DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 655 SE 063 746

AUTHOR	Vellom, R. Paul
TITLE	Teaching about Classroom Management in a Constructivist Methods Class Environment.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	26p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Classroom Techniques; *Constructivism (Learning); Higher Education; Mathematics Education; *Reflective Teaching; Science Education; Secondary Education; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Skills; Technology Education

ABSTRACT

This paper describes a preservice science, mathematics, and technology methods class at The Ohio State University--Columbus that was designed to challenge students' assumptions about teaching, students, and schools while engaging students in study of their own activity and reflective writing. The course experience suggests that teaching about complex issues related to practice (such as classroom management) should be structured over substantial periods of time and across multiple settings and tasks. (WRM)

TEACHING ABOUT CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT IN A CONSTRUCTIVIST METHODS CLASS ENVIRONMENT.

R. Paul Vellom, The Ohio State University

Among the National Science Education Standards (National Research Council, 1996) are Professional Development Standards which state,

> Professional development for teachers of science requires integrating knowledge of science, learning, pedagogy, and students; it also requires applying that knowledge to science teaching. Learning experiences for teachers of science must
> -Address teachers' needs as learners and build on their current knowledge of science content, teaching and learning.
> -Use inquiry, reflection, interpretation of research, modeling, and guided practice to build understanding and skill in science teaching. (pg. 62)

In preservice teacher education, methods courses seem to be the ideal (and often designated) place to concentrate on these standards. Among middle school and secondary programs, approaches are varied, as are the structure of programs within which methods courses are nested. For instance, some programs include a sequence of methods courses, while others may only include one. Regardless of this varying structure, it is clear that methods courses bear the burden of assisting preservice teachers to move into teaching in ways that many of them have only minimally experienced, from the role of student.

Recent research and modification of preservice teacher education programs in science education has included applying conceptual change constructs (Stofflett, 1994), as well as emancipatory teaching (Koballa & French, 1995) in preservice coursework. Both of these approaches build on constructivist ideals, which include moving from teacher-directed to student-centered instruction, in order to model effective teaching and encourage a wider range of interactions among participants in the course. However, many of the major barriers that commonly stand in the way of preservice interns developing student-centered teaching approaches are issues of classroom management. Simply put, while many interns can see and understand the benefits of inquiry learning for their students, they have not the least idea of how to go about teaching in this kind of a setting. Primary on their minds is how to control a class in which students are given some freedom to choose paths for exploration. To preservice interns who lack significant experience in schools in the teacher's role, freedom to choose paths of inquiry is confounded with freedom to do other things, many of them potentially undesirable, disruptive, or divergent from the learning path of the lesson. These barriers to inquiry can be captured in a small number of questions: 1) How can I manage student-driven inquiry? 2) How do I minimize behavior problems? 3) How do I handle them when they occur? 4) How can I plan for group or individual inquiry in ways that support learning along productive paths, and still give students some freedom in inquiry?

Preservice interns, given the opportunity, will often note that their biggest concern going into a school setting is, "handling the disruptive student", or "classroom control". While they put the concern in these terms, a common response to these concerns is to focus on question #3 as the majority of the answer. That is, planning is seen as the essential element of control. A well-worn axiom is, "Keep them busy, and they won't have time or occasion to create a problem". A colleague put it another way, "The primary reason for discipline problems is poor planning".

The preservice program in Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education at The Ohio State University - Columbus campus is a post-degree program of four or more (typically five) quarters, beginning in the summer of each year. The interns take an intensive summer of study in education, coupled with completion of coursework for certification in mathematics, sciences, or technology (formerly vocational education). During this summer, they do not work in schools, but rather experience peer teaching in a variety of settings at the university. As the Autumn quarter begins, they are placed in schools-- many of them for the first time-- for four mornings per week, and on Friday attend a clinical seminar designed to support and extend their learning about schools, teaching, and themselves. This clinical seminar is their first real methods course, and provides the setting for this study.

Challenging preservice interns to define the role of the teacher:

One goal of the methods class described here is to help preservice teachers add to the teacher-directed approach that they've experienced most in their coursework, by embracing a student centered approach to designing instructional situations for their classrooms. This movement is complicated by a concurrent move from the receptive roles of students that most students bring to teacher education programs, to the active, determinant role that most teachers must play in designing and enacting instructional events and sequences in their classrooms.

Most prospective teachers do not come to their methods courses with a well-elaborated view of teaching, but rather regard the primary task of the teacher as transmitting information. This common perception can be rooted in earlier experiences in science in elementary and high schools, where science may have been represented as a set of terms to be defined and memorized, and reinforced in more recent experience with college where lecture is the dominant teaching strategy. In many of these college courses, recitation sections are a complement to the lectures, and this situation creates an expectation among students that "teaching is telling", that the substance of learning for students is "getting lots of information down in a short time", and that students should be eager receivers of that information, seeking to assimilate the same information as the teacher, in the same structure. Essentially, they are to learn what the teacher knows, the way the teacher knows it.

A set of implications for methods courses emerges when the principles, "We learn what we live", and "We teach how we were taught", are considered in relation to this experience and related assumptions. Some research has illustrated the persistence of personally-held theories in science learning (Driver,date; A Private Universe) and have made a case for similar theories-in-action (Schon, 1979) in teaching. Essentially, Schon posits that teachers teach as they were taught, unless they develop convictions that push them to adopt (and personalize) new models. This change occurs best when the teachers are given time, a supportive atmosphere in which to test and try new ideas, and a range of strategies from which to choose (Barth, 1990).

Many traditional methods courses have been comprised mainly of lectures related to the history of science education, lesson planning, classroom/lab management, lab safety, curricular design, some laboratory work or sampling of activities, surveys of existing curricula, and the development of a small number of unit plans. This construal of "methods" fails to meet students' expectations for what a methods course should provide, and does not support the development of dynamic, personalized models of teaching at the preservice level.

In contrast, the methods class examined here was designed to challenge students' assumptions about teaching, students, and schools, while engaging students in ongoing

study of their own activity, and reflective writing. Koballa & French (1995) enumerated a rationale for methods courses, which we share:

> Not surprisingly, these preservice teachers, who during their careers will have a critical impact on the cognitive and social development of hundreds of young students, have never been asked to take charge of their own learning and/or to assist others to do the same. Courses built around experiences that encourage preservice teachers to reflect on their own actions, value their own ideas, and function autonomously should prepare them to do so (61).

How was this methods class "constructivist"?

The constructivist label implies that a transmission model of learning was not the focus, but instead that students made their own knowledge. There are some problems with setting this up as a dichotomy between transmission and construction, however. One problem is that the transmission model has everything to do with the teacher as the director of learning. It is, by nature, a description of teacher action.

Constructivism, on the other hand, centers on what happens from the student perspective-- and in this case, what happens between the students, between students and teacher, and between all of the elements of each instructional event. It's very name comes from the process of constructing that students (and teachers!) do in the process of learning. So, there is a shift here that we should acknowledge, and perhaps consider more carefully. It could be, for instance, that transmitting information, known to be a

common and efficient teaching model (lecture), is an important part of the constructivist classroom.

I regard the essential element of constructivist classrooms to be reflection, or reflective action. This is the place where participants make sense of all that they have access to at a particular point in time. This includes, for each participant, understandings at the moment, all past experiences, the information and experiences that might form a part of the current instructional event, and particular constraints or challenges to which participants may be responding. It is the hallmark of constructivism that students and teachers not only be afforded the opportunity to put these things together into some sensible formulation, but that we each be required to do so.

In each of the instructional events described below, I (the instructor for the course) assumed that students should bring some of themselves or their experience to the instructional event. Often, this 'something' was an artifact of reflection. Making the students' understandings and reflections play a central role in each instructional event ensured the kind of engagement described by Newmann (1992) as a "psychological investment" in learning. This investment was critical in determining what each student would later take from the situation; what they brought to the instructional event deeply influenced what I as instructor could give back to them, what my reactions and interactions would include, and how I would shape my message. Reflexively designed

instruction resulted, in which all participants were encouraged to engage, challenge, reflect, posit, and justify.

Course activities focusing on Classroom Management

In the course of this instruction, the preservice interns were challenged to reflect, describe, and personalize information and experiences in a variety of ways. Below, six instructional events are presented as examples, all focusing on classroom management in order to illustrate how a series of related events, over time, can assist interns and the instructor to build understanding. These events are presented in chronological order (the order in which they occurred in the course).

In each case, a description of the event and how it fit into the larger context of the course is presented. Next, actual intern's responses, excerpts from reflective writings, or a tabulation of some sort is included, to give the reader some ideas of the kinds of interactions that ensued. Last, a brief discussion, including information about extensions or connections to other coursework in the program, ensues.

1. Eliciting expectations for field experience, as well as concerns and questions:

Description:

At the outset of the course (before they reported to schools for the first time), interns were asked to list (write out) their expectations for the field experience by

responding to the following questions: 1) What do you hope to learn? 2) What do you hope to do? 3) In what ways do you expect to grow?

At the end of the first class meeting (also before they reported to their field experience schools) interns were given an opportunity to list their questions and concerns, and if they had indicated concerns, to rank their level of concern using a 4-point scale (4=very high, 1=low). Written expectations were then sorted and tallied by the instructor, as were concerns, and the results examined for major trends. Since the responses indicated several kinds of things (goals, hopes, anxieties, needs), the set of responses was also kept in original form, for reference during later parts of the course.

Intern Responses:

While many interns did not rank their responses, 31 of 34 mentioned "classroom management" or "discipline" as concerns. In these 31, taking those who ranked their responses, all marked these as "very high" or "high"(4 or 3 on the scale). To the instructor, this was seen as validation of his planning in this area for this course. Intern concerns, sorted, were:

Concerns ranked 4 or 3	**n**
Establishing appropriate relationships with students	5
How to prepare for field experience, details of experience	18
Classroom management / discipline	19
classroom management / logistics, flow	1
Substantial fear related to personal ability	1

Integration (content areas) in teaching	2
Assessment in classroom practice	1

Level of concern: (4 = very high, 3 = high, 2 = moderate, 1 = low)

Discussion and Extensions:

These writings were seen as important indicators of the student's notions of what they would experience in schools, and their hopes for themselves. Underlying most responses to these prompts were statements of need, and personal goals and priorities. While many interns did not rank their responses, 31 of 34 mentioned "classroom management" or "discipline" as concerns. Among those who ranked their responses, none of them marked these as "moderate" or "low". To the instructor, this was seen as validation of his planning in this area for this course.

The term "classroom management" can be related strictly to discipline and control-related issues, but often also includes spatial arrangements within the classroom, teaching challenges such as transitions from one activity to another, personal attributes of teachers such as organization, and a host of issues related directly to engagement and cognitive work done by the students. Good & Brophy (1984) distinguish preventative management issues from reactive ones. This distinction was seen as productive, and informed the design of the course.

2. Observing in mentors' classrooms and looking for "unwritten rules":

Description:

Interns were given the following assignment:

Perform a clinical observation of at least 15 minutes, during which you are to make records focused on sensory inputs, using the following format:

Time	What I see, hear, sense	What I think, question

You are to try to focus your written records on the "Time" and "What I see, hear, sense" columns. As you observe, if you have questions about motives or wish to record judgments or other thoughts beyond what your senses tell you, you may write these in the "What I think, question" column.

Interns were asked, after they had completed the observation, to reflect on the experience and to try to write the "unwritten rules" for activity and interaction in the classroom during the observed period. Interns then presented and justified these claims in small groups in the methods course.

All of the interns willingly completed the observation during their first week in the schools, and brought these (written observations and reflective elaborations on the underlying rules) to class as assigned. In class, I asked them to pair up, swap, and read; then, a round of questioning for clarification ensued. Once pairs had finished this activity, I asked them to form groups of 4, and to discuss what they had observed in light of a goal of coming up with "teaching principles" that seemed to be in effect in their

classrooms. I asked them to write all of these for the group on a big sheet of newsprint, and at a later point, these were all hung up for consideration by the whole class.

Intern Responses:

Some interns indicated (via conversations with me, feedback given verbally during class, and the course evaluation discussed below) a positive view of the observation exercise, and seemed to appreciate the structure and observer-role approach to examining classroom interactions and ground rules. These same folks indicated that the questioning for clarification was also a valuable part of the exercise, as they got to probe for additional information to help them understand what was going on in their partner's classroom, and to better appreciate the differences between their own classroom and that of their partner.

A wide variety of teaching principles resulted from the last part of the exercise. These are attached as Appendix A. These principles reflected, at least in some sense, the areas of most concern to these interns (by preponderance of number). However, one might also look at the principles as indicating the most significant features of their classrooms. Whatever the interpretation, all six of what George Posner (1996) called the basic issues in teaching were represented in the listed principles:

1. Control: Who should control what goes on in teaching, and what should be the range of their control?

2. Diversity: How unique are learners, and how should one treat learners on the basis of their differences?
3. Learning: How do people learn in terms of both the process of learning and the motivation for it?
4. Role: How formal (versus personal) should teachers be in their relationships with the learners?
5. School and Society: To what extent do the sources of and solutions to teacher's problems require structural changes in schools or society?
6. Knowledge: What is knowledge? Is knowledge a given set of facts, concepts, and generalizations to be transmitted, or is it more a personal or social construction developed by processes of reasoning and negotiation? (46)

Some examples of intern-generated principles for each of these issues are presented below:

1. Control: Who should control what goes on in teaching, and what should be the range of their control?
   -The teacher sets clear expectations for the class and gives students freedom to exceed them
   -Students will perform to teacher expectations
   -Student responsibility and accountability are important

2. Diversity: How unique are learners, and how should one treat learners on the basis of their differences?
   -Students take responsibility for their own learning
   -Students and teachers are co-responsible for students' learning
   -High expectations for all diverse learners

3. Learning: How do people learn in terms of both the process of learning and the motivation for it?
   -Student practice of concept applications is important for effective processing of knowledge
   -Practice makes understanding
   -Praise & encouragement are key student motivators
   -Question-guided lessons and independent thinking are essential for learning

4. Role: How formal (versus personal) should teachers be in their relationships with the learners?
   Content overrides personal relationships
   -Teachers should only accept the best effort from students and self
   -Personal relationships and respect of students is important
   -Teachers should be consistent in all things

5. School and Society: To what extent do the sources of and solutions to teacher's problems require structural changes in schools or society?
   -Proficiency tests are more important than the textbook
   -Students can't handle much
   -As long as the students are not being disruptive, I don't care what they do

6. Knowledge: What is knowledge? Is knowledge a given set of facts, concepts, and generalizations to be transmitted, or is it more a personal or social construction developed by processes of reasoning and negotiation?
   -Teachers should make learning meaningful to the students
   -Teachers should be open to new ideas

Discussion and Extensions:

This activity was designed to move the interns beyond summary judgments of their mentors, a tendency that had been observed in earlier preservice cohorts at this institution. I wanted them to gather data, and to be free to write (and temporarily dismiss) judgments and questions, instead working hard on observing. After collecting the data, I wanted them to make personal sense of it, and since this was subject to some interpretation, to then have to justify their claims in small peer groups. The additional benefit of seeing and hearing colleagues' experiences was intended to lead each intern to more productive understandings of his/her particular setting, and the range and nature of school settings in the surrounding area. Finally, I also wanted each intern to commit to

some statement(s) about what they perceived in the school setting, and to try to reason through the benefits and costs inherent in different instructional and management strategies. I saw the process of making a personal commitment in relation to various teaching principles as an essential activity in defining themselves in their classrooms.

3. Reading about research on teacher attributes and management:

Description:

Looking in classrooms (Good & Brophy, 1984) chapters 6 and 7 were recommended reading for interns, as a source of information that they might need in order to know where to start on classroom management. This reading was assigned early in the course, but no specific exams, tests, or quizzes were designed to "cover" the material.

Intern Responses:

No response mechanisms were built into the course for this particular resource. However, the resource was selected based on earlier program evaluation surveys which indicated a broadly felt need for "textbook information" on classroom management. The Good & Brophy presentation is in a textbook format, with sections addressing different areas of concern. As indicated above, the survey data was validated by the relatively high concern for classroom management that was broadly noted at the outset of the course. The instructor judged that this reading would fulfill, at least in part, the need

expressed, and that students would seek this information as they needed it. Indeed, several students indicated (in the course evaluation) that they appreciated this information, and that it had been significantly useful to them.

Discussion and Extensions:

As noted above, one of the strengths of this text is that the authors distinguish preventive management issues from reactive ones, and the instructor liked this formulation because it assumes that most discipline and control problems emerge from poor or inadequate planning. Putting planning first in discussing management allowed the students to take the idea of these two kinds of management out into the schools with them, and to use them as an analytic construct as they watched and participated in classrooms. Many used the distinction in journal writings, and also made reference to other ideas from this text that were helpful.

The instructor's idea was to utilize the text as a rich information resource, and in so doing to help move interns beyond the "technician" view of teachers towards the "artisan" view. That is, Good & Brophy were seen as the right kind of text because it lacked a prescriptive quality. Instead, the text presents ideas and principles for consideration, and discusses practical aspects of their use and disuse. Interns found this a rich mining ground for strategies and for developing principles to guide their decisionmaking about teaching.

4. Role-playing and analyzing difficult student-teacher interactions:

Description:

A role-play of an angry, public interaction between a student and teacher was used to introduce the problem of handling disruptive students. A student was selected during a class break, and asked to wait until class was largely begun, and then to challenge the instructor to provide additional clarification on the grade for an assignment. The instructor asked her to wait until later because the class was waiting, the student refused, and the conflict escalated until the instructor called it and thanked the student. The instructor invited critique of the situation, and then interns were provided a construct for analyzing roles in these situations, called 'Rights and Responsibilities' (adapted from Campbell, 1991):

> Rights and Responsibilities allow us to analyze uncomfortable or emotionally charged interactions, in order to more clearly understand what happened, and to choose appropriate measures to remediate the situation.

Briefly, whenever one person has a right, the other person has a responsibility.

So, you will list these on the same line on a page, so that you can see how this plays out. Here's what I suggest:

1. Capture the situation briefly by writing a description of what happened, trying to avoid judgmental language. You may include your version of actual words and interchanges in order to reconstruct the situation.
2. Set up columns labeled "Right" and "Responsibility".

3. For each right you can think of, begin with the person's name to whom it belongs, and write the right.
4. Go to the other column, put the other person's name, and write the corresponding responsibility.

We will try this briefly in class, and you may take notes below. Listing of rights & responsibilities goes on until exhausted:

RIGHT	RESPONSIBILITY
Student: To request and receive clarification on grading of paper within a reasonable time span	Teacher: To provide clarification on grading of paper within a reasonable time span
Teacher: To defer providing clarification until individual attention can be given	Student: To accept decision to defer

The interns were then assigned to record and reflectively analyze (in their journal for fieldwork) one such interaction they observed during the quarter. The instructor also indicated that he would like to read these and give feedback to each student.

Intern responses:

The instructor received and reviewed only a handful of analyses during the quarter, and these revealed a general appreciation for the need to carefully think through interactions in order to maintain a learning environment. Interns expressed some appreciation for the construct and technique, as 3 indicated on the course evaluation that it specifically was one of the most valuable aspects of the course.

Discussion and Extensions:

While "the jury is still out" on interns' work with this technique, the heated role-playing event, which most students initially believed was a real scenario, became an icon in the culture of the intern cohort, being mentioned several times, both orally and in student journals over the course of the quarter, as an event that made an impact. One intern indicated that the idea that teacher and student could be co-responsible for negative interactions was an eye-opener to him, and had changed the way he thought about teachers' interactions with their students, writ large.

5. Writing reflectively to define oneself on selected issues:

Description:

Interns were assigned to write reflectively about 3 other assigned issues during the quarter: classroom management, assessment, and questioning in the classroom (together with some cataloguing and preliminary analysis of questions from an actual lesson they had taught or observed). From the syllabus:

> Criteria for these writings include going beyond careful description to analyze, synthesize, and personalize. "I would....because..." statements are encouraged. (3-5 double-spaced pages).

These writings were turned in as regular assignments, for instructor response. Grading criteria for the course indicated that evaluation of these writings would be conducted on the basis of the instructor's judgment on two criteria: addressing the

prompt, and sufficient effort. The instructor wanted his responses to be substantial (issues-related) rather than evaluative (grade-related), and wanted the students to expect this kind of response.

Intern Responses:

In these writings, interns most clearly and deeply defined themselves in light of what they had experienced. Many indicated (in the course evaluations) that these writings were one of the most useful aspects of the course, helping them to figure out who they wanted to be in the classroom. In essence, many were able to move from the "they" stance to the "I" stance that the instructor valued. Excerpts from Mark's writing:

> "[School] has about a 50 percent attendance rate. Even though this is a terrible statistic, it actually helps manage classrooms. The students who cause the stereotypical problems aren't there...
>
> ...When I get my classroom I don't think I will have the advantage of authoritative size. I will have to establish my authority by my words and actions. I want to emulate my mentor teacher by not threatening the students.
>
> -Mark

In instances in which this was noted in their writing, the instructor made specific, explicit note of it, and coupled this with praise and encouragement. Several interns expressed a desire for "more written feedback" on their writings, even though the instructor was assiduous about comments, marginal notes, and inviting further inquiry and conversations on key issues.

Discussion and Extensions:

The instructor was very pleased with the degree to which these writings required and enabled students to place themselves in the role of the teacher, and to make defining statements that represented commitments to specific teaching philosophies, practices, and approaches. While responding to these writings was VERY time-consuming (there were 38 students in this cohort!), it is seen as essential to scaffolding interns into a comfort with making personal claims about what they valued in teaching. These claims were seen as the beginnings of what Schon (1987) called, "personal theories-in-use", the principles that guide teaching practice.

6. Course evaluations indicating interns' views of the course experience:

Description:

Interns were asked to respond to three prompts at the end of the course instructional sequence: 1) What were the most useful aspects of the course? 2) What suggestions could you give for improving the course? 3) Any other messages you may have for the instructor.

In accordance with procedures at the University, these evaluations were written in the absence of the instructor, and were delivered to clerical staff for word processing in anonymous form. The instructor received all responses for each prompt, randomly ordered, and with identifying marks removed. In addition to the written evaluations, a

standardized 25-item Likert instrument evaluating the effectiveness of the course and various instructor attributes was administered.

Intern Responses:

In course evaluations: 18 out of 33 interns mentioned activities related to classroom management as one of the best aspects of the course, and of these, 5 mentioned the need for more time to be spent on this in future iterations of the course, and in successive teacher education coursework for this cohort. Some mentioned, as suggestions for improving the course, even more focus on issues related to management, and several mentioned that they would suggest including the Good & Brophy readings earlier in the program.

Discussion and Extensions:

The prominence of positive remarks about classroom management issues in the evaluations for this course are a strong indication that both the topics and the approaches were meaningful for the majority of students.

The instructor is considering further modifications to the course, specifically aimed at enhancing interaction around the reflective writing component. In effect, when the instructor's feedback is not seen as substantial enough, even though the instructor intentionally focused on writing good comments, there is a need for more interaction, more sense-making, around these writings. Perhaps the greatest value in these

modifications will be creating situations in which students make and defend claims, analyze and evaluate situations in context, and come to personal decisions about their own priorities in these areas.

Summary and Discussion:

Teaching to support learning in a constructivist framework must proceed from some personal commitments made by the instructor, which mirror the commitments that the instructor was trying to promote in his students in the course examined above. While the data presented above is admittedly far from thoroughly and systematically analyzed, it does bear out the usefulness of several principles in this setting:

1. Teaching about complex issues related to practice (such as classroom management) should be structured over substantial periods of time, and across multiple settings and tasks.
2. Teaching about these complex issues should include observation of actual classroom teaching (either in person or via video segments), provision and use of some analytical tools, reflective writing and substantial response to it, and the requirement that interns define and defend personal positions related to each issue.

The course episodes and activities described above can be taken individually and fit into existing coursework. However, as a set, these activities seem to have had a substantial impact on the professional learning of this cohort of interns. Table 1 is provided as a brief summary of the set:

Activity	Pattern of Interaction
Interns write their expectations for field experience; they also write questions and	Writings sorted by instructor and tallied; expectations and concerns tallies shared with interns. Questions reviewed by

concerns. Concerns were ranked.	instructor, addressed individually or in group over time.
Interns read Good & Brophy, ch's 6&7, for information on management and teacher attributes	None planned; course reflected important distinction in proactive and reactive management techniques and approaches. Some interns used concepts and information later in course.
Teacher-intern role-play of heated verbal exchange, analyzed in terms of roles & responsibilities; journal assignment to analyze a difficult interaction they observe during quarter.	Role-play followed by group critique and analysis, led by instructor. Elucidation of method for capturing and analyzing interactions; connection to documenting same in teaching practice. Feedback given to interns individually, as comments on written records and analyses; some individual discussions.
Reflective writing on classroom management	Daily journal used as starting point for 3+ pg. writing that includes description, evaluation or analysis, and personal commitments in the area of classroom management.
Course evaluations addressing most and least useful aspects of course.	Instructor designed prompts; evaluation administered by an intern, delivered to clerical staff, typed to maintain anonymity. Responses then sorted and tallied by instructor, and recommendations catalogued for future iterations of course.

Table 1: Activities related to classroom management in a 10-week methods course.

Taken together, these activities over the span of 10 weeks of the course provided these interns opportunity and encouragement to look at their experiences in the schools from a different position, that of the teacher. In pushing the interns towards this stance, key elements of instruction included:

1. eliciting detailed statements of expectations, concerns, and questions at the outset of the course, in order to guide instructional design decisions
2. first-hand observation of classrooms using a provided tool (3-column format) coupled with reflective writing
3. formulating "teaching principles" in their own words in a collaborative setting
4. observing or taking part in role-playing, coupled with analysis, provision of a tool (rights & responsibilities format) and use of it
5. provision of rich textual resource of non-prescriptive information (Good & Brophy)
6. reflective writing on classroom management that included description and some analysis, synthesis, or personalization, and significant instructor responses

7. course evaluations which promoted student thinking about various aspects of the course, and the relative value of these in promoting professional growth in specific areas.

References

American Association for the Advancement of Science (1989). *Science for all Americans.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, Douglas (1991). Syllabus and course materials for course entitled, "Ethnography in Classrooms". East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.

Good, T.L. & Brophy, J.E. (1984). *Looking in classrooms (3rd ed).* New York: Harper & Row.

Koballa, T. & French, M. (1995). Dilemmas, decisions, and recommendations: Personal empowerment in an elementary science education methods course. *Journal of Science Teacher Education,* (6)*2,* 61-70.

National Research Council (1996). *National Science Education Standards.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Posner, G.J. (1996). *Field experience: A guide to reflective teaching (4th ed.).* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Schon, D.A. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stofflett, R. (1994). The accommodation of science pedagogical knowledge: The application of conceptual change constructs to teacher education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching,* (31)*8,* 787-810.

SE063746

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: 1. Using Scoring Guides to Teach Preservice Teachers About Student-Centered Learning
2. Teaching About Classroom Management in a ~~Preservice~~ Constructivist Methods Class Environment.

Author(s): R. PAUL VELLOM

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:
	1. 1999 2. 1998

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, →

Signature: R Paul Vellom	Printed Name/Position/Title: R. PAUL VELLOM, ASSISTANT PROF.	
Organization/Address: THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY 333 Arps, 1945 N. High St, Columbus, OH 43210	Telephone: 614 292-8056	FAX: 614 292-7695
	E-Mail Address: Vellom.1@osu.edu	Date: 8.9.00