**Lesson Evaluation Document Submission**

**Lesson Details:**

**Date**:

02/06/23

**Time:**

11.15am

**Location**:

D312 Computer Classroom, Otago Polytechnic

**Observer:**

Hamish Smith – Head of CITE LV4, Lesson recorded & sent to Krissi Wood

**Attendance:**

7 Students, 1 Lecturer

**Lesson Notes:**

The lesson was originally planned to take place at 11am in D105B. This would have allowed time me to set up and start at 11am then run the lesson until 11.45am. This would have allowed for a 45 minute lesson. Unfortunately, two days prior to the lesson I was informed that the students would not be able to take part in the lesson until 11.15am as they had another task to undertake beforehand. This meant that the lesson length was shortened by 15 minutes.

**Learner Feedback:**

Due to the lesson time being shortened, the activities based around learner feedback were shortened drastically. I had originally intended to ask each student individual questions and ask for feedback on how they found the lesson, such as what they learnt and if they had any questions about the content. I did have time directly after the PowerPoint to ask the students if they had any questions, at this point in time they did not. I asked again at the very end of lesson if they had any questions which they did not. I was aware that we were very pressed for time and that the students needed/wanted to get away to for their lunch break.

To achieve some form of learner feedback, I sent out a student feedback survey to attendees of the tutorial. I received seven responses to the survey.

Survey Link - <https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/GT53NQJ>

**Feedback Survey Questions & Responses:**

*Q1 What new knowledge did you learn during the tutorial?*

Two students said they learnt nothing new. Three students said they learnt more about APA referencing. One said they understood how to create a good report layout. One said they now knew how to create a report template.

*Q2 Is there anything you wish the tutorial had covered?*

One student said everything was covered really well. One student said they wished they had learnt how to create a custom table of contents. One said more coverage about the different parts of the report. Another said that they wished the tutorial had given more information about what to do when stuck and how to word information more clearly for the reader.

*Q3 What do you think went well in the tutorial?*

One student responded “Yes”. Two students said report writing and features of a report were well covered. One student responded that the tutor spoke clearly and made it interesting. Two students said everything went well. One said when “we got to do some research”.

*Q4 What do you think could have gone better in the tutorial?*

One student said “no”. One student said more in-depth information about writing reports. One student said the power point seemed rushed and another said more time for the tutorial. The last said that more interactive activities could have been included.

*Q5 Did you enjoy the lesson?*

Four students enjoyed the lesson, and three students were neutral about the lesson. No students said they didn’t enjoy the lesson.

**Analysis of Learner Feedback:**

No learner feedback was gained during the lesson. The students were asked a few times if they had any questions and they said they did not. I could only hope that this meant that they understood everything I had said in the PowerPoint presentation and that they comfortably followed the steps and instructions that I gave them during the activities.

The survey of student feedback allowed me to gain some insight into how the lesson went from the viewpoint of the students. Overall, the students did seem to learn something new during the lesson, predominantly how to structure a report and how to correctly reference in APA7 format, which were my objectives for the lesson. Two students mentioned that they would have liked to learn more about report writing and how to create a custom table of contents. Unfortunately, these suggestions were outside the scope of my lesson plan, as learning more about professional report writing in terms of language would take more than one lesson in my opinion. I never considered teaching the students how to create a custom contents page as using the prebuilt contents page feature of Microsoft Word is much easier and more user friendly.

I thought the comments from students relating to the lesson being rushed, particularly the activities, were very fair. I knew that as we headed into the activities after the PowerPoint that we were very pressed for time. However, I was pleased to see that no students said that they did not enjoy the lesson overall.

**Self-Evaluation:**

In hindsight the shortened lesson severely impacted my abilities to carry out the activities and reflection I had planned for the lesson. By the time I was set up and the recording started, I realized we were running behind for time. I still took my planned amount of time for the PowerPoint presentation as I felt that this was the most informative part of the lesson. This took approximately 15 minutes which only left us 10 minutes for my two planned activities and learner reflection.

The planned activities were shortened on the fly. I had intended to get the students to create a full report template that they could use in later assignments. Instead, I had them start one and explained what the next steps would be if they wished to continue it. When it came time to look up a quote to reference there was only a few minutes left in the lesson, so it was very rushed. I was unable to write up their examples on the whiteboard and have a small discussion as I had planned. I also did not have time to ask each student individually what they learned or if they had a question to ask. I only had time to ask the class in general if they had any questions, which no one did.

The lesson could have gone better had I shortened my presentation time. This would have allowed more time for activities. Another option would have been to rebook the lesson time and date, which would have allowed for a full 45 minute session with the learners. However, due to being at this point in the semester, it would have been difficult to rebook this session with the students as they are approaching their end of semester assignments and exams. Hamish, head of CITE L4, had expressed that the lesson needed to take place sooner rather than later. This was so that the students could benefit from the information learned before they started their final reports. I chose to go ahead with the time and date which certainly impacted my abilities to carry out the lesson as I had planned it.

Overall, I feel the lesson went as well as it could with the allotted time that I had available. I learnt a lot during the planning process and even more during reflection. I felt that my PowerPoint presentation went well and that the learners were engaged with the content. I am confident in my public speaking abilities, so I feel this was very beneficial to learners as I know I can speak clearly and confidently. I felt my voice projected well to room and that all students could hear and see me clearly. I also think my pace of speaking was good. The only other thing I would’ve liked to have changed was having some more bullet points or images on my slides to help illustrate some of the points I was making during the presentation. All in all, I am happy with how the lesson went, the students clapped, and I felt good when I finished.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Delivery Rubric | Exemplary 9-10 | Excellent 7-8 | Sufficient 5-6 | Inadequate 4-3 | Poor 2-1 |
| Introduction | Introduction that captivates the learners. Fully engages the audience using a variety of introduction elements. Adheres to best practice INTROSH techniques. Thoroughly explains all aspects of the INTROSH plan. | Introduction that almost captivates the learners. Engages most of the audience using a variety of introduction elements. Adheres to most of the best practice INTROSH techniques.  Explains all aspects of the INTROSH plan | Would be mostly sufficient to engage the learners. Most of the components required for an effective introduction present. Considered INTROSH techniques. | An attempt to be able engage the learners was made. Few components required for an effective introduction present. States some aspects of the INTROSH plan | Very poor introduction made that would not engage the learners. Very little components required for an effective introduction present, if at all. States very few or no aspects of the INTROSH plan |
| Content Delivery | Delivery is extremely well structured, and points flow logically. Audience easily follows along.  Pacing out well so that all the content was thoroughly covered. | Delivery is structured well, and points flow naturally. Audience mostly understands. Pacing fills out the time. | Delivery is structured sufficiently so as not to cause too much confusion. Pacing mostly fills out the time. | An attempt to structure the delivery. Audience may not follow easily. Pacing seems confused or rushed. | Very little structure content. Audience does not follow along. Pacing does not seem to have been adhered to. |
| Delivery Engagement Techniques | Variety of techniques used to fully engage the learners. Comprehensive questioning used to keep learners fully attentive. Controlled the room with a strong but supportive presence | Several techniques used to engage the learners. Questioning used proficiently to keep learners engaged. Controlled the room with an adequate presence | Sufficient techniques used to mostly engage the learners. Some questioning used to keep learners engaged. Minimal control the room with enough presence | A few techniques used to try and engage the learners. Some questioning used that doesn’t keep learners engaged. Unsuccessful control of the room with an inadequate amount of presence | Very few techniques used to engage the learners. Very little questioning used that doesn’t keep learners engaged. Very little presence and did not have control of the room |
| Assessment | Assessment that confirms comprehensive learner achievement of the objectives. | Assessment that confirms learner achievement of the objectives. | Sufficient assessment that mostly confirms learner achievement of the objectives. | Insufficient assessment that does not confirm learner achievement of the objectives. | Poor attempt at an assessment that ignores learner achievement of the objectives. |
| Evaluation | Feedback from learners is thoroughly analysed. Document contains all the required aspects, and all have been considered thoughtfully. | Feedback from learners is analysed. Document contains all the required aspects. | Feedback is gathered from learners. Document contains the required aspects at a superficial level. | Feedback is minimal from learners. Document contains some required aspects at a superficial level. | Very little useful feedback is gathered from the learners. Document contains few of the required aspects at a token level. |