

ANALYSIS OF LESSON

EDUC 540-902: STUDENT TEACHING SEMINAR

LISA M. BARBI

DREXEL UNIVERSITY

In observing my cooperating teacher implement a mathematics lesson plan, I found that she was distinguished in her ability to meet all components within the domains of Danielson's Framework by setting clearly defined goals (domain 3) to be executed through careful planning and a variety of strategies and resources. The most profound evidence that substantiated this distinguished status was the receptiveness of the students and the students' willingness to meet the goals set forth by the teacher at the beginning of the lesson. I recognized this receptiveness in all of the students, even within a student with autism who struggled greatly with the ability to maintain focus to participate in the lesson at hand. I mention this student with autism because the lesson needed to be carefully planned and flexibly implemented, while incorporating manipulatives and electronic devices in order to gain his receptivity to participate in the learning process and engage the other students in the classroom. In creating this dynamic lesson plan, the cooperating teacher met with me to discuss her plan for implementation and discuss my thoughts on how we could engage the students in an active and meaningful manner. The cooperating teacher used various strategies to implement instruction including small group assignments, interactive games including a variety of manipulatives, and the use of electronic devices, which elevated the learning process and made it an interactive experience. What was most impressive to me was how the cooperating teacher encouraged me to incorporate my ideas for engaging the students through use of Play-Doh and Legos. She found these manipulatives a great motivator to all of the students, especially the student with autism and these specific manipulatives enabled the students to extend knowledge from the lesson in a kinesthetic manner while creating products demonstrating each student's assimilation of the content.

The cooperating teacher takes a refreshing approach to the lesson in that she uses a constructivist philosophy to provide instruction to her students while including me in the

planning and implementation process. The constructivist approach to instruction is based on the idea that people gain knowledge and understanding from interactions between experiences and thoughts. Such an approach encourages extension of knowledge by the students and an application of prior understanding to know concepts. A constructivist classroom seems to be the best environment to meet the components within domain 2 of Danielson's Framework. Through well-planned lessons that are teacher guided and student driven in an organized, positive, and engaging environment, the cooperating teacher demonstrated how to create an effective learning environment that fosters safety and accountability among the students. In this classroom environment, not only are the students empowered to take ownership of various aspects of the instructional process, the teacher is empowered to grow and development as set forth in Danielson's four domains (<http://www.iobservation.com/danielson-collection/> retrieved October 5, 2014).

As I conclude this analysis, I recognize that according to the first domain of Danielson's Framework, a distinguished teacher's plans and practice reflect understanding of prerequisite relationships among topics and concepts and provide a link to necessary cognitive structures needed by students to ensure understanding (Danielson, 2011, p. 5). Through the observation process, it was evident that my cooperating teacher spent a great deal of time reviewing the content and researching supplemental materials that would enhance the students' learning experience. She seamlessly met the other three domains of Danielson's Framework, especially creating a respectful rapport with students in a safe and engaging learning environment. Although the cooperating teacher, in my opinion, was distinguished in most of the components of Danielson's four domains, I did find some areas in which I would make slight changes. For instance, I think time could have been maximized in the beginning of the lesson by having the

manipulatives readily available to the student with autism alleviating the need to focus additional attention on him while the other students had to wait for further instruction. Once we set forth guidelines for the student with autism to use one of the manipulatives, a textured bright green sphere, as a focus ball to hold and squeeze during instruction, he was able to maintain focus on the lesson for longer periods of time. Secondly, I would have stopped more frequently throughout formal instruction and performed informal audits of student understanding by a show of hands. By doing so, the teacher can identify instructional needs that must be met with differentiation and recognize what students require remediation. Lastly, I would use the Smartboard and white board more actively displaying the problems that the students were viewing in their workbooks and encouraging student volunteers to solve problems on the board. Doing so enables the teacher and the students to actively model problems and diagnose issues within the process while the students incorporate movement into the lesson.

References

C. Danielson. (2013). The Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument. Retrieved on October 5, 2014 from www.danielsongroup.org.

Learning Science International and ASCD. (2014). The Danielson Collection. Retrieved on October 5, 2014 from <http://www.iobservation.com/danielson-collection/>.