

Formal Teacher Observations: Student Teaching Video

Patrick Oriani

Grand Canyon University EAD-530

2/11/23

### **Format of Evaluation Tool**

My organization has built its structure and has undergone specific adaptations to ensure that it is compatible with the educational system we use. The framework is divided into four distinct parts: the preparation and planning stage, the teaching stage, the classroom environment, and the professional duties stage. Within each area, several different indications may be used to determine whether or not a particular instructor lives up to the requirements for that subject. Evaluators working with educators go through pre-conference, observation, and post-conference phases as part of the model's process. When this methodology was first put into place around eight years ago, administrators had never previously gotten any official instruction on how to be efficient and consistent in their assessments.

This kind of evaluation is founded on research. It makes evaluation more transparent for educators, boosting opportunities for collaborative problem-solving and two-way communication with individuals responsible for evaluations. At my school, the faculty members choose two key areas to focus on each year, and at the pre-conference, they work together to devise strategies for how those areas might be improved. Throughout the process, instructors will be requested to produce artifacts that support their strengths and must ensure that these artifacts demonstrate efficacy across all areas. As a result of the dialogue being open to all participants from the very start to the very end, educators have a better understanding of their ratings and how they can use feedback to improve in areas where they struggle.

### **Explanation of Video**

I watched a film of Dr. Mostofo's math class in which he emphasized the significance of students' comprehension of core topics. In another, Mr. Perez demonstrated drill and repetition

with his elementary school kids by repeating the same ideas aloud. The video with Mr. Perez was more engaging, despite being just two minutes long and focusing on a specific strategy. I chose to evaluate the other video starring Dr. Mostofo since it was longer, included more strategies to analyze, and afforded me more possibilities to provide constructive critique. As he guides pupils through a sequence of arithmetic problems, Dr. Mostofo adopts various techniques to retain their attention and engagement. Pupils work alone at their desks as he projects lessons, checks for understanding, and randomly calls on students. I saw minimal time between his questions to the class and their responses. As for the dryness, it could be simply mathematics speaking. The classroom had a friendly atmosphere while he was there, and he did not seem to create any problems.

Although the teaching techniques were excellent, the class seemed to be staged since only ten students were present (hence there were several empty chairs at the tables), and the students all appeared to be aware of the camera. When a student is called to the board, a microphone will be in his or her pocket. Compared to the earlier video with Mr. Perez, this made the instructional video seem less authentic. Even though there were no serious flaws and the lecturer was knowledgeable about the subject matter, the session could have jumped out more uniquely and successfully.

### **Score Explanation**

I would give this teacher a very high score in the teaching part of the test because I witnessed strong evidence of outstanding communication with students, the use of questions and discussion tactics, and the involvement of students in the learning process. However, to deliver an appropriate evaluation and score, I would either need to see artifacts or have more time than the eight minutes that were provided to me to see each of the components that make up the

instruction domain. There was no indication of adaptability and responsiveness in either the instructional tactics (3e) or the evaluation (3d). I would have enough praises to give, and in addition, I would be able to make some valuable recommendations for refining the instruction in a few crucial areas.

### **Positive Feedback with Evidence**

The lecturer was knowledgeable about the subject matter and used several techniques to keep his pupils involved and eager to learn. The lecturer provided clear, concise directions, used visual aids throughout the session and included prompts to maintain students' active engagement. Students were given activities that required them to work alone, exchange their results with a partner, present their work on the board, and work together to solve problems. Since he knew his students' names, Dr. Mostofo kept his pupils engaged by randomly calling on them throughout the class.

### **Constructive Feedback with Evidence**

Dr. Mostofo's approach had many helpful ideas but also had room for development. To begin, there was the wait time and students' answers; however, it is possible to gauge the effectiveness of the teacher's assessments by calling on individual students or having the whole class raise a hand if they have questions; it is also difficult to tell how well these methods work. There was not much time to recover from the check for comprehension, and asking children to admit they did not comprehend in front of their peers may be intimidating. Students might participate in class independently and anonymously using digital tools like Socrative or Peardeck. Both resources provide instantaneous feedback to instructors based on their students' performance. Students may quickly and anonymously report whether or not they comprehend the topic by responding to true or false questions, agreeing or disagreeing, and providing brief

responses. The instructor may evaluate the student's level of comprehension before moving on to new material, and she can show that she is adaptable and responsive by making any necessary changes to the lesson plan. This can also increase the amount of built-in differentiation in classroom education.