Do Your Learners Do the Thinking?

DEVELOPING LEARNERS'

HIGHER-ORDER THINKING SKILLS

IN SCIENCE FOR GRADES 7, 8, 9 & 10

MENTOR'S GUIDE

A Professional Learning Package on the
PPST Indicators 1.5.2 and 1.5.3

This Mentor's Guide in Science for Grades 7, 8, 9 & 10 was developed through the **Philippine National Research Center for Teacher Quality (RCTQ)**, a partnership between the **Philippine Normal University** and the **SiMERR National Research Centre-University of New England**, with support from the **Australian Government.**

Published 2022 in the Philippines by the Department of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PROJECT TEAM

Research Center for Teacher Quality

Allen A. Espinosa, PhD
Project Leader

Donnadette S.G. Belza
Mikkey Mari M. Tuazon
Project Officer

Thaddeus Owen Ayuste, PhD
Jaypee M. Limueco, PhD
Emeliana Nemeth, PhD
Mary Joyce Castillo
Part-time Research Officers

Science Content Writers / Reviewers

Dr. Debra Panizzon
Ms. Dagmar Arthur
Mr. Gerry McCloughan
UNE-SiMERR
National Research Centre

UNE-SiMERR National Research Centre

John Pegg, PhD
Director

Joy Hardy, PhD
Deputy Director

Ken Vine, PhD
Principal Research Adviser

RCTQ Senior Staff

Gina O. Gonong, PhD
Director

Ma Lourdes D. Pantoja
Deputy Director

Ali G. Anudin, PhD
Levi E. Elipane, PhD
Senior Program Managers

Arvin Yana
Senior Manager for Communications and Advocacy

Krupskaya M. Añonuevo
Senior Manager for Projects, Planning, and Linkages

Support Staff

Ma Izella D. Lampos
Lizette Anne L. Carpio
Jeanny S. Burce
Ma. Lourdes C. Dimasakat
Janine Rose L. Dueñas
Earl Joseph M. Cruz
Nicole Ingrid M. Resuena
Riza Q. Abarca
Beverly E. Estocapio
Norrisa Opiña-Satumbaga

Layout and Design

Mikkey Mari M. Tuazon
Cristy A. Mendoza
Sharwin F. Calimlim
Kristine Jean Calacapa

Technical Working Group

Salvador D. Arquilita
Principal III, Diplahan NHS,
SDO Zamboanga Sibugay

Jaypee K. Balera
Master Teacher I, Bannawag HS, SDO North Cotabato

Dinah B. Dumlao
Master Teacher I
Piddig NHS, SDO Ilocos Norte

Rosalyn C. Gadiano
Education Program Supervisor,
SDO Palawan

Ferrera E. Oira
Master Teacher I
RTPM Dumaguete Science HS,
SDO Dumaguete City

Darwin B. Paas
Master Teacher I, Baguio City NHS, SDO Baguio City

KC M. Reyna
Master Teacher I, Butuan City
School of Arts and Trades
SDO Butuan City

Minda L. Soldevilla
Education Program Supervisor,
SDO Guimaras

Depmar C. Valdez
Education Program Supervisor
SDO Cauayan City

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Project Adviser

Usec. Nepomuceno Malaluan
Undersecretary and Chief of Staff
of the Office of the DepEd Secretary

National Educators Academy of the Philippines

John Arnold Siena
Director IV

Anna Marie San Diego
OIC-Project Development Officer V
Professional Development Division

Jayson Peñafiel
Focal Person

Australian Embassy-Manila

Francesca Lawe-Davis
First Secretary

Jennifer S. Wong
Ester Roxas

Philippine Normal University

Bert J. Tuga, PhD
President

Ronald Allan S. Mabunga, PhD
Harry B. Huliganga
Jennie V. Jocson, PhD
Lordinio A. Vergara, PhD
Vice Presidents

Content Expert Reviewers

Anna Cristine B. Lopez
Master Teacher
Pulo NHS, SDO Cabuyao

Carmen R. Lim
Education Program
Supervisor,
SDO Catbalogan City

Cynthia Luz A. Nabutel
Master Teacher II, Aurora
National Science High
School, SDO Aurora

Chozara P. Duroy
Education Program
Supervisor, DepEd Region V

Marvin L. Diaz
Master Teacher II
SDO Quezon City

Elma Lyne V. Pambid-Labio
Master Teacher I
Pinto NHS, SDO Ifugao

Luzviminda B. Jasmin
Education Program
Supervisor, SDO Digos City

Kathleen Joy Bongcawel
Master Teacher I
San Jose NHS
SDO Zamboanga del Sur

Julieven R. Abrea
Senior Education Program
Specialist
Bureau of Learning Delivery

<This page is intentionally left blank.>

INTRODUCTION TO THE MENTOR'S GUIDE

Hello, dear Mentor! Welcome to this ***Professional Learning Package in Science!***

This *Mentor's Guide* was developed to complement the *Teacher's Resource*. This has been created from the item bank and *Teacher's Resource* on PPST indicators 1.5.2 and 1.5.3.

This is intended for you – master teachers and school leaders – to coach and further support our teachers effectively and, at the same time, collaborate with them. Collaboration among teachers and school mentors are essential to enhance the teaching and learning process. This 'team-up' approach suggested in this resource aims to help build better communication and interactions among staff as you learn from each other.

As a highly proficient practitioner, you have an important role to play in the achievement of the intended learning outcomes stipulated in the materials. Likewise, your participation in this endeavor will assist your mentees acquire the skills, knowledge, attitude, and values as they advance their career level.

Note: **The Teacher's Resource in Science: Life Sciences, Chemistry, Physics and Earth Sciences, includes 82 assessment items involving 220 individual questions.**

Both the *Teacher's Resource* and this *Mentor's Guide* are appropriate for use in Learning Action Cells (LAC), classroom applications, and mentoring, among others, as complementary materials.

Mentoring Instructions

To assist you in the role, you may refer to these mentoring instructions:

Read the teacher's resource. It is important to read the item bank and teacher's resource to understand the background upon which the material is built, and know learn the main pointers teachers can acquire while preparing their teaching plan and dealing with their student learners.

Set a one-on-one session. This session is simply a chance for teachers to deal with what they have learned by sharing their thoughts and having constructive and complementary discussions with another person.

Ideas for Mentors:

Using the items in LACs might include:

- Initially, selecting a single Item/or Item set to use to introduce the structure and features of the package to mentees
- Suggesting as small set of items around a single topic for mentees to try before a next LAC session, so the whole group can feedback and share ideas on the same set of items
- Discussing the full range of HOTS strategies being modelled in the resource
- Asking mentees to identify an item of interest to review, try with their students, evaluate and then report back to their group
- Leading your LACs group to identify some general strategies that support HOTS, e.g., *building questions up in a topic from unistructural to multistructural to relational*; or *using open questions and scaffolds*.

Ideas for Mentees:

Using the items:

- Trying some items themselves to reflect on their knowledge and understanding
- Trying some item with their students – maybe some in early grades and some in higher grades
- Sharing some items with their school colleagues – this could be useful for collaborative discussions; clarifying the focus the school has on the Philippine Curriculum that they are currently implementing
- Adapting or developing some items for your school's context.

Further or complementary study:

- Reading more about HOTS
- Exploring PISA competencies and PISA testing and how they might be used in your school

How to use the Mentor's Guide?

This *Mentor's Guide* provides an outline of how you may support your teachers. The following are provided in this material:

Capacitating my Mentee on the SOLO-based Assessment Items

Provides activities and/or outlines a work plan for master teachers, school heads, and supervisors to coach and mentor teachers about the identified strategies in the *Teacher's Resource*

Reflection Log

Provides opportunities for master teachers, school heads, and supervisors to assist teachers in reflecting on their teaching strategy, the **S**tructure of the **O**bserved **L**earning **O**utcome (SOLO) model, the challenges they encountered, and how they address the challenges that arose.

As a mentor, you need to make sure that the teachers who are using the *Teacher's Resource* have an understanding of its purpose and the content provided in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST) **Domain 1: Content Knowledge and Pedagogy** (Strand 1.5).

This is also a chance for you to undertake the following:

- Clarify important points indicated in the key learnings and the guide below.
- Provide feedback based on how teachers answered the items or activities.
- Ask for and confirm changes in teacher perspectives and teaching plans.
- Initiate and conduct individual and group discussions you think are necessary and relevant.

Capacitating my mentee on the

SOLO-based Assessment

Activity 1. Organizing LAC Session

Introduction

The content of the *Teacher's Resource* can be used to engage teachers in collaborative learning sessions such as the Learning Action Cell (LAC). Both mentors and teachers should be given the chance to share insights and expertise in teaching higher-order thinking skills to learners. Similarly, it is vital that teachers share the challenges encountered during the teaching-learning process so that, with your guidance and support, these challenges can start to be addressed.

Being able to master the **S**tructure of the **O**bserved **L**earning **O**utcome (SOLO) model requires reading, discussion and practice. While the ideas may sound straightforward, both you and your colleagues (mentees) require hands-on activities to help comprehend the model.

It is interesting that as you spend more time on SOLO, new brain-based perspectives associated with teaching and learning open up. In the following mentoring activities, you will begin applying the SOLO model to current pen and paper questions. These can serve as diagnostic, formative or summative activities employed in classrooms.

An important characteristic of the SOLO Model is a series of levels that measures increasing sophistication (quality) in responses to questions directed to learned tasks. There are five levels of response in the Basic SOLO Model, but three are most relevant to the work undertaken in the teacher resource.

The reader is encouraged to read and analyse the work provided in the following, Activity 2, for a much fuller appreciation of Basic SOLO and the SOLO levels. However, as an initial introduction the three levels used to classify responses are referred to as unistructural, multistructural and relational where:

A **unistructural** response involves one relevant operation or action from the stimulus;

A **multistructural** response involves several relevant independent operations or actions;

A **relational** response integrates all relevant pieces of information and operations from the stimulus.

These three levels comprise a U-M-R **cycle** of development, and offer an important pedagogical tool for teachers to assist them in planning instruction and assessment.

Getting Started First Time

An introduction to the HOTS Teacher's Resource

First in conversation with the teachers choose a question from a subject area in Science from the Teacher Resource. Teachers might suggest a preferred question to start.

Teachers may wish to start with an item from Biology and Grade 7. They may wish to choose Item 001.

Now talk through the first page (see a copy below). This information situates the item in the Philippine Curriculum as expected taught content and also the related PISA competency. It also describes briefly the HOTS thinking strategy employed in the question.

Item 001		
	Subject	Life Sciences – Biology
	Grade Level	7
	Topic	Difference between Plant and Animal Cell
	PISA Competency	**General:** Explaining phenomena scientifically ***Specific*:** Recalling and applying appropriate scientific knowledge (OECD, 2018, p. 104).
	K to 12 Curriculum Competency and Curriculum references	4. *Differentiate plant and animal cells according to presence or absence of certain organelles. Code: S7LT-IIc-4* (Department of Education, 2016, p. 112). **Curriculum Standard and Content Standard:** *The learners demonstrate an understanding of the difference between animal and plant cells* (Department of Education, 2016, p. 112).
	Higher Order Thinking Strategy adopted	✓ Explicitly using SOLO (from U → M → R)

Next move onto the questions. Most questions in this Resource have a STEM. A STEM contains information necessary to be able to undertake the question. It usually does not have a question within it.

Item 001

Observe the following diagrams of a typical animal and plant cell as observed under a light microscope. Each cell consists of a number of 'organelles' that have specific functions to help the cell receive and use the nutrients required to survive while removing waste products that could kill the cell.



This STEM sets the scene or situates the learner in the area in which the questions are to be answered.

What follows in this item are four questions (1a to 1d) based around SOLO levels. The expectation is that students will be able to respond up to a certain level and after this, the student will make mistakes or be unable to process the question adequately.

Note: all questions relate back to the STEM in some way. Also, the question difficulty (in terms of SOLO) increases as the learner proceeds through the item.

Teachers should be given the Item and the four questions. Teachers should work with a partner and discuss each question and write down what they think an appropriate correct response would be provided by a student. They may also consider what incorrect responses students might make in the different question parts.

Once all teachers, either singly or in pairs, have completed all items than teachers as a group should work their way through the answers comparing the responses they think students would make.

When this is done we will now go more formally through each question part and teachers would agree on the answer for the first part. Disagreements should be clarified.

Question a: Looking at the animal and plant cells, all organelles are labelled except for one. This is highlighted by the arrow with no label. What is the name of this organelle?

Your Answer:

Then the SOLO level for the response and the question should be discussed and reasons found to justify the SOLO level.

The process will now proceed to the second question part.

Question b: There are a number of structural differences between animal and plant cells. State two that can be observed in the diagrams.

Your Answer:

Then the third question part should be addressed.

Question c: Explain the function of chloroplasts in plant cells.

Your Answer:

Then the fourth question part should be addressed.

Question d: Animal cells do not have chloroplasts, yet they obtain the food or nutrients needed to survive. If not being produced in our cells like plants, where do the nutrients animals need to survive come from? Provide as much detail in your answer as you can.

Your Answer:

After a fulsome discussion the Mentor should provide the formal answer. This can be found in the latter part of the resource and two aspects are particular relevant here.

The first are Sample answers for each part, Question 1a and Question 1b.

SAMPLE ANSWERS

a. *Nucleus*

b. Any two of the following are acceptable.

1. *Plant cells have a cell wall and cell membrane while animal cells only have a cell membrane.*
2. *Plant cells have chloroplasts that are green in colour while animal cells lack these organelles.*
3. *Plant cells have starch granules that are produced by the chloroplasts while animal cells do not have these.*
4. *Plant cells have large fluid-filled vacuoles while those in animal cells tend to be smaller and less numerous.*
5. *Plants cells have a more rigid structure than plants.*

Discussion should follow and a comparison with the answers the teachers generated. Also the SOLO coding. In this case, Questions 1a and 1b are multistructural.

The last two parts are discussed next, Item 1c and 1d are both relational levels and maybe quite challenging for all but the very best Grade 7 and even challenging for most students in Grade 10.

c. *Chloroplasts ensure that plants obtain the food or nutrients they need to survive. Chloroplasts contain a green pigment (called chlorophyll) that allows plants to use the sun's energy converting it into chemical energy. Photosynthesis is the name of this process. Glucose is produced during this process along with oxygen. Plants are able to use glucose as a building block to produce other nutrients or compounds they need to survive.*

d. *Plants are called producers because they can manufacture their own nutrients through photosynthesis. Animals cannot do this so rely on consuming other plants and animals to obtain the nutrients needed to survive. This is why animals are called 'consumers'. Animals that eat only plants are called 'herbivores'; those that eat only other animals are known as carnivores; while those animals that ingest both plants and other animals are called 'omnivores'.*

Finally teachers should be asked to consider the Writer's reflection about the Item.

WRITER'S REFLECTION:

The answers provided to the questions in **Item 1** are based upon what is required for students to understand at this point in their learning as determined by the curriculum. However, should similar questions be asked of students in Grades 9-10 or the senior grades of schooling, it would be expected that their conceptual understanding would be deeper. For example, once students learn about the organelles observed through electron microscopy, they become more focused on the 'factory-like' functioning of these organelles as sites for chemical processes that drive the cell and ultimately the survival of multicellular organisms.

The session ends with Final commentary from teachers including

(i) what stood out for them;
(ii) how do they think their students would perform (at what level).
(iii) would they like to try this item with students in different grades and report back at the next meeting about their findings.

HANDS-ON ACTIVITY

Overtime and after teachers have had experience with a number of Activities and Questions, and tried some with their students, you will help your mentees in formulating questions using the SOLO model.

1. As a mentor, provide a learning competency to your mentee(s).
2. Let them prepare questions on the unistructural, multistructural, relational, in particular. (Note: extended abstract level questions are optional).
3. Review the questions they formulated. Provide comments and suggestions on how your mentee(s) can improve the questions they formulated.
4. If you are mentoring two or more teachers, it is a good idea to have a peer review of outputs.
5. Give them time to revise their outputs before the final review of the questions.

Activity 2 Introduction to the Basic SOLO Model

Enclosed is a summary of the Basic SOLO Model. Teachers have access to this in the Teacher's Resource in Science. It is reproduced below. This will help guide your thinking as well as establish baseline information for you and your teacher colleagues. It is worth stressing that there is more to the SOLO model but this is designed to be an entry into SOLO-type thinking, especially as it is related to ideas about learning quality – in particular, a practical classroom based operational thinking related to lower-order and higher-order thinking.

This Introduction, in four Parts, to the basic SOLO Model was written by Professor John Pegg of the SiMERR National Research Centre in Australia. The aim is to situate the reader within the early, and still highly relevant, research and thinking that has been undertaken on SOLO so as to provide a stronger base for the reader in assessing learner responses. This is particularly relevant in the case of explaining lower-order and higher-order thinking.

Part 1 Background to SOLO

The SOLO Model (the SOLO Taxonomy) of John Biggs and Kevin Collis (Biggs & Collis 1982, 1991; Pegg, 2003, 2020) is a cognitive (brain-based) developmental framework that offers a useful tool to explore the quality of a learner response in a specific context. The notion of 'quality' is not unfamiliar in Education discussions, its importance is seldom challenged. However, trying to tie down a meaning for quality and what it means operationally has shown not to be so easy.

At its basis, SOLO is interested in describing the nature of a learner response to a question or stimulus. This information offers insights into what a learner knows, understands and can do, as well as directions along which instruction may most profitably proceed.

When asked the 'quality' of a student's learning, a common response is to mention the number of facts or pieces of relevant information a person knows something about. This information might be further supported by citing scores on a recent examination, or the number of correct items a person has achieved in some test/quiz.

Such descriptions of 'quality', definitely offer a perspective on learning performance – a view that knowledge creation is about acquiring more and more pieces of information. In terms of operationalizing 'quality', this description can result in predictable and routine approaches to instruction involving drill and practice. However, this view can also limit a breadth of practices in teaching involving more demanding higher-order practices such as analysis, explanation, and synthesis, and that may lead to unfortunate long-term consequences for a learner.

Being told that a student obtained a score of 73% on a test tells us very little about the quality of the learning, except that the student probably knows more than someone who achieved 63% on the same test and not as much as someone who scored 83%. However, little can be interpreted if the comparison was with a person who achieved 70-72% OR 74-75%.

Data are clear that tests are often limited in their ability to discriminate meaningful student learning on scores within a few percentage points of one another. The impact of misguided interpretations of learning is even more dramatic when scores hover around the 50% mark. A mark which usually holds an unprecedented and undeserved importance by society.

Also, there are often issues interpreting student scores when students obtain the same score. Do similar scores on a test mean that students have the same questions correct or incorrect? Ideas of equivalence can be misleading. It is possible, for example, that one student earned their marks on the most straightforward questions across the test, while another respondent might be able to achieve correct responses on some quite difficult questions in certain areas and perform poorly in other areas.

It would seem quite likely that a student who is able to respond to some more difficult questions is likely to be able to advance more quickly with support, than a student who is only able to undertake the more basic questions correctly.

Further, and more importantly, numeric descriptions of quality do little to explain:

- what a learner knows or understands;
- in what directions a teacher, or the learner themselves, might move to improve or advance their learning; and, as importantly,
- how might this notion of 'quality' link to how the brain learns.

SOLO offers help in addressing these concerns. The focus of the SOLO categorization is on cognitive processes in addressing an issue or question rather than the end-products alone. SOLO offers a framework that enables explorations and descriptions of the quality of *'how well'* learning has progressed in different contexts. This provides a genuine balance to more typical approaches, mentioned earlier, that describe 'how much' is known.

The application of SOLO to the analysis of learner responses enables insights into learner cognitive development as well as understandings of possible cognitive blockages associated with the pattern of ideas that are impacting on leaner growth. As such, SOLO offers teachers insights into learner thinking and subsequent teaching actions.

Part 2 Overview of SOLO

Over the past 40 plus years, since the late 1970s, SOLO has built a substantial evidence base involving many thousands of research studies resulting in many hundreds of published articles. Now, SOLO has an extensive and growing universal following.

SOLO has emerged out as a consequence of describing learning through the eyes of a learner involving two separate but related activities. This involves:

- the acquisition or development of relevant ideas, facts, skills, concepts, processes and strategies; and
- the use of this acquired information in some form such as to solve problems, apply understanding, or explain or interpret meaning.

This reflects the two main ideas in Part 1 above concerning describing quality as 'how much' and 'how well'.

In terms of this current publication, this dual approach to thinking about 'quality' linked to SOLO, offers a realistic and practical description of what lower-order and higher-order thinking looks like as demonstrated in a learner's response.

In particular, SOLO enables teachers to distinguish between skills, knowledge and content that may be considered as lower-order functioning (or the result of surface learning) and those described as higher-order functioning (or the result of deep learning). SOLO supports teachers with ways to identify the practical meaning of lower-order and higher-order quality, and ways to identify examples in different contexts.

Such practical advice on applying decision skills, to distinguish lower- and higher-order functioning is achieved by describing an operationalized balance between:

(i) the degree of complexity of how responses are structured by the brain; and
(ii) relevant information associated with the content/context.

As lower-order skills and understandings are necessary pre-requisites for higher-order thinking, the ability of teachers to efficiently and effectively separate lower- and higher-order categorizations is a critically important skill. SOLO offers a structure upon which such decisions can be made.

This significant strength of the SOLO model lies in its links with neuroscience and how the brain learns, i.e., the cognitive (brain) processes. These brain-based ideas behind SOLO are linked to:

- information processing capacity, such as, working memory demands;
- the creation of neural pathways/networks through deliberate practice;
- the amount of information able to be retained by the learner in a particular domain; and,
- features specific to learning tasks or activities.

Overall, despite the obvious importance of the notion of 'quality' to education, descriptions of what is meant by quality have not received the attention, or use in practice, it deserves. SOLO offers an alternative to traditional assessment counts of 'how many', by placing SOLO centre stage in learning and teaching. Teachers who learn to apply SOLO routinely in the classroom find that it is relevant and useful to understanding learning situations in all subject areas.

Further, when used correctly, SOLO can help teachers not only apply more *objective* and *systematic* assessment techniques, but it can help clarify developmental learning pathways to inform lesson and syllabus development, as well as strengthen formative-assessment approaches.

There are four main aspects to modern descriptions of SOLO. These are:

- SOLO levels
- the SOLO modes
- SOLO levels within modes
- SOLO cycles.

All four aspects are important for completeness, but initially, it is sufficient for the reader to become familiar with the meaning, use and application of the concepts around **SOLO levels (Section Part 3 below).** This feature is the one most prominent in early general discussions. Also, when information about SOLO is provided, say on the Web, the information provided on **SOLO levels** is usually the sole focus.

Part 3 Introduction to *SOLO Levels: Language and Meaning*

Biggs and Collis (1982) believe the way the brain structures learnt material, 'structural organization' of knowledge, is the difference between well learned from poorly learned material. It is this structural aspect of knowledge in the brain that underpins descriptions of quality. They (Biggs and Collis):

> believe that there are 'natural' stages in the growth of learning any complex material or skill…in certain important aspects these stages are similar to, but not identical with, the developmental stages in thinking described by Piaget and his co-workers. (Biggs & Collis, 1982, p. 15)

SOLO Levels

SOLO Levels are the most well-known aspect of the SOLO model. The SOLO levels describe the increasing sophistication (the increasing quality) of responses in handling certain tasks/questions relevant to a particular activity or domain. The levels are given specific names that every teacher needs to acquire and use accurately and consistently.

In the 1982 version of SOLO there are five levels of response. They represent a developmental continuum beginning from a level that describes an irrelevant or incorrect understanding, through a series of three levels describing how the brain structures understanding to an acceptable degree, to a fifth and final level where a response extends beyond what might typically be expected as an acceptable response.

Unistructural, Multistructural and Relational Levels

In what follows the middle three levels are described first, and the first and last of the five levels are considered second. The three middle levels have the names unistructural, multistructural and relational. The names are almost self-explanatory. Their level descriptions are:

A *unistructural* (U) response is one where the focus is on a single attribute. It might involve writing a single sentence with one main idea, or undertaking one algorithm, or providing one reason or suggestion, or identifying one relevant piece of information from the stimulus, etc. The key to this level is in the name. The prefix 'uni' stands for 'oneness'. So, the 'structure' of the response is a single aspect that is relevant to the question or activity.



Figure 1: Unistructural level

A *multistructural* (M) response is one that includes several relevant independent pieces of information from the stimulus or comprises a number (i.e., more than 1) usually sequential actions, explanations, algorithms, etc. The key to this level is in the name. The prefix 'multi' stands for 'many'. So, the structure of the response contains more than one aspect that is relevant to the question or activity. Further the different aspects are seen to be independent of one another. There is no integration of pieces of information or seeing inter-related aspects.



Figure 2: the Multistructural level

A *relational* (R) response is one that integrates all relevant pieces of information or data from the stimulus. These aspects in the stimulus are now linked to one another resulting in an overall coherence, a pattern, to the data presented and any approach to be undertaken. There is no inconsistency within the known system.



Figure 3: The Relational level

These three levels are often referred to as a SOLO unistructural–multistructural–relational cycle or a SOLO UMR cycle.



The three levels described above offer descriptions of increasing complex structures of thinking by the brain in which higher levels are directly built upon preceding levels, i.e., the mutlistructural response contains the unistructural response, a relational response identifies the relationships among the separate elements of the multistructural response. Taken together, the three levels represent a SOLO UMR cycle.

Prestructural and Extended Abstract levels

Two other SOLO levels can be found in the literature. They are most relevant to and used when people talk about the SOLO Taxonomy based around the 1982 book. The names of the two levels are prestructural and extended abstract.

The prestructural level, as the word indicates, occurs 'pre' or 'before' the structure starts and so it is used to code responses that fail to address a relevant feature. Such a response is described as:

A prestructural level (Pre) of response is one that does not focus on the relevant question or activity. Usually, the answer is quickly given with little thought. The answer is likely to be irrelevant or simply repeat information already provided in the question or activity.



Figure 4: The Prestructural level

The extended abstract level, as the word meaning indicates, occurs after a relational response. So, it is used to identify a response that goes beyond what might typically be expected. In such cases the answer would have a deeper perhaps more abstract feel, hence, the name.

An extended abstract (EA) response is one that goes beyond what was expected at the relational level. In school situations it can involve deduction, ability to close on situations not experienced. Answers can be held open or qualified to allow for logical alternatives.



Figure 5: The Extended Abstract level

The two outer levels, one below and one above the middle three levels, respectively, are named prestructural and extended abstract.

Finally, a useful question is: What are the variables that determine or underpin the level of response given by a learner? There are five.

The Degree of Abstractness: The first level (pre-structural) is personal to the learner and not the topic. The next three levels (unistructural, multistructural and relational) are relevant to the area of focus and share similar characteristics. The last level (extended abstract) is more general and extends beyond the previous levels in an appropriate abstract way.

Number of Organizing Dimensions: The first level does not have an organizing dimension relevant to the activity or question. For the next three levels the organization is based on one dimension, several independent dimensions, and an integration of the independent dimension. The final level moves beyond the previous by adding an overarching general framework encompassing the earlier work.

Consistency: The first level is the most inconsistent. This encompasses the information provided and the response provided. The next two levels provide growing consistency as more elements are used in determining a response. The relational level response is consistent within the internal or provided context of the learner. The extended abstract level response not only is able to work within the internal context but can also consider external principles or other contexts providing a much deeper and often more nuanced response.

Openness of Conclusion: The list of levels demonstrates a graduation of thinking from 'closed' to 'open'. 'Closed' is where learners respond very quickly to an activity or stimulus, sometimes without even understanding the question. As a learner offers increasing levels of response, there is more time and consideration provided, i.e., the response becomes more 'open' so as to enable more room for considered interpretations. This 'openness' is maximized for extended abstract responses.

Sequence of Levels: The levels are developmental with an earlier level being a building block for the next level. A unistructural response is within the related multistructural response. A relational response integrates the elements of the earlier multistructural response. An extended abstract response has within it the relational response but extends it through embedding the response within a broader external environment or through incorporating broader principles or theoretical positions.

Part 4 The SOLO Model and Instruction

The strength of the SOLO model is the linking of the hierarchical nature of cognitive development through the modes (not mentioned in this Summary) and the cyclical nature of learning through the levels.

In terms of SOLO levels, each level provides building blocks for the next higher level. SOLO also provides teachers with a common and shared language that enables them to describe in a meaningful way their observations of student performance. This is particularly important when teachers try to articulate differences between lower-order and higher-order skills and understandings.

Emerging from careful research work of SOLO is the observation that while the lower levels in the SOLO model can be taught in the traditional sense. The shift to developing learner higher-order skills and for them to be able to respond to questions with higher-order responses requires a quality in the thinking of the learner that cannot be guaranteed by explicit teaching alone.

There appears to be certain teaching approaches and strategies that might be better applied when students are identified as responding at one SOLO level than when at another. Knowledge of this pattern can better help teachers develop a rationale for their actions and help inform the nature of their instruction to targeted groups.

Part 5 Final Comment

Overall, it has been clear that for the great majority of teachers, assessment of subjects taught in school are dominated by a focus on content (in the form of facts) and skills (associated with computational techniques), and the ability of learners to reproduce these on demand. This narrow focus can have a sterile effect upon innovations and developments in the Science curriculum and even on what it means for a person to think scientifically.

The issue for teachers is about

(i) interpreting the quality of the learning in terms of 'how well' material is understood (Biggs & Collis, 1982; 1991); and
(ii) selecting the most appropriate strategies, procedures or teaching activities for their students at their SOLO response level.

Higher-order goals of learning, such as judgement formation, solving relevant problems, and on developing understanding, must encompass not only the content, but also the interrelationships between various processes and procedures.

Nevertheless, these more demanding skills and developments must be built on fundamental lower-order knowledge, skills and understandings. Quality education, instruction and learner outcomes, must embrace the full range of abilities as described and categorized through the SOLO model in the topics identified.

Activity 3 LAC Session on Background to HOTS in the Classroom

LAC Objectives: At the end of this 1.5-hour LAC session, teachers would be able to:

a. summarize the PISA 2018 results of Filipino learners;
b. define higher-order thinking skills (HOTS);
c. identify which strand in the PPST promotes HOTS; and
d. appreciate how the assessment items in the teacher's resource can help promote higher-order thinking skills.

Note: This Lac session should only be undertaken after the teachers have used and become familiar with the (relevant) Subject Teacher Resource and have undertaken a number of questions and tried at least one Item or Question set with their class.

BEFORE THE SESSION
✓ Inform teachers about the schedule, topic, and objectives of the session and ask them to read the Executive Summary of https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/PISA-2018-Philippine-National-Report.pdf;
✓ Confirm who will serve as the documenter, preferably on a rotating basis;
✓ Prepare the venue and necessary equipment, such as a laptop and/or projector (if face-to-face);
✓ Ensure that the seating arrangement during the LAC session complies with physical distancing protocols (if face-to-face). Alternatively, an agreed platform can be set up if the session will be conducted online. Make sure that the selected platform is accessible to all LAC members;
✓ If the LAC session is online, make sure to share guidelines for conducting online meetings (e.g., find a quiet place in your home where you can focus, mute your mic when not speaking, etc.). Prepare slides needed for the session.

DURING THE SESSION

1. **Pulse check (10 minutes)**
   - **8 minutes:** Start the LAC session with the following check-in questions: *What is something that worries you about your students as learners? How do you deal with that worry?*
   - **2 minutes:** Check/summarize if there are common worries and common ways of dealing with them.
2. **Introduction of topic (5 minutes)**
   - Ask teachers who among them have read the Executive Summary of *PISA 2018: National Report of the Philippines*. If most of them have read the Executive Summary, ask them to pair up and share with each other how they felt while reading the Executive Summary. If only a few have read it, ask them to pair up and quickly go over the summary together.
3. **Activity (60 minutes)**
   - **5 minutes:** Given what they read, ask the teachers to reflect: *Since the PISA does not assess how well learners remember facts but how they are able to interpret texts, solve mathematics problems, or explain phenomena scientifically using their knowledge and reasoning skills (higher-order thinking skills (HOTS)), how do we define HOTS as teachers? Given our HOTS definition/s, what do we need to do as teachers to help our learners develop their HOTS?*
   - After teachers reflect on their own views, show these definitions from the *PPST Resource Package Module 3* (on the board, manila paper or on a slide):
     - CREATIVE THINKING SKILLS: These are thinking skills that involve exploring ideas, generating possibilities and looking for many right answers rather than just one.
     - CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS: These are high level thinking skills such as analysis, evaluation, interpretation, or synthesis of information and application of creative thought to form an argument, solve a problem, or reach a conclusion.
     - HIGHER-ORDER THINKING SKILLS: These are complex thinking processes which include analysis, evaluation, synthesis, reflection and creativity.
   - **25 minutes:** Ask the teachers to discuss the following in groups of 4 to 5: *Are the definitions of creative-thinking skills, critical-thinking skills, and HOTS from the PPST Resource Package similar to their our own definitions? What are the similarities and differences? Given the HOTS definition/s, what do we need to do as teachers to help our learners develop their HOTS?*

- **10 minutes:** Ask a representative from each group to quickly share the highlights of the group discussion. Limit each sharing to a few minutes.
- **5 minutes:** Summarize the group sharing. Connect comments to PPST Strand 1.5 (*Strategies for developing critical and creative thinking, as well as other higher-order thinking skills*) and on what teachers need to do to develop learners' HOTS. Emphasize that teachers need to apply a range of strategies for developing HOTS not just to improve PISA scores but also to ensure that learners are able to "build a reliable compass and the navigation tools to find their own way through an increasingly volatile, uncertain and ambiguous world" (Schleicher, 2019). By developing learners' HOTS, we help learners think for themselves and collaborate with others meaningfully, in work and citizenship.
- **15 minutes:** Overall summary of the discussion and check if the objectives of the session have been met. Relate the discussion to the teacher resource that the teachers have been using.
- Close the session by thanking the teachers for their contributions and active participation. Say that you hope to have that same level of enthusiasm in the next LAC session.

AFTER THE SESSION

- ✓ Remind teachers to read Introductory pages of the *Teacher's Resource* (from the cover to *What teachers can expect from this Resource Material*) a few days before the second LAC session.
- ✓ Remind teachers of the schedule (and modality) of the next LAC session and give them the necessary details should the session be online

REFLECTION LOG

Ask your mentee to reflect on his/her experiences in adapting the SOLO. Use the following as a guide:

1. **Describe your understanding of the SOLO model? What stands out for you at this stage?**

2. **Describe your experiences in integrating SOLO in your teaching practice? Discuss any positive experiences.**

3. **What challenges have you encountered in integrating SOLO in your practice?**

4. **How did you address those challenges?**

REFERENCES

Biggs J, Collis K (1982) Evaluating the Quality of Learning: the SOLO Taxonomy. Academic Press, New York.

Biggs J, Collis K (1991) Multimodal learning and the quality of intelligent behaviour. In Rowe H (ed) Intelligence, Reconceptualization and Measurement, Laurence Erlbaum Assoc, New Jersey, p 57–76.

Department of Education, PISA 2018 National Report of the Philippines.

DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2017. "National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers." Department of Education

DepEd Order No. 024 s. 2020. "National Adoption and Implementation of the Philippine Professional Standards for School Heads." Department of Education

Government of the Philippines, Department of Education. 2016. K to 12 Curriculum Guide Science (Grade 3 to Grade 10). Pasig City.

Pegg J (2003) Assessment in Mathematics: a developmental approach. In: Royer JM (ed) Advances in Cognition and Instruction. Information Age Publishing Inc, New York, p 227–259

Pegg J. (2020) Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) Model. In: Lerman S. (eds) Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education. Springer, Cham

Schleicher, Andreas. (2019) PISA 2018: Insights and Interpretations. OECD Publishing.

DepED
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

in collaboration with

RCTQ
Philippine National
Research Center for Teacher Quality
Australian Aid
une University of New England
SiMERR