- Diamond, M. R. (2004). The usefulness of structured mid-term feedback as a catalyst for change in higher education classes. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 5*(3), 217–231.
- Froyd, J. E. (2008). White paper on promising practices in undergraduate STEM education. *Commissioned Paper for the Evidence on Promising Practices in Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Education Project, The National Academies Board on Science Education*. <http://www.physics.emory.edu/faculty/weeks/journal/froyd-na08.pdf>
- Gess-Newsome, J. (1999). Pedagogical Content Knowledge: An Introduction and Orientation. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), *Examining Pedagogical Content Knowledge: The Construct and its Implications for Science Education* (pp. 3–17). Springer Netherlands.
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2005). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, 1*, 3–31.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. In *Review of Educational Research* (Vol. 77, Issue 1, pp. 81–112). <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487>
- Kiewra, K. A. (1985). Providing the Instructor's Notes: An Effective Addition to Student Notetaking. In *Educational Psychologist* (Vol. 20, Issue 1, pp. 33–39). [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2001\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2001_5)

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact Educational Practices: What They Are, who Has Access to Them, and why They Matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

National Research Council, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences, & Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning with additional material from the Committee on Learning Research and Educational Practice. (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition*. National Academies Press.

Novak, G. M., Patterson, E., Gavrin, A., & Christian, W. (1999). *Just-in-time Teaching: Blending Active Learning with Web Technology*. Prentice Hall.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *A third decade of research. Vol. 2 of How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A Motivational Science Perspective on the Role of Student Motivation in Learning and Teaching Contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(4), 667–686.

Sadler, P. M., Sonnert, G., Coyle, H. P., Cook-Smith, N., & Miller, J. L. (2013). The influence of teachers' knowledge on student learning in middle school physical science classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal, 50*(5), 1020–1049.

Walberg, H. J., & Others, A. (1985). Homework's Powerful Effects on Learning. *Educational Leadership: Journal of the Department of Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A, 42*(7), 76–79.