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The full cycle of a teacher observation was done at Sinclairville Elementary School of a fifth grade teacher doing an EveryDay math lesson. The process of this evaluation was: a pre-observation meeting in which the teacher and evaluator discussed questions related to the upcoming in-class observation, the actual in-class observation during the math lesson, and a post-observation reflection conference in which the teacher and evaluator discussed the lesson observed the positives and negatives of this lesson and the teacher received the rating scale from the Charlotte Danielson rubric.

The method for the pre-observation meeting was taken from the Charlotte Danielson model in which the teacher was asked a series of questions in an interview format. The questions pertained to; the curriculum the lesson related to, the sequence of learning, the specific needs of some students in the class, the learning outcomes, the engagement of students in learning, differentiated instruction, how to measure what was learned, and what specifically the teacher would like the observer to pay close attention to (Danielson, 2007, p. 173).

The observation was done in-class as the teacher was observed doing an EveryDay math lesson to a fifth grade class. The rubric used for this observation was from the Charlotte Danielson model. Particular attention was paid to Domains 2 and 3 as these are; the classroom environment and instruction. Domain 2 has components 2a-2e and each component has sub-categories, domain 3 has components 3a-3e and each component has sub-categories. The lesson is rated based on whether the teacher reaches certain levels of these sub-categories (Danielson, 2007, p. 9-18). The teacher was evaluated based on a rating scale of; unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished.
Full Cycle Clinical Observation

In all cases of this observation the teacher was given a level of “proficient” and in five components she received a rating of “distinguished”. All “distinguished” levels were received in the instruction domain.

The post-observation conference was also taken from the Charlotte Danielson model in an interview format. This was a time for reflection on the lesson observed and the teacher was asked a series of questions based on; the success of the lesson, student samples of work, classroom procedure, if she stuck to her lesson, different aspects of instructional delivery, and if she would do anything differently if she had to do this lesson over again (Danielson, 2007, p. 171). After the questions were asked the Danielson rubric was reviewed and the ratings were explained that she had received. There was a brief discussion about the reasoning behind these ratings, what they meant to her as a teacher, and she was asked if she had any questions for the interviewer.

Reflecting on the full clinical cycle of evaluation, the process seems to be quite time consuming. Importance must me placed on time management for the supervisor as this process according to the Danielson model seems to be very time intensive and with a large teacher body, being thorough and managing time seems to be the real challenge. It is important in the pre-conference to establish educational goals for the lesson. Henson talks about the importance of such goals as a school, but it is equally important to establish these goals individually. “Mastery goals are noncompetitive goals that students pursue to gain mastery over the content they are studying” (Henson, 2010, p. 215). During this lesson the instructor clearly has placed an emphasis on this to the students and this has helped as it was clearly evident in observing the students work in the classroom.
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