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INTRODUCTION

Science teacher educators face a significant challenge: preparing the next generation of teachers to enact reform-based science with an increasingly diverse student body in an era of accountability. Culturally responsive teaching, which uses “the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them” (Gay, 2010, p. 31), has been associated with several positive academic outcomes for culturally, racially, and linguistically diverse students, including improved science achievement, attitudes, and identities (Lee & Buxton, 2010). Given the chronic science achievement gap between students of color and their white peers, culturally responsive teaching seems an ideal tactic for mitigating this disparity. However, many prospective and beginning science teachers have had relatively little prior experience with ethnically and linguistically diverse people (George, 2013). As a result, though unfortunate, it is not surprising that many prospective science teachers exit preparation programs without fundamentally altering their beliefs about the abilities of culturally diverse students or improving their confidence in teaching them.

There is, however, a growing body of research that provides guidance on how to effectively prepare culturally responsive science teachers, be it through having teachers critically reflect on their own practices (Mensah, 2013a), actively participating as learners in culturally relevant science exemplars (Lee, 2004), or being supported through the curriculum design process (Brown & Crippen, 2016a). Despite this knowledge, similar to Hernandez, Morales, and Shroyer (2013), our team “struggled to find a unifying approach in teacher education to guide the preparation and assessment of culturally responsive science teaching” (p. 806). Examples from the literature are disproportionately situated in professional development programs offering more instructional flexibility and longer durations (e.g., Brown & Crippen, 2017; Johnson, 2011; Zozakiewicz & Rodriguez, 2007). Traditional teacher preparation programs neither emphasize nor require multicultural science education coursework (Ferguson, 2008). Moreover, most existing multicultural education courses deal only with pragmatic skills, not developing core elements in teachers such as sociopolitical consciousness and abilities to foster students’ cultural competence (Gorski, 2009).

In response to concerns of being underprepared to effectively teach science to culturally diverse students and a paucity of multicultural science education courses to draw from, our team designed and implemented a theoretically- and contextually-grounded induction course for beginning secondary science teachers (within 1-5 years of professional experience). This innovative course contained essential experiences for culturally responsive science teacher development not previously found together in the literature and sequenced them in accordance with theory on how teachers learn. In this paper, we report on our course design and implementation experiences, as well as science teacher outcomes. We now detail the larger context for the course and its enrolled teachers.

CONTEXT

Program

PREPSci (Promoting Reflective and Equitable Practice through Science Induction) is a series of three, 3-credit graduate courses completed by secondary (grades 6-12) science teachers in their first years of teaching following completion of a 12-month post-baccalaureate teacher licensure program. The post-baccalaureate nature of the program ensures that candidates have a bachelor’s degree in the content area in which licensure is sought. Admission requirements include content coursework equivalent to an undergraduate major, as well as a required science research experience. The entire post-baccalaureate program includes two components: the 12-month initial licensure component and the completion of a M.Ed. degree (i.e., the PREPSci course series). Students enter the 12-month initial licensure program as a cohort, completing coursework including a three-course science methods sequence with extensive, supervised practicum and student teaching experiences in addition to coursework in the history and philosophy of science, technology integration, and cultural context of teaching and learning.
schools. To complete the M.Ed. degree, teachers enroll in the PREPScI series post-licensure to earn the additional required 9-credits.

The PREPScI course series starts with a yearlong, online induction program, the Teacher Induction Network (TIN). According to Ellis, McFadden, Anwar, and Roehrig (2015), induction programs “support beginning teachers over time through professional development, mentoring, and collaboration” (p. 405). Through our design-based research approach, we have continually modified TIN to best support teachers’ professional growth and develop reflective, reform-based practices. TIN incorporates the following primary components: individual reflective journals, small group Vexation-Venture activities (Johnston & Settlage, 2008), Professional Development Inquiries (Danielson, 2007), and video clubs. These components arise from an effort to provide teachers multiple affordances for developing their reflective and reform-based practices in an online learning environment (McFadden, Ellis, Anwar, & Roehrig, 2014; Roehrig, Donna, Billington, & Hoelscher, 2015). Notably, missing from TIN was a focus on equitable and culturally responsive science teaching. Thus, we added two courses with this important focus—the first is the four-week, face-to-face summer course that is the focus of this paper, followed by a 3-credit blended action research course that facilitates beginning secondary science teachers’ investigations of their developing culturally responsive practices.

The four-week equity-focused PREPScI induction course took place during the Summer 2016 semester at a research-intensive university located in a large metropolitan area in the Midwestern United States. The first two authors engaged in course design, with the first author leading its design and the second author assisting the process. As a former secondary science teacher and a teacher educator with 9 years of experience developing equitable science teachers, the first author was the instructor of record for the course. The second author was the course teaching assistant. As a former secondary science teacher, she provided a perspective that grounded theory in the realities of classroom teachers. They met biweekly for three months prior to course implementation to discuss literature on culturally responsive science teachers, consider specific experiences for the course that were literature-based but also sensitive to the needs of the teachers in the PREPScI course series, and to identify essential classroom artifacts teachers would need for the course. Course design ideas were recorded in an ongoing Design Decisions Report (DDR) kept by the first author. Figure 1 is a screen capture of questions and goals guiding our initial meetings.

### Teachers and Their Professional Settings

Eighteen secondary science teachers participated in this course, all of who were licensed by the state and had been teaching full-time between 1-5 years at the time of enrollment (see Table 1). As undergraduates, all of the teachers majored in a science or engineering discipline, including Biology (50%), Physics (26%), Chemistry (8%), Biomedical Engineering (8%), and Mechanical Engineering (8%). Given their strong content backgrounds, teachers were qualified to teach in multiple science subject areas. Although their schools were located across multiple contexts, most taught in urban environments where they served students whose racial and linguistic backgrounds frequently differed from their own.

### COURSE DESIGN PROCESS

#### Theoretical Grounding

Course experiences were founded on the following conjectures about the knowledge and practices of culturally responsive science teachers:
• Culturally responsive science teachers have asset-based views of students from culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse backgrounds (Villegas & Lucas, 2002).

• Culturally responsive science teachers understand the influence of culture on teaching and learning (Howard, 2010; Nasir, Rosebery, Warren, & Lee, 2009).

• Culturally responsive science teachers affirm students’ and families’ funds of knowledge in instruction (Gay, 2010; González, Moll & Amanti, 2005).

• Culturally responsive science teachers use instruction to advance sociopolitical consciousness in students (Furman & Calabrese Barton, 2006; Mensah, 2011, 2013b).

As indicated by the first conjecture, the course contained an overarching theme of developing affirming attitudes in teachers toward culturally and linguistically diverse students (Gay & Kirkland, 2003; Villegas & Lucas, 2002), as Brown (2014) has found that science teachers who successfully enact culturally responsive instruction may still hold deficit views of their students’ families and/or communities.

To promote asset-based attitudes toward culturally-based ways of communicating, interacting, and thinking about science, we knew from existing research that it would be important to first help teachers understand how cultural backgrounds influence student learning (Howard, 2010). Self-reflection and the development of critical consciousness regarding race, culture, and language are also advocated as activities for science teachers to regularly engage in (Gay & Kirkland, 2003). However, science methods courses typically lack opportunities for self-examination of this nature (Ferguson, 2008). Thus, building in opportunities for teachers to be critically reflexive was key when designing the course.

From our own research (Brown & Crippen, 2016b) and research from other science educators (Laughter & Adams, 2012; Patchen & Cox-Petersen, 2008), we expected that our science teachers might struggle with enacting culturally responsive science instruction beyond promoting caring classroom environments and be disinclined to include sociopolitical connections in their instruction. In his survey of multicultural education courses across U.S. higher education institutions, Gorski (2009) found that 70% did not address such fundamental aspects of culturally responsive teaching. Thus, these were additional areas targeted during course design. We planned a variety of activities, including time to read and discuss theoretical foundations of core culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) topics and to experience and critique sociopolitically-tied science lessons.

Science teachers often report having little cultural knowledge about their students (George, 2013). Common techniques for learning about students’ communities include home visits (Johnson, 2011) and service learning projects (Calabrese Barton, 2000). However, in-service science teachers have reported feeling uncomfortable with such practices, and found them to be intrusive to families and inconsistent with their other professional demands (Brown, 2014). To provide relevant cultural and community knowledge while addressing teachers’ concerns, we worked with the university library specialist to compile Group-Level Repositories for the predominant ethnic, cultural, and racial communities that teachers would likely teach in their settings. These Group-Level Repositories are a unique approach to improving cultural knowledge. Each Repository contained written and audiovisual (AV) resources about a specific ethnic, cultural, or racial group that teachers were educating but confessed to knowing little about. For instance, the metropolitan areas of our state are densely populated with individuals from Hmong and East African origins. Hmong people are immigrants to the U.S. from Southeast Asia, many of who fled their homeland after the war between Vietnam and the U.S.

At times, the Repository also contained class-wide resources not tied to a particular ethnic group but were germane to the week's topic. For example, during Week 1, science teachers watched Chimimanda Adichie's TED talk, *The Danger of a Single Story*. All Group-Level Repository sources were vetted beforehand by the first author and the university library specialist to ensure they portrayed asset-based views and, when possible, were created by members of the particular group they were about. Figure 2 is an example Group-Level Repository article read by science teachers who chose to focus on Hmong populations. Figure 3 depicts a page from the website *Becoming Minnesotan* containing oral history audio files shared by recent Somali immigrants.

Lastly, our team's previous research indicated that science teachers are more likely to enact rich and appropriate culturally responsive instruction when they have had opportunities to examine their own classroom- and student-level data (Brown & Crippen, 2016a). Structured reflection on their practice and the systematic study of student learning enables teachers to tailor instruction directly to their students’ needs and strengths, a core aspect of culturally responsive pedagogy. We incorporated a series of protocols — the *Growing Awareness Inventory* (GAIN; Brown & Crippen, 2016b) — to facilitate teachers’ examination of context-appropriateness for specific culturally responsive connections.

**Contextual Grounding**

While the literature provided theoretical grounding for specific course experiences and their suggested sequence, our team also wanted to ensure that the course was context-appropriate. Because a large percentage of teachers who take the course are typically enrolled in the PREPScI course series, we had certain expectations about them and their settings prior to course implementation. This included their prior knowledge. The third and fourth authors have both previously served as instructors for the yearlong online induction course and, thus had intimate knowledge about what science teachers were likely to know and do as a result of the online course.

To contextually ground the course for beginning secondary science teachers’ needs, we also performed a field-based assessment with a select group (n=9) of enrolled teachers the entire academic year before the course was taught. These teachers were participants in our larger, grant-funded project examining the development of reflective and equitable science teachers that all authors were a part of. During this time, the first and second authors visited the classrooms of each teacher two or three times, conducting observations...
and post-lesson debrief interviews. These observations gave us a sense of reform-based and equitable science practices being implemented, as well as practices that teachers struggled with or did not use. They also allowed us to gather student demographic information, which was used to compile the Group-Level Repositories. In the debrief interviews, we asked teachers to comment on the aspects of their lessons that they were most pleased with and those that they would change, if any. Additionally, we asked them to share their thoughts about culturally relevant instruction and where, if at all, they felt such instruction was present in the observed lesson. The first and second author discussed these contextualized findings in our biweekly course design meetings.

This information provided valuable insights around which course experiences were later designed. Primarily, these included the culturally relevant examples we provided, the specific practices we modeled, opportunities for us to highlight culturally responsive practices that teachers were already doing well, and material for the construction of the Group-Level Repositories. For example, teachers' self-assessments and classroom observations indicated that they felt most comfortable holding high expectations of their students and providing respectful classroom spaces, but made neither family nor sociopolitical connections a regular part of their science instruction. As a result, both were made explicit during our course. The first author compiled these responsive design elements in her ongoing Design Decisions Report (DDR) to keep track of all possible connections. Below, we share two excerpts from the DDR. The first highlights our emphasis on science and engineering practices—as opposed to specific science content—when providing culturally responsive examples, and the second demonstrates how we explicitly drew upon teachers' practices when introducing culturally relevant leverage points:

...the lessons will likely be heavy on science and engineering practices, but light on the specific content of a discipline. This is because we want to make it accessible to everyone and we want them to think through the content area connections and extensions, just like we want them to think through and look for student experience-based connections and extensions based on their students' artifacts. The course needs to have time built in to do both...

...we can provide everyday situations that can be applied to CRP as they learn. For example, for group work and students constructing products together, I can build off my notes from [teacher's] 4/20/16 observation (heat vs temperature) as a way to move from "telling information" [to students] to information—generating on students' parts...

Additionally, several teachers involve their kids in solving word problems (in particular the physical sciences - look at [teacher's] classroom and all the equations permanently listed on the board: \( F_g = mg, P_Eg = mgh, F_t = \Delta mv \), etc.). [We can] show how this can be done in more group- and individually-accountable ways that also allows teachers to have consistent check-ins from groups at each point (ask them to describe how often they have kids solve problems, what they as teachers tend to do during that time, what the content of kids' questions are during that time, what they'd like to improve, etc.)

In addition to its theoretical foundations, this contextual grounding allowed our team to further ensure that the science teachers would be engaged in responsive, authentic activities during the induction course, an important element of facilitating learning (Putnam & Borko, 2000).

THE COURSE: CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE SCIENCE TEACHING

Conjecture-Driven Course Experiences

We sequenced specific activities in accordance with a situated cognition perspective on how teachers learn. As “fundamental orientations” for culturally responsive teaching (Villegas & Lucas, 2002), teachers’ sociocultural awareness and affirming attitudes toward culturally diverse students were first targeted. We then built in opportunities to evaluate culturally responsive science lesson examples from there. We used the Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol (CRIOP, Powell & Rightmyer, 2011) to facilitate teachers’ critique of the example lessons, while also asking them to comment on appropriateness for their specific contexts. The CRIOP is a validated observation protocol that operationalizes seven aspects of culturally responsive instruction: Classroom Relationships; Family Collaboration; Assessment; Curriculum/Planned Experiences; Instruction/ Pedagogy; Discourse/Instructional Conversation; and Sociopolitical Consciousness (Powell, Cantrell, Malo-Juvera, & Correll, 2016). The lesson critique approach is consistent with recommendations for preparing culturally responsive science teachers (Ferguson, 2008; Hernandez et al., 2013). Because of the comprehensive nature of the CRIOP, when teachers evaluated lessons using it they also gained awareness that culturally responsive science teaching is more than explicit curriculum changes.

The first three weeks of the course centered on a specific topic each week (see Table 2). Each week’s topic was explored using the following format: Day 1 - readings, discussions, and personal connections to the week’s topic; Day 2 - experience and critique culturally responsive pedagogy in science (CRP Science) exemplars; Day 3 - classroom-based analysis for context appropriateness. The first and second authors created this structure specifically because it allowed the teachers to first grapple with content according to their own experiences before seeing what it might look like...
when applied to a science classroom. We also felt it was of utmost importance that teachers engaged in active learning experiences around the weekly themes when they experienced exemplars, rather than just read about them or listen to a lecture.

Because we wanted to ensure that teachers had opportunities to adapt any relevant materials to their contexts, the first and second author structured Day 3 so that it involved teachers in first analyzing their practices through video-recorded lessons taught during the school year and then examining their students’ artifacts. Teachers spent the remaining class time working in teams as they learned about their students’ ethnic and cultural backgrounds in the Group-Level Repositories. We asked them to process this information as a team and think through how their instruction could be modified based on specific student needs. The final week of the course focused solely on curriculum design and teachers’ incorporation of CRP Science into their curricula. In this section, we detail main activities according to their respective weeks in the course. These activities are denoted by an asterisk.

**Week 1: The Influence of Culture on Learning**

Before teachers started our course, the first author inventoried their initial ideas about two things: (a) their own success in science and (b) the science success of culturally, racially, and linguistically diverse students. Based on the literature and our own previous experiences, we expected a range of ideas to surface. Knowing these initial perspectives allowed us to target subsequent learning experiences, as it is often difficult to get teachers to explicitly profess deficit-based thinking about students of color. When comparing the ways they speak about themselves compared to “underrepresented students,” however, this disparity becomes more evident.

To gather this information, teachers were required to complete an activity, *Success in Science*, before the first day of class. Two versions of this assignment were provided. Both versions contained identical tasks, with the exception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>READINGS/DISCUSSIONS/PERSONAL CONNECTIONS TO TOPIC</th>
<th>EXPERIENCE &amp; CRITIQUE EXEMPLARS</th>
<th>CLASSROOM BASED-ANALYSIS FOR CONTEXT-APPROPRIATENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAY 1</td>
<td>DAY 2</td>
<td>DAY 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1: Culture and Learning, Developing Affirming Views (Conjecture 1)</td>
<td>Card Sort Activity *Success in Science Activity Culturally Responsive Teaching Continuum</td>
<td>*Nature of Science Activity *Personal Identity/Culture Mosaic</td>
<td>*Student Identity Profile analysis Growing Awareness Inventory (GAIn) 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2: Funds of Knowledge (Conjecture 3)</td>
<td>*Finding CRP in STEM Activity Reading Reflections Discuss readings on Funds of Knowledge</td>
<td>*Multiculturalism and Culturally Relevant Pedagogy interactive lesson with guest speaker Dr. Felicia Mensah</td>
<td>Student-Video Analysis through GAIn 2 *Group-Level Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3: Critical Consciousness (Conjecture 4)</td>
<td>*Privilege Walk activity Reading Reflections *Space Traders discussion</td>
<td>Cell Cycle and Genetics of Cancer *Cancer Risks and Environmental Justice activity</td>
<td>*Analyze Student - Interview Audio Recordings through GAIn 3 Group-Level Repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4: Curriculum Writing (Conjecture 2)</td>
<td>Curriculum Design *CRP Science Points to Ponder guide CRP Science Unit Template Reading Reflections</td>
<td>Card Sort Activity Curriculum Design *CRP Science Points to Ponder guide CRP Science Unit Template</td>
<td>Curriculum Design *CRP Science Points to Ponder guide CRP Science Unit Template Final Reflections and Next Steps...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2.** Course activities according to daily schedule. *course activities detailed in narrative.
that one half of the class was required to comment on their own experiences (the “My Success in Science” version), while the other half was tasked with commenting on others’ experiences (the “Others’ Success in Science” version). The assignment asked them to: (a) identify factors contributing to either “my” science success or the science success of “underrepresented students/students of color” and describe their choices; (b) construct a pie chart depicting the strength of influence of each factor; and, (c) pose recommendations for equitable science based on their answers to (a) and (b). Figure 4 presents directions for the “Others’ Success in Science” version.

On the first day of class, the first and second author provided teachers with direct quotes and pie charts from their completed assignments, organized by either My or Others’ success in science. We asked them to work in groups to analyze the data (i.e., their quotes and charts) and make claims about how they viewed their own science success and the success of culturally diverse students. This experience set the tone for how teachers were expected to participate in class: critically reflective and using direct evidence to make claims, be it about students, themselves, or science content.

Once initial ideas were surfaced, we wanted science teachers to understand that culture impacts what people learn and how they learn it (Nasir et al., 2009). Thus, we also devoted time in this first week to building their understanding that science as it is commonly taught has its own specific culture. These defining cultural features are known as the nature of science (NOS) (NRC, 2012), which includes specific ways of interacting with the world (e.g., posing questions about natural phenomena that can be directly tested, obtaining empirical evidence that can be quantified and described) and determining “legitimate” or “valid” knowledge in science (information that is substantiated by direct evidence, claims that are reasoned through this evidence). The Nature of Science activity required groups of teachers to select and read through two lessons from a preselected bank of lesson plans on the “History of Science” created by Dr. Robert A. Hatch at the University of Florida. These lessons were selected because they made explicit several key features of the Nature of Science. As they read, teachers answered a series of questions:

- How is knowledge gained and when is knowledge considered accurate/valid in this lesson?
- What actions/activities are students expected to engage in during this lesson?
- What thought processes are students encouraged to use and what types of thinking are valued in this lesson?
- How are students expected to communicate and talk about the knowledge they gathered?

We posed these particular questions because they targeted observable elements of “culture,” including the shared knowledge, practices, and communication of a community. Groups were then asked to define the Nature of Science using their responses to questions. A large group share-out and discussion followed and allowed teachers time for processing and reflecting after the activity.

We also took this time to help teachers acknowledge that their previous experiences and identities as science learners come through in their own physical classroom environments. In addition to inventorying their classroom settings, we had each teacher construct their own Personal Identity/Cultural Mosaic, using cutouts from popular magazines (see Figure 5). The purpose of this activity was to help teachers recognize their own culturally-based identities. After a brief data analysis exercise where teachers used their mosaics as data sources (e.g., we posed questions such as “How many mosaics contained religious connections?” and “What was the most frequent identity facet displayed in the mosaics?”) and communicated results, they discussed how their classroom environments can communicate certain messages about who is welcome and what is valued, intentionally or implicitly.

We then introduced tenets of cultural difference theory (Gay, 2010), which states that students whose home cultures and ways of communicating and interacting are different...
from those valued by science (i.e., NOS) will likely face challenges when experiencing traditional science teaching and learning. One way to lessen this difficulty is by affirming students’ identities in the classroom (Lee & Buxton, 2010). On Day 3, we asked teachers to examine two classroom-based artifacts: (a) Identity Profiles completed by their students just prior to the course (from National School Reform Faculty Paseo Protocol)—and (b) video recordings of their classroom teaching. Using these artifacts, teachers were asked to determine the degree to which (a) their own identities and (b) their students’ identities were present in the recording, if at all. This led to a discussion about possible ways to cultivate more inclusive, respectful learning environments and also introduced teachers to the idea that the study of their instruction can be a useful tool for understanding equitable science instruction.

Week 2: Funds of Knowledge in the Science Classroom

Culturally responsive pedagogy advocates a learning environment that is community-based, affirms diversity, and uses students’ funds of knowledge in instruction (i.e., community, home, and family skills and knowledge; González et al., 2005) to ease differences between home culture and the typical science classroom culture. However, science teachers struggle with constructing culturally relevant experiences for their students. While the reasons for this struggle vary, it is often simply due to a lack of sufficient cultural knowledge about their students (George, 2013). Thus, Week 2 activities focused on including funds of knowledge in science instruction while also providing actual funds of knowledge-based resources from which teachers could draw.

Working in small groups, teachers began the week with structured readings discussions. These were selected by the first author to highlight the importance of eliciting student and family knowledge, as well as multiple perspectives on what counts as intelligence and “legitimate knowledge” to diverse communities. The teachers responded to specific questions about their readings, such as:

- In “Who are the Bright Children?” Sternberg (2004) discusses the intelligence of others as being judged through an individual’s implicit definition for intelligence. In what ways have you experienced an implicit definition for intelligence being used to judge the intelligence of others and, reflecting on those experiences, how would you analyze them after reading Sternberg? How would you define intelligence?
- Should all teaching be “a daily search for the child’s point of view” (Paley, 1986, p. 123)? What might be accomplished from this? What might be forfeited?
- Thinking about the many issues that urban school teachers face today and any challenges you face in your own classroom, what helpful information did you find in Upadhyay (2006) about collecting information on students’ funds of knowledge and creating a classroom that integrates teacher and student lived experiences into science learning?

FIGURE 5. Personal Identity/Cultural Mosaics created by two secondary science teachers enrolled in the course.
The discussion gave teachers a chance to process the readings together and speculate on how they might be applied to their own contexts. Afterward, the second author engaged them in an innovative investigation with science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) connections. This activity allowed teachers to experience an engaging content-focused investigation with plenty of opportunities for incorporating students’ funds of knowledge. In this activity, Finding CRP in STEM, teacher teams were first presented with a scenario—the local National Guard branch must respond to flood conditions and rescue any affected citizens in the most efficient and effective way. Each team was challenged to construct a watercraft prototype and calculate the maximum occupancy it could hold when scaled-up. Teams first created and labeled a diagram of their prototype. They then constructed it using available materials and tested it in a simulation container. Finally, they calculated mass of the watercraft and the volume and mass held by it, all of which were presented in a force diagram illustrating the watercraft’s maximum capacity. After teachers participated as students would during the activity, teacher teams were asked to consider how, if at all, an engaging STEM lesson could be modified to integrate their students’ and communities’ funds of knowledge. To do this, the teams were given the original lesson plan and asked to draw from their readings, Student Identity Profiles, and their own experiences when making suggestions. They then modified the lesson plan together and wrote a summary stating the changes made and their justification for these changes.

In the second day of this week, we collaborated with Dr. Felicia Mensah—Professor of Science Education at Teachers College, Columbia University, and leading scholar on preparing culturally relevant science teachers—to engage the teachers in an interactive lesson on multicultural and culturally relevant science education. In this lesson, teachers were asked to describe characteristics of culturally relevant science teaching, provided with examples of CRP in science-specific contexts that had funds of knowledge ties, and asked to evaluate one of those examples according to Banks’s (2015) typologies of multicultural curricular reform, paying particular attention to any funds of knowledge connections. Banks’s typologies were used for this activity because they categorize different levels at which multicultural content can be integrated into instruction. In the lowest typology levels, multicultural content is simply “added” to instruction and leads to superficial integration (e.g., celebrating Cinco de Mayo). Higher typology levels indicate more meaningful multicultural content integration and opportunities for social action. By examining funds of knowledge connections this

**FIGURE 6.** Modifications suggested by teachers for an engaging STEM lesson to make it more culturally responsive.
way, teachers were able to consider the different ways in which meaningful integration can occur. They were then asked to reflect upon the ways in which funds of knowledge can be effectively integrated into science classrooms.

During this week, teachers were also introduced to the Group-Level Repositories. The goals of the Repositories were to help teachers (a) identify common practices, events, community issues, cultural norms, and ways of communicating for the ethnic group that they chose to focus on and (b) connect these findings to possible topics for their Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in Science (CRP Science) curriculum unit. We began by asking them to select an ethnic or racial group that they wanted to learn more about. They then formed teams according to those choices. In teams, teachers were asked to read the sources and look for possible topics for their CRP Science units. They kept their ongoing ideas in a shared Google Document that the first and second authors also had access to.

**Week 3: Using Science to Raise Critical Consciousness in Students**

Because it aims to empower learners who are traditionally disenfranchised in the U.S. educational system, at its core, CRP is emancipatory (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2010). To achieve this aim, culturally responsive teachers invite students to identify oppressive practices, examine and challenge them when studying their content area, and construct action plans to remedy oppressive practices when possible. However, these critical consciousness-raising experiences are consistently absent from K-12 classrooms, particularly in science (Ferguson, 2008; Morrison, Robbins, & Rose, 2008).

To allow teachers to experience the need for critical consciousness in a very personal way, the first author began Week 3 with a Privilege Walk activity, which she adapted from the Diversity Education Task Force by selecting fewer statements than originally listed based on their relevance to our particular context. The remaining parts were the same as the original Privilege Walk activity. This activity was selected because it has been advocated by Villegas and Lucas (2002) as an important tool to use when preparing culturally responsive teachers. This is because the Privilege Walk helps teachers identify and begin to understand the myriad privileges they possess by virtue of their racial and socioeconomic backgrounds. Developing awareness of their position in the world is fundamental to being able to understand larger structural systems and how they operate to privilege some and oppress others, intentionally or not.

We used this activity to segue into our discussion of Space Traders, a story written by Derrick Bell (1992), who is considered to be the founder of critical race theory. The story presents a proposal made by the Space Traders—an alien community from a distant star—to the people of the United States at a time when the environmental and financial future of the U.S. is dire: “In exchange for all the African Americans in the United States that will be taken back to our home star,” the Space Traders proposed, “we will ensure the health, financial, and environmental prosperity of those left remaining in the country” (p. 160). The story then presents perspectives from multiple individuals on this offer, some of whom viewed it as a travesty and others who welcomed it as a much-needed opportunity. The first author chose Space Traders to expose and help teachers wrestle with institutionalized racism. She

![FIGURE 7. Screen capture of a teacher’s thinking while interacting with the story, Space Traders, by Derrick Bell.](image-url)
structured this experience in two ways: first with having teachers record their individual thoughts as they read the story, which counted as part of their reading reflection for the week; and, second, through a structured group-wide discussion that emanated from their reading reflections. Teachers were asked to come to the discussion prepared with a question to ask of the whole group, and these became the foundation for our conversation. Figure 7 displays one teacher’s thoughts as he read *Space Traders*.

In this excerpt, the teacher displays a range of emotions and thoughts as he interacted with and tried to make sense of Bell’s story. Initially, he was excited by the prospect of alien contact, which quickly changed once he understood the purpose for their visit. He kept an open mind at first, hoping that there might be some altruistic motive behind the aliens’ proposition. But, his rejection of their idea was soon cemented, at which point he positioned himself squarely counter to this. His reflection also demonstrates critical reflexivity, particularly when discussing the cabinet conversation and his own thoughts about racial diversity in the U.S.

After experiencing critical consciousness tenets from a personal standpoint on Day 1, on the second day the first author engaged teachers in an activity on *Cancer Risks and Environmental Justice* (Brown, 2012). This activity began with a lesson on the cell cycle and the genetics of cancer. Teachers then worked in teams as they identified Environmental Protection Agency-designated Superfund locations throughout the state, examined the presence of carcinogens at these sites, and then compared U.S. Census data on the income and race/ethnicity demographics of these areas to non-Superfund site locations in the same county. Each team reported their findings to the class. An evidence-based discussion of whether or not a correlation existed between Superfund site locations and income and/or race/ethnicity was held. The activity concluded with teacher teams evaluating the *Cancer Risks and Environmental Justice* lesson for its cultural responsiveness according to the CRIOP. Through this activity, teachers were able to envision how sensitive topics can be embedded into rigorous, inquiry-based science learning experiences.

On Day 3, teacher teams continued working on their Group-Level Repositories. Teachers also worked individually to examine more student artifacts, this time using audio recordings of student interviews to identify additional possible culturally responsive connections for their CRP Science curriculum units. To assist teachers with this task, the third in a series of GAIn protocols was used (Brown & Crippen, 2016b). GAIn is a set of structured observation and reflection protocols that guide science teachers in critically examining their classroom environment and identifying ways to incorporate students’ experiences into science instruction. In the third protocol, teachers are asked to “hold a conversation with your focus group students to learn about aspects of their life outside of school [and] incorporate information from your conversation into upcoming science lessons.” To guide the conversation, teachers were given a set of questions and prompts to ask students that was adapted from Villegas and Lucas (2002), Carlone, Haun-Frank, and Webb (2011), and Upadhyay (2009) (see Figure 8).

**FIGURE 8.** Focus group interview questions posed to students by their science teachers before the course.
in Science (CRP Science) curriculum units. Teachers were required to include at least four science lessons in their units, contain all materials (e.g., handouts, lecture notes) necessary to prepare the lessons, and demonstrate explicit and meaningful culturally responsive connections for the students and communities they serve. Teachers could choose to make these connections from a funds-of-knowledge approach, a sociopolitical-consciousness approach, or a combination of both.

Two structures were provided to support teachers during the curriculum design process: a CRP Science Unit Points to Ponder guide created by the first author and a unit planning template, adapted from Wiggins and McTighe’s (2005) Understanding by Design model. These structures focused teachers’ attention to both Western and culturally responsive science content and practices. Whereas teachers used preexisting units, state science standards, and textbooks to address Western science components of their curriculum units, to incorporate contextually-appropriate and culturally relevant science elements, they applied findings from GAIn protocols (i.e., classroom-based analyses) and Group-Level Repositories.

We were available to teachers at all times during this week, consulting with them as needed. Moreover, teachers were encouraged to collaborate with one another, in either Group-Level Repository teams or science discipline-specific teams. To set the tone for collaboration, the week began with two brainstorming sessions. In the first session—in which teachers were grouped by content area—teachers generated possible culturally responsive topics and strategies based on specific, related science standards. In the second session, teachers met with their Group-Level Repository teams to brainstorm relevant curriculum connection for their specific ethnic and cultural groups.

At the end of each curriculum-writing day, teachers uploaded their working unit planning templates to our course management system (e.g., Moodle). They also were required to write a daily progress report, which concluded with an articulation of their design plans for the following day. This allowed us to monitor teachers’ ongoing progress and help them chart out next steps. Once teachers completed their CRP Science units they were asked to explicate how GAIn and Group-Level Repository findings were applied to the lessons. Responses were recorded at the end of their CRP Science units, with the intent that it would be immediately accessible to the teachers as they prepared to enact the unit.
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Because the class was conducted in a face-to-face format, all teachers were expected to fully participate in and, at times, facilitate our class discussions. The assigned weekly readings and Reading Reflections, on which many of the discussions centered, were due before class on Day 1 (Tuesdays). We expected that in-class and online contributions be professional, productive, and obvious. To concretize these expectations, we stated that class and online participation included, but was not limited to:

- Attending class, coming prepared to discuss the assigned readings.
- Regularly participating in in-class activities, such as the Classroom-Based Analyses (i.e., GAIn protocol-based assignments) that you will do on Day 3 (Thursdays) and the Group-Level Repository information that you will construct with your team.
- Maintaining your Curriculum Design Ideas log, including think-aloud comments.
- Regularly participating in your Group-Level Repository teams, as well as completing assigned online activities such as the Reading Reflections.

Reading Reflections

We also expected teachers to meaningfully engage with course readings. To guide this engagement, the first author purposefully created Reading Reflections questions and prompts. The questions/prompts were not intended to have a correct answer; rather, she expected that teachers answer them in a way that demonstrated personal and professional reflection, as these questions/prompts were often the foundation for subsequent in-class discussions. The Reading Reflection questions were available on our course Moodle site and were due before class time on Day 1 (Tuesdays) of each week, unless otherwise noted by the first author.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in Science (CRP Science) Curriculum Unit

As their capstone project, teachers designed an instructional unit with at least four lessons that reflected their students’ backgrounds and were also responsive to their needs (based on findings from Classroom-Based Analyses, Day 3 of Weeks 1 - 3). Additionally, the science unit was required to align with state science standards. To assist with the unit design process, teachers were provided ample in-class design sessions, a lesson-planning template (selected by the second author), and a CRP Science Unit Points to Ponder guide (created by the first author). The final curriculum unit was due one week after the final day of class.

**SUCCESES AND CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED**

Throughout the course, we continually provided feedback on teachers’ assignments and participated in their small group discussions. These sources have given us insight into the successes and frustrations experienced by science teachers during the induction course. While we celebrated the successes, as instructional designers, we also honed in on the source of teachers’ frustrations in considering possible areas for course revision. In this section, we share teacher successes according to guiding course conjectures, as well as design challenges.

**Teacher Successes**

**Conjecture 1: Affirming views of students.**

The teachers’ note-taking and reflections after interacting with the Group-Level Repositories indicated that they developed better-informed perspectives of the cultural and religious practices, community events, and local issues of the ethnic groups on which they focused. For example, one teacher’s notes included: “Hmong 2.0 [name of article] refers to the first generation to be born in America...[they] feel an obligation to take care of their parents and give back...”
to their communities” (Hmong/Southeast Asian Immigrant Group-Level Repository) and another wrote, “The issue facing Latinos...isn't unemployment...it is finding jobs that pay enough to get out of poverty” (Latino/a Group-Level Repository). Moreover, a content analysis of Group-Level Repositories indicated that these groups were generally written about using affirming, rather than deficit-based language. One teacher stated, “the schools weren't meeting the needs of the Latino kids - it's not that they can't learn, it's that they haven't been given the right opportunities for learning” (Latino/a Group-Level Repository).

At the start of class, several teachers held deficit-based assumptions about culturally diverse students, which we noticed in their Others’ Success in Science assignment. However, this had shifted noticeably to more affirming attitudes by the end of the course. For example, one Earth science teacher originally stated, “Sometimes students' individual talents and abilities contribute greatly to achievement. If they really struggle with science they may lack the intrinsic motivation to learn science” (Others' Success in Science, week 1), but near the end of the course, when reflecting on students’ backgrounds, the teacher stated:

As I thought of the ELL students that I've had in the last few years and the over-simplification of the lesson I may have been doing...it is good to be reminded of the fact that ELL students need (higher level) opportunities for discourse with their classmates to truly engage with the materials and develop their English proficiency (GAIn Protocol 3, week 3).

The small-group discussions during the Card Sort Activity also indicated the teachers had developed affirming views of their own students over the course of the four weeks. During this activity’s small-group discussion in Week 4, one Physical Science teacher stated:

Funds of knowledge really made me think about those students that I have traditionally viewed maybe as disengaged or maybe not wanting to learn has helped me understand what they bring to the table and how I can meet them where they are at (Card Sort Activity, week 4).

Conjecture 2: Culture in teaching and learning.

Completion of GAIn protocols indicated teachers were highly reflective of their teaching and the presence or absence of CRP in their classroom practices prior to the course. For example, after watching a video recording of their classroom, one Physical Science teacher wrote, “I honestly did not see myself searching for any students' points of view” (GAIn Protocol 2, week 2).

In-class discussions and teacher reflections suggested that teachers recognized the importance of adding culturally responsive practices into their courses and analysis of their curricula indicate this was a high priority. One Physics teacher reflected that:

…when Western culture places value on science content knowledge separately from the cultural context that a student brings, there is a disconnect. If a student can't see himself or herself in the topic or how it relates to them, they are not motivated to learn it. In addition to that struggle, the culture of the home and the student's background plays a large role in whether or not that student even values success in the Western sense of the word (Reading Reflection, week 2).

In addition to the teachers’ recognition that a student’s culture influences learning, teachers also identified science as having its own culture that can influence students’ learning in the classroom—particularly that of their diverse students. During the Nature of Science Activity, one group of teachers identified the culture of science in the lesson they were analyzing as being:

Similar to the way [science] has been traditionally taught. Students are expected to bring their knowledge from outside the class, collect data, and then analyze their data to further their understanding of the scientific knowledge and make connections between the evidence and their lives (Nature of Science Activity, week 1).

In the discussion following the activity, it was evident the teachers recognized this is not always a natural or easy process for students. One Chemistry teacher stated:

Students who are able to develop a meaningful context for absorbing new information based on their personal experiences are able to improve their critical thinking and problem solving skills...but, science curriculum is set in middle class white knowledge and culture, which students from lower socioeconomic and immigrant classes do not possess (Reading Reflection, week 1).

Conjecture 3: Legitimizing Funds of Knowledge.

The Card Sort Activity, Reading Reflections and GAIn protocols demonstrated teachers’ abilities and desires to add funds of knowledge to existing curriculum materials. The teachers acknowledged strengths of their existing practices (i.e., contextualizing content in real-life situations), but also found it important to extend beyond what they had previously done in their classrooms. For example, one Biology teacher indicated that:

I feel that I am good at giving students an opportunity to access their prior knowledge about subjects and discuss what they have seen or experienced in their own lives, but I could take that one step further and incorporate what I hear in mini-discussions with my students to improve their learning.

Yet another Biology teacher reflected, “I learned that it really is super important to try and make that connection and relationship with each student, but also to make a connection with their families” (Reading Reflection, week 1).
Not only did the teachers seem to desire to extend their practices in ways that legitimized and made use of the students’ funds of knowledge effectively, they also stretched themselves to come up with strategies to make this happen. One Physics teacher suggested “utilizing resources within my school (teachers who are from the community and experienced science teachers) that might have some valuable insight” (GAIn Protocol 3 - week 3). A second teacher suggested that [In the past] I have found myself looking for a ‘correct’ answer and limited student discussion on the topic if it did not pertain to this correct answer. Upon looking at video of myself teaching I realized that I had stopped good critical thinking and scientific questions because I was looking for a correct answer that I had come up with. After reflecting I realized that my students had thought of new ways to answer the questions that I had posed to them based on their own experiences (GAIn, 2 week 2).

Conjecture 4: Sociopolitical Consciousness.
In addition to adding funds of knowledge, teachers felt compelled to extend their existing practices in such a way that they empowered students and raised critical awareness of social justice issues. For example, one Biology teacher reflected:

I need to be aware of the text that’s found in society and the bias that comes along with it. Asking and encouraging students to think about the “why” behind rules and norms in schools and society helps engage students and gives them questioning and reasoning skills (Reading Reflection, week 3).

Yet another Biology teacher reflected, “This [conversation] is important to have because it’s hard for the dominant group to relate to a situation from a viewpoint other than their own” (Reading Reflection, week 3). It seems evident that the teachers felt compelled to alter their practices for reasons deeper than just that they “should.”

In looking at how the teachers thought about their curricular modification, it was evident they were committed to improving incorporation of culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP) in their new science units. A Physical science teacher suggested that, “Sociopolitical consciousness is one of the major areas I want to work on in this unit and I feel that the unit’s topic offers up many cultural misconceptions [about chemical abuse] for my class…to learn about” (Reading Reflection, week 4). Finally, a Life Science teacher reflected:

I took many of the Group-Level Repository findings into consideration as I was creating my unit. Although I have worked with Latino/a families extensively throughout my time in education, and even taught in a dual immersion school, I have never taken these findings into consideration in my teaching…according to a couple of [Latino/a Group-Level Repository] articles, maintaining, learning about, and celebrating culture can actually boost Latino/a achievement in school. I also noticed that the Group-Level [Repository] findings confirmed what I have heard from and know about my own students. Family is extremely important and comes first in the Latino/a community. Families are very close and often times either live together or close to each other. Another large theme is jobs…Although working hard is extremely important the articles also suggested that Latino/as are the largest group of undocumented workers in [this state] and many live in fear of deportation. Because of this fear there are many Latino/a families without health care or who do not receive services they need or could benefit from. To connect these Group-Level findings to my unit I will bring family experiences and culture into my lessons in the form of home interviews” (CRP Science unit).

Through ongoing conversations held with the teachers and evidence provided in their work, it was apparent that by the end of the course the teachers had developed more affirming views of their culturally diverse students, come to more fully understand the influence that culture has on teaching and learning, and recognized the importance of incorporating funds of knowledge and sociopolitical consciousness into their science curricula.

Design Challenges
Despite the successes we have shared, the first and second authors also encountered multiple challenges while implementing the course. We detail these here, accompanied by descriptions of teacher frustrations that led to identifying the specific design challenges.

Challenge 1: Teacher identity.
For many teachers, the topics and conversations in the course were new and emotionally overwhelming. At times, this led to conflict, such as when they discussed Derrick Bell’s (1992) Space Traders story. In such instances, we allowed multiple perspectives to be voiced but had difficulty deciding when to intervene, especially if conflicting views were shared in a respectful manner. We experienced both success and failure at properly facilitating those moments so that they allowed for difficult, yet productive conversations. Additionally, though we built in collaborative brainstorming opportunities around curriculum design on multiple occasions, teachers largely worked in isolation while constructing their curriculum units. Though they stayed in close proximity to one another, most teachers wore headphones, worked silently, and generally only asked for input from the course instructors while writing. Given that curriculum design is extremely complex (Forbes & Davis, 2010), we had hoped that teachers would draw upon each other’s strengths throughout the entire process.
Challenge 2: Striking a balance between transforming ideologies and providing pragmatic assistance.

As “fundamental orientations” (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) and “ideological anchors” (Gay, 2010) for culturally responsive teaching, science teachers must have asset-based attitudes toward their students of color and ample sociocultural awareness. This knowledge transcends content area teaching; thus, teacher education experiences focused on strengthening these core areas do not always have explicit content ties. For example, the Privilege Walk and The Space Traders story can be used with teachers from all content areas. As instructional designers, we firmly believe that our science teachers must engage in such experiences. However, this created a tension at times, as teachers wanted more “example lessons” of culturally responsive science education for their content areas.

We attempted to create a balance between ideology transformation (i.e., developing teachers’ affirming attitudes and sociocultural awareness) and pragmatic assistance (i.e., providing exemplar lessons to teachers before they had adequate foundational knowledge was irresponsible and possibly counterproductive to cultivating cultural responsiveness.

Challenge 3: Logistics of the teaching context.

Another challenge suggested by the teachers is not unique to the development of CRP in the classrooms, but one that impacts all classroom pedagogy. This challenge is that of the ratio of teacher to students in high school classrooms, and the difficulty that comes in learning to know all students well. One Chemistry teacher suggested:

My concern is that you can’t learn that much from all your students. [In one of the readings] they showed how important it is to go to the family’s home and meet the family and see the home life to learn more about the student, but how could you possibly do that with all your students? I try to do the best I can within my own classroom to get to know the students and make a relationship, but even then that is hard. I had a class of 39 students. It is very hard to do all that a teacher is expected to do and more with that kind of class size (Reading Reflection, week 2).

Yet another (Physics) teacher stated:

As science teachers, we are expected to provide students with equal and equitable opportunities to not only learn science but to...obtain high levels of science literacy...which is something that I currently don’t feel I’m able to do, and that frustrates me. How are we supposed to do that for every single student from every single background? I am trying to approach this challenge with an open mind but it is difficult since I do not have the opportunity to experience...all cultures (Reading Reflection, week 3).

Challenge 4: Racial homogeneity of teachers.

Lastly, the most vexing issue does not have an easy solution. As indicated in Table 1 our teacher population was racially homogeneous, which at times appeared to hinder the surfacing and challenging of multiple perspectives. Aside from the first author, only one teacher of color actively challenged the dominant perspectives being shared in small- and whole-group discussions, which she reported as being emotionally exhausting. Related to the first challenge, we also struggled with how to elicit varied perspectives when those that were shared often closely resembled one another. This was something identified and acknowledged by teachers themselves. One Physics teacher indicated that

…it takes time and a great deal of effort to create curriculum that is relevant to students’ lives and to their Funds of Knowledge, not to mention, teachers or curriculum designers need to be very familiar with students’ common experiences in order for the connections made to be authentic and actually support their learning. Many teachers today are not ethnically diverse, even though they are teaching a diverse population, and they perhaps do not receive sufficient information about various groups’ Funds of Knowledge, making it difficult for teachers to come up with examples, explanations, lessons, etc. that would be relevant and helpful to their students (Reading Reflection, week 2).

These challenges highlight the difficulty of teaching a course focused on equitable science teaching—a concept that can be personal, emotional, and challenging for some teachers. However, they also provide insight into ways the course can be modified for improvement in future implementation.

CONCLUSION & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Science teacher educators are faced with a grand challenge: to prepare equitable and reform-based science teachers. In response to concerns of science teachers feeling ill-equipped to educate culturally and linguistically diverse students (Lee & Buxton, 2010), we designed an induction course that blended theoretical foundations of culturally responsive pedagogy with practical applications in science-specific contexts. Applying principles of situated cognition (Brown et al., 1989; Putnam & Borko, 2000) to course experiences, we engaged teachers in collaborative and authentic activities such as critically reflecting on their classroom practices and student artifacts; problematizing science as it is traditionally taught in U.S. schools; experiencing, critiquing, and modifying CRP Science exemplars; and studying community-level funds of knowledge accounts. We were encouraged by course artifacts indicating that beginning secondary science teachers developed affirming views of culturally diverse students, demonstrated understanding of the influence of culture learning, and designed curricula that integrated students’ funds of knowledge and sociopolitical issues with
rigorous science learning experiences. We experienced design challenges as well, leaving us to recommend the following course revisions.

**Better Scaffolding of Difficult Conversations**

As previously mentioned, at times we felt we could have better facilitated difficult conversations. Though we structured conversations through purposeful prompts, eliciting multiple perspectives, and involving teachers in crafting discussion questions, we sometimes struggled with adequately facilitating these discussions. To remedy this weakness, we suggest applying the dialogic conversation element of Rodriguez's (1998) sociotransformative constructivism model to better scaffold critical, productive discussions in future course iterations. According to Rodriguez, dialogic conversation:

> moves beyond merely understanding what is being said to understanding the reasons why the speaker chooses to say what he or she says in a particular context. The dialogic conversation allows the listener/speaker to ask..."Who is doing the talking?" In other words, whose voice (insights, values, and beliefs) are being (re)presented by the speaker/listener? (p. 599)

Structured dialogic conversations can provide "opportunities for open and intellectually honest communication" (p. 603) among teachers as they discuss social justice-related topics in the course.

**Additional Curriculum Design Supports and Structures to Foster Collaboration**

Though great care was taken to provide science teachers with curriculum development templates and helpful guides as they crafted their lessons, we did not ensure that the design process was collaborative. Given that some teachers chose similar science topics and focused on the same ethnic/cultural groups, we see the lack of collaboration as a missed opportunity. To teach in culturally relevant ways, as Mensah (2011) asserts, it was essential that the elementary pre-service teachers with whom she worked had "the support of diverse others (i.e., their pre-service teacher peers, course instructor, and cooperating teachers at the school) to exchange ideas and to engage in conversations that focus on student diversity, student learning, and pedagogical and content connections" (p. 307). When teachers plan in isolation, they may risk making superficial culturally responsive connections. In an investigation of elementary pre-service teachers' identification of and planning for funds of knowledge in science lessons for their field experiences, McLaughlin and Calabrese Barton (2013) noted that integration most often occurred as an engaging hook to begin the lesson, rather than through substantive connections.

Not all studies involving teachers as designers of culturally responsive science materials report similar findings, however. During a four-week summer course focused on multicultural science curriculum development, Suriel and Atwater (2012) required beginning secondary science teachers to develop curriculum units and provided them with an evaluation rubric aligned to Banks' (2015) typologies for guidance. The authors contended that having direct experience as a "marginalized cultural other" was crucial in developing teachers capable of highly culturally integrated curricula" (p. 1288), not collaboration. While we were pleased with the CRP Science curriculum units designed by our teachers, we aim to better support teachers in this process in the future. Though inconclusive, research suggests that collaboration during curriculum design may enhance the quality of the final products produced by science teachers.

We also have unresolved challenges. We are still wrestling with better balancing experiences focused on transforming core aspects of cultural responsiveness in our teachers (e.g., attitudes toward students of color) while satisfying their need for concrete science-specific instructional examples. Given that the course spans four weeks, there is limited time to tackle these monumental goals. While teachers in the PREPScI course series can continue inquiring about culturally responsive science education during the fall action research course, not all teachers enroll in it. Moreover, though optional, CRP-focused action research projects are not required in that course. Instead, teachers may inquire about any element of their classroom that is inequitable and important to them. Solutions to date have eluded us to some extent, despite a wealth of previous experiences among our design team and a growing literature base to draw from. Accordingly, we are of the opinion that this is an important challenge deserving explicit attention.

By sharing our experiences designing and implementing this four-week induction course for beginning secondary science teachers, we aimed to provide direction for teacher educators and others interested in advancing culturally responsive science education. In detailing successes and challenges, as well as suggestions for course revision, it is our hope that science teacher educators and professional developers might envision how such activities might be adapted for their specific contexts. Continued conversations between researchers, teacher educators, and others involved in advancing culturally responsive science teaching are crucial to the academic success of culturally and linguistically diverse student populations.
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