

Video Analysis

Explanation:

The following artifact is a video showing my instruction from my M401 field experience and from student teaching. My M401 experience was completed in Mrs. “K’s” 2/3 multi-aged class at West Street Elementary in the spring of 2004. My student teaching was completed at Sunny Day School in Mrs. “C’s” half day kindergarten classes. Along with my video, I have included the analytical tools that I used to assess the video.

Sabrina tells the reader from the beginning that her video is a comparison of her teaching during her M401 field experience and student teaching. She states the grade levels and locations, and the reader expects the artifacts accompanying the video to include data collected using analytical tools from the student teaching handbook. The following paragraph sets the scene for the first video clip, including the lesson objective. She cites two INTASC principles, which are supported by implementation

The beginning of my video shows a clip of my M401 instruction. During the clip, I was attempting to use questioning to help students recall a previous lesson about leadership (6). My goal was to have students use the information about leadership qualities that they learned in the previous lesson to identify characteristics that make individuals good leaders. The objective of this lesson was then to have students be able to identify reasons why President Lincoln was considered to be a great leader (2).

After the M401 section of my video, I have included a portion of a math review that was taped while I was student teaching in a kindergarten class. The questions I was asking were designed to help students review the concept of fewer. I used the manipulatives along with the questions to provide students with concrete examples of the concept.

I used the four questions from the reflective analytical tool to assess this video. I used this analytical tool to assess my wait time, my positive teacher statements, gender equity in questioning, and the type of questions I was asking. What I found was that in my M401 portion, all of my questions were on a recall/information level. In asking these questions, I called on boys 75% of the time. I also found on my wait time that I was only giving students 1.5 seconds of wait time on average and didn’t provide any wait time after their responses. I was also shocked to find that in this clip, I didn’t provide my students with any positive statements.

When I used these same questions to assess the student teaching portion of my video I found that 33% of my questions were on a recall/information level and 66% were on a reflective/thought provoking level. My initial wait time on questions was .83 seconds. In this portion of the video, I provided students with .5 seconds of wait time after they responded to a question. When examining my gender equity in my questioning, I found that females answered 66% of my questions. In this part of the video, I was very happy to find that I had 6 positive teacher statements, such as giving a student a hand slap and comments such as “Good!” and “Beautiful!”

Reflection:

Using these analytical tools has been very enlightening. After assessing my M401 video, I was somewhat shocked at what I saw. I would never have guessed that I was using such a high percentage of lower level questions in my instruction. I also never realized that I was so inequitable in my questioning. My wait time needed much improvement, because I was not allowing any time for students to add to their initial responses. Most shocking to me was that I did not provide my students with any positive comments or feedback.

After realizing these weaknesses, I wanted to make a goal for myself to improve these areas during student teaching. This video and the analytical tools show that I used more higher level thinking questions during my student teaching experience. I accomplished this by writing my questions on cards, noting which level the questions fell on Bloom’s Taxonomy. In this way, I could make sure that I was asking students questions that helped them to develop critical thinking skills (4)

In this section of the video, my analytical tool shows that my questioning was still very inequitable because I asked girls to answer 66% of my questions. However, 2 of my lower level thinking questions were asked

Sabrina details how she evaluated her M401 video, made improvement plans, and used student teaching to try new strategies. In evaluating the student teaching video, she was able to determine whether or not those plans actually made a difference.

of a female student in an attempt to help her get to a higher level of thinking. In actuality, I asked 2 females and 2 males to answer my questions. I accomplished better gender equity in my questioning by using popsicle sticks with

all of the students' names written on them. The boys had their names on one color and the girls were on another color. When I had a question, I just pulled a popsicle stick. In this way, I could keep track of which students were answering questions, and which gender was answering more of the questions.

This reflection indicates not only how she knows she is growing professionally, but also how her improvement is reflected in her students. Knowing these tools have been valuable in self-assessment, Sabrina affirms her dedication to continued reflection, improvement, and professional growth.

teaching than in M401. However, I did provide some wait time after the students' responses. I only gave students .5 seconds on average, so obviously wait time is a skill that I still need to consciously work on in the future.

In my student teaching portion of the video, I gave my students more positive comments than in my M401 video clip. This was an important area of improvement for me, because all students want to know that their work and opinions are appreciated. By providing the positive feedback, students instantly know that what they had to say was important and will probably be more likely to volunteer information or comments in the future.

Using these analytical tools has taught me a lot about my teaching. Although I have seen some improvement in these areas, I still need to continue to work to make sure that I am constantly growing as a professional. All the areas that I discussed in this analysis will be important to my teaching, regardless of the grade I teach. As a teacher, I can easily use these same tools to measure my growth and ensure that I am continuing to reflect on my practices.

The artifact supporting this piece is the following data table.

	M401		STUDENT TEACHING	
<i>Measuring Teacher Questions</i>				
Recall/Information Questions	4 (100%)		2 (33%)	
Reflective/Thought Provoking Questions	0 (0%)		4 (66%)	
<i>Measuring Wait Time 1</i>				
Average	(4 questions - 6 seconds)	1.5 seconds	(6 questions - 5 seconds)	.83 seconds
<i>Measuring Wait Time 2</i>				
Average	(4 incidents - 0 seconds)	0 seconds	(6 incidents - 3 seconds)	.5 seconds
<i>Positive Teacher Statements</i>				
	0		6	
<i>Measuring Gender Equity</i>				
Recall/Information Questions	MMM		FF	
Reflective/Thought Provoking Questions			MFM	
Total Questions Asked	4		6	
Total # Female Responses	1		4	
Total # Male Responses	3		2	
% Females responding to recall	25%		33%	
% Males responding to recall	75%		0%	
% Females responding to Reflective	0%		33%	
% Males responding to Reflective	0%		33%	

Video Lesson

Explanation:

The videotaped lesson included in this portfolio is sections of the Applied Biology's Reebop genetics/meiosis lab. In this lab, students created marshmallow creatures called "Reebops". Working in groups, students created their Reebop using a set of chromosomes that coded for particular traits such as number of humps, number of eyes, color of legs, etc. Students had to decide if their Reebop's genotype for a particular trait was dominant or recessive, and then refer to an information sheet that told them what the phenotype is for that genotype. Once the group had the Reebop's phenotype figured out, they built it using marshmallows, colored miniature marshmallows, toothpicks, pushpins, pipe cleaners, etc.

This lab gave students a hands-on experience with meiosis and genetics. By creating their own creatures by going from genotype to a phenotype, students were better able to discern between the two concepts, as well as determine if a trait is dominant or recessive given a genotype.

This lab demonstrates:

She is very specific in naming the principles and themes she is meeting through implementation.

- My understanding of genetics and related topics (INTASC 1 - Content)
- My understanding of student learning styles by creating a hands-on activity for kinesthetic learners. (INTASC 3 - student diversity in learning)
- My ability to create varied instructional activities (INTASC 4 - instructional variety to promote critical thinking/problem solving, IL)
- My ability to create a positive and energetic learning environment (INTASC 5 – motivation & management)

Reflection:

The students really enjoyed this lab and were very proud of the Reebops they created. During the lab, the classroom atmosphere was very energetic yet focused. I know students gained a tremendous amount of understanding from this lab based on proceeding class work, assessments, and discussions.

Specific examples support claims of student understanding of the content.

As seen in the video, students were able to answer questions about what they were doing, and were also able to ask one another questions. Both of these facts show understanding. While this class had the reputation of being a behavior problem, I feel they handled themselves well, taking their work seriously and doing a good job.

Along with the video and this explanation – reflection, Amanda also included:

- the lesson plan for this lab
- a copy of students' written directions
- the students' lab sheet

Combined, this gave the reader a complete picture of what was planned for the lesson, what actually happened during the lesson, and what Amanda learned about herself and her students as a result.