



University
of Glasgow

Ticking the box: How simple checklists can improve feedback to student teachers, probationers and colleagues.

Hazel Crichton, The University of Glasgow

Orla Herron, Lourdes RC Secondary Glasgow



University
of Glasgow

- **Aims of this presentation**

- **Setting the context**
- **The implementation of the project**
- **Conclusions**



Underperforming student(s)

- **Many don't realise that they are less than competent (Cleland et al., 2005)**
- **Less able to self-assess (Langendyk, 2006)**
- **Unaware of how to improve (Yariv, 2011)**



University
of Glasgow

Donaldson: Every teacher is a teacher educator

Teacher support: issues

- **Time to deconstruct lessons meaningfully and provide formative feedback**
- **Concerns about ‘nitpicking’**
- **Concerns about undermining confidence Yariv, 2006)**



- **Construction of a checklist which would enable teachers to provide feedback instantly and which could be used as a basis for reflection/ discussion**
- **Checklist would pinpoint areas of strength and areas for development**

Teaching area	Good	Acceptable	Needs attention
Subject knowledge			
Curriculum knowledge			
Lesson plan			
Links to unit aims			
Coherence of lesson			
Links made to previous learning			
ICT use			
Instructions			
Variety of skills practised			
Links between activities			
Questioning			
Target language			
Classroom management			
Pupils contributions			
Homework			
Recap			
Assessment/Feedback			



Teaching area	Good	Acceptable	Needs attention
Pace of activities			
Overall timing			
Learning intentions achieved			



Putting it into practice

- **Context**
- **Classroom teacher**
- **Giving feedback – the reality:**
 - Issues of time;
 - Focus on areas of improvement;
 - Effect on student confidence;
 - Inconsistency of support
- **PT responsibility: difficult to monitor progress**



- **Initial support unsustainable by class teachers**
- **Feedback had reverse effect**
- **Weekly mentor meetings**
- **Issues:**
 - Time to gather feedback from each teacher
 - Lack of immediacy
 - ‘Second-hand’ feedback
 - Feedback was ‘too late’



Students' needs

- **Specific feedback immediately after each lesson**
- **Feedback from the teacher actually observing the lesson**
- **Clear targets for improvement**
- **Opportunities to implement improvements**
- **Advice reinforced from different sources**



University
of Glasgow

Tool for observation & providing feedback

- **Checklist**
- **Staff response: immediate feedback, user-friendly**
- **Focus for observations - specific**
- **Written comments as a time-saving tool**



The Outcome

- **The first checklists**
- **Consistency in strengths and areas for development**
- **Identifying priority areas**
- **3 targets at a time**
- **Self- evaluation**



End results

- **Initial results: marked improvement in 3 target areas**
- **Process continued**
- **Moving the balance from areas of improvement to areas of strength**
- **Visual aid to monitor progress**
- **Reduced comments**
- **Increased confidence**



Conclusion (1)

- **Focus for student when planning and delivering lessons**
- **Focus for student when evaluating lessons**
- **Focus for staff when observing lessons and providing feedback**
- **Visual aid to monitor progress which helped to build confidence**
- **Staff satisfaction**



Conclusion (2)

- **Advantages for the PT**
 - Time saving when gathering staff feedback
 - On-going monitoring process
 - Focus for discussion at mentor meetings
 - Useful for final report
 - Reassuring
- **Use in other areas of the school**
- **Potential use for probationer teachers**