|  |
| --- |
| **Microteach Reflection** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Name:*** | Graham MacBean | ***This reflection needs to have a 5-10 sentence paragraph completed for each category in the Reflection template. Consult with the rubric below to guide your responses.*** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Presentation Rubric** | **Exceptional** | **Superior** | **Above Average** | **Satisfactory** | **Below Average** | **Weak** |
| **Evaluates his/her own performance making suggestions for improvement** | Exceptional reflection that considers self and peer feedback and determines personal goals for the future (with possible strategies to address them) | Completes all components, referencing specific portions and feedback from peers | Completes all components, referencing specific portions of the lesson and delivery | Completes all components of the reflection adequately | Reflection provides little insight or evidence of critical analysis | Reflection minimal or does not critically address components of the lesson |

***Strengths of the lesson***

After consulting with Mr. Gammie, reviewing my peer evaluations, and personal reflection through watching my video, I was able to identify a few strengths in my micro-teach. I managed to teach in clear voice (though perhaps too loud at some points) and conduct myself in a self-assured manner.

As well, a creative use of space and approach to the SLO resulted in an engaging and fun experience for the students. Finally, I managed to tie a fun physical activity into the curriculum in a way that produced a positive response from students. This was evidenced not only in their mood, but also by the fact that all the students answered the worksheet questions correctly.

***Revisions that could be considered***

To begin, while I started with a brief intro, I rushed into lesson after the students were seated without articulating the objectives of the lesson. This could have been tied effectively to the lesson itself, as my objective (having the students understand the material) could have been compared to the first term, objective. Speaking of objectives, my third learning objective was worded in such a way that it could not stand on its own, and should have been reworded.

Next, while my attempts at a Socratic method of questioning elicited correct responses, I did not leave time for the students to come to an understanding of their own. As well, I did not thank the students for their input, which might leave students afraid to venture a ‘wrong’ answer.

Furthermore, the ‘sponge activity’, which I likely did not have time for, was undertaken with a bad topic choice. In an effort to illustrate the point of the lesson with raw imagery, the lesson morphed into areas that would have been awkward/inappropriate for a grade 6 audience, namely love and violence.

Finally, a lack of time forced an abrupt ending, so I was unable to effectively close the lesson and present the subject of next class.

***Overall evaluation of the lesson and next steps***

Overall, I was initially pleased with the lesson and the student response. However, through reflection I identified my weaknesses as being of the same flavor as those which caused me trouble in my practicum. First, in eagerness to excel I tried to fit too much in, and did not take the time to step back and consider how I was teaching. Second, and more importantly, my ignorance of school dynamics lead me to choose a subject matter and an approach to questioning which would not have been ideal in classroom.

In my next opportunity teaching at Nicholas Sheran, I plan to incorporate these lessons by taking more time, listening to students and acknowledging their input, and asking the teachers what an exemplary communication dynamic with the students would look like in a grade 3 setting.