LOUGHBOROUGH MKIT5 SEMINAR: NOTES FROM GROUP 2

The initial question, from which various responses arose, concerned the adoption of one or other of the three “models” of developing and deepening teacher subject knowledge presented in the paper.

However, whilst the first two papers did present what seemed to be models, namely, the carrying out of mathematical tasks and interrogating one’s own experience, on the one hand, and The Knowledge Quartet on the other, it was not altogether clear what *model* the third paper might seem to embody. Was it textbooks? tasks? understanding-as-connectivity?

Nevertheless, assuming that there are, then, three models on offer the question arose “does it matter which of these three are adopted in training teachers?

One response to this was that it might depend upon the training course. For example, on a CPD course it might be perfectly appropriate to set participants mathematical tasks to work on and/or introduce them to the other two models with identifiable topics and pedagogical pointers.

During a PGCE course, however, it might be felt (wrongly or rightly) by the tutor that she or he knew certain things about the teaching of mathematics that s/he strongly believed that a trainee ought not to begin teaching without also knowing. Similarly, trainees themselves on such courses (wrongly or rightly) might suppose that they had been sold short unless they had been ‘taught how to teach’ mathematics in some respects, at least. Indeed, if they were given a task-based course they would have to be convinced how the work involved in such tasks “percolated” into the classroom, so to speak. On the other, hand it was realised that trainees might not be in strong enough position, in this respect, to know what form their training should take.

Peter Huckstep