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Introduction

There is great interest in digital video for professional learning for both pre-service and practicing teachers. Technological improvements make it easy to use computers to produce near-professional quality videos. The capacity and affordability of electronic storage makes it possible to store and share videos efficiently.

At the preservice level, video provides teacher candidates with opportunities to connect theory and practice through systematic reflection situated in authentic teaching and learning situations. Video makes it simple for preservice teachers to observe themselves, and it may be a useful tool for supervisors to focus preservice teachers’ reflection on their own teaching. There are many different ways that supervisors and preservice teacher candidates to use video for observation and conversation.

With recent significant improvements in video technology (powerful computer video applications, size and affordability of video equipment, and convenient storage for large video files), there is evidence that there is a surge of interest in using this technology in teacher education. Recent developments in the use of digital video in preservice teacher education include renewed interest in traditional video applications such as microteaching and new approaches such as online instructional video (Brunvand & Fishman, 2007; Givvin, Hiebert, Jacobs, Hollingsworth, & Gallimore, 2005; Harris, Pinnegar, & Teemant, 2005), video study groups (Tochon, 2007), and video clubs (Sherin, 2007; van Es & Sherin, 2006).

Some distinguishing features between different uses include:

- **Video purpose**—modeling effective teaching strategies, fostering reflection or evaluating teachers (Brouwer, 2007)
- **Video content**—full length or edited videos of oneself, videos of colleagues or other teachers, staged or authentic videos
- **Reflection context**—individual viewing and reflection on videos, group viewing and discussion of videos in university or workplace settings, or watching and interacting around videos online

As tools for teacher learning, some video uses are more “closed,” or didactic, where teachers compare teaching with representations of best practice. Other uses are more “open,” or autonomous, where teachers choose what to observe and how to analyze their teaching. In this paper, I suggest that what teachers perceive and how they interpret it depends in part on the control which teachers exert over video production and/or viewing. This, in turn, may influence the outcomes of teacher learning (Brouwer, 2007). One assumption of this project was that there are benefits to participants’ autonomy in the use of video.

The research described in this paper addresses the larger question of what and how teachers can learn from autonomous uses of digital video by posing the following question:

- How does the introduction of video into supervisory post-observation conferences between supervisors and preservice teacher candidates influence their conversations?
Methods

Data
The project began with the recruitment of five faculty and professional staff who supervised teacher candidates during practicum and/or student teaching at the early, middle, and secondary levels during Spring and Fall 2008. The principal investigator explained to these participants that the research would focus on the nature of the supervisory and reflective conversations between supervisors and their supervisees. Each supervisor was asked to identify at least one supervisee who was interested in participating in the project. Although five supervisors initially agreed to participate, three were unable to complete all videotaping activities. This paper is based on an analysis of the video records of two different beginning supervisors, each working with candidates in an early childhood licensure program. One supervisor completed all of the video activities with two different interns. The three pairs are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Teacher Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Rita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Tina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Becky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All supervisors were provided with basic training in the use of the video-camera and video editing software so they could run the videocamera, download the video to their computer, and share and view it with their intern using a computer. At the beginning of the semester, the supervisors engaged in standard clinical observation protocols. Halfway through the semester, the supervisors and student teachers identified goals for improvement and jointly determined strategies for videotaping to document progress towards these goals. Each supervisor videotaped the student teacher at least once, and during one or more post-observation conferences, the supervisor and student teacher watched the video to identify scenes that illustrated challenges or progress in meeting their goals. These observation conferences involving the viewing of video were also videotaped.

For each supervisor-intern pair, the following data was collected:
1. Video of a post-observation conference that did not involve videotaping the lesson or viewing any videotapes. These conferences were typically based on lessons observed during the first 5 weeks of the semester.
2. Video of a 30-60 minute lesson taught by the teacher candidate to be used as the basis of a post-observation conference involving video.
3. Video of a post-observation conference in which the primary focus of the conference was on the video of the lesson.
4. Supervisory materials collected as part of the routine work of supervision (e.g. written lesson plans and supervisors’ write-ups for each formal observation)

The design of this research project began with the desire to learn what happens when supervisors and preservice teacher candidates use video autonomously. In some projects, teachers exercise control over the content, by selecting a focus for recording, by taping classroom events themselves, or by editing videos of their own teaching. In other projects,
teachers control the *interactions* around video by framing the content of feedback, e.g. by selecting discussion protocols or by moderating discussions about video.

To preserve autonomy, supervisors were given the freedom to decide what kind of lesson they would videotape and what guidelines they would follow when videotaping. This was done to allow for the range of supervisors’ expertise in using the video equipment and to allow them to choose the instructional formats and video content that would best support their supervisory purposes. Regarding the post-observation conference, supervisors had the freedom to decide how they would incorporate video into their supervisory conferences.

**Analysis.**
All videos for each pair were gathered into one location and stored on an external hard drive. The principal investigator watched all videos for each pair in order and took notes on each video to document the primary conferencing strategies used by each supervisor. The principal investigator logged the major chunks of each conference, noting time stamps, to see how the time was used.

From this initial viewing, themes were identified that represented the differences between conferences with and without video for each pair. The videos were viewed again with special attention to these themes. After this, the researcher compared differences between the supervisors to see if there were any consistent differences that occurred in the conferences where video was used.

**Findings**
Both supervisors videotaped whole group lessons and used the videocamera to capture primarily whole group instruction. In Rita’s lesson that Susan videotaped, the lesson involved whole group activity followed by a small group project. As Susan taped the small group activities, she went from group to group and occasionally asked the group members a question about what they were doing. Kristin occasionally panned the class or zoomed in on particular students but the majority of the video was focused on the teacher conducting whole group activities. At the point where the lesson turned to individual work, Kristin stopped videotaping.

The overall findings indicate several differences that were consistent across supervisors. These include the use of time, with more time spent on discussion of specific details about the lesson, and more time focusing on specific incidents during the lesson. Conferences with video took longer, especially if the student teacher had not previously had a chance to watch the video. The second includes the degree that the student teacher initiated a topic for discussion by asking a question or focusing on something in the video. The third is the shift towards increased percentage of the time spoken by the student teacher.

In the following sections, I provide an analysis of each pair and how the supervisory conferences differed with and without video. This section concludes with a cross-case analysis of the common findings across all three pairs.
Susan and Rita

Susan and Rita’s conferences were strikingly different from the other pairs. The conferences were noticeably shorter, and the student teacher spoke more during the conference without video than the conference with video. The timeline with major chunks of each conference can be found in the Appendix.

In Susan and Rita’s conference without video, Susan began the conference by summarizing the topic of the lesson she had observed for approximately 3.5 minutes. Susan then proceeded to ask Rita for evidence of how she had demonstrated progress in three goals that Susan had identified as areas where Rita needed to develop further. These three goals were “getting to know students,” “maintaining accurate records,” and “maintaining consistent standards of behavior.” The pair spent 2-3 minutes discussing evidence for each one of these goals. After this, Susan asked Rita about her learning objectives and finally asked Rita how she planned to follow up this lesson. The total conference was 14:24 minutes. Susan’s interactions consisted primarily of questions, and Rita provided an extended answer for each question that Susan asked. In all, Rita spoke for 65% of the total time of the conference.

In the conference with video, Susan and Rita watched the video on the computer, both for the first time. As in the first conference, Susan and Rita had identified professional goals for Rita. The difference between the conference with and without video was that Susan occasionally stopped the tape and asked Rita descriptive questions like, “What did you just see?” and “What did you just say?” Rita would then describe what she had just observed on the tape and decide which goal was addressed by her actions on the tape. Rita spoke for 20.4% of the time during this conference.

Susan and Tina

Susan came to the conference prepared with her observation notes and the formal write-up of the lesson on the university observation form. She began the conference by summarizing the topic and main activities of the lesson. Then, using the form as a guide, she walked through each of the four domains. During this time, the student teacher was not allowed to look at the form.

The structure of the conference closely followed the university observation form, which is organized by the four Praxis domains. For each domain, Susan invited the intern’s reflection on that domain and allowed her to respond, and then shared her own assessment. For example, she asked Tina, “Why did you specifically make this a language arts lesson instead of a math lesson?” and then explains that she felt the lesson plan was well done. “Is there anything about the lesson planning itself that seemed difficult?” Tina was confused about the proper format to follow. “What did you like about the lesson plan?” Tina said that she had had a hard time anticipating what students would say.

Susan also asked questions to reflect on her practice of supervision. For example, Susan asked Tina “What did you think of that style of communication? You sending me your plan and then me sending you comments with changes tracked?” Susan explained that this was only her second semester of using Word’s “Track changes” feature to provide feedback on lesson plans.

One striking difference with Susan and Tina’s conference is that Tina actively shaped the conversation by posing questions to clarify Susan’s expectations. For example, after Susan provided her with several ways to modify the lesson, she asked “Would I state all of that in my
lesson plans?” Later in the conference after Susan noted a concern about one of the learning centers that did not seem to fit with her lesson objective, Tina asked a question about what she should do with the centers since her mentor teacher had agreed to prepare two of the centers (one of which was the one that Susan had concerns about). She also asked questions about how she could have improved the lesson. For example, she asked, “Do you think when they were doing the shape mobiles that it would have been good to let them cut their own shapes?”

Susan’s conference with Tina lasted an hour and 26 minutes—much longer than her conference with Rita. During this time, Tina spoke for 23.3% of the time.

The video of Susan and Tina’s conference with video begins in mid-stream, so it is impossible to document the full use of time. However, during the time available, as in her video conference with Rita, Susan and Tina viewed the video together. It is less apparent in this conference that Susan and Tina were looking for evidence of meeting specific goals. The conference followed the sequence of the lesson, with Susan occasionally stopping the video to ask Tina a question about the lesson. Some of the questions Susan asked include:

“No what are you doing? This is positive.”
“What happened there?”
“What are you noticing about behavior right now?”

The conference concluded with Susan asking Tina several overall questions about the lesson, inviting her to share what went well and how she felt about her goals for the lesson.

Although the video was not a complete conference, the total time of the conference video was 43:34, and Tina spoke for 31.3% of the time. During this time, Tina did not pose any questions to Susan as she had done during the conference without video. Tina did not ask to stop the video at any point.

Kristin and Becky

Kristin and Becky’s conferences followed a similar pattern with Susan and Tina’s conferences. Like Susan, Kristin began her conference asking Becky to share how she felt about the lesson and whether she felt her objectives had been met. After responding for approximately 2 minutes, Kristin shared her perspective on the lesson overall, and then began to share her feedback domain by domain, using the formal observation write-up she had completed. For each domain, Kristin asked Becky to reflect briefly on her perspective in that domain and then shared her own assessment. She focused on each domain for 4-6 minutes, with 6 minutes devoted to an overall assessment of the lesson and 3 minutes explaining the next steps for Becky to complete the formal observation form. The total length of the conference was 27 minutes, and Becky spoke for 25.4% of the time. During the entire conference, Becky did not pose any questions or suggest any topics to discuss.

In the conference with video, Kristin began the conference by providing Becky with a list of things to look for as they watched the video. Both Kristin and Becky had watched the video prior to the conference. Kristin indicated to Becky that she had not completed the formal observation form yet, and she told Becky that either one could choose to stop the video if she saw something interesting to discuss.

During this conference, Kristin and Becky both chose places to stop the video and talk about things they observed on the video. Kristin typically stopped the tape to illustrate something that she had written to pay attention to on her form, e.g. “teacher as model.” Becky
stopped the tape at moments when she had difficulty deciding what to do next. For example, during a discussion in which Becky asked students the meaning of a word in the title of their next reading selection, Becky is unsure what to say to students when they provide answers that are blatantly incorrect. She stops the tape and says to Kristin, “While I’m doing that I never know how to respond.” At another point in the conference, Becky notices her questioning techniques by pointing out to Kristin, “I didn’t plan on doing it this way, but this shows that I’m focusing on higher level thinking skills.” There are at least four instances where Becky identifies a brand new topic to discuss based on what she sees in the video. The total length of the conference was 1:00:00, and Becky spoke for 28.8% of the time.

Cross-Case Comparison

Although the numbers of conferences and supervisors involved is too small to generalize, there are some observations that were consistent in the comparisons of the conferences with video and those without video. These rough analyses also offer some questions worthy of further study.

First, there are some consistent differences about the structure of the conferences. Conferences without video tended to center around the forms and were structured according to the domains in the forms. This ensured that all topics were discussed, but if the supervisor had already completed the formal observation write-up, student teachers may have perceived that there was less opportunity for them to reflect since their supervisor had already assessed them using the items on the observation form. The supervisors appreciated the fact that the forms allowed them to provide feedback on many aspects of the student teachers’ teaching including areas for improvement.

Conferences with video tended to follow the lesson chronologically and focused more on teaching behaviors and student behaviors than on planning. Planning was addressed as it became important to understand what was happening in the lesson. It was much more difficult to analyze the conferences with video since the conferences focused more on discussing and interpreting specific incidents in the lesson. Topics introduced early in the conference were frequently revisited and discussed again in the context of other incidents that illustrated a point that the supervisor wanted to make about the lesson.

Second, there was a significant difference in time for conferences with and without video: the total amount of time in the conferences and the amount of time during which student teachers were speaking. Both supervisors and student teachers shared that the process was time consuming. Although the videos of the conference were incomplete, conversations with both supervisors indicates that the total amount of time for conferences with videos were much longer, especially after adding the extra amount of time necessary for participants to watch the videos (together or independently).

In two of the three pairs, there was an increase in the total amount of time spoken by student teachers, as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison of Time in Conferences With and Without Video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference without video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The amount of speaking time by the student teacher increased in two out of three pairs, even though there were portions of the conference when neither person was speaking because they were watching video of the lesson. The exception was the Susan/Rita pair, which can be explained by the way the two conferences in this pair were structured. In the conference without video, Susan asked Rita questions and invited Rita to comment on these questions without sharing her assessment of the lesson. In the conference with video, Susan noted that the focus of the conference was on identifying instances that provided evidence for meeting one of the goals rather than on discussing specific episodes. As a result, there was little talk between the Susan and Rita at all during this conference, except to note moments where Rita should write something on her chart.

Third, there was a difference in the content of the conferences with and without video. In the conferences without video, the supervisors controlled the content of the talk. Even though Tina poses questions in the conference without video, the questions are intended to provide clarification about points that Susan made during the conference. The only conference in which a student teacher actually raises a question about teaching or nominates a topic for discussion was during Kristin and Becky’s conference with video. I suspect that this has something to do with the fact that Kristin explicitly indicated to Becky that she could stop the tape at any time if she wanted to discuss something.

Even though the supervisors controlled most of the talk, it is evident from the conferences with video that the video allowed both student teachers and supervisors to notice things that they may not have noticed on their own. For example, Susan draws Rita and Tina’s attention to their use of space in the classroom—for Rita, it is seeing how she distributes the small groups, and for Tina, how she restricts her entire class to a very small space while completing an activity where she could have used a much larger space. Kristin points out to Becky that one of her students spent eleven minutes in the bathroom, and Becky notices a misspelled word that she put on the whiteboard. In all three conferences with video, there are moments where the student teacher or the supervisor points out something that they would not have noticed if not for watching the lesson on video.

Fourth, there was a difference in the attitudes of supervisors and student teachers about the conferences with and without video. All participants entered into the project with some hesitation. Both supervisors, who were new to this role, had concerns about developing their supervisory skills while attempting to incorporate video into their supervision in a meaningful way. Both supervisors shared concerns about their technical expertise, ranging from questions about the basic use of the video camera, setting the camera on a tripod, ensuring that the camera was recording properly, worrying about recording over previous recordings, and capturing video onto a computer for sharing and viewing. Although they had wireless microphones available to use during videotaping, both supervisors chose not to use this equipment. Both supervisors were
unsure what they were supposed to be videotaping during the lesson, and both supervisors faced challenges in capturing video onto a computer and burning videos onto DVDs to share with the teacher candidates. Like the supervisors, the student teachers expressed some concerns about the project. They felt nervous and self-conscious about videotaping themselves teaching, even though all three student teachers were performing adequately.

In spite of their initial hesitance, all participants emerged from the experience with a positive feeling about the experience. In a written reflection about the experience, Susan notes that the conference with video felt more positive because “[Rita] and I watched her lesson captured on video with enthusiasm because we were able to find proof she had indeed met her goals.” Although she felt that the conference with video was positive, however, she also expressed concerns that the conference with video did not allow enough time to discuss all of the items from the observation form used by the university, and she worried that the conferences with video limited her ability to provide feedback on other aspects of teaching that needed attention. Although the research project ended, both supervisors have continued to use video as part of their supervision work, and they now require their student teachers to videotape themselves at least once.

Conclusions

Supervisory conferences with and without video provide different opportunities for conversations about teaching between supervisors and student teachers. Some differences are inherent in the introduction of video, and other differences appear rooted in differences in how supervisors choose to structure these experiences.

Some differences seem inherent in video. Time is definitely a factor. Any attempt to incorporate video into supervisory practices requires that supervisors receive adequate training in the use of video technology and have opportunities to think about how they intend to use the technology to maximize its benefits for student teachers. Supervisors will also need time and experimentation to decide how to use video technology, and more time for student teachers to view and discuss videos of their teaching. In two out of three video-based conferences, student teachers spoke more. It would be worth collecting additional data to determine whether this is a trend that would be true for additional pairs of supervisors and student teachers. Video-based conferences certainly allow student teachers and supervisors to notice things that they would not see without the use of video.

Other differences seem to stem from supervisors’ decisions about how to structure conferences with video. Although there may be many ways to use video with student teachers, supervisors should have thought about how they intend to use it. Some of the decisions that Susan and Kristin had to make as they used supervision with their student teachers include:

- When is video used most productive— as a component of earlier field experiences, at the beginning of student teaching, or towards the end?
- Whether or not to make video available to student teachers prior to supervisory conferences. If student teachers are to watch videos beforehand, supervisors must have the ability to download and quickly share videos of lessons taught.
Supervision with Video

- What kind of advance organizers should be used to guide video-based supervisory conferences? Should supervisors use formal observation instruments, nominate specific things that student teachers should notice, work from student teachers’ self-identified professional goals, or ask student teachers to nominate specific moments of interest during a lesson?
- Who should be allowed to nominate places for discussion—the student teacher, the supervisor, or both?
- How should videos be used during the conference—to find evidence of something specific (such as meeting specific goals) or to discuss specific problematic or interesting episodes during the lesson?

The fact that both supervisors continue to advocate its use among fellow supervisors and students suggests that the value of video outweighs the cost, at least for these two supervisors. The student teachers appreciated the experience, and they came away from the project with a tangible product of their efforts—videos of their teaching—which they could use as a portfolio artifact and an artifact that may be useful as part of their job search. This exploratory research project identified some common themes that occurred in observation conferences between supervisors and student teachers, but it has also raised new questions worth exploring in greater detail.
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## Appendix: Timelines of Conferences

### Susan and Rita Conference without Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan summarizes the observed lesson</td>
<td>0-3:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan questions Rita for evidence about “Getting to Know Students”</td>
<td>3:25-5:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan questions Rita for evidence about “Maintaining Accurate Records”</td>
<td>5:25-10:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Maintaining Consistent Standards of Behavior”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan questions Rita about her learning objectives</td>
<td>10:40-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan asks how Rita plans to follow up this lesson</td>
<td>12:00-14:24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Susan and Rita Conference with Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watching video. Supervisor stops tape and asks, “What did you just see?”</td>
<td>0:00-8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student teacher completes a form provided by supervisor in which she opens and what she just observed and places it under one of the goals that they had identified. I wanted it to be expectations, but could it be… Explain how they were put into groups and relates lesson to student backgrounds.</td>
<td>8:01—11:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor: What did you just say? What is that? Student Teacher: Expectations. Supervisor: Let’s go back—you need to tell me. What was the underlying thing of saying you’d come around to help? End of lesson.</td>
<td>11:16-14:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Susan and Tina Conference Without Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of lesson</td>
<td>0:00-1:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of Planning and planning supervision</td>
<td>1:00-13:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of the lesson itself, with a focus on engaging the students using a hook activity</td>
<td>13:00-21:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain A Questioning ST about her feelings about the lesson—planning and content, what was the best part about the lesson, what would you like to have improved?</td>
<td>21:30-24:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor suggestions about plans (content)</td>
<td>24:00-32:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and instructional strategies)</td>
<td>Supervisor reviews scores and comments from observation form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving over to Domain B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I gave you a 2.5 on this item. Can you tell me why I gave you a 2.5 about stating specific and appropriate expectations? Give me an example.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let’s focus on the centers. Now why do you think I gave you a 2.5? Students did not know what they were supposed to be doing at the centers. What would you have had for the fourth center? Fasteners, rings, flipbooks. Management of centers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain C—intern’s ideas. What did you think about this? Uses blank observation form. In which one of these were you the strongest or improved the most?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I thought you were pretty solid in this area overall.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3—where were you the strongest?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain D—supervisor shares information about lack of observation in some areas of Domain D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares completed observation form with intern and offers summary comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Susan and Tina Conference with Video**

| Starts in mid-conference. Susan asking a question of the intern? | 0:00-3:30 |
| Watching video | 3:30-4:20 |
| Susan stops. Now what are you doing? | 4:20-6:25 |
| Watch. What are you doing? This is positive. Q about use of space. You see… | 6:25-11:00 |
| Q about matching of the cards. It was then I realized that they couldn’t match. | 11:00-15:45 |
| What happened there? By this point the kids didn’t understand what they were expected to do. Sup provides suggestions for how to recover the lesson. Feel free to start again. | 16:01-22:30 |
| Watching video | 22:30-25:45 |
| Stop video for about 3 minutes to jot down some thing | --- |
| What are you noticing about behavior right | 25:45-29:15 |
Supervision with Video

### Kristin and Becky’s Conference Without Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you feel? Were your objectives met?</td>
<td>0:00-2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Here’s what I thought. Overall good, but minor things</td>
<td>2:00-5:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain B is about classroom management. Supervisor asks intern to reflect, then offers strengths and suggestions.</td>
<td>5:54-11:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain C</td>
<td>11:00-16:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain D—Professionalism</td>
<td>16:50-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall observations and suggestions</td>
<td>18:00-24:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any questions? Next steps (follow-up form)</td>
<td>24:00-27:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Kristin and Becky’s Conference With Video

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A list of things to look for as we watch it together. I did not yet do the formal observation, just comments about the domains. Either one can stop it at any time.</td>
<td>0:00-2:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor stops it. Asks “Strength?” ST: I’m using wait time. I saw Brandon’s hand go up right away and I didn’t want to call on him immediately.</td>
<td>2:00-3:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Never know whether I agree or disagree, when a student answers it incorrectly.</td>
<td>3:45-7:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on higher order thinking**</td>
<td>7:35-8:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor: Watching—that’s really very boring. Teacher as model.</td>
<td>8:00-11:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: Encounter—I brought that up specifically for the ESL student**</td>
<td>11:25-14:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher as model, using intonation.</td>
<td>14:25-16:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor: I panned the students so you could see their reaction. What do you notice? ST: I didn’t notice it when I was videotaping, but when I went back and watched, I saw it (SUP)</td>
<td>16:00-18:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST: I like how Brandon said he thought the author was a man. I wish I had highlighted that. Perhaps stop in a couple of places.</td>
<td>18:00-21:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:00-10:00</td>
<td>look for a map of Belize. ST: Can the sun really dance on the sand? ST: Entertain, persuade or perform? Supervisor: “I’ve got to take this back just a minute so you can listen to your response to one of the students”—SUP “I agree with you, Melissa. Does everyone else agree?” The camera influenced her to participate more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-20:10</td>
<td>Students telling stories. 1-2-3 keep going. How to help students make connections to the story. Need to help different students without background knowledge connect to the story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:10-23:30</td>
<td>Checking on student understanding. Entertain, persuade or inform? Sense of humor—teacher as model. Dictionary. I’m always encouraging them to problem solve with that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:30-26:00</td>
<td>Working with students on vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:00-32:00</td>
<td>Vocabulary words for the week. I wish there were more vocabulary words. Suggestion to give out more words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:00-36:30</td>
<td>What are we going to do with all these words now? Now what do we have time to do? Alphabetizing words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:30-49:00</td>
<td>Students moving into independent work—sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49:00-54:30</td>
<td>Final comments—learning about the wait-time and bringing students to the realization of who participated, who hasn’t answered. Strengths and things to consider. Domain A—clear planning. Did the implementation include the fourth purpose? Domain B—great rapport, used sense of humor, clear behavioral expectations, patient dictionary, library, be careful when How long Skyler was gone Domain C—excellent use of questions, predictions, why questions, pacing was good. Overall, an excellent lesson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL TIME: 19:30 out of 1:07:43 (28.8%)