

Chapter 1 : Building mathematics skills | Better: Evidence-based Education

building classroom climates for mathematical learning. In this series of video slideshows and downloadable practitioner guides, Inside Mathematics invites you to explore the teaching practice of two engaging practitioners, Mia Buljan (2nd grade) and Patty Ferrant (8th grade).

Preschool children should be encouraged to use them to explore and create, while teachers can use these simple toys to teach fundamentals. The preschoolers learn and develop their imaginations without even realizing it. While children play and create, teachers can use the building blocks as learning tools. When teachers actively participate in playtime, they can use the building blocks to teach several classroom skills and fundamentals. Babies begin to learn the art of stacking blocks before they turn one. Preschoolers master this skill. Practicing fine motor skills prepares the hands for writing and using scissors. Children also use gross motor skills to stack larger blocks. Both small and larger sizes, however, work on hand-eye coordination and balancing skills. Each time the building or tower falls down, the preschooler tries to build it higher. Teachers should quietly observe and notate how many blocks the children can stack at the beginning of the school year and see how coordination improves by the end of the year as evidenced by tower size. Preschool math, for instance, involves number recognition, shapes, patterns, and sorting. Teachers can use building blocks in at least three of those categories. Building blocks are now offered in a variety of shapes. Preschool teachers can have their students sort the blocks into different shapes and identify the name of each shape what makes them different from one another. The students can also sort blocks based on color or size. Preschool teachers begin introducing patterns to their students. Recognizing and creating these patterns is a fundamental math skill. Teachers can build block towers with different colored patterns, then ask the children to finish the patterns. Once the kids learn to recognize repeating colors, they can create their own building block patterns. Using building blocks as learning tools in preschool help engage the creative side of the brain to think outside of the box. Blocks of different shapes work best for this type of play. At the beginning of the school year, teachers can give their students blocks and tell them to build whatever they want. Many students start out with simple towers. Then, the next day, the teacher tells the students to build a block house. As the creations grow more unique, the instructor makes the projects more challenging. By the end of the year, let the children build whatever they want and see if their creations are more creative than simple towers and houses at the beginning of the year. In fact, using building blocks as learning tools helps develop creativity, introduce math skills, and develop motor skills. Teacher interaction with the students during block play helps maximize learning.

Chapter 2 : Building Conceptual Understanding through Concrete, Real-Life Examples - Everyday Mathematics

The concept of deep learning, as opposed to surface learning, is being increasingly recognized by teachers. This guide for mathematics teachers helps to change the focus from 'doing and finishing' to.

Pocket I was a wayward kid who grew up on the literary side of life, treating math and science as if they were pustules from the plague. One day, one of my students asked me how I did it—how I changed my brain. I wanted to answer Hell—with lots of difficulty! Learning math and then science as an adult gave me passage into the empowering world of engineering. Fortunately, my doctoral training in systems engineering—tying together the big picture of different STEM Science, Technology, Engineering, Math disciplines—and then my later research and writing focusing on how humans think have helped me make sense of recent advances in neuroscience and cognitive psychology related to learning. In the years since I received my doctorate, thousands of students have swept through my classrooms—students who have been reared in elementary school and high school to believe that understanding math through active discussion is the talisman of learning. Casualties of the Korean War, the men were in bad shape. The latest wave in educational reform in mathematics involves the Common Core—an attempt to set strong, uniform standards across the U. At least superficially, the standards seem to show a sensible perspective. They propose that in mathematics, students should gain equal facility in conceptual understanding, procedural skills and fluency, and application. The devil, of course, lies in the details of implementation. In the current educational climate, memorization and repetition in the STEM disciplines as opposed to in the study of language or music, are often seen as demeaning and a waste of time for students and teachers alike. Many teachers have long been taught that conceptual understanding in STEM trumps everything else. Imparting a conceptual understanding reigns supreme—especially during precious class time. The problem with focusing relentlessly on understanding is that math and science students can often grasp essentials of an important idea, but this understanding can quickly slip away without consolidation through practice and repetition. By championing the importance of understanding, teachers can inadvertently set their students up for failure as those students blunder in illusions of competence. As one failing engineering student recently told me: I understood it when you taught it in class. He had not developed any kind of procedural fluency or ability to apply what he thought he understood. There is an interesting connection between learning math and science, and learning a sport. When you learn how to swing a golf club, you perfect that swing from lots of repetition over a period of years. Your body knows what to do from a single thought—one chunk—instead of having to recall all the complex steps involved in hitting a ball. At some point, you just know it fluently from memory. If you use the procedure a lot, by doing many different types of problems, you will find that you understand both the why and the how behind the procedure very well indeed. The greater understanding results from the fact that your mind constructed the patterns of meaning. Continually focusing on understanding itself actually gets in the way. So I launched directly from high school into the Army. I had loved learning new languages in high school, and the Army seemed to be a place where people could actually get paid for their language study, even as they attended the top-ranked Defense Language Institute—a place that had made language-learning a science. I chose Russian because it was very different from English, but not so difficult that I could study it for a lifetime only to perhaps gain the fluency of a 4-year-old. Besides, the Iron Curtain was mysteriously appealing—could I somehow use my knowledge of Russian to peer behind it? After leaving the service, I became a translator for the Russians on Soviet trawlers on the Bering Sea. Working for the Russians was fun and engrossing—but it was also a superficially glamorous form of migrant work. There was pretty much only one other alternative for a Russian language speaker—working for the National Security Agency. I began to realize that while knowing another language was nice, it was also a skill with limited opportunities and potential. Unless, that is, I was willing to put up with seasickness and sporadic malnutrition out on stinking trawlers in the middle of the Bering Sea. Their mathematically and scientifically based approach to problem-solving was clearly useful for the real world—far more useful than my youthful misadventures with math had been able to imagine. So, at age 26, as I was leaving the Army and casting about for fresh

opportunities, it occurred to me: If I really wanted to try something new, why not tackle something that could open a whole world of new perspectives for me? That meant I would be trying to learn another very different language—the language of calculus. With my poor understanding of even the simplest math, my post-Army retraining efforts began with not-for-credit remedial algebra and trigonometry. This was way below mathematical ground zero for most college students. Trying to reprogram my brain sometimes seemed like a ridiculous idea—especially when I looked at the fresh young faces of my younger classmates and realized that many of them had already dropped their hard math and science classes—and here I was heading right for them. But in my case, from my experience becoming fluent in Russian as an adult, I suspected—or maybe I just hoped—that there might be aspects to language learning that I might apply to learning in math and science. What I had done in learning Russian was to emphasize not just understanding of the language, but fluency. Fluency of something whole like a language requires a kind of familiarity that only repeated and varied interaction with the parts can develop. Where my language classmates had often been content to concentrate on simply understanding Russian they heard or read, I instead tried to gain an internalized, deep-rooted fluency with the words and language structure. I practiced recalling all these aspects and variations quickly. After all, through practice, you can understand and translate dozens—even thousands—of words in another language. This approach—which focused on fluency instead of simple understanding—put me at the top of the class. Chunking was originally conceptualized in the groundbreaking work of Herbert Simon in his analysis of chess—chunks were envisioned as the varying neural counterparts of different chess patterns. Gradually, neuroscientists came to realize that experts such as chess grand masters are experts because they have stored thousands of chunks of knowledge about their area of expertise in their long-term memory. Chess masters, for example, can recall tens of thousands of different chess patterns. Whatever the discipline, experts can call up to consciousness one or several of these well-knit-together, chunked neural subroutines to analyze and react to a new learning situation. This level of true understanding, and ability to use that understanding in new situations, comes only with the kind of rigor and familiarity that repetition, memorization, and practice can foster. As studies of chess masters, emergency room physicians, and fighter pilots have shown, in times of critical stress, conscious analysis of a situation is replaced by quick, subconscious processing as these experts rapidly draw on their deeply ingrained repertoire of neural subroutines—chunks. When I felt intuitively that there might be a connection between learning a new language and learning mathematics, I was right. Day-by-day, sustained practice of Russian fired and wired together my neural circuits, and I gradually began to knit together chunks of Slavic insight that I could call into working memory with ease. By interleaving my learning—in other words, practicing so that I knew not only when to use that word, but when not to use it, or to use a different variant of it—I was actually using the same approaches that expert practitioners use to learn in math and science. I practiced feeling what each of the letters meant— f for force was a push, m for mass was a kind of weighty resistance to my push, and a was the exhilarating feeling of acceleration. The equivalent in Russian was learning to physically sound out the letters of the Cyrillic alphabet. I memorized the equation so I could carry it around with me in my head and play with it. If m and a were big numbers, what did that do to f when I pushed it through the equation? If f was big and a was small, what did that do to m ? How did the units match on each side? Playing with the equation was like conjugating a verb. I was beginning to intuit that the sparse outlines of the equation were like a metaphorical poem, with all sorts of beautiful symbolic representations embedded within it. Time after time, professors in mathematics and the sciences have told me that building well-ingrained chunks of expertise through practice and repetition was absolutely vital to their success. In fact, I believe that true understanding of a complex subject comes only from fluency. I learned Russian not just by understanding it—understanding, after all, is facile, and can easily slip away. What did that word mean? I learned Russian by gaining fluency through practice, repetition, and rote learning—but rote learning that emphasized the ability to think flexibly and quickly. I learned math and science by applying precisely those same ideas. Language, math, and science, as with almost all areas of human expertise, draw on the same reservoir of brain mechanisms. As I forayed into a new life, becoming an electrical engineer and, eventually, a professor of engineering, I left the Russian language behind. Although I was excited to take the long-dreamed-of trip, I was also worried. What had those

years of gaining fluency really bought me? Sure enough, when we first got on the train, I spoke Russian like a 2-year-old. But the foundation was there, and day by day, my Russian improved. And even with my rudimentary Russian, I could handle the day-to-day needs of our traveling. Soon, tour guides were coming to me for help translating for the other passengers. When we finally arrived in Moscow, we hopped in a taxi. The driver, I soon discovered, was intent on ripping us off—heading directly the wrong way and trapping us in a logjam of cars, where he expected us ignorant foreigners to quietly acquiesce to an unnecessary extra hour of meter time. Underneath it all, when it was needed, the fluency was there—and it quickly got us out of trouble and into another taxi. Fluency allows understanding to become embedded, emerging when needed. As I look today at the shortage of science and math majors in this country, and our current trend in how we teach people to learn, and as I reflect on my own pathway, knowing what I know now about the brain, it occurs to me that we can do better. As parents and teachers, we can use simple, accessible methods for deepening understanding and making it useful and flexible. We can encourage others and ourselves to try new disciplines that we thought were too hard—math, dance, physics, language, chemistry, music—opening new worlds for ourselves and others.

Chapter 3 : How I Rewired My Brain to Become Fluent in Math - Issue Learning - Nautilus

*Pocket PAL: Building Learning in Mathematics [Stephanie Prestage, Els De Geest, Anne Watson] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. The concept of deep learning, as opposed to surface learning, is being increasingly recognized by teachers and, here.*

Moreover, the political importance for governments in fostering high attainment in mathematics is evident in most countries around the world. Department for Children, Schools and Families. The group comprises researchers and teacher educators from eight universities, together with some representative teachers, local authority advisers and policy makers. The group has carried out four systematic reviews of relevant literature focusing on key aspects of the teaching and learning of mathematics in primary and secondary schools in England. The third review looked at the use of ICTs to teach algebra in primary and secondary schools. Taken as a whole, there are a number of evidence-based practices that can be advocated, and these are highlighted here in terms of three key themes. Inclusiveness Perhaps the most powerful theme that has emerged from these reviews is the importance of classroom practices that promote a sense of inclusiveness. It is thus extremely important for teachers to ensure that all pupils are able to experience a sense of progress and success in the mathematics they are doing. An important aspect of this is the use of differentiated tasks, so that pupils can engage with mathematics in a way that is appropriate for their ability and level of prior understanding, and that they receive support and encouragement when needed. Inclusiveness also requires teachers to make use of strategies where the share of contribution each pupil in a class makes to discussion is equal and equally-valued by the teacher. A danger with mathematics teaching is that sometimes, in order to avoid pupils experiencing failure, a teacher will adopt a comfort zone around their work, so that pupils may not feel sufficiently challenged or stretched by the work they do. Our reviews, however, indicate that a powerful influence on how pupils develop a positive self-identity as learners of mathematics comes from experiences in which they are challenged to think harder and deeper about the mathematics they are doing. The insight they then develop in the context of this effort enables them to feel they can succeed, and to also get a sense of the enjoyment that comes from problem solving, which generates a deeper understanding of the mathematics they are doing. One particular aspect of this involves the use of ICT. At one level the use of ICT by the teacher and pupils can act as a powerful motivator, but there is a danger that too much teaching and learning involving ICT can be superficial in terms of the depth of mathematical understanding being fostered. It is only when ICT is linked to the promotion of deeper learning that the real benefits of using ICT as a vehicle through which mathematics skills can be fostered are genuinely realised. Ownership In many classes, the teacher is viewed as the expert, and learning is seen by pupils as a matter of paying close attention to what the teacher says and does before trying some exercises for oneself. Ownership refers to the ways in which teachers make use of strategies where pupils can take greater control over the direction of the lesson. An effective strategy here is to go beyond the use of a teacherâ€™pupil dialogue comprising a simple sequence of initiationâ€™responseâ€™feedback ie the teacher asks a question, the pupil gives an answer, the teacher comments on the answer to enrich the dialogue by asking more challenging questions, asking pupils to explain their answers, and involving other pupils in a more extended sequence. The term co-construction has become more frequently used to describe how teachers can adopt a more equal role with pupils in how they generate and consider different approaches to solving mathematical problems and evaluate these together. Conclusion In order to become capable and strategic learners in mathematics, pupils need to have confidence in their own ability and self-identity as learners of mathematics. This can be contrasted with those strategies which can be characterised as viewing learning in mathematics as elitist only for clever pupils , superficial the application of well-rehearsed procedures and teacher-centred follow what the teacher says and does. All four of our reviews have also pointed to the need for high quality professional learning activities to enable teachers of mathematics to make use of such evidenced-based strategies. He is also the author of two very popular textbooks on teaching: Research Evidence in Education Library. Kyriacou C Inclusive Teaching in Mathematics. Mathematics in School, 37 5 , 17â€™ This article is available to subscribers only. If you are an

existing subscriber, please login. New subscribers may register below. Existing Users Log In.

Chapter 4 : Building Blocks as Learning Tools: Ideas for in the Classroom and at Home

Building Mathematics Learning Communities: Improving Outcomes in Urban High Schools - Kindle edition by Erica N. Walker. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets.

Chapter 5 : Building Classroom Culture | calendrierdelascience.com

In a Mathematics Education Review Group was established at the University of York by Maria Goulding and myself, funded by the Department for Education and Skills (now: Department for Children, Schools and Families).

Chapter 6 : classroom videos /building classroom climates for mathematical learning /

The series also covers the Standards for Mathematical Practice elaborated in the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics and examines why developing conceptual understanding requires a different approach to teaching and learning.