THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSTRUMENTS FOR ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES IN STANDARDS-BASED TEACHING

C. L. WAINWRIGHT
College of Education, Pacific University
Forest Grove, OR 97116
wainwric@pacificu.edu

L. FLICK
Mathematics and Science Education, Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
flickl@ucs.orst.edu

P. MORRELL
School of Education, University of Portland
Portland, OR 97203
morrell@up.edu

Abstract

We provide a description and rationale for the development of two instruments: 1) a classroom observation protocol; and, 2) a teacher interview protocol—designed to document the impact of reform-based professional development with undergraduate mathematics and science faculty, and its impact on the resultant preparation of teachers. Constructed upon review of the research on teaching and standards documents in mathematics and science, these instruments form the basis for data collection in a three-year longitudinal study of teaching practice among early career teachers as well as undergraduate college faculty. In addition, we suggest further applications of the observation protocol beyond the original purpose of our research study.

Introduction

In 1997, the Oregon Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers (OCEPT) was established with funding from the National Science Foundation. It was designed to improve the preparation of science and mathematics teachers in elementary, middle, and high schools, and to attract a more diverse group of students to the teaching profession.

The Journal of Mathematics and Science: Collaborative Explorations Volume 6 (2003) 21-46

College level mathematics and science courses tend to promote the success of those who major in the subject and find the subject matter intrinsically interesting, thus limiting the number of students who enroll in these courses. Elementary and middle level teachers are expected to teach mathematics/science to all students at crucial points in our educational system. Thus, pre-service teachers form an important population who ought to enroll in numerous content courses and should, ideally, enjoy these valuable mathematics and science experiences.

Making content courses both more effective and more inviting for a broader range of students is an important goal in the development of a mathematics/science literate society; this is especially critical in the preparation of future teachers. More effective teaching and assessment methods that will motivate and challenge students who are not majoring in mathematics/science and may not find these content areas intrinsically interesting have a research base in the literature of mathematics and science education [1-3]. However, the educational research literature in higher education is at an early stage of development, and includes studies which are qualitative in design and diverse in perspective. Methods for more effective teaching and assessment have also been highlighted in recent reform documents in mathematics and science education which are primarily focused on K-12 education [4-10].

OCEPT was designed to foster innovations in the teaching and assessment of college level mathematics and science courses. Prospective elementary, middle level, and secondary teachers taking these courses will have firsthand experience in learning mathematics and science through the modeling of strategies and technologies that should not only benefit them as learners, but should also support more effective pedagogy when they begin their own teaching. They should view these courses as a valuable component in their preparation for classroom teaching.

As OCEPT approached its fifth and final year, a variety of evaluation strategies were developed in order to determine its effectiveness. Numerous methods were implemented, including: a) the development of case studies at core institutions; b) tracking Faculty Fellows' professional development; and, c) collecting data on supply and demand trends *within the state*, as well as quantitative data on the number of teachers entering the profession from underrepresented groups. In addition, the Outcomes Research Study was designed to determine the impact OCEPT Fellows and their courses have had on the quality of newly-licensed Oregon teachers.

The Outcomes Research Study

The specific research study questions sought to be answered by the Outcomes Research Study are:

1. What is the relationship between student teachers' instructional practices and their undergraduate preparation?
2. How did Faculty Fellows' participation in OCEPT contribute to their instructional design and practice?
3. How do student teachers'/Faculty Fellows' teaching practices reflect those recommended by current research in mathematics/science education?
4. What is the relationship between student teachers'/Faculty Fellows' perceptions of their own instruction and the observed classroom practice?

Our goal was to document and describe standards-based practices in college courses taught by OCEPT Faculty Fellows. In addition, we wanted to study the classrooms of student teachers who had been enrolled in those courses. In both settings, we wanted to compare teacher instructional intentions (as described during the interviews) with observations of actual classroom teaching.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to develop the instruments considered necessary for conducting the Outcomes Research Study. In preparing to engage in this study, we faced a classic problem of research in relatively undeveloped fields of study. There are few accepted methods and a dearth of good data from which to build. New approaches and new instruments are necessary to address the meaningful questions posed by scholars in the field. Jenks and Riesman expressed the problem in the preface to their analysis of higher education over three decades ago: "...responsible scholarship must invent methods and data appropriate to the important problems of the day. To reverse this process, choosing one's problems to fit the methods and data that happen to be most satisfactory, strikes us as an invitation to triviality..."[11] Consequently, this is the first of a series of reports designed to describe our efforts to study reformed teaching at the college level and its impact on new teachers. In so doing, we hope to avoid another longstanding and contrasting criticism of scholars and innovators in educational reform—that past work is ignored as though there is nothing on which to build

[12]. Between these two critical positions, we hope to develop innovative methods while maintaining a clear connection to past scholarship.

Existing Protocols

Choosing an observation protocol for this study involved thinking about the context of teaching both in college courses as well as in K-12 classrooms. From the perspective of college instructors, educational reforms are intended to improve understanding and use of subject matter. From the perspective of K-12 teachers, the purpose is similar, but reform goals give a greater emphasis to improving student-teacher interactions. Further reflection on these two contexts suggests that they are more similar than they are different; this is especially true for college science and mathematics courses designed for non-majors such as elementary and middle level teachers. In these courses, reform advocates have stressed the need for significant improvement not only in translation of content into instruction, but also about the necessity of positive and encouraging student-teacher interactions [4]. For these reasons, protocol design proceeded under the assumption that the same observation tool would be used in classrooms from the elementary level through undergraduate college level.

The broad use of such an observation tool came with obvious caveats. We knew from the outset, for example, that we would not see the same constellation of behaviors in an undergraduate mathematics class as we would see in a mathematics lesson in an elementary school classroom. There was no *a priori* expectation that all K-12 teachers and college instructors would be meeting the same criteria. Further, we knew that when observing college lecture classes, the kinds of student-teacher interactions afforded by that setting would be significantly different from what is possible and desirable in a recitation section. There are numerous other differences that became a matter of reflection as we put the instruments to use. This will be discussed in more detail in the Implementation section of this paper.

Several scholars have attempted to design classroom observation protocols that assessed standards-based teaching practice. Methods of validation have tended to be *ad hoc* in nature. For example, Sawada and Piburn worked from personal expertise to design an observation protocol (RTOP) of 25 items in three categories supplemented by observational field notes [13]. Reliability data was derived primarily from observer training and inter-rater reliability. They have achieved some correlation with RTOP ratings and student achievement. These interesting results provide no methods for isolating intervening variables. The problem is that there is no agreed-upon set of practices that represent the mathematics and science standards. Even the expected standards-based outcomes are open to wide interpretation. What does it mean, for instance, for a student to engage in problem solving in mathematics or inquiry in science? Other observational protocols have proceeded with significantly different assumptions about the nature of reformed teaching. For example, an unpublished paper by L. Dana, "The Situated Laboratory Activity Instrument (SLAI): A User's Handbook" focuses on a protocol based on instructional activity in laboratory settings. Another unpublished paper by N.G. Lederman and R. Schwartz, "Nature of Science and Scientific Inquiry: Operational Definitions and Teaching Approach as Promoted in Project ICAN" describes a procedure based on teaching about the nature of science.

The literature base also lacks clarity when it comes to determining what is going on in classrooms when standards-based instruction is taking place. There is often confusion in research reports between learning theory and instructional theory. For example, a researcher conducts a study and describes what students are doing and assesses what they are learning. From this, the researchers may inappropriately infer what teachers should do, when in fact no data were collected on the actions of the teacher [14, 15]. Data on how students learn and conditions for learning do not translate directly into teaching practices. Instructional design theory is concerned with what a teacher does and must include specific instructional method variables. Learning theory is concerned with mental representation, memory, reasoning, and other inferred mental processes. The distinction is important because instructional design theory directs teachers to emphasize particular variables that have been operationalized in research. Operationalizing learning theory research for the classroom, however, is much more subtle and challenging for the teacher [16].

After examining the published instruments and protocols, we decided that none of the existing tools and methods met our needs. We determined that we needed to develop our own tools to carry out the Outcomes Research Study.

Development of New Protocols

We examined two decades of research on explicit teaching for initial guidance on the development of an observation protocol [17]. This work has produced the following reliable set of observable instructional principles [18] relative to a defined perspective of teaching:

- Review previous and prerequisite learning.
- Clearly state learning goals.
- Present new material in small steps.
- Give clear and detailed instructions and explanations.
- Provide high levels of active practice for all students.
- Ask large numbers of questions and obtain responses from *all students.*
- Guide students during initial practice.
- Provide systematic feedback.
- Provide explicit instruction for independent practice and continually check for understanding.

Research on explicit teaching has provided a productive background for researchers and teachers interested in developing constructivist teaching approaches. More recent research has learned that high school and college age students have trouble using logical competence in scientific reasoning despite their presumed attainment of the Piagetian level of formal thought. Examining ninth graders through adults, Kuhn's results show broad problems in argumentation skills [19]. These problems include confusing co-occurrence of events with cause and effect, preference for confirming rather than disconfirming evidence, and failure to consider potentially important factors by judging them irrelevant. A critique of this work by Koslowski and Maqueda suggested that Kuhn's evaluation may be overly restrictive [20]. However, Koslowski and Maqueda emphasized that these capabilities require purposeful practice involving reflection on the relationships between theory and evidence and how they mutually constrain possible conclusions. In their review of these issues, Driver, Newton, and Osborne emphasize the significance of explicit teacher support in modeling, and providing practice in thinking through various interpretations of evidence [21]. The message is that relevant cognitive skills are not developed ready for use in classrooms or daily experience, but must be prompted, exercised, coached, and reinforced.

We also relied on the existing observation protocols in helping in our design. We appreciated the observational categories of Sawada and Piburn [13]. Dana's (2000) laboratory observation protocol presented two useful dimensions: the student's role and the teacher's role.

We reviewed studies of the Social Science Education Consortium which utilized the 5E model and provided descriptions of teacher and student actions consistent with the model [22,23]. The Lederman and Schwartz study (2001) described relevant characteristics of the nature of science and scientific inquiry appropriate for classroom teaching, identifying reform practices by specific statements delivered by the teachers in class. The Horizon Research Corporation observation protocol provided valuable descriptive categories [24]. Finally, we examined the protocol designed by Lawrenz, Huffman, Appledoorn, and Sun for use in National Science Foundation Collaborative projects such as ours [25].

Building primarily on the work of Sawada and Piburn, the Social Science Education Consortium, and Lawrenz, et al., the authors designed the OCEPT Classroom Observation Protocol (O-TOP) (see Appendix A) [13, 22, 25]. As we each reviewed and revised the instrument, it was circulated repeatedly among the three of us for feedback. Further review of the initial instrument suggested that observations of teaching should consider what is happening to include not just teacher actions, but also student behaviors. As noted by Good and Brophy "...observers often try to reduce the complexity of classroom coding by focusing their attention exclusively on the teacher...but it is misplaced emphasis. The key to thorough classroom observation is student response. If students are actively engaged in worthwhile learning activities, it makes little difference whether the teacher is lecturing, using discovery techniques, or using small-group activities for independent study." [26]

During the revision phase, the authors reviewed the instrument with respect to personal background and expertise in science education reform-based practices. In addition, the team reviewed the instrument for:

a) limiting the observation categories to a number that an observer can remember and reflect upon during a class period;
b) developing examples so that trained observers experienced in classroom teaching could reach agreement on meaning; and,
c) setting a scale for each category that could be reliably applied.

The resultant instrument was examined by the entire research team, consisting of four science and/or mathematics education faculty and three graduate students. As a group, we discussed the meaning of each item and the wording used as prompts. The team proposed revisions and additions to the instrument wording. When we felt there was sufficient agreement, we viewed a videotape of classroom teaching and individually rated the observed instruction on each of the ten items. Table 1 shows the percent agreement among the seven observers for rating each item with the same score, as well as for rating each item within one point difference. For eight of the ten items, more than half of the research team agreed on the same score. For the same eight items, all seven observers were within a one-point differential.

Two of the items initially caused a problem in interpretation. For Item #2 (Metacognition) and Item #5 (Student Preconceptions), there was a 57% and 71% agreement within one on the five-point scale. The graduate students on the team had less experience with the topic of metacognition than the college faculty, and less experience in applying the research on misconceptions/preconceptions as well. Through discussion, the group reflected on personal classroom experience and related this to the meaning of reform standards. In the end, we were able to identify specific changes warranted in the instrument as a whole and, for Items #2 and #5 in particular, to ensure reliability in the use of the instrument. Further validation and reliability checks were carried out by pairs of researchers observing actual classrooms at the elementary, middle, high school, and college levels.

Table 1

Percent Agreement in Using the O-TOP

Item	Same Score	Within One
1	100%	100%
2	29%	57%
3	57%	100%
4	57%	100%
5	43%	71%
6	57%	100%
7	71%	100%
8	86%	100%
9	71%	100%

10	57%	100%

We felt the resultant instrument captured what needed to be observed and did so in a way that was manageable with a reasonable amount of training. In addition, the authors also designed an interview protocol, OCEPT Teacher Interview Protocol (O-TIP), based directly on the O-TOP (see Appendix B). The four open-ended questions prompt broad discussion within the ten categories of the classroom observation protocol. The process of reviewing and refining the O-TIP was considerably shorter given that the major categories had already been validated. Using the O-TIP along with the O-TOP acts to further validate the observational data and adds an in-depth description of the instructor's perspective.

The interview and observation protocols were further examined and evaluated by various expert groups. For example, the team presented the instruments at the OCEPT summer institutes and Oregon Academy of Science conference. Feedback from all groups was readily accepted and applied in strengthening the instruments.

Pilot Study

A pilot study to field test the instruments was implemented at three institutions (Oregon State University, University of Portland, and Pacific University). For this process, students were identified who were currently accepted into a teacher education program, working toward initial licensure, and had taken at least two courses from OCEPT Fellows. Twelve student teachers and six Faculty Fellows were involved in the pilot study. Most student teachers were observed teaching on three occasions; the Faculty Fellows were observed twice. Global scan field notes were taken during each observation, and the O-TOP instrument was completed following each class. As noted above, the initial observations were done by two members of the research team to check for inter-rater reliability in the use of the instrument. After the series of observations, the student teachers/Faculty Fellows were individually interviewed using the interview protocol. The interviews (typically thirty minutes in length) were audiotaped and later transcribed.

Data Analysis

The amount of data collected during the pilot study was daunting. We had 48 sets of observational field notes, 48 completed O-TOP instruments, and eighteen interview transcripts. We realized that when we applied these tools to our actual study, where we hoped to have a sample of twenty student teachers and fifteen Faculty Fellows, the amount of data would be even larger.

To assist in analyzing this volume of data, the observers wrote a composite for each participant summarizing data from the field observations, the O-TOP instruments, and the O-TIP transcribed interview. The composites specifically included these items:

1. A table listing the student teacher's O-TOP rating for each item for each observation
2. A graph showing the sets of O-TOP ratings for comparisons
3. A description of the context
    - class type/methodology (e.g., lecture, lab, demonstration)
    - subject content/topic
    - place in sequence of unit (e.g., introduction, on-going, review) and/or relationship of observations (three consecutive days, etc.)
    - description of students and makeup of the class (e.g., sophomores and juniors in an elective class)
    - size of class
    - institution (public v. private, etc.)
    - important constraints (e.g., room setup, equipment limitations)
4. A description of the observed behaviors that led to the O-TOP scores for each observation
5. Patterns and interpretations of the total data set, relying on observations, O-TOP ratings and interview data
6. Additional pertinent comments/concerns not captured above

The authors then analyzed all the composite case studies—referring to primary documents when necessary—to see if any generalizable patterns emerged. We are hopeful this method of analysis will be manageable as we continue with an expanded three-year longitudinal study.

Results

We were pleased with the actual application of the protocols. We were able to reliably gain the data we needed to answer the questions posed for the Outcomes Research Study. It should be noted, however, that the broad use of the observational tool came with obvious caveats. We knew from the outset, for example, that we would not see the same constellations of behaviors in an undergraduate mathematics class as we would see in an elementary mathematics class. There was no *a priori* expectation that all K-12 teachers and college instructors would be meeting the same criteria. Further, we knew that when observing college lecture classes, the kinds of student-teacher interactions afforded by that setting would be significantly different from what is possible and desirable in a recitation section.

Additionally, unlike several other observation protocols (for example, MacIsaac and Falconer) that rate the teaching experience and then total the numerical ratings, the O-TOP is meant to be a descriptive tool [27]. We designed the O-TOP to generate a profile of what was happening across instructional settings rather than to assign a score to a particular lesson. In other words, we treat the ratings on the O-TOP items as categorical rather than interval data. This differs from the way the R-TOP has been used in recent reports [13]. We see the O-TOP results in combination with interviews and field notes from classroom visits as a prelude to theory building. Our understanding of how the items of the O-TOP performed in classroom observations had to be informed by the class context as well as the teacher's perspective.

Implications for Future Research

A great deal of interest in the observation instrument has developed from various sources suggesting applications of the O-TOP tool beyond its original intent in the Outcomes Research Study. Several school of education university supervisors have reported using the instrument to provide feedback to their student teachers while observing in the field. Higher education faculty members have adopted the O-TOP as the protocol for implementing peer reviews within their departments. New teachers have indicated that the O-TOP provides a user-friendly checklist of good practices to consider during lesson planning, while experienced teachers have utilized the observation protocol as a component of their ongoing professional development. Some teachers have asked their principals to use the O-TOP during the annual evaluation process, especially principals who are unfamiliar with standards-based teaching in mathematics and science. Even college faculty and teachers outside of mathematics and science education have commented on the O-TOP's ability to describe effective teaching in their own content areas. For each of these applications, a preference has been expressed for the non-numerical version of the O-TOP, in which the "scoring" is recorded on a continuum rather than on a "0 to 4" scale (see Appendix C).

The program of research stimulated by OCEPT that generated the instruments described here asks the broad question, "How does the whole of the college experience develop teacher knowledge and skill?" Specifically, we are interested in the higher education experiences that influence K-12 teaching in mathematics and science. It was a new concept for many faculty in mathematics and science departments to think of themselves as part of the teacher education process. Another broad implication from our work is the need to address the question, "How can we design tools that help higher education faculty evaluate their curriculum and instruction to better meet the needs of future teachers (as well as their non-education students)?" When considering the needs of elementary teachers, as compared to high school teachers, this implication has an even greater impact. Elementary teachers are an important subset of a much larger population of students taking content coursework who are non-majors. Therefore, investigations that lead to an improvement in the academic experience of prospective elementary teachers will also improve the experience of the majority of all other students taking those mathematics and science content courses.

Discussions among science, mathematics, engineering, and technology (SMET) faculty often focus on the expectation that teachers need additional subject matter courses, despite the fact that the courses available to non-majors are often taught in lecture-dominated formats where content is unconnected to familiar situations. Meetings with SMET faculty often confront the fact that about half of prospective elementary teachers take fewer than six semesters of science and almost half of those will not take any physics or chemistry at all. The mathematics faculty are only mildly appeased by the fact that virtually all students (96%) take a "mathematics for elementary teachers" sequence, but most will take no additional college mathematics courses. Education faculty are aware that only about half of future elementary teachers will meet NSTA's course background standards [28].

The O-TOP instrument is the kind of tool that can provide a common language for higher education faculties to use when discussing the structure and delivery of courses for teachers. Increasing faculty interest in new approaches to upgrading the content knowledge of future and practicing teachers holds the promise of promoting collaborative research efforts between SMET and education faculties. The O-TOP tool is a starting point for research in designing data-based feedback to professors and graduate teaching assistants for the improvement of teaching. It provides a positive response to glaring shortcomings that have been identified in mathematics and science curriculum and instruction [4].

One outcome from the OCEPT project has been the development of a set of indicators to assist faculty in designing and evaluating their course revisions with respect to their value for prospective teachers. The Indicators for Selection of Mathematics and Science Content Courses Appropriate for Future Teachers (see Appendix D) were evaluated by SMET and education faculties of various institutions and organizations before they were employed as a self-evaluation tool for course modifications supported by OCEPT. These broad recommendations are consistent with recommendations for changes in science education at the collegiate level [29].

The demands of teaching for higher order outcomes, such as promoting understanding of problem solving or scientific inquiry, is resulting in an increased awareness of teachers' interactions with students. The O-TOP instrument provides a starting point for K-12 teacher reflection on instructional practices. As higher education faculties become more aware of the impact of student-teacher interactions on student outcomes, they too have cause for reflection on their instructional practices. In a recent analysis of her own teaching, for example, Parsons outlined the implicit emphasis on reflection in teaching [30]. She cites a large body of research dealing with: a) defining reflection; b) developing curriculum to facilitate reflection; and, c) examining the developmental process associated with reflection. She notes that the literature is rich in K-12 in-service and pre-service teaching, but sparse concerning reflection in college and university teaching. Not only can O-TOP provide a valuable tool for feedback that will support reflection for college and K-12 teachers, it can also be a starting point for a common dialogue on teaching that spans K-16 instruction.

Summary

Our research team has developed instruments for classroom observations and interviews which have a variety of applications at multiple levels of instruction. Through the use of these protocols, we hope to report on the relationship between beginning teachers' instructional strategies and the courses/instruction they experienced as an undergraduate. These instruments are appropriate for encouraging reflection and self-evaluation among K-12 teachers and college-level instructors alike. ■

References

[1] R.J. Sternberg, *Teaching Introductory Psychology: Survival Tips from Experts*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 1997.

[2] S. Tobias, *Revitalizing Undergraduate Education: Why Some Things Work and Most Don't*, Research Corporation, Tucson, AZ, 1992.

[3] B.E. Holton and G.K. Horton, "The Rutgers Physics Learning Center," *The Physics Teacher*, **34** (1996) 138-143.

[4] *Shaping the Future: New Expectations for Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology*, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC, 1996.

[5] *Science for All Americans*, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, DC, 1989.

[6] *Benchmarks for Science Literacy*, American Association for the Advancement of Science: Project 2061, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, 1993.

[7] *National Science Education Standards*, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 1996.

[8] *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 2000.

[9] *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Reston, VA, 2000.

[10] J.E. Roseman, S. Kesidou, and L. Stern, "Identifying Curriculum Materials for Science Literacy," 1996, Internet: http://www.project2061.org/research/roseman/roseman2.html.

[11] C. Jencks and C. Reisman, *The Academic Revolution*, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, NY, 1968.

[12] P.W. Jackson, "The Reform of Science Education: A Cautionary Tale," *Daedalus*, **112** (1983) 143-166.

[13] D. Sawada and M. Piburn, *Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP): Training Guide*, Arizona Board of Regents, Phoenix, AZ, 2000.

[14] W-M. Roth, "Experimenting in a Constructivist High School Physics Laboratory," *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, **31** (1994) 197-223.

[15] G. Carter and M.G. Jones, "Relationship Between Ability-Paired Interactions and the Development of Fifth Graders' Concepts of Balance," *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, **31** (1994) 847-856.

[16] C.M. Reigeluth (ed.), *Instructional-Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory*, Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates, Publishers, Hillsdale, NJ, 1999.

[17] B. Rosenshine and N. Furst, "The Use of Direct Observation to Study Teaching," in R.M.W. Travers (ed.), *Second Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL, 1973.

[18] B. Rosenshine and R. Stevens, "Teacher Behavior and Student Achievement," in M.C. Wittrock (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, NY, 1986.

[19] D. Kuhn, "Thinking as Argument," *Harvard Educational Review*, **62** (1992) 155.

[20] B. Koslowski and M. Maqueda, "What is Confirmation Bias and When Do People Actually Have It?" *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, **39** (1993) 104-30.

[21] R. Driver, P. Newton, and J. Osborne, "Establishing the Norms of Scientific Argumentation in Classrooms," *Science Education*, **84** (2000) 287-312.

[22] *Teaching about the History and Nature of Science and Technology: Teacher's Resource Guide, Field Test Edition*, Social Science Education Consortium, Colorado Springs, CO, 1994.

[23] R.W. Bybee, *Achieving Scientific Literacy: From Purposes to Practices*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH, 1997.

[24] *Local Systemic Change Core Evaluation Data Collection Manual*, Horizon Research Corporation, Inc., Chapel Hill, NC, 1999.

[25] F. Lawrenz, D. Huffman, K. Appeldoorn, and T. Sun, *Classroom Observation Handbook*, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 2001.

[26] T.L. Good and J.E. Brophy, *Looking in Classrooms*, Longman, New York, 1997.

[27] D. MacIsaac and K. Falconer, "Reforming Physics Instruction Via RTOP," *The Physics Teacher*, **40** (2002) 479-485.

[28] *Standards for Science Teacher Preparation*, National Science Teachers Association, 1998, Internet: http://www.nsta.org.

[29] *Transforming Undergraduate Education in Science, Mathematics, Engineering, and Technology*, Committee on Undergraduate Science Education, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1999.

[30] E.C. Parsons, "Reflecting upon Philosophy and Practice Correspondence: Guidelines for College and University Educators," Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Education of Teachers in Science, Costa Mesa, CA 2001.

Appendix A

OCEPT-Teacher Observation Protocol (O-TOP)

Outcomes Research Study – 2002

This instrument is to be completed following observation of classroom instruction. Prior to instruction, the observer will review planning for the lesson with the instructor. During the lesson, the observer will write an anecdotal narrative describing the lesson and then complete this instrument. Each of the ten items should be rated 'globally'; the descriptors are **possible indicators**, not a required 'check-off' list.

Not Observed — Characterizes Lesson

1. This lesson encouraged students to seek and value various modes of investigation or problem solving.
(Focus: Habits of Mind)

N/O	1	2	3	4

- Teacher/Instructor:
  - Presented open-ended questions
  - Encouraged discussion of alternative explanations
  - Presented inquiry opportunities for students
  - Provided alternative learning strategies
- Students:
  - Discussed problem-solving strategies
  - Posed questions and relevant means for investigating
- Shared ideas about investigations

2. Teacher encouraged students to be reflective about their learning.
(Focus: Metacognition – students' thinking about their own thinking)

N/O	1	2	3	4

- Teacher/Instructor:
  - Encouraged students to explain their understanding of concepts
  - Encouraged students to explain in own words both what *and* how they learned
  - Routinely asked for student input and questions
- Students:
  - Discussed what they understood from the class *and* how they learned it
  - Identified anything unclear to them
  - Reflected on and evaluated their own progress toward understanding

3. Interactions reflected collaborative working relationships and productive discourse among students and between teacher/instructor and students.
(Focus: Student discourse and collaboration)

N/O	1	2	3	4

- Teacher/Instructor:
  - Organized students for group work
  - Interacted with small groups
  - Provided clear outcomes for group
- Students:
  - Worked collaboratively or cooperatively to accomplish work relevant to task
  - Exchanged ideas related to lesson with peers and teacher

4. Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were valued.

(Focus: Rigorously challenged ideas)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Encouraged input and challenged students' ideas
- Was non-judgmental of student opinions
- Solicited alternative explanations

Students:
- Provided evidence-based arguments
- Listened critically to others' explanations
- Discussed/Challenged others' explanations

5. The instructional strategies and activities probed students' existing knowledge and preconceptions.

(Focus: Student preconceptions and misconceptions)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Pre-assessed students for their thinking and knowledge
- Helped students confront and/or build on their ideas
- Refocused lesson based on student ideas to meet needs

Students:
- Expressed ideas even when incorrect or different from the ideas of other students
- Responded to the ideas of other students

6. The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding in the context of clear learning goals.

(Focus: Conceptual thinking)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Asked higher level questions
- Encouraged students to extend concepts and skills
- Related integral ideas to broader concepts

Students:
- Asked and answered higher level questions
- Related subordinate ideas to broader concept

7. Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence.

(Focus: Divergent thinking)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Accepted multiple responses to problem-solving situations
- Provided example evidence for student interpretation
- Encouraged students to challenge the text as well as each other

Students:
- Generated conjectures and alternate interpretations
- Critiqued alternate solution strategies of teacher and peers

8. Appropriate connections were made between content and other curricular areas.
(Focus: Interdisciplinary connections)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Integrated content with other curricular areas
- Applied content to real-world situations

Students:
- Made connections with other content areas
- Made connections between content and personal life

9. The teacher/instructor had a solid grasp of the subject matter content and how to teach it.
(Focus: Pedagogical content knowledge)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Presented information that was accurate and appropriate to student cognitive level
- Selected strategies that made content understandable to students
- Was able to field student questions in a way that encouraged more questions
- Recognized students' ideas even when vaguely articulated

Students
- Responded to instruction with ideas relevant to target content
- Appeared to be engaged with lesson content

10. The teacher/instructor used a variety of means to represent concepts.
(Focus: Multiple representations of concepts)

N/O	1	2	3	4

Teacher/Instructor:
- Used multiple methods, strategies and teaching styles to explain a concept
- Used various materials to foster student understanding (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.)

Appendix B

Outcomes Research Study
OCEPT Teacher Interview Protocol (O-TIP)

Student thinking:
How does your instruction support development of thinking skills?

1. [Habits of Mind] This lesson encouraged students to seek and value alternative modes of investigation or of problem solving.

2. [Metacognition] Teacher encouraged students to be reflective about their learning

5. [Students preconceptions and misconceptions] The instructional strategies and activities probed students' existing knowledge and preconceptions.

7. [Divergent Thinking] Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence.

Social skills & collaboration:
How does your instruction support development of social and collaborative skills?

3. [Students discourse and collaboration] Interactions reflected collaborative working relationships among students (e.g., students worked together, talked with each other about the lesson) and between teacher/instructor and students.

Content:
How does your instruction support development of content understanding?

4. [Rigorously challenged ideas] Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were valued.

6. [Conceptual thinking] The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding in the context of clear learning goals.

8. [Interdisciplinary connections] Appropriate connections were made to other areas of mathematics/science, to other disciplines, and/or to real-world contexts, social issues, and global concerns.

9. [Pedagogical Content Knowledge] The teacher/instructor had a solid grasp of the subject matter content and how to teach it.

Instruction:

Besides student thinking skills, content understanding, and social/collaborative skills, what else guides your selection of instructional approaches?

10. [Multiple representations of concepts] The teacher/instructor used a variety of means (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.) to represent phenomena.

Additional Questions:

Student teachers/Early Career Teachers: In your undergraduate classes, what strategies were modeled that you now use? How did your undergraduate preparation contribute to your instructional design and practice? (If students don't name OCEPT Faculty Fellows, prod for them specifically.)

Faculty Fellows: Describe your level of participation in OCEPT activities. Has your affiliation with OCEPT contributed to your instructional design and practice? If so, how?

Appendix C

OCEPT-Teacher Observation Protocol (O-TOP)

Outcomes Research Study – 2002

This instrument is to be completed following observation of classroom instruction. Prior to instruction, the observer will review planning for the lesson with the instructor. During the lesson, the observer will write an anecdotal narrative describing the lesson and then complete this instrument. Each of the ten items should be rated 'globally'; the descriptors are **possible indicators**, not a required 'check-off' list.

1. This lesson encouraged students to seek and value various modes of investigation or problem solving.

(Focus: Habits of Mind)

Not Observed ←——→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Presented open-ended questions
- Encouraged discussion of alternative explanations
- Presented inquiry opportunities for students
- Provided alternative learning strategies

Students:
- Discussed problem-solving strategies
- Posed questions and relevant means for investigating
- Shared ideas about investigations

2. Teacher encouraged students to be reflective about their learning.

(Focus: Metacognition – students' thinking about their own thinking)
:

Not Observed ←——→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor
- Encouraged students to explain their understanding of concepts
- Encouraged students to explain in own words both **what** and **how** they learned
- Routinely asked for student input and questions

Students:
- Discussed **what** they understood from the class and **how** they learned it
- Identified anything unclear to them
- Reflected on and evaluated their own progress toward understanding

3. Interactions reflected collaborative working relationships and productive discourse among students and between teacher/instructor and students.

(Focus: Student discourse and collaboration)

Not Observed ←——→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Organized students for group work
- Interacted with small groups
- Provided clear outcomes for group

Students:
- Worked collaboratively or cooperatively to accomplish work relevant to task
- Exchanged ideas related to lesson with peers and teacher

4. Intellectual rigor, constructive criticism, and the challenging of ideas were valued.
(Focus: Rigorously challenged ideas)

Not Observed ←→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Encouraged input and challenged students' ideas
- Was non-judgmental of student opinions
- Solicited alternative explanations

Students:
- Provided evidence-based arguments
- Listened critically to others' explanations
- Discussed/Challenged others' explanations

5. The instructional strategies and activities probed students' existing knowledge and preconceptions.
(Focus: Student preconceptions and misconceptions)

Not Observed ←→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Preassessed students for their thinking
- Helped students confront and/or build on their ideas
- Refocused lesson based on student ideas to meet needs

Students:
- Expressed ideas even when incorrect or different from the ideas of other students
- Responded to the ideas of other students

6. The lesson promoted strongly coherent conceptual understanding in the context of clear learning goals.
(Focus: Conceptual thinking)

Not Observed ←→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Asked higher level questions
- Encouraged students to extend concepts and skills
- Related integral ideas to broader concepts

Students:
- Asked higher level questions
- Related subordinate ideas to broader concept

7. Students were encouraged to generate conjectures, alternative solution strategies, and ways of interpreting evidence.
(Focus: Divergent thinking)

Not Observed ←——→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Accepted multiple responses to problem-solving situation
- Provided example evidence for student interpretation
- Encouraged students to challenge the text as well as each other

Students:
- Generated conjectures and alternate interpretations
- Critiqued alternate solution strategies of teacher and peers

8. Appropriate connections were made between content and other curricular areas.
(Focus: Interdisciplinary connections)

Not Observed ←——→ Characterizes Lesson

(Focus: Interdisciplinary connections)
Teacher/Instructor:
- Integrated content with other curricular areas
- Applied content to real-world situations

Students:
- Made connections with other content areas
- Made connections between content and personal life

9. The teacher/instructor had a solid grasp of the subject matter content and how to teach it.
(Focus: Pedagogical content knowledge)

Not Observed ←——→ Characterizes Lesson

Teacher/Instructor:
- Information presented was accurate and appropriate to student cognitive level
- Selected strategies that made content understandable to students
- Was able to field student questions in a way that encouraged more questions
- Recognized students' ideas even when vaguely articulated

Students
- Responded to instruction with ideas relevant to target content
- Appeared to be engaged with lesson content

10. The teacher/instructor used a variety of means to represent concepts.
(Focus: Multiple representations of concepts)

Not Observed	Characterizes Lesson
←	→

Teacher/Instructor:
Used multiple methods, strategies and teaching styles to explain a concept
Used various materials to foster student understanding (models, drawings, graphs, concrete materials, manipulatives, etc.)

Appendix D

Indicators for Selection of Mathematics and Science Content Courses Appropriate for Future Teachers[1]

Characteristics of the Course:

- National and/or state *Standards* are incorporated in course design. (*National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards, National Science Education Standards, AAAS Benchmarks*, and/or *Oregon Content Standards*)
- An integral part of the course is student engagement in activities (laboratory experiences use of manipulatives).[2]
- Opportunities are provided for students to learn about and engage in inquiry.[2]
- Instruction is designed to encourage conceptual development through the use of a variety of methods, activities, resources and educational technologies. [2]
- Course content integrates relevant issues of science, mathematics and society.
- Lecture portion of course is closely coordinated with laboratory, discussion and/or recitation sections.
- Course grades are based on a variety of evaluation methods including authentic assessment (such as the Oregon CIM scoring guides – Mathematics Problem-Solving or Scientific Inquiry Scoring Guides).
- Opportunities exist for connections to the K-12 classroom environment.

Characteristics of the Instructor:

- Engages students interactively in instruction.
- Takes student prior knowledge into account when planning for instruction.
- Promotes a sense that all students can succeed in the course.
- Models thinking and study skills important for succeeding in the course.
- Emphasizes the value of science, mathematics and technology for all people of all ages.
- Models an enthusiasm for an inquiry orientation to learning.
- Is familiar with K-12 classrooms and teachers.

---

[1] Developed by participants in the Oregon Collaborative for Excellence in the Preparation of Teachers National Science Foundation grant project, 1999

[2] OCEPT recommends that all educators study and utilize current research-based instructional methods such as those described by Rutherford and Ahlgren in Ch. 13 of Science for All Americans and in How People Learn (NRC).