Expertise in medicine and science and how it is best learned and taught”

Carl Wieman
Stanford University
Department of Physics and Grad School of Education

copies of slides will be available

*based on the research of many people, some from my science ed research group
Major advances past 1-2 decades ⇒ Guiding principles for achieving learning

- College sci classroom studies
- brain research
- cognitive psychology
I. Exactly what is “thinking like a scientist” (our educational goal), or “thinking like a good doctor”

II. How is it learned? Guiding principles for teaching

III. Examples testing this in research in college science courses.

IV. New Wieman group research – adaptive expertise in medicine and science. Assessing and improving.
I. Expertise research*

historians, scientists, chess players, doctors,...

Expert competence =
- factual knowledge
- **Mental organizational framework** \(\Rightarrow\) retrieval and application

or ?

- Ability to monitor own thinking and learning
  (“Do I understand this? How can I check?”)

New ways of thinking-- everyone requires MANY hours of intense practice to develop.

Brain changed

*Cambridge Handbook on Expertise and Expert Performance
II. Learning expertise*--

Challenging but doable tasks/questions
Practicing all the elements of expertise with feedback and reflection.

Some components of science expertise
• concepts and mental models + selection criteria
• recognizing what information is needed to solve, what irrelevant
• does answer/conclusion make sense- ways to test
• variations in complex normal, or novel & important?

Knowledge important but only as integrated part. When and how to use.

* “Deliberate Practice”, A. Ericsson research accurate, readable summary in “Talent is over-rated”, by Colvin
What is the role of the teacher in development of expertise?

“cognitive coach”. Designing practice tasks, motivating, giving feedback

Subject expertise of teacher is essential—

• designing practice tasks
  (What is thinking like a doctor or med reseacher? How to practice specific components & at proper level?)

• feedback/guidance on learner performance
  Most important-- how to improve
3. Evidence from the Classroom

~ 1000 research studies undergrad science
- consistently show greater learning
- lower failure rates
- benefits all, but at-risk most

a few examples—
- learning from course
- learning in classroom

PNAS Freeman, et. al. recent massive meta-analysis
Measuring how well can apply mechanics concepts like physicist to make predictions in novel context.

Pre to post comparison, average trad. Cal Poly instruction.

1st year mechanics.

9 instructors, 8 terms, 40 students/section. Same instructors, different methods = better learning.

Hoellwarth and Moelter, Am. J. Physics May '11.
Learning in the in classroom*

Comparing the learning in two identical sections of 1st year college physics. 270 students each.

Control--standard lecture class—highly experienced Prof with good student ratings. Experiment--physics postdoc trained in principles & methods of effective teaching.

They agreed on:
- Same learning objectives
- Same class time (3 hours, 1 week)
- Same exam (jointly prepared)- start of next class

*Deslauriers, Schewlew, Wieman, Sci. Mag. May 13, ’11
Class design

1. Targeted pre-class readings, short online quiz.

2. Questions to solve, respond with clickers or on worksheets, discuss with neighbors. 
   *Authentic questions- require expert thinking*

3. Discussion by instructor follows, not precedes.

4. Activities address motivation (relevance) and prior knowledge.
Clear improvement for entire student population. Engagement 85% vs 45%.
Principles and methods also apply to more advanced topics and students (more relevant to medical education)--
TABLE II. Progression through sequential stages of a typical class period. Each action of students and instructors is described in detail within text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Instructors/TA(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Complete targeted reading and pre-class online quizzes</td>
<td>Formulate/review activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Listen/ask questions</td>
<td>Introduce goals of day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>Group work on activities</td>
<td>Circulate in classroom, answer questions and assess students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>Listen/ask questions, provide solutions and reasoning when called on</td>
<td>Facilitate whole class discussion, provide feedback to class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...repeat as needed...</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>Hand in in-class work</td>
<td>Wrap up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Exam Scores

nearly identical ("isomorphic") problems
(highly quantitative and involving transfer)

practice & feedback 2\textsuperscript{nd} instructor

practice & feedback, 1\textsuperscript{st} instructor

1 standard deviation improvement

taught by lecture, 1\textsuperscript{st} instructor, 3rd time teaching course

Stanford Active Learning Physics courses (all new in 2015-16)

### 2nd-4th year physics courses, 6 Profs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 70</td>
<td>Modern Physics</td>
<td>Wieman</td>
<td>Aut 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 120</td>
<td>E&amp;M I</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Win 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 121</td>
<td>E&amp;M II</td>
<td>Hogan</td>
<td>Spr 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 130</td>
<td>Quantum I</td>
<td>Burchat</td>
<td>Win 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 131</td>
<td>Quantum II</td>
<td>Hartnoll</td>
<td>Spr 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 110</td>
<td>Adv Mechanics</td>
<td>Hartnoll</td>
<td>Aut 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS 170</td>
<td>Stat Mech</td>
<td>Schleier-Smith</td>
<td>Aut 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stanford Outcomes

- Attendance went from 50-60% to ~95% for all.
- Covered as much or more content
- Student anonymous comments:
  90% positive (mostly VERY positive, "All physics courses should be taught this way!")
  only 4% negative

- All the instructors (tenure-track Profs) greatly preferred to lecturing.

  Typical response across ~ 200 faculty at UBC & U. Col. New way of teaching much more rewarding, would never go back.
Uses expertise much more directly.
How to make more effective teaching the norm---

**A better way to evaluate undergraduate science teaching**
Change Magazine, Jan-Feb. 2015
Carl Wieman
(also medical classroom teaching)

measure extent of use of practices that research shows lead to great learning

CBE—Life Sciences Education
Vol. 13, 552–569, Fall 2014

The Teaching Practices Inventory: A New Tool for Characterizing College and University Teaching in Mathematics and Science
http://www.cwsei.ubc.ca/resources/TeachingPracticesInventory.htm
Carl Wieman* and Sarah Gilbert†

~10 min or less to complete
Assessing, then better teaching, of “adaptive expertise”

“Routine expertise”—fast and accurate on well-defined repetitive tasks. *(Board exams– set of model symptoms, match with diagnosis and treatment.)*

“Adaptive expertise”—recognize anomalies, recognize what need to learn, and learn effectively.

Assessment Scenario--Some model symptoms, some not

- Recognize anomalies?
- Guide selection of possible models of diagnosis by underlying science?
- Know what information to seek to constrain possibilities?
- How to best obtain that information?

then test teaching interventions  *Marty Keil*
A scientific approach to Science (Eng) teaching

Good References:
S. Ambrose et. al. “How Learning works”
D. Schwartz et al. “The ABCs of how we learn”
Colvin, “Talent is over-rated”

cwsei.ubc.ca-- resources, references, videos
http://www.cwsei.ubc.ca/resources/TeachingPracticesInventory.htm
Learning outside of class (HW) also important

1. Expertise practiced and assessed with typical HW & exam problems.
   - Provide all information needed, and only that information, to solve the problem
   - Say what to neglect
   - Not ask for argument for why answer reasonable
   - Only call for use of one representation
   - *Possible* to solve quickly and easily by plugging into equation/procedure

- concepts and mental models + selection criteria
- recognizing relevant & irrelevant information
- what information is needed to solve
- How I know this conclusion correct (or not)
- **model** development, testing, and use
- moving between specialized representations
  (graphs, equations, physical motions, etc.)
Effective teaching practices, ETP, scores various math and science departments at UBC before and after for dept that made serious effort to improve teaching.
Field and Phase in Optical Resonator-- Lecture

Lossy ("real life" or damped) Resonators

Amplitude of the field in one round trip is reduced by
- absorption on mirrors
- leakage
- scattering

\[ u_{n+1} = re^{i\phi} u_n \]
so...
\[ u_1 = u_0re^{i\phi} \]
\[ u_2 = u_1re^{i\phi} = u_0r^2e^{i2\phi} \]

Lump all of these effects into one factor $\Rightarrow r$
- on each round trip
   $|u_{n+1}| = r |u_n|$, $r < 1$ read const for each round trip
- still have a longitudinal roundtrip phase
\[ \phi = 2kd = \frac{4\pi c}{\lambda} d \]

To find total field in cavity:
\[ u_T = u_0 + u_1 + u_2 + u_3 \ldots \]
\[ = u_0 + u_0re^{i\phi} + u_0r^2e^{i2\phi} \ldots \]
\[ = u_0(1 + h + h^2 + \ldots) \]
\[ = \frac{u_0}{1 - h} \]

\[ u_T = \frac{u_0}{1 - re^{i\phi}} \]
3) Consider this optical setup

Steck writes the right moving wave amplitude in the cavity as:

\[ U = U_0 + U_1 + U_2 + \ldots \]

where \( U_{n+1} = r e^{i2kd} U_n \)

3a) Explain what this second expression means:
3b) What is the meaning of the terms \( U_n \) and \( U_{n+1} \)?
3c) What is \( U_0 \) in terms of \( r_1, r_2, t_1, \) and \( U_{\text{laser}} \)?
3d) What is \( r \) in terms of \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \)?
3e) Suppose there was a loss inducing optical element inside the cavity with a field transmission coefficient of \( t_{\text{loss}} \). What would \( r \) be in terms of \( t_{\text{loss}}, r_1 \) and \( r_2 \)? What if \( t_{\text{loss}} \) were complex?
3e) What is the effect of changing the index of refraction of the material between the mirrors? Is this equivalent to changing the distance between the mirrors? Why or why not?
3f) What is the effect of changing the wavelength of the input laser field? Is this equivalent to changing the distance between the mirrors? Why or why not?

3g) Evaluate the infinite sum for the field and derive an expression for the intensity

\[ \text{Hint} \quad 1 + a + a^2 + a^3 \ldots = \frac{1}{1 - a} \]
Necessary (and probably sufficient) 1st step—have good way to evaluate teaching quality

Requirements:
• measures what leads to most learning
• equally valid/fair for use in all courses
• shows how to improve, & measures when do
• is practical to use on annual basis

method that currently dominates--student evaluations, fails badly on first three (most important)

Better way—thoroughly characterize all the practices and decisions used in teaching a course. Determine extent of use of research-based methods (ones shown to improve learning).

better proxy for what matters
III. How to apply in classroom? *(best opportunity for feedback & student-student learning)*

example - large intro physics class

**Teaching about electric current & voltage**

1. Preclass assignment--Read pages on electric current. Learn basic facts and terminology without wasting class time. Short online quiz to check/reward.

2. Class starts with question:
When switch is closed, bulb 2 will
a. stay same brightness,
b. get brighter
c. get dimmer,
d. go out.

3. Individual answer with clicker
(\textit{accountability=intense thought, primed for learning})

4. Discuss with “consensus group”, revote.
\textbf{Listening in!} What aspects of student thinking like physicist, what not?
5. Demonstrate/show result

6. Instructor follow up summary—feedback on which models & which reasoning was correct, & **which incorrect and why**. Many student questions.

Students practicing physicist thinking—feedback that guides thinking—other students, informed instructor, demo

In class just the beginning. Building the same elements into homework and exams equally important.
U. Cal. San Diego, Computer Science
Failure & drop rates – *Beth Simon et al., 2012*

![Bar Chart]

- **Fail Rate**
- **Standard Instruction**
- **Peer Instruction**

**Courses**
- CS1*
- CS1.5
- Theory*
- Arch*

**Failure Rates**
- CS1*: 10% Standard, 11% Peer
- CS1.5: 14% Standard, 6% Peer
- Theory*: 25% Standard, 3% Peer
- Arch*: 20% Standard, 7% Peer

**Average** 20% Standard, 7% Peer
2. **Limits on short-term working memory**—best established, most ignored result from cog. science

Working memory capacity **VERY LIMITED**!
*(remember & process 5-7 distinct new items)*

**MUCH less than in typical lecture**

*slides to be provided*

Mr Anderson, May I be excused? My brain is full.
Reducing demands on working memory in class

• Targeted pre-class reading with short online quiz
• Eliminate non-essential jargon and information
• Explicitly connect
• Make lecture organization explicit.
How to apply cog. psych. principles in classroom? *(practicing expert thinking, with feedback)*

**Example from teaching about current & voltage**--

1. Preclass assignment--Read pages on electric current. Learn basic facts and terminology. Short online quiz to check/reward (and retain).

2. Class built around series of questions & tasks.
When switch is closed, bulb 2 will
a. stay same brightness
b. get brighter
c. get dimmer,
d. go out.

3. Individual answer with clicker
   (accountability, primed to learn)

4. Discuss with “consensus group”, revote. (prof listen in!)
How practicing thinking like a scientist?
• forming, testing, applying conceptual mental models, identifying relevant & irrelevant information, ... 
• testing reasoning

+ getting multiple forms of feedback to refine thinking

Still instructor talking (~ 50%), but reactive.

Requires much more subject expertise. Fun!
Perceptions about science

**Novice**

Content: isolated pieces of information to be memorized.

Handed down by an authority. Unrelated to world.

Problem solving: following memorized recipes.

**Expert**

Content: coherent structure of concepts.

Describes nature, established by experiment.


*adapted from D. Hammer*

Measure student perceptions, 7 min. survey. Pre-post intro physics course ⇒ more novice than before chem. & bio as bad

Best predictor of physics major

*adapted from D. Hammer*
Perceptions survey results—Highly relevant to scientific literacy/liberal ed. Correlate with everything important

Who will end up physics major 4 years later?

7 minute first day survey better predictor than first year physics course grades

recent research⇒ changes in instruction that achieve positive impacts on perceptions
How to make perceptions significantly more like physicist (very recent)--

• process of science much more explicit (model development, testing, revision)

• real world connections up front & explicit
Student Perceptions/Beliefs

Kathy Perkins, M. Gratny

- All Students (N=2800)
- Intended Majors (N=180)
- Survived (3-4 yrs) as Majors (N=52)

Percent of Students

CLASS Overall Score (measured at start of 1st term of college physics)

Novice

Expert
Student Beliefs

- Actual Majors who were originally intended phys majors
- Survived as Majors who were NOT originally intended phys majors

CLASS Overall Score (measured at start of 1st term of college physics)

- Novice
- Expert
**Emphasis on motivating students**
*Providing engaging activities and talking in class*
*Failing half as many*
*“Student-centered” instruction*

**Aren’t you just coddling the students?**

Like coddling basketball players by having them run up and down court, instead of sitting listening?

**Serious learning is inherently hard work**
*Solving hard problems, justifying answers—**much** harder, much more effort than just listening.*

But also more rewarding (if understand value & what accomplished)—**motivation**
A few final thoughts—

1. Lots of data for college level, does it apply to K-12?

   There is some data and it matches. Harder to get good data, but cognitive psych says principles are the same.

2. Isn’t this just “hands-on”/experiential/inquiry learning?

   No. Is practicing thinking like scientist with feedback. Hands-on may involve those same cognitive processes, but often does not.
Use of Educational Technology

**Danger!**
Far too often used for its own sake! *(electronic lecture)*
Evidence shows little value.

**Opportunity**
Valuable tool *if* used to supporting principles of effective teaching and learning.

Extend instructor capabilities.
Examples shown.

- Assessment (pre-class reading, online HW, clickers)
- Feedback (more informed and useful using above, enhanced communication tools)
- Novel instructional capabilities (PHET simulations)
- Novel student activities (simulation based problems)
New paradigm on learning complex tasks (e.g. science, math, & engineering)

old view, current teaching

knowledge soaks in, variable

new view

transform via suitable “exercise”
17 yrs of success in classes. Come into lab clueless about physics?

2-4 years later ⇒ expert physicists!

Research on how people learn, particularly physics

• explained puzzle
• different way to think about learning
• how to improve classes
Perfection in class is not enough!  
*Not enough hours*

- Activities that prepare them to learn from class (targeted pre-class readings and quizzes)

- Activities to learn much more after class  
  **good homework**—
  - builds on class
  - explicit practice of all aspects of expertise
  - requires reasonable time
  - reasonable feedback
Components of effective teaching/learning apply to all levels, all settings

1. Motivation

2. Connect with and build on prior thinking

3. Apply what is known about memory
   a. short term limitations
   b. achieving long term retention (Bjork)
      retrieval and application-- repeated & spaced in time (test early and often, cumulative)

4. Explicit authentic practice of expert thinking.
   Extended & strenuous
Motivation-- essential
(complex- depends on background)

Enhancing motivation to learn

a. Relevant/useful/interesting to learner
(meaningful context-- connect to what they know and value)
requires expertise in subject

b. Sense that can master subject and how to master, recognize they are improving/accomplishing

c. Sense of personal control/choice
Survey of student opinions--transformed section

“Q1. I really enjoyed the interactive teaching technique during the three lectures on E&M waves.”

Not unusual for SEI transformed courses
How it is possible to cover as much material? (if worrying about covering material not developing students expert thinking skills, focusing on wrong thing, but...)

- transfers information gathering outside of class,
- avoids wasting time covering material that students already know

Advanced courses-- often cover more

Intro courses, can cover the same amount. But typically cut back by ~20%, as faculty understand better what is reasonable to learn.
Benefits to interrupting lecture with challenging conceptual question with student-student discussion

Not that important whether or not they can answer it, just have to engage.

Reduces WM demands—consolidates and organizes. Simple immediate feedback ("what was mitosis?")

Practice expert thinking. Primes them to learn.

**Instructor listen in on discussion. Can understand and guide much better.**
Highly Interactive educational simulations--
phet.colorado.edu  >100 simulations
FREE, Run through regular browser. Download
Build-in & test that develop expert-like thinking and learning (& *fun*)

balloons and sweater

laser
clickers*--

Not automatically helpful--

give accountability, anonymity, fast response

Used/perceived as expensive attendance and testing device ⇒ little benefit, student resentment.

Used/perceived to enhance engagement, communication, and learning ⇒ transformative

• challenging questions -- concepts
• student-student discussion ("peer instruction") & responses (learning and feedback)
• follow up instructor discussion - timely specific feedback
• minimal but nonzero grade impact

*An instructor's guide to the effective use of personal response systems ("clickers") in teaching-- www.cwsei.ubc.ca
What is the role of the teacher?

“Cognitive coach”
• Designs tasks that practice the specific components, of “expert thinking”.
• Motivate learner to put in LOTS of effort
• Evaluates performance, provides timely specific feedback. Recognize and address particular difficulties (inappropriate mental models, ...)
• repeat, repeat, ...-- always appropriate challenge

Implies what is needed to teach well: expertise, understanding how develops in people, common difficulties, effective tasks and feedback, effective motivation.
Why *so hard* to give up lecturing? *(speculation)*

1. tradition
2. Brain has no perspective to detect changes in self. “*Same, just more knowledge*”
3. Incentives not to change—research is closely tracked, educational outcomes and teaching practices not.

Psychology research and our physics ed studies

*Learners/experts cannot remember or believe previously held misunderstandings!*
Retirement curves measured in Bus’s Sch’l course. UBC physics data on factual material, also rapid drop but pedagogy dependent. (in prog.)

Concept Survey Score (%)

Retention interval (Months after course over)

long term retention

transformed $\Delta = -3.4 \pm 2.2\%$

award-winning

career study

traditional $\Delta = -2.3 \pm 2.7\%$
Comparison of teaching methods: identical sections (270 each), intro physics. (Deslauriers, Schewlew, submitted for pub)

I

Experienced highly rated instructor -- trad. lecture

wk 1-11

very well measured -- identical

Wk 12 -- experiment

II

Very experienced highly rated instructor -- trad. lecture

wk 1-11
Two sections the same before experiment. (different personalities, same teaching method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control Section</th>
<th>Experiment Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students enrolled</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual mastery (wk 10)</td>
<td>47±1%</td>
<td>47±1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean CLASS (start of term)</td>
<td>63±1%</td>
<td>65±1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Agreement with physicist)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Midterm 1 score</td>
<td>59±1%</td>
<td>59±1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Midterm 2 score</td>
<td>51±1%</td>
<td>53±1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance before</td>
<td>55±3%</td>
<td>57±2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement before</td>
<td>45±5%</td>
<td>45±5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of teaching methods: identical sections (270 each), intro physics. (Deslauriers, Schewlew, submitted for pub)

I
Experienced highly rated instructor--trad. lecture

wk 1-11

identical on everything diagnostics, midterms, attendance, engagement

Wk 12--competition

elect-mag waves
inexperienced instructor
research based teaching

wk 13 common exam on EM waves

II
Very experienced highly rated instructor--trad. lecture

wk 1-11

elect-mag waves
regular instructor
intently prepared lecture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>control</th>
<th>experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Attendance</td>
<td>53(3) %</td>
<td>75(5)%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engagement</td>
<td>45(5) %</td>
<td>85(5)%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring student (dis)engagement. Erin Lane

Watch random sample group (10-15 students). Check against list of disengagement behaviors each 2 min.

example of data from earth science course
Design principles for classroom instruction
1. Move simple information transfer out of class. Save class time for active thinking and feedback.

2. “Cognitive task analysis”-- how does expert think about problems?
3. Class time filled with problems and questions that call for explicit expert thinking, address novice difficulties, challenging but doable, and are motivating.
4. Frequent specific feedback to guide thinking.
What about learning to think more innovatively? Learning to solve challenging novel problems

Jared Taylor and George Spiegelman

“Invention activities”—practice coming up with mechanisms to solve a complex novel problem. Analogous to mechanism in cell.

2008-9—randomly chosen groups of 30, 8 hours of invention activities. This year, run in lecture with 300 students. 8 times per term. (video clip)
Plausible mechanisms for biological process student never encountered before

![Average Number](image)

Control
Structured Problems (tutorial)
Inventions (Outside of Lecture)
Inventions (During Lecture)
Average Time to First Solution Thread

Control
SPSA (Outside of Lecture)
IA (Outside of Lecture)
IA (During Lecture)
Bringing up the bottom of the distribution

“What do I do with the weakest students? Are they just hopeless from the beginning, or is there anything I can do to make a difference?”

many papers showing things that do not work

Here-- Demonstration of how to transform lowest performing students into medium and high.

Intervened with bottom 20-25% of students after midterm 1.

a. very selective physics program 2nd yr course
b. general interest intro climate science course
What did the intervention look like?

Email after M1—“Concerned about your performance. 1) Want to meet and discuss”; or 2) 4 specific pieces of advice on studying. [on syllabus]

Meetings—“How did you study for midterm 1?” “mostly just looked over stuff, tried to memorize book & notes”

Give **small number** of **specific** things to do:
1. **test** yourself as review the homework problems and solutions.
2. **test** yourself as study the learning goals for the course given with the syllabus.
3. **actively (explain to other)** the assigned reading for the course.
4. Phys only. Go to weekly (optional) problem solving sessions.
Intro climate Science course (S. Harris and E. Lane)

![Scatter plot showing midterm scores](image)

- **No intervention**
- **Email only**
- **Email & Meeting**

**Legend:**
- No intervention
- Email only
- Email & Meeting

**Graph Key:**
- Midterm 1 Score vs. Midterm 2 Score
- Scatter plot with data points representing different intervention types.

**Intervention and No Intervention Regions:**
- Red box: Intervention regions
- Blue box: No intervention regions
• End of 2nd yr Modern physics course (very selective and demanding, N=67)

• Intro climate science course. Very broad range of students. (N=185)

bottom 1/4 averaged +19% improvement on midterm 2!

Averaged +30% improvement on midterm 2!
Bunch of survey and interview analysis end of term.

⇒ students changed how they studied

(but did not think this would work in most courses,
⇒ doing well on exams more about figuring out instructor than understanding the material)

Instructor can make a dramatic difference in the performance of low performing students with small but appropriately targeted intervention to improve study habits.
(lecture teaching) Strengths & Weaknesses

Works well for basic knowledge, prepared brain:

- **bad, avoid**
- **good, seek**

Easy to test. ⇒ Effective feedback on results.
Information needed to survive ⇒ intuition on teaching

But problems with approach if learning:
- involves complex analysis or judgment
- organize large amount of information
- ability to learn new information and apply

Complex learning-- different.
Reducing unnecessary demands on working memory improves learning.

- jargon, use figures, analogies, pre-class reading
Characteristics of expert tutors*  
(Which can be duplicated in classroom?)

**Motivation major focus** (context, pique curiosity,...)  
Never praise person-- limited praise, all for process

Understands what students do and do not know.  
⇒ timely, specific, interactive feedback

Almost never tell students anything-- pose questions.

Mostly students answering questions and explaining.

Asking right questions so students challenged but can figure out.  Systematic progression.

Let students make mistakes, then discover and fix.

Require reflection: how solved, explain, generalize, etc.

*Lepper and Woolverton pg 135 in Improving Academic Performance*
Changing educational culture in *major research university science departments* necessary first step for science education overall

- Departmental level
  - *scientific approach to teaching, all undergrad courses* = learning goals, measures, tested best practices
  - Dissemination and duplication.

All materials, assessment tools, etc to be available on web
Institutionalizing improved research-based teaching practices. *(From bloodletting to antibiotics)*

Goal of Univ. of Brit. Col. CW Science Education Initiative *(CWSEI.ubc.ca)* & Univ. of Col. Sci. Ed. Init.

- Departmental level, widespread sustained change at major research universities  
  ⇒ scientific approach to teaching, all undergrad courses
- Departments selected competitively
- Substantial one-time $$$ and guidance

Extensive development of educational materials, assessment tools, data, etc. Available on web. Visitors program
Fixing the system

but...need higher content mastery, new model for science & teaching

Higher ed → K-12 teachers → everyone

STEM teaching & teacher preparation

STEM higher Ed
Largely ignored, first step
Lose half intended STEM majors
Prof Societies have important role.
Many new efforts to improve undergrad stem education (partial list)

1. College and Univ association initiatives (AAU, APLU) + many individual universities
2. Science professional societies
3. Philanthropic Foundations
4. New reports — PCAST, NRC (~april)
6. Government — NSF, Ed $$, and more
7. ...
The problem with education—

**Everyone** is an expert—
countless opinions, all considered equally valid

Value of a scientific approach—
separate out reality from opinions

**Scientific Approach**
- theories
- experiments
- results
- revised theories more experiments
- finally reproducible and right

Data!! Nobel Prize