

Mallory Scholl
9/12/22
Missed Live Session

Dr. Bobek,

I want to apologize for missing our session on Monday. I unfortunately had something come up unexpectedly. Thank you for providing me with an opportunity to complete a summary to share my learning with you from the session.

Respectfully,
Mallory

After watching the recording from this weeks session I learned that we discussed the the traditional scientific method. I learned that the traditional scientific method includes four parts: the problem, procedure, observations & data, and the conclusion. The problem with using the traditional scientific method is that it is linear & prescriptive rather than flexible like what scientists actually do. In real life, scientists may start with questions, or with hypothesis, or conclusion etc. Scientists may follow the experimental design model rather than the scientific method. We did discuss however, how the traditional scientific method lends itself nicely as a prescriptive place to start for elementary teachers.

We also discussed the nature of science and the difference in language that we can use. You discussed with the class “dead words” from Schwartz, 2007 such as proof, right/ wrong, true/ false, and correct/ incorrect. These words do not promote the nature of science (NOS). We discussed the difference between observations & inferences when we are teaching students about the nature of science.

Finally, you discussed the Nature of STEM assignment. It is due Sunday, October, 2nd. We are able to select one nature of STEM; Science, Technology, Math, Engineering to complete our assignment. We need to include an list of tenants, look at our area of teaching & reflect upon how we address them or not (it is meant to be a reflection), and you discussed how there is no limit on length of the assignment.

Please let me know if there is anything additional that you need me to complete to make up for my absence.