

Peer Observation and Classroom Evaluation Form
The College of Education
The University of Texas at El Paso

Evaluation Form

Name: Martine Ceberio Date: April 6, 2017

Location: CCSB1.0704 Number of Students: 39

Evaluator: Christina Convertino

Classrooms are complex environments. To recognize and understand how teaching and learning occur in a classroom, the peer evaluation should focus on different aspects and dimensions. As a result, this evaluation form pays particular attention to the following features in undergraduate and graduate classrooms: the physical environment, the features of the learning task, the patterns of student activities and interactions, and the role of the fellow.

Focus Area #1 *The Physical Environment*

Evaluator Notes: In this area, the physical layout of the classroom should be described, including the arrangement of the room and position of teacher and students. Additionally, pay attention to the implications of the physical space for student-student and student-teacher interactions.

Notes and Comments:

In the room, where the observation was conducted there are 7 rows of tables that run horizontally from each side of the room with just enough room to walk in between or on either side of each row. The tables face the front of the room where there is a drop down screen and a whiteboard. During the observation, a PPT was projected onto the screen and was visible. However, due to the depth of the room, visibility of what was written on the whiteboard was quite limited, especially for rows in the back. In this room, there are approximately 8 Dell desktop computers placed on one of each of the 7 tables. On the day of the observation, there were approximately 39 students of which 9 were female. Of the 39 students, it appeared that approximately 13 students were using a personal laptop, and the rest were using the desktop computers for course related activities. The layout of the room does allow for some student-student interaction, albeit limited since the tables are fastened and there is little room between rows. During the observation, Dr. Ceberio directed the students to work together on several occasions, which was accomplished by having them work in pairs (turn to your neighbor). In a few instances, I observed students, who also found creative ways to work in groups of 3 or 4. In still fewer cases, approximately 4 instances throughout the entire class meeting, I observed a student working alone during pair designated activities. Throughout the time that students worked in pairs, Dr. Ceberio circulated

throughout the room to answer student questions. Her engagement with students in the center of the room and or in the middle of rows was limited during this time due to the arrangement of the tables, which precluded her from reaching those students.

Focus Area #2 *The Learning Task*

Evaluator Notes: In this area, describe the goals of the lesson or class activity, both in terms of content and classroom management. Describe how the learning task is communicated as well as whether the goals of the lesson have been attained. Describe the pace, flow and teaching strategies utilized as well as reference to curricular materials & resources used.

Comments: The primary learning objectives for the class meeting were to complete a prior activity on “code tweaking” and then to introduce “testing.” Dr. Ceberio began the class by introducing the learning objectives for the day. Following, she provided a review of what they had been working on in the prior class meeting, this provided context to the day’s activities. To do this, she used phrases, like, “last time, you had a main method, once you understand you will go to the next variation of this method (...)” thus, providing cues to help students make connections between prior, current, and future learning objectives (development of learning).

The pace and flow of instruction were pretty constant following a pattern of lecture to introduce tasks or new content, (often an example on white board was provided to show content) followed by learning activities based on the material just presented (most of the activities happened in pairs). Students used computers and paper to complete activities. Approximately mid-way into the class meeting, the complexity of problems increased. At this point, the pace of the class slowed and Dr. Ceberio spent more time at the white board writing out the problems and showing the class how she would solve them. She used cues like, “what is important is the building block in this code, this line is crucial it tells you how to reverse characters,” so that she was not just showing but also explaining the process that she was demonstrating. In addition, she asked students to tell her, “What would we do? Why is it a problem?” Initially, it was students in the front of the room, who responded to these questions, thus making it difficult for those in the back to hear the answer. Dr. Ceberio also called on students to respond, demonstrating that she knew students’ names. She called on both male and female students. However, fewer students in the back half of the room were called on and/or raised their hand to answer a question. At one point, she encouraged the class to Google something after class. In total, the primary instructional materials and resources were power point, whiteboard, and a program on-line, which students accessed to complete activities.

Focus Area #3 *The Students*

Evaluator Notes: In this area, describe the knowledge and skills that the students need to complete the tasks as well as reference the patterns and levels of participation in class.

Comments:

Learning objectives were clearly developmental in the sense that future learning objectives built on prior concepts and skills. Thus, students needed to have knowledge of prior content in order to engage in new learning. Students also needed to have knowledge of the program where the activities were accessed and how to access them. Students needed to be able and/or willing to participate in student-to-student interaction. Students also needed to be able and/or willing to ask questions in a large-classroom setting.

Rotation #4 *The Teacher*

Evaluator Notes: In this area, describe how the teacher introduces the lesson and communicates expectations. Describe how feedback is provided and how the teacher interacts with students and manages the classroom.

Comments: Dr. Ceberio demonstrated dedication, interest, and engagement in teaching. She clearly communicated objectives and expectations. She also demonstrated reflective practice in the sense that she responded to students progress with the learning activities, making adjustments to pacing and adding additional explanation at those points in the lesson, where there was clear indication that the majority of students were struggling to grasp an idea (activity). She used humor and examples to illustrate complex ideas and was encouraging of students overall learning trajectories using comments like, "What I meant to teach you is making you become more fluent in taking some code and tweaking it, this is important because you will find yourself doing this a lot, you will get some code from some company, or it is your code but your client wants a change fast so you have to know how to do this." In another example, she made explicit connections between the reason students need to learn the material (which, she admitted can be tedious at times), and their future professional lives. "We teach you to do this but then when you get into the world, you will have to use this," after, which she described examples of people who design tests for plane and in cannot ask for redundant tests, because of cost and time. Thus, providing clear evidence of her role and commitment to student learning and to developing students' professional identities. "

Global Comments

Strengths: A comfortable and respectful learning environment characterized by clear learning objectives and activities to apply learning.

Suggestions for Improvement: The physical layout of the room requires interventions to ensure that students in the back half of the room can see white board, can hear lecture and student responses that occur in the front and middle of the room, and are encouraged to respond to questions in the context of whole class question and answers. One additional, yet minor recommendation is to use “questions” more often and earlier in the lesson to gauge student comprehension (formative assessment). For example, it might help student learning to pause during lecture and ask students, “are you with me?” before moving on to next step in explanation. Or to use questions, such as, “what is this like?” Rather than saying what it is like, “this is an integer, which becomes a string...,” this will provide instructor with on-going formative assessment of student learning.