

A critical evaluation and the identification of next teaching and learning steps focusing on a case study of an individual learner or a group of learners, based on an observed critical incident.

Tripp observes that “critical incidents are produced by the way we look at a situation” (1993, p8). It is through an in-depth analysis of a seemingly mundane classroom occurrence that this case study seeks to explore the wider context in which the learners have experienced the incident. Consequently, it will be discussed what educators can do to continue enhancing our learners educational experience in light of the critical incident. The process of evaluating the incident and identifying next teaching and learning steps will be instrumental in developing the standard for professional learning as set out in the Professional Standards for Teaching and Leadership (Welsh Government, 2019b).

Firstly, School X will be contextualised, offering insight into the learning environment and classroom culture in which the incident occurred. The methodology will then outline why this case study has used a written recording of non-participant observation over other styles of observation, acknowledging both its strengths and limitations. The critical incident will then be unpacked alongside Donaldson’s Four Purposes (2015) in order to understand the incidents relevance within in the Welsh Governments educational agenda. The literature review will explore key themes arising from the critical incident, namely classroom talk, Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (1978, p86) and peer collaboration. Finally, through professional reflection of the incident and the key areas signposted above, this case study suggests what next steps could be taken to further support the learner’s educational journey.

In order to comply with BERA’s Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2018), the school where the observations took place will be referred to as School X throughout the case study. This ensures the confidentiality and anonymity of institutions and participants discussed. School X is a modern three form entry school with over seven hundred pupils. It is one of the largest schools in Wales and is situated in the capital city, Cardiff. It has been selected by the Welsh Government as a Curriculum Pioneer School to “provide practical support and expertise for all schools to develop the pedagogical and leadership skills crucial to successful implementation of the new

curriculum” (Welsh Government, 2017). School X has been categorised as a green school since 2015 when national categorisation began. The Welsh Government uses the categorisation system to “to identify the schools that need the most help, support and guidance to improve” (2019a). As a green school, school X is entitled to up to four days support per annum (Welsh Government, 2019a, p4).

The policies and attitudes in School X underpin the classroom culture and learning environment, i.e. Learning Heroes, such as Collaborative Catrin and Resilient Rhys. These support meta-cognitive thinking among the learners. School X’s website states that, “metacognition encourages children to take a greater responsibility for their learning, with teachers supporting and encouraging them” (2019). This will be important later when looking closely at peer collaboration and the role of the teacher within this. The school presents as a ‘thinking school’, which is visible through classroom observation and wall displays throughout the school. School X’s 2015 Estyn report read that “many pupils across the school achieve good standards in their thinking skills [and] they use strategies, such as thinking maps, effectively” (p5). School X also adopts a ‘3b4me’ policy which promotes resilience and problem-solving skills which relate to the case study’s attention to peer collaboration. It also steps away from the traditional idea of the student being dependent on the teacher. Although there are many policies developing within School X, it is their learning heroes, thinking maps and 3b4me policy that will help scaffold our understanding of the critical incident in relation to classroom talk, Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (1978) and peer collaboration.

The incident was recorded through written notes via non-participant observation. In total, four classroom observations were carried out. Details of these observations, along with the corresponding assisted reflective conclusions, can be found in the appendices. For the purpose of this case study, an incident from observation notes 4, entitled Chromebook, will be used. The corresponding assisted reflective conclusions model has been used to initiate a written reflective practice.

Audio or visual recording could have made the dialogic analysis of the incident more accurate. However, it could also in turn have made the learners more aware of the observation. Cohen et al highlight the potential for the Hawthorne Effect in which “the presence of the researcher alters the situation” (2007, p.189). Its effect on the participants behaviour can disturb the validity and

reliability of research. Ideally, the dialogic exchange could have been recorded without my physical presence as this could have contributed to the Hawthorne Effect affecting the incident. However, in order to record sufficient written notes my presence was required.

Although Nisbet and Watt warn against the potential for journalism within case studies, both Alderman and Nisbett and Watt credit case studies strength in its realism (cited in Cohen et al, 2007, p254). This assignment seeks to avoid sensationalism through using Tripp's (1993) understanding of an incident as commonplace, made critical only through analysis. The incident was observed not with the intention to seek out ways to analyse classroom talk, Vygotsky's ZPD (zone of proximal development, 1978) and peer collaboration, rather the incident is "indicative of underlying trends, motives and structures" (Tripp, 1993, p25). It could be argued that contemporary dialogue surrounding classroom talk and peer collaboration are almost spotlighted within the context of a pioneer school, reflecting Yin's argument that school context is invaluable to understanding the critical incident (as cited in Cohen, 2007, p254).

The critical incident can be seen touching on all four of Donaldson's purposes (2015, p4). It is perhaps most closely linked to the students acting as ambitious, capable learners and enterprising, creative contributors. In its simplest form the incident was one learner asking a peer, who was working on a different task, for help with a problem on a 'Chromebook'. However, it is key to consider that for this to happen without rebuke, the classroom environment had to be one where classroom talk and peer collaboration was facilitated. This poses broader questions about how teachers can encourage quality peer collaboration. This will be addressed directly in the literature review. As set out under the headline ambitious, capable learners in Successful Futures (Donaldson, 2015), it is key that learners are ready to learn throughout their lives. In this incident, the desire to work through the problem indicates a readiness to learn from the student that was stuck on the 'Chromebook'. It also provides an opportunity for the learner helping their peer as they are connecting and applying their knowledge and skills to find a solution. This underpins the behaviour of enterprising and creative contributors.

The classroom culture supports a '3b4me' policy where peer collaboration plays a crucial role in problem solving. As seen in the incident, the learners had the confidence to seek appropriate peer support, before going to a teacher. This ties in closely to learners being healthy, confident individuals as both students in the incident have used skills and knowledge to manage everyday

life as independently as they can. Hodgkinson and Mercer acknowledge that “many school curricula reflect the importance placed on children understanding the application of innovation, technology and their inter-connectedness in our global society” (2008, pxi). As technology continues to play a greater part in learners’ lives within and beyond the classroom, it could be argued that solving a technical problem has become part of managing everyday life. Looking at the incident more broadly, it is feasible to argue that it is evidence of the learner becoming an ethical, informed citizen. As technology is increasingly relevant in the professional workplace the learner is taking the necessary steps to become a citizen of Wales and the world through their ability to communicate verbally as practiced with their peer and through using technology for personal or professional use.

The literature review will look at three main questions; how can classroom talk inform our understanding of peer collaboration; how do teachers and peers feature in a learners ZPD and what can teachers do to facilitate productive classroom talk and peer collaboration?

Hodgkinson and Mercer have acknowledged that classroom talk, much like play, is not a by-product of children learning, but in fact an “educational tool for guiding development of understanding and jointly for constructing knowledge” (2008, pxi). Mercer et al investigate effective classroom talk using Barnes initial work ‘From Communication to Curriculum’ (1976) as a source of inspiration. It is Barnes investigation of exploratory talk, rather than presentational talk, this will be most beneficial when considering the critical incident. Whereas presentational talk focuses on content and manner, exploratory talk as proposed by Barnes allows learners “to try out new ideas” (cited in Mercer et al, 2008, p5). This may take form in “hesitant, broken...and incomplete” (Barnes cited in Mercer et al, 2008, p5) speech as it is indicative of the learners working and remoulding their own thoughts and ideas, often in relation to their peers’ contribution. Consequently, it is important to consider the role of the peer in exploratory talk.

Davidson and Georgsen (2010) reflect on whether peers can fulfil the role of the more knowledgeable other within Vygotsky’s concept of the zone of proximal development (1978). Davidson argues that from Vygotsky’s “understanding it is unlikely that this more capable peer would be a child, let alone a child at the same age as the learner in question” (2010, p6). In the incident, the collaboration between two pupils did result in solving a learner’s problem. If the peer who helped is considered as the more knowledgeable other in this incident, it is interesting to

reflect on whether they acted as a pseudo-teacher using direct instructions or whether the learners truly engaged in Barnes understanding of exploratory talk to find a solution (cited in Mercer et al, 2008, p5).

This case study does not offer the space in which to investigate this fully. However, analysing the learners' dialogue could offer clarification. For example, if the more knowledgeable peer used presentational language and was the only speaker, it would suggest they were acting more as a pseudo-teacher mimicking direct teaching methods to explain instructional steps to their peer. On the other hand, if both learners engaged in a symbiotic dialogue that was formed and remoulded during the exchange then it is more likely to fit into Barnes understanding of exploratory talk (cited in Mercer et al, 2008, p5). It is worth acknowledging that the more knowledgeable other does not necessarily need to be understood as a fixed person or learning tool within the classroom. Throughout the curriculum and extra-curricular activities, learners could find opportunities to be both receive or provider the more knowledgeable other.

Vygotsky defines the Zone of proximal development as shown below:

It is the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers (1978, p86).

However, Fernandez et al (2015) make an important contribution to the discussion surrounding the role of peers in the ZPD and challenge Vygotsky's theory in suggesting that the need for a more knowledgeable other is not essential for learning. When looking at group peer collaboration Fernandez et al propose it "is better understood as a symmetrical version of the concept of the Intermetal Development Zone, in which language is used in a dynamic and dialogical way to maintain and develop a shared context" (2015, p69). Classroom culture and learning environment are key tools in understanding how learners may come to be able to support each other. Fernandez et al explain it may not be intentional, but peers can support each other's learning "by using effective communicative strategies for solving a problem together" (2015, p69). It could be argued that this is exactly what took place during the incident as School X provides learners with thinking and metacognitive strategies. Although it is not possible from a single observation to definitively classify the peers as symmetrical or asymmetrical, Fernandez et al's (2015) research suggests that a more knowledgeable other is not necessary for learning when learners are

equipped with the communication skills to collaborate in order to solve problems. For this reason, learners developing thinking skills and peer and self-assessment through assessment for learning will feature as key strategies in the evaluation and next steps.

Mercer has addressed the conflicting ideas surrounding peer classroom talk acknowledging that “research has shown that simply putting children into groups and leaving them to solve problems by themselves is not enough to ensure that they will use cooperation and dialogue to good effect” (2008, p69). However, equally valid is the research supporting Barnes assertion that peer talk “can make an important contribution to learning” (cited in Mercer et al, 2008, p70). It is possible to suggest that Vygotsky’s scepticism in the ability of a child to provide the zone of proximal development and Barnes belief in the merit of exploratory talk between peers for collaboration do not need to hang in paradox. In fact Mercer proposes that “whole- class, teacher-led discussion and group-based activities are not alternative ways of learning, but complementary ones” (2008, p70). Barnes himself acknowledges that “successful group work requires preparation” (cited in Cohen et al, 2008, p7). This poses questions surrounding the role of the teacher not only in preparing for successful group work, but also in fostering a classroom environment that supports productive peer collaboration, facilitating exploratory talk as one possible tool.

Barnes proposes that for students to engage in exploratory talk they must feel relaxed and at ease (cited in Cohen et al, 2007, p6). Within the incident, the teacher can be seen as facilitating this as the learners were allowed to choose where and how to sit, within in safe reason. Many learners, including the learner who asked for help from their peer in the incident, chose to sit on the carpet area with the ‘Chromebook’ on their laps. Barnes acknowledges the teachers significant role in managing social relationships within the classroom (cited in Cohen et al, 2007, p2). The incident may not have been possible if the teacher were to stop the learners from talking to each other or choosing their seating arrangements. This acknowledges the importance of classroom culture, the role of the teacher and student autonomy, in encouraging exploratory talk.

For Mercer, quality peer collaboration is frequently left an untapped resource in the classroom as learners “talk is often not productive” (2008, p57). Mercer suggests that ground rules on talk in the classroom could be a potential solution to maximizing the potential for productive peer talk and collaboration (2008, p66). Ground rules as a suggestion to encourage classroom talk will be used later in the evaluation and next steps.

Furthermore, Mercer proposes that the educational place of talk (2008, p95) could be more widely considered within the curriculum. Subsequently, Donaldson's *Successful Futures* recognises that oracy is "of central importance to thinking and learning" (2015, p48). As outlined in a report on oracy in the 2022 Welsh curriculum, oracy has historically been the "poor relation" (Mercer and Manion, 2018) to literacy and numeracy, but the new curriculum offers promising progress in proactively developing the skills of effective verbal communication. The importance of classroom talk in a pioneer school, such as School X, could indicate the potential for quality collaborative peer talk as the new curriculum is rolled out.

It is worth reflection that education in Wales is in a transitional state between the current curriculum from 2008 and that which will be official in 2022. Consequently, how does this affect my own place in that as a trainee teacher in Wales in 2019. This is worth consideration when evaluating potential next steps in relation to the critical incident and how this will inform my practice in relation to the Professional Standards for Teaching and Learning (Welsh Government, 2019).

In their reflection on how teacher training can nurture critical reflection, Cornish and Jenkins describe training to be a teacher as a "developmental process" (2012) in which critical reflection forms a key part. However, there appears to be a danger in talking about the process of going from student to teacher as the title of teacher seems to function as a destination which one could reach and collapse at like the finish line of a marathon. Although their research does draw on the "nonlinear nature of professional growth" (2012), one of my initial reflections at this early stage in my professional development is not to see my PGCE or NQT years as hurdles to be achieved before finally 'becoming a teacher', but rather part of a lifelong commitment to learning in my career.

Of course, my view that a lifelong commitment to learning is essential in teaching could be the greatest of my 'prescriptive assumptions' (Brookfield, 2017). Brookfield proposes that "critical reflection is, quite simply, the sustained and intentional process of identifying and checking the accuracy and validity of our teaching assumptions" (2017, p3). One thing is clear, that critical reflection is a tool that I will need to use relentlessly, as honestly and humbly as my conscious and unconscious assumptions allow, if I am to avoid the stagnation in practice that 'becoming a teacher' can lead to.

Brookfield proposes that “critical reflection is, quite simply, the sustained and intentional process of identifying and checking the accuracy and validity of our teaching assumptions” (2017, p3). This echoes the guidelines set out in Professional Standards to Teaching and Learning that stipulates “the teacher consistently extends knowledge, skills and understanding and can show how reflection and openness to challenge and support informs professional learning” (2019). In order to do this, I will be using Brookfield’s four critical lenses to support my reflection process; our autobiographies as learners and teachers, our students’ eyes, our colleagues’ experiences; and theoretical literature (2017).

On initial inspection of Brookfield’s’ four lenses, I identified our autobiographies as learners and teachers and our colleague’s experiences as the two I have most naturally gravitated towards in my professional reflection so far, revealing gaps in my current ability to reflect through the student eyes and through theoretical literature. From the point of view of Brookfield and Cornish’s research, this in itself seems indicative of the early phase of my teaching career that I am in. Cornish and Jenkins observe that learning through theory and research is “typically resisted” (2012) by students. For this reason, I will try to position my next steps in regard to reflection of the critical incident within the literature surrounding classroom talk and peer collaboration. I will consider two main elements in my next steps; developing critical thinking skills in learner’s and assessment for learning to, as part of this I will address the importance of questioning.

I intend my own teaching to be informed by Alexander’s understanding of dialogic talk which recognises the important function and interdependency of teacher talk alongside pupil talk if peer dialogue is going to be utilised to its fullest potential. This works closely alongside Mercer’s findings, as addressed earlier, that both teacher-led discussion and grouped peer activities are not strategies positioned in opposition, but in fact can work together as part of a classroom environment that fosters productive peer collaboration, exploratory talk functioning as key goal within that (2008). Alexander identifies that “it is largely through the teacher’s talk that the pupil’s talk is encouraged, facilitated, mediated, probed and extended” (2017). Immediately, this signposts me to the benefits of embedding successful Assessment for Learning (AFL) strategies as an essential tool to maximise the potential for teacher and pupil talk.

Alexander proposes that teachers need “to develop a broad repertoire of talk-based pedagogical skills and strategies” (2017) in order to model, grow and develop their pupil’s capacities for

productive talk. One resource that I intend to use is Welsh Governments 'How to develop thinking and assessment for learning in the classroom' (2010) which sees metacognition and AFL as "inextricably linked" (2010, p5). Nonetheless, they both "retain specific characteristics" (2010) and it is important that I understand this when choosing a strategy. Due to the size of this essay, I can't look closely into specific strategies. However, in order to build the repertoire of dialogic practice that Alexander supports, I would choose strategies based on the specific needs of the learner.

Firstly, I would look to create ground rules for discussion within my class. This strategy is supported by both Mercer's research (2008, p70) and the guidance document created by the Welsh Government (2010). As a teacher I intend to lead an important role in "guiding pupils... use of language and modelling the ways it can be used for thinking collectively" (Mercer, 2008, p70). In order to check students understanding of this and develop it further into their own practice; "the class could be invited to create their own rules" (Welsh Government, 2010, p9).

The ground rules could act as a success criterion for productive classroom talk and peer collaboration. The guidance elaborates that "for peer and self-assessment to be meaningful, learners must understand and have been involved in the construction of success criteria" (2019, p27). This process is an essential facet of AFL and thus, the creation of ground rules to act as a success criterion for productive classroom talk and peer collaboration also supports my commitment to effective AFL.

Secondly, I intend to develop and nurture my questioning skills. Boyd asserts that questioning is a teachers "arguably most powerful, talk move... [as] questions serve to regulate and direct the immediate scope of classroom talk." (2016) However, Boyd acknowledges teachers providing questioning alone is insufficient. Questioning techniques which are open and promote discussion are essential as "questions are received and responded to in light of recurring discourse conditions" (Boyd, 2016). For this reason, I could use AFL strategies such as Basketball, not Ping Pong (Welsh Government, 2010, p41) and phone a friend (2010, p64).

The strength in these strategies is that students can build on each other's knowledge in response to questioning. The guidance stresses that "teachers should try to ensure that all learners are seen by their peers as the expert communicator in at least one skill area" (Welsh Government, 2010, p64). For this reason, it is important I provide such opportunities in response to quality

questioning across the breadth of the curriculum in order to allow for a whole range of skills to be and intelligences to be practiced.

Finally, for the purpose of this case study, I will look at developing metacognition within my learners. Guidance produced by the Welsh Government explains that “managing metacognition is arguably the most difficult aspect in developing pedagogy to support thinking” (2010, p21). One example provided are Lily pads, this idea uses Mr. Frog which would be ideal for working with the foundation phrase. However, the same principle could be called Metacognitive Stepping stones (Welsh government, 2010, p59) for older learners. Although the guidance offers two suggestions, Lily pads and Reflection Triangles, neither seem to have user friendly aesthetics. For this reason, developing metacognition appears to be the strategy with the least well documented approaches and an area I will have to keep researching in my teaching practice.

In conclusion, this case study has utilised non participant observation in order to record four incidents, the fourth of which was chosen for this case study. Through close analysis of the ‘Chromebook’ incident in the context of the school and wider literature, classroom talk, Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (1986, p86) and peer collaboration have been identified as key themes. Further exploration of these themes has informed my next steps for teaching. The Professional Standards for Learning and Teaching outline that in working towards qualified teacher status teachers will be able to understand the importance of the “effective establishment and on-going management of the learning environment, in promoting positive learning habits and behaviours” (2019). My pedagogy will seek to manage a positive learning environment and learning habits through developing develop thinking skills and assessment for learning strategies with my learners. I will do this through questioning, embedding meta-cognitive practice and creating ground rules for productive classroom talk. My students will recognise the strength of their problem-solving ability, using exploratory talk which does not necessitate a more knowledgeable other.

However, these approaches are not exhaustive or exclusive and will need to evolve in response to future teaching experiences. The Professional Standards for Teaching and Learning requires a teaching workforce that “consistently secures the best outcomes for learners through progressively refining teaching” (2019b). The process of observation and analysis of an incident to inform my next steps for teaching, as presented in this case study, is evidence of refining my

own teaching and will have made a significant contribution to securing the best outcomes for learners in my teacher practice.

Word count: 4,129

References

Alexander, R. (2017) *Dialogic Teaching in Brief*.

Available at: <https://www.robinaalexander.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Dialogic-teaching-in-brief-170622.pdf>

(Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Barnes, D. (1976) *From Communication to Curriculum*. London: Penguin.

BERA (2018) *Ethical Guidelines for Education Research*

Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018>

(Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Boyd, M (2016) *Relations Between Teacher Questioning and Student Talk in One Elementary ELL Classroom*.

Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1086296X16632451>

(Accessed on: 20th October 2019)

Brookfield, S. (2017) *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. Second edition, San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen et al (2007) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge.

Cornish & Jenkins. (2012) *Encouraging teacher development through embedding reflective practice in assessment*.

Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ967943>

(Accessed on: 20th October 2019)

Davidson & Georgsen (2010) *ICT as a tool for collaboration in the classroom: Challenges and lessons learned*. Designs for Learning, 3(1-2), 54–69.

Donaldson, D (2015) *Successful Futures*.

Available at: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-03/successful-futures.pdf>

(Accessed on: 1st October 2019)

Estyn report (2015) School X. (Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Fernandez, M et al. (2015) *Re-conceptualizing “Scaffolding” and the Zone of Proximal Development in the Context of Symmetrical Collaborative Learning*.

Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1100363.pdf>

(Accessed on: 20th October 2019)

Mercer & Hodgkinson (2008) *Exploring talk in school*. London: Sage.

Mercer & Manion (2018) *Oracy across the welsh curriculum*.

Available at: <https://oracycambridge.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Oracy-across-the-Welsh-curriculum-July-2018.pdf>

(Accessed on 10th October 2019)

School X Website (2019) (Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Tripp, D (1993) *Critical Incidents in Teaching: Developing Professional Judgment*. London: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L (1978) *Mind in Society*.

Available at: <http://ouleft.org/wp-content/uploads/Vygotsky-Mind-in-Society.pdf>

(Accessed on: 15th October 2019)

Welsh Government (2010) *How to develop thinking and assessment for learning in the classroom*.

Available at: https://www.gwegogledd.cymru/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/How_to_develop_thinking_and.pdf

(Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Welsh Government (2017) *New School Curriculum: Overview*.

Available at: <https://gov.wales/new-school-curriculum-overview>

(Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Welsh Government (2019a) *National School Categorisation System*.

Available at: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2019-01/national-school-categorisation-system-guidance-for-parents-and-carers.pdf>

(Accessed on: 10th October 2019)

Welsh Government (2019b) *Professional Standards for Teaching and Learning*. Available at:

<https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/hwb-live-storage/fc/a7/a4/e2/e348428381e68434ea93f611/professional-standards-for-teaching-and-leadership-interactive-pdf-for-pc.pdf>.

(Accessed on: 20th October 2019)

Appendices**OBSERVATION / FIELD NOTES 1 (MAT learners)**

(Questions adapted from Fletcher Wood (2016))

Date: 26/9/19

Lesson details:

Year 2 class.

Main focus on literacy with cross curricula links to art and design in this particular task.

Classroom culture

(Are the students focused on learning?)

The students are arranged into four groups operating on a carousel basis.

The students are differentiated by ability into four groups. Each group has its own name related to the schools learning superheroes. These support growth mindset. The naming of the groups, such as 'Awesome Avengers' and 'Courageous Captains', is an example of growth mindset policy running throughout the whole school.

The physical layout of the classroom allows for both support and autonomy. The four groups carousel throughout the day between four stations; two supported, two with minimal supervision. When supported by the class teacher or TA, the students sat on a horse shoe shaped table where the teacher was sat in the inner arch. This allowed for the teacher or TA to be facing all the students and work closely with the whole group or individuals as necessary. The only other table in the classroom was a rectangular shape. This is where the students worked independently on a task and it could be argued that the shape of the table encouraged learner collaboration. Finally, the fourth work station was outside and for the most part completely unsupervised. When I did go out to observe them a learner remarked "Look there's a teacher here" which could reflect how used to independent learning they are

in that area. I did not respond and tried to remain at a distance while they resumed their learning. The students appeared to be working together and collaboratively learning.

Full student autonomy to get water, move around the classroom freely, unless during carpet time when they must raise their hands.

The teacher supported a calm classroom culture by using relaxing music from a youtube compilation that was played during all tasks and practised guided mindfulness breathing techniques after the students came back from lunch.

After break the learners watch Newsround while they drink their milk and ate a healthy snack. Watching Newsround could be seen as promoting the learners to be ethical and informed citizens.

Objectives

(Is there a clear purpose to the lesson? How do the lesson activities promote that purpose?)

I joined the lesson during the activity so cannot clarify whether there was a SMART learning objective set initially. However, there was certainly a clear focus on the task for the students working with the teacher and TA. Both groups were guided and given differentiated tasks depending on their level. The purpose of the lesson; to identify the features of a comic strip, was well scaffolded through a colour coded system where the students would underline a certain feature with the colour corresponding to their features table.

However, the group of learners I was closely observing were working on the independent learning table. They were copying onomatopoeic words and colouring them in. The image below is very close to the worksheet the learners were working from. The objective of this task seemed to be familiarising yourself with onomatopoeic language, especially in the style used by cartoons, so that the students can identify them as part of a comic strip and use them when producing their own comic strip.



Direction

(Are the students clear about what they are doing and how to do it well?)

The learners had an example worksheet in front of them to copy from or use as inspiration. If they wanted to create their own onomatopoeic designs the students knew what they needed to produce and how it was meant to look. They did not necessarily know the steps necessary to create the design, but they appeared to be able to experiment with colours and design in order to do this.

Access and challenge

(Are all students able to engage in the lesson? Are all students challenged?)

Although the learners did seem clear with what they were meant to do they were often distracted. This could be for multiple reasons, but perhaps as MAT learners copying designs did not provide an appropriate level of challenge. However, some may not have engaged because drawing or colouring did not interest them or because there was plenty of room for the students to talk off topic on an independent learning station. The students could have completed the task without assistance and in that sense the task did not provide too much challenge when a TA or teacher was not going to be as available.

Assessment

How does the teacher assess student understanding before, during and after the lesson? How is this used in their teaching?

During this task, the teacher did walk round to observe and encourage students who were off task, but there wasn't any formal assessment and it is unclear whether this work will be kept and put in their books to be marked. The work was done on scrap paper and was not dated or titled.

Their understanding of onomatopoeia's more broadly was informally assessed during their work with the teacher to identify parts of a comic trip. However, this was produced on a different part of the carousel at a different stage of the lesson and day. When the learners to complete work with the TA/teacher the teacher marked in red and the students responded in purple pen to show direct response to the teachers marking. However, I did not observe this taking place with the work the MAT learners produced on the unassisted table so am unclear of what AFL techniques will be used in that instance.

Specifics / Critical Incidents

Are there particular telling moments and examples which it would be helpful to discuss?

The behaviour of MAT students was the incident I followed most closely during this observation.

Four students ask to go to the toilet suggesting they were not focussed on task as they all wanted to go together. Three learners went for a long period of time. They returned to the table only to play with rubbers, rather than getting on with the task. They appeared unengaged with task. One MAT learner appeared to try to distract learners in another group with rubbers. No new work produced for a long period for time. The MAT learner who was distracting others with rubbers does not appear to respond to conditioned classroom choral drills to tidy up when bell is rung by helper heddiw. The MAT learner then goes out to toilet again, seemingly without adult notice, washes their hands four times and distracts a student from another class. This student appeared much more focussed later in the day when working directly with the teacher than when in unattended group.

Interestingly, this MAT learner was one of only two students that came to introduce themselves to myself while observing that day. It was MAT students that seemed most aware of our presence in the classroom and asked questions or tried to share stories with us.

Model Beirniad Wedi Adfyfyrio (BWA)

Assisted Reflective Conclusions (ARC) Model

Dyddiad/Date: 26/9/19

Digwyddiad critigol (Ffocws)/Critical incident (focus) 1 Mat Learners:

Behaviour of MAT learners during unsupervised/independent task appeared distracted. Distraction included going to the toilet as a large group and playing with stationery.

Profiad/ Experience	
Teimladau/ <i>Feelings</i> <i>Beth yw eich teimladau ynghylch y profiad?</i> <i>“What are your feelings regarding the experience?”</i>	When reflecting on this I am aware that the Hawthorne Effect could be seen most clearly in the MAT learners as they seemed most aware of my presence in the classroom. I came to this assumption through the fact two MAT learners formally introduced themselves to me and the MAT learners as a group were those who most tried to talk and question throughout the observation. The fact the MAT learners are supposed to be working independently in this incident is particularly relevant. It prompted me to ask questions about student autonomy and learners' ability to direct themselves at such a young age. Having looked closely at the Foundation Phase methodology that is being used in Wales alongside Successful Futures, the use of independent learning stations seems to be in line with encouraging independent and capable learners. Therefore, the incident caused me to reflect on what I could do to my classroom in the future to ensure students are engaged during independent tasks. It also made me feel as though I needed to research more closely the behaviour of MAT students and I felt that going to the NACE website https://www.nace.co.uk/ for further advice could be beneficial.

	It was potentially worrying that the learners weren't engaged and that they were not producing work or focused on the task. It was of concern that the challenge was not of an appropriate level.
Cofio a Deall/ <i>Remember and Understand</i> <i>Allwch chi restru'r agweddau ar y profiad dysgu a aeth yn dda?</i> <i>"Can you list the aspects of the learning experience that went well?"</i> <i>Pa elfennau o'r profiad dysgi oedd yn siomedig?</i> <i>"What were the elements of the learning experience that were disappointing?"</i>	The most disappointing elements of the learning experience were the MAT learners apparent lack of engagement with the task which then would lead onto a lack of learning. An element that could have affected this is not enough challenge, not interesting enough material, not enough adult or peer support or encouragement. Another potentially contributing element was a lack of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. It seemed that was a lack of motivation to complete the task which is disappointing in itself, but could this have been improved with meta-cognitive skills to manage intrinsic motivation or extrinsic motivation provided by the teacher through things like DOJO points. There was a dojo point system active in the class so could this have been used more effectively.
Gwerthuso a <i>dadansoddi/ Evaluate and analyse</i> <i>Beth fyddwch chi'n cadw'r un fath i sicrhau dysgu ac addysgu effeithiol yn y dyfodol?</i> <i>"What will you keep the same to ensure effective teaching and learning in the future?"</i>	Their appears to be great importance placed on learners ability to learn independently and thus, the opportunity for such learning as is used during the observation, should be kept the same to ensure effective teaching and learning in the future. Likewise, the use of the rectangular table for those working on an independent is something I would keep the same as I think it physically positions the learners in an arrangement that encourages them to talk to each other and hopefully, use each other as a resource.

<i>Beth oedd achos yr elfen siomedig bwysicaf?</i> <i>“What was the cause of the most important disappointing element?”</i>	Perhaps, I would identify lack of challenge as the cause of the most important disappointing element. It appeared that the students found copying from a worksheet unengaging and unappealing. Had the task of been more challenging the MAT learners could have been more intrigued to attempt it or work closely together using problem solving skills.
Casgliadau a chamau gweithredu/ <i>Conclusions and actions</i> <i>Beth yw eich atebion posibl i'r materiaon siomedig a nodwyd?</i> <i>“What are your possible solutions to the disappointing issues identified?”</i> <i>Beth ydych yn mynd i'w wneud nesaf?</i> <i>“What will you do next?”</i>	A possible solution is to differentiate the task of the independent learning table for learners. Although the main task completed with the teacher or TA had clear differentiation between learners, the independent task was the same for all learners. Thus, perhaps not applying an appropriate level of challenge. Another possible solution is to provide some extrinsic motivation for those working independently to keep them on task. Whether this be with a reward point, free time or sticker. Finally, providing the learners with strategies to assess their own learning could also be helpful. For example. KWLH grids or other AFL strategies. Asking them to peer assess their work ten minutes into the task could also provide a form of motivation.
Y profiad newydd / <i>Transformed experience</i>	

OBSERVATION / FIELD NOTES 2 (Full stop misconception)

(Questions adapted from Fletcher Wood (2016))

Date: 26/9/19

Lesson details:

Literacy lesson in a reception class.

Clear focus on using capital letters, finger spaces and full stops in writing practice.

Writing skill scaffolded round the term theme: Me and my home.

Classroom culture

(Are the students focused on learning?)

As the students are in reception the task is delivered on a carousel basis. For example, one group is doing the task directly with the teacher; another group may be practicing another skill with the TA, such as reading. The two other groups are playing independently. One inside, one outside. Both inside and outside there are learning stations to engage them in tasks relating to the terms theme; Me and my home.

The classroom is bright and colourful with thinking maps on the wall. It is well equipped with I pads for digital learning and welsh language is used across displays. The classroom also has some polish translation on the displays to accommodate for a student whose first language is Polish and is learning English and Welsh as additional language.

There is also a role play area designed to be like a kitchen to support the theme of learning for this term, but this will be adapted into a new scenario as the terms theme changes. This way their play remains within the learning agenda.

Objectives

(Is there a clear purpose to the lesson? How do the lesson activities promote that purpose?)

The group working with the teacher is of particular interest in this observation. There was a clear purpose of the lesson; to create simple sentences to describe their house using capital letters, finger spaces and full stops. The lesson activity promoted this as the teacher first read a book eliciting the place of capital letters and full stops. The teacher then modelled simple sentences to the group she was working with in order to draw out the key features she wanted them to produce in their own work.

Direction

(Are the students clear about what they are doing and how to do it well?)

The students have identified the key features they need to use in a story and then watched it be modelled to them. The example sentences were rubbed off the board when they did their own version of task to see if the students could use them from memory. In this sense, the students may not have been clear in the act of production as they were having to use their memory but it had been well modelled to them beforehand.

The teacher seemed to remove the modelled example to check their understanding and I assumed this was key to the task.

Not all students seemed clear on how to complete the task well and did mistakes with capital letters, finger spaces and full stops but the used questioning to try and elicit the answer from the students. The students then had chance to respond to teachers marked written feedback after the task so they knew how to improve next time. The teacher seemed to allow the students to make mistakes in the production of their work, rather than encouraging them to rub out mistakes in response to her correction.

Access and challenge

(Are all students able to engage in the lesson? Are all students challenged?)

This task did seem quite challenging for all students as writing skills are fairly new to all students in reception. For some just gripping the pencil is still a challenge, whereas others are focussing on writing along the line. Using finger spaces between words appeared a problem for all students and

was the feature the students needed most prompting on. There was clear differentiation in regard to levels of challenge that the teacher presented to each group. For MAT students, all three features should be clear and where possible, even the use of using extended sentences by using 'and'. On the other hand, an attempt at writing and letter formation was challenge enough for some learners. The students did seem engaged in the lesson for the first ten minutes. However, for those students who found writing skills difficult, I did hear some asking when they could go and play.

Assessment

How does the teacher assess student understanding before, during and after the lesson? How is this used in their teaching?

The teacher checked understanding of the three features before the task through reading a story to the whole class and identifying capital letters, finger spaces and full stops throughout the text. She also checked student understanding when modelling sentences. Before sending the learners off on their individual tasks the teacher asked the learners to use their thumbs to indicate how confident they felt about the task. Thumbs up for confident, thumbs sideways for ok, thumbs down for needing much more help. During the task, the teacher used observation and verbal feedback. After the lesson, she marked the work in red pen and then the students came and made corrections based on her initial written feedback.

Specifics / Critical Incidents

Are there particular telling moments and examples which it would be helpful to discuss?

One student in particular seemed to have a misconception around full stops. Instead of using full stops at the end of the sentence, they used it at the end of every line.

This appeared to be an interesting misconception as they were the only student that appeared to make it in the class. What is of most interest is how the student arrived at that misconception. For example, had they not understood the modelling, or had they not been confident to ask a question to clarify. Although this was picked up in the learners production of work, they had carried this misconception from the story and modelling and could be quite ingrained in their thinking pattern. The sentence did not produce enough writing to clarify whether this misconception would be used

again and again throughout their work. As a reception learner, they were only expected to write one sentence and this is where the misconception occurred.

Model Beirniad Wedi Adfyfyrion (BWA)

Assisted Reflective Conclusions (ARC) Model

Dyddiad/Date: 26/9/19**Digwyddiad critigol (Ffocws)/Critical incident (focus) 2 Full stops misconception:**

A reception learner appears to have applied a misconception with full stops. Instead of putting the full stop at the end of a sentence, they used it at the end of each line regardless of what point of a sentence the line finished at.

Profiad/ Experience	
Teimladau/ <i>Feelings</i> Beth yw eich teimladau ynghylch y profiad? <i>"What are your feelings regarding the experience?"</i>	My initial response to the incident was actually of interest. I wanted to understand how the learner had formed the misconception and what impact it was going to have on the production of future work. Was this misconception going to be something that could be corrected with verbal and/or written feedback during the lesson or was it a misconception that was to reoccur in future work that would need a lot of support to be constructed? Due to the early stage of learning of a reception class the misconception did not evoke concern or surprise as such. The learners were very much in the early stages of learning punctuation and how to apply them to their own writing, and thus, mistakes are expected. It is more the nature of the misconception that is of interest, rather than the learner making a mistake.
Cofio a Deall/ <i>Remember and Understand</i> Allwch chi restru'r agweddau ar y profiad dysgu a aeth yn dda?	On the whole, the learning experience was overwhelmingly positive. The learner had used capital letters correctly and finger spaces. It is in fact the learners successful use of finger spaces that meant their work went over one line. Only once working over multiple lines did the learner

<i>"Can you list the aspects of the learning experience that went well?"</i> <i>Pa elfennau o'r profiad dysgi oedd yn siomedig?</i> <i>"What were the elements of the learning experience that were disappointing?"</i>	make a mistake regarding full stops. The learner has still attempted to use a full stop which is positive. Also positive is that the teacher picked up on the error. This was helped by the fact the learners work with the teacher in small groups and they use a horse shoe shaped table where the teacher has a good ability to observe. Another positive aspect is that the learner was able to verbal feedback during the production and then written feedback after production. Learners are then given time to respond to their written feedback so there are several points where the learner can reflect on their work. It could be argued that more assessment for learning strategies could have been used to pick up on the student's misconception before it occurred in their writing. However, if the learner did have a misconception around full stops, they would not have identified it as a problem during thumbs up/across/down feedback. The teacher could have also modelled sentences again to the learner using the story book or by writing on the white board to explain further or again the rules of a full stop. However, maybe this was not possible due to time constraints in the lesson and may have been done after the observation.
Gwerthuso a dadansoddi/ <i>Evaluate and analyse</i> <i>Beth fyddwch chi'n cadw'r un fath i sicrhau dysgu ac addysgu effeithiol yn y dyfodol?</i> <i>"What will you keep the same to ensure</i>	There were a lot of effective teaching practices used during the observation. Modelling through a story book as whole class, before modelling by written sentences on a white board with small groups seemed to work well for the majority of learners. The teacher addressed the key areas of punctuation via a storybook in which the students were engaged. Due to their young age in reception, productive carpet time is limited and so further modelling in small groups seemed like a very productive idea.

<i>effective teaching and learning in the future?"</i> <i>Beth oedd achos yr elfen siomedig bwysicaf?</i> <i>"What was the cause of the most important disappointing element?"</i>	Perhaps the most disappointing element was that the student probably required further modelling. However, as addressed above this may have happened in another lesson after the observation took place.
Casgliadau a chamau gweithredu/ <i>Conclusions and actions</i> <i>Beth yw eich atebion posibl i'r materiaon siomedig a nodwyd?</i> <i>"What are your possible solutions to the disappointing issues identified?"</i> <i>Beth ydych yn mynd i'w wneud nesaf?</i> <i>"What will you do next?"</i>	A possible solution could have been to tackle less features in one lesson. Perhaps, capital letter, finger spaces and full stops was too much of a challenge for some learners in one piece of work at that stage in their learning. However, school X was explicit about their high expectations in writing and that is reflected in the incident. It had been remarked that perhaps learners get less time to do creative things and learn important skills such as holding a paintbrush or pencil properly due to the writing pressures applied so young. In the future in my own teaching, I would hope to take a happy medium between skills, such as by not overly prioritising literacy over other areas of the curriculum, especially so early on in the foundation phase. However, I think modelling punctuation through a story book was an excellent strategy I would like to employ. Likewise, knowing when it is best to use whole class and small group teaching.
Y profiad newydd / <i>Transformed experience</i>	

OBSERVATION / FIELD NOTES 3 Freeze

(Questions adapted from Fletcher Wood (2016))

Date: 26/9/19

Lesson details:

Afternoon session. Year 2. Guided group reading: literacy with cross curricula links to digital competency.

2 groups reading with the teacher/TA

1 group using Chromebook's to follow guided reading on Giglet <https://giglets.com/>

1 group doing comprehension task independently

Classroom culture

(Are the students focused on learning?)

The students did seem less focused during the afternoon session which did appear to impact their concentration on the learning. Although the teacher was aware of this and made to reengage them after lunch through quick guided meditation during carpet time when setting up their task. A certain level of silliness remained.

The students on the Giglet seemed most engaged. However, the learners doing guided reading in a group with the teacher seemed most distracted. The learners did not seem to be equally engaged and focused and this appeared to cause some frustration among the learners. For some, the guided reading seemed like an easy task, but were not engaged when others were speaking. For others, the task was more challenging, and they took longer to read which seemed to cause boredom or frustration with others. This seemed to lead to a general feeling of disengagement and the group did not seem to all concentrate on the task at hand.

Objectives

(Is there a clear purpose to the lesson? How do the lesson activities promote that purpose?)

The purpose of the activity for the group with the TA and teacher was to practice reading aloud, using phonics and breaking down words into sounds in order to decode new vocabulary. The learners needed to work on different elements in literacy and oracy. For example, some did not seem to have a problem with reading longer words and thus, were working on their fluency and responding to punctuation. Whereas for others being able to work out the words was their challenge and, in this case, not as much attention was drawn to other elements such as fluency.

Direction

(Are the students clear about what they are doing and how to do it well?)

The students on Giglet via the Chromebook (<https://giglets.com/>) were guided by the software. Although they did run into some technical issues, they used peer support before going to the teacher. The learning app seemed to guide them through the task well enough that they knew what to do in regard to reading and the following activities.

The group reading with teacher and TA were heavily supported and appeared clear about what they were doing. Although this did not necessarily translate into them focussing.

On the whole the students did know how to do the task well as they used to guided reading and the format they use in the class. The groups with the TA and teacher were also heavily scaffolded so any words or issues they were unclear on they could provide examples of how to do it well. This was less obvious for the two groups working independently. However, both of those tasks were scaffolded well though Giglet or a comprehension worksheet and thus the learners seemed aware of what they were meant to be doing and how do it well. A lot of this time also seemed informed by the routine of it. The learners seemed to understand what was required at guided reading time whether working with a TA/teacher or independently as it is something they do fairly frequently.

Access and challenge

(Are all students able to engage in the lesson? Are all students challenged?)

As the students were split into levelled groups there did seem to be appropriate level of challenge provided in general. Giglet allowed students to work at their own pace so they could provide as much challenge as necessary, providing they were on task. The independent table working on

comprehension spoke among each other a lot to try and work out an answer or what a question wanted.

The groups with TA/teacher could be challenged on things more specific to their reading needs as they could receive instant feedback which manages the level of challenge.

The incident in itself which will be discussed further later does not suggest there could have been an issue with the level of challenge. However as this is integral to the incident, I have discussed this in more detail below.

Assessment

How does the teacher assess student understanding before, during and after the lesson? How is this used in their teaching?

The teacher will be able to see what their students achieved on giglet by looking at the learners account. The teacher was able to use basketball questioning as an assessment for learning technique while doing guided reading with the learners.

On the unsupervised table where students worked on a comprehension activity the learners were able to choose whether to work collaboratively or independently and I witnessed both techniques being used. The teacher is less able to monitor this table and they are not given verbal feedback during the task.

It is unclear what will be done in regards to their comprehension work as this was not included in the observation. However, School X has a marking policy that means the work will probably receive written feedback which the learners will then later have the chance to respond to.

When a learner asked the teacher a question, instead of answering it, she first put it forward to the other learners to encourage peer support. She also used questioning. 'The Tree' 'Why is this not an example of alliteration?' Excellent scaffolding of learning. The learners had an opportunity to help their peer answer a question posed by a peer. The students proved capable of answering it between them and it is excellent the teacher provided them the opportunity to do so.

Specifics / Critical Incidents

Are there particular telling moments and examples which it would be helpful to discuss?

T: 'I am just going to freeze everybody. Why do you think I'm freezing?'

Ss: 'Because we are being silly'

This incident was of particular interest due to the learners response. Although they had appeared off task and distracted as soon as the teacher said freeze they appeared to know immediately that procedure meant they were to stop.

The learners were very quick in response to the teachers question and it also sounded like a choral drill.

It is of interest that although the learners were off task, they seemed aware of this in their response to the teachers question and thus were clearly capable of reflecting on their learning.

If we are to suppose then that the students acknowledged they were off task, then it would be interesting to think why they were.

They are multiple reasons. However, one may be that as they were a MAT group there seemed to be big disparity in abilities. Some students seemed bored with their peers inability to pronounce a word first time or at the pace of reading.

The teacher has provided scaffolded self-reflection followed by verbal warning to receive a warning card. The single incident is employing so many techniques. We can see behaviour management, questioning, use of extrinsic motivation and reward systems, just to name a few.

Model Beirniad Wedi Adfyfyrrio (BWA)

Assisted Reflective Conclusions (ARC) Model

Dyddiad/Date: 26/9/19

Digwyddiad critigol (Ffocws)/Critical incident (focus 3 Freeze):

Behaviour Management

T: 'I am just going to freeze everybody. Why do you think I'm freezing?'

Ss: 'Because we are being silly'

Profiad/ Experience	
Teimladau/ <i>Feelings</i> <i>Beth yw eich teimladau ynghylch y profiad?</i> <i>"What are your feelings regarding the experience?"</i>	I was very impressed with how the teacher dealt with the students' behaviour. The behaviour after lunch time was noticeably less engaged and focused. This technique and question allowed the students to self and peer assess their behaviour. I think the teacher dealt with the situation at the appropriate time. The teacher was not so strict as to allow no leniency. However, when the learner's behaviour was becoming a real to their learning, the teacher used a technique that the learners seemed familiar with and responded well to. It was not such a surprise that the students concentration appeared less focused after lunch time. However, it was quite a stark contrast to the morning session where the students had behaved very well and seemed very focused on their learning.
Cofio a Deall/	

<i>Remember and Understand</i> <i>“Allwch chi restru elfennau'r achos yng nghyd-destun y dysgu?”</i> <i>“Can you list the aspects of the incident in the context of learning?”</i>	This critical incident brings sheds light on a few aspects in the context of learning. Namely, student autonomy, choral drilling, peer and self-assessment and effective questioning. I am particularly interested in student autonomy and peer and self-assessment as these are two elements that I saw again and again in the observation. It also brings into question whether the level of challenge was appropriate for the learners.
<i>Gwerthuso a dadansoddi/ Evaluate and analyse</i> <i>“Beth y gellid ei gadw yr un fath i sicrhau addysgu a dysgu effeithiol yn y dyfodol?”</i> <i>“What could be kept the same to ensure effective teaching and learning in the future?”</i>	The teacher should continue to support student autonomy and peer/self assessment through effective questioning and monitoring of children's behaviour. The technique of freezing appeared to be well known to the learners and something they know how to respond to productively. For this reason, selecting the best AFL strategies that suit the class and using them throughout the term or year could be a good way to scaffold learners' self-reflection. Likewise, the teacher intervened at a point where the students were distracted, but the teacher was still in control. For this reason, knowing when the appropriate time is to use AFL strategies will be important as I consider behaviour management in my own class.

Casgliadau a chymau gweithredu/ <i>Conclusions and actions</i> <i>“Beth yw eich atebion posibl i'r mater a nodwyd?”</i> <i>“Beth y gellid ei wneud nesaf?”</i> <i>“What are your possible solutions to the issue identified?”</i> <i>“What could be done next?”</i>	The behaviour of the students had been noticeably less focused after lunch. The teacher could have addressed this sooner. However, the teacher had already tried using a mindfulness breathing activity before setting the task. Perhaps, the teacher could have identified this in their planning if it is regularly a problem. However, this cannot be assumed from a single observation. I have heard in School X that some teachers account for this in their planning, and thus, do more structured activities like guided reading in the morning, and plan context for learning in the afternoon session. This could be a possible solution. Likewise, it is worth considering how to support MAT learners in particular during guided group reading. What strategies could be used to help them deal with the frustrations of waiting for others to finish something that might come so naturally to other learners. I could use the NACE website to look further into solutions or ask for guidance.
Y profiad newydd / <i>Transformed experience</i>	

OBSERVATION / FIELD NOTES 4 Chromebook

(Questions adapted from Fletcher Wood (2016))

Date: 26/9/19

Lesson details:

Year 2 class. Main focus on literacy with cross curricular links to digital competency.

Classroom culture

(Are the students focused on learning?)

During this particular observation, student autonomy played an important role. The classroom culture appeared to support learners using their autonomy. This was seen by the learners working on the Chromebook's deciding to sit on the floor rather than at tables. This was not challenged by the teacher as the students genuinely seemed engaged in their task while also choosing a different area of the classroom to utilise than all the other groups of learners.

Students also seemed confident in their abilities to ask peers for help. There is a 3b4me policy in School X which encourages learners to find other resources for answers rather than asking the teacher as soon as a problem arose. They were supported to do this by having learning passports they could independently refer to with learners' individual log ins for the Chromebook and software's. Similarly, asking a peer for help occurred as if it was common place suggesting that verbal peer collaboration could be part of the classroom culture.

It is also of interest that the classroom culture was supported by readily available digital technology. The class had Chromebook's, iPad and an interactive whiteboard. These suggest that digital technology is well embedded in the classroom culture and the digital competency skills acquired through this allow for the learners to access the Giglet tasks independently.

Objectives

(Is there a clear purpose to the lesson? How do the lesson activities promote that purpose?)

This lesson took place during the morning session and the Giglet task that is focussed on in particular in this observation is part of a wider literacy lesson. The students working with the teacher and TA were taking part in guided group reading. Thus the purpose of the lesson appeared to be to develop reading skills. However, there was not a specific learning objective provided.

The Giglet activity supported the learners developing their reading skills through providing a reading appropriate to the learners level and providing comprehension questions after.

Direction

(Are the students clear about what they are doing and how to do it well?)

The learners seemed very confident using the Chromebook's independently and they seemed to have good digital competency skills that allowed them to access the Giglet task. The software leads the students through the reading via comprehension questions and thus the students did seem to be clear about what they were doing and how to do it well. It was not the learners first time using the particular programme and their log in and account was set an appropriate level for them.

The greatest confusion seemed to arise from technical issues rather than actually reading and responding to the text on Giglet. The learners had digital passports they could use with all their log in details on and the classroom culture appeared supportive of peer collaboration. During the observation, learners were seen asking each questions related to the task and seemed to have good problem solving skills.

Access and challenge

(Are all students able to engage in the lesson? Are all students challenged?)

All the students had differentiated tasks to enable them to engage in the task. Each learners log in details are personalised and within that the texts that are available on their account are based on the level the teacher has provided for them. If the learners successfully complete a task they are able to move up to the next level. In this way the software is able to manage challenge.

The only thing that prevent students engaging in the lesson were technical issues. However, the teacher had ensured all log in details were provided by digital passports and the Chromebook's were charged ready for use.

Assessment

How does the teacher assess student understanding before, during and after the lesson? How is this used in their teaching?

The teacher is able to check learners previous learning on Giglet to set the task the students were carrying out during the lesson. Although there is not much assessment during the task from the teacher that is somewhat intentional as it has been designed as an independent task for the learners. However, after the session the teacher will be able to log onto Giglet and see the learners progress. However, I cannot speculate more on this and this was not part of the observation.

The students did seem very engaged in the task suggesting that level of challenge was appropriate. Had the learners behaviour of been more distracted, perhaps there would have been more assessment during the activity.

Specifics / Critical Incidents

Are there particular telling moments and examples which it would be helpful to discuss?

Digital competency supporting collaboration/ student autonomy

Learners get out Chromebooks unassisted and open straight away to the set up the task using their own digital passport. The digital passport provides their individual passwords for the software they will be using in that session, Giglet. One learner goes and asks a student from another group to help when they are stuck. This appears to reflect the students awareness of their own and their peers strengths and weaknesses as the student specifically went to get help from that student rather than asking the teacher or another peer.

The peers agreed to help each other and they appeared to talk through the problem and try several methods on the Chromebook before being satisfied they had solved the problem. The exchange seemed to build on both students knowledge. One the learner on the Chromebook had solved their problem; they appeared to be feeling confident and asked the rest of the group on the Chromebook if anyone needed help. It did not take place in a way that was disruptive or distracting. Students also show problem solving skills and collaboration when putting the chrome books away.

Model Beirniad Wedi Adfyfyrio (BWA)

*Assisted Reflective Conclusions (ARC) Model***Dyddiad/Date: 26/6/19****Digwyddiad critigol (Ffocws)/Critical incident (focus) 4 Chromebooks:**

One learner goes and asks a student from another group to help when they are stuck. This appears to reflect the students awareness of their own and their peers strengths and weaknesses as the student specifically went to get help from that student rather than asking the teacher or another peer.

The peers agreed to help each other and they appeared to talk through the problem and try several methods on the Chromebook before being satisfied they had solved the problem. The exchange seemed to build on both students knowledge. One the learner on the Chromebook had solved their problem; they appeared to be feeling confident and asked the rest of the group on the Chromebook if anyone needed help.

Profiad/ Experience	
Teimladau/ <i>Feelings</i> Beth yw eich teimladau ynghylch y profiad? "What are your feelings regarding the experience?"	Several aspects of this incident were of great interest to me. Firstly, how developed the students digital competency skills were in year 2 and the excellent availability of digital technology in the classroom. Secondly, the way student autonomy is practiced in the classroom. The students were able to choose where to sit during the activity and to ask peers from another group for help. Student autonomy appeared to be regular practice in the classroom as these occurrences took place without causing disruption or distraction. Finally, I was very interested in the exchange between the two peers that led them to solving one learners problem. There exchange and use of problem skills acted as a source for further research into literature surrounding this area.

Cofio a Deall/ <i>Remember and Understand</i> <i>Allwch chi restru'r agweddau ar y profiad dysgu a aeth yn dda?</i> <i>"Can you list the aspects of the learning experience that went well?"</i> <i>Pa elfennau o'r profiad dysgi oedd yn siomedig?</i> <i>"What were the elements of the learning experience that were disappointing?"</i>	Many aspects went well. For example, the students appeared confident in their abilities to use Chromebooks. They seemed capable of choosing an area in the classroom that most suited their learning. This was displayed by some moving onto the carpet to work rather than on desks. The students also seemed confident in their abilities to seek help from peers and to work together to solve a problem. Although the teacher does not seem very active within the incident, this circumstances in which it occurred would not have been possible without the teacher creating and allowing a classroom culture that facilitated student autonomy and peer collaboration.
Gwerthuso a <i>dadansoddi/ Evaluate and analyse</i> <i>Beth fyddwch chi'n cadw'r un fath i sicrhau dysgu ac addysgu effeithiol yn y dyfodol?</i> <i>"What will you keep the same to ensure effective teaching and learning in the future?"</i>	I think the classroom culture played a big role in this incident and thus, I would also like my classroom to foster student autonomy and peer collaboration as well. If possible, I would also like my classroom to have access to up to date digital resources. The Chromebooks were an excellent resource to the learners, and they had clearly been taught how to use them independently with confidence. This is something I also hope to do in my own class. Supporting students in seeing each other as a resource is also something really important I have taken from the incident. For example, I could create ground rules for discussion that would support my learners in taking part in productive peer discussion. Productive peer discussion is

<i>Beth oedd achos yr elfen siomedig bwysicaf?</i> <i>“What was the cause of the most important disappointing element?”</i>	a skill that I would like to practice and develop throughout the academic year so that learners are able to practice oracy and problem-solving skills together. As this was a positive incident, there is not necessarily a disappointing element. It could be argued that could have been more interaction from a teacher or TA. Perhaps, the learner’s collaboration could have been developed or assisted by the intervention or scaffolding provided by teacher input. Equally had the teacher witnessed the exchange perhaps they could have provided praise to the students and used it a talking point during carpet time with the whole class. It could have also earned the learners some dojo points which is a reward system in place in the classroom.
Casgliadau a chamau gweithredu/ <i>Conclusions and actions</i> <i>Beth yw eich atebion posibl i’r materiaon siomedig a nodwyd?</i> <i>“What are your possible solutions to the disappointing issues identified?”</i> <i>Beth ydych yn mynd i’w wneud nesaf?</i> <i>“What will you do next?”</i>	In response to this incident, I intend to develop my own understanding of peer collaboration, classroom talk and how to instil digital competency tasks into the classroom. I will do this through further reading of research based literature in this area and look at examples of best practice in these areas on the Estyn website. I think questioning, setting ground rules for classroom talk, instilling peer and self assessment as regular classroom practice will act as possible solutions to supporting more productive peer collaboration in the classroom. In terms of finding a solution to the disappointing elements, I hope to use monitoring effectively in the classroom to catch as many key incidents like this. In addition, students could nominate dojo points for themselves or others if they feel something significant has happened that the teacher was unable to see.
Y profiad newydd / <i>Transformed experience</i>	