

**Group Forum: Creating
Teacher Feedback and Prototype 2**

Alisha Butler Fairchild

Educational Technology Leadership, M. Ed., University of Louisiana Monroe

EDIT 5055: Instructional Design and Program Development

Dr. Melissa Warr

September 27, 2021 (23:59)

Teacher Feedback

I decided to present my prototype 1, Demystifying Technology, to the same teacher I interviewed at the beginning of our journey to gain understanding of the problems we face in the education system. During our exchange, “Coach O,” as I will refer to him as, made several valuable points that have enabled me to further anticipate pushback and/or obstacles for my training sessions. The first valuable piece of feedback I received came from the objective language. The phrase “across 8 teacher in-service days” led Coach O to believe there would be 8 entire days dedicated to this process when I had only planned to utilize 1.5-2 hours of each of these in-service days for the PD. Therefore, the wording to the objective will be modified so that it does not possibly overwhelm staff members upon viewing. Another concern Coach O had was that if the PD is scheduled for in-service days, the morale and motivation of staff may be lacking due to in-service days being required and the possibility of the staff having a “I’m here because I have to be” attitude. This is something I should anticipate and prepare for with incentives for those who are motivated to participate and buy in. Coach O believes that older group of staff members may have a “just show me how so I can fix it” mindset. I am not sure how I will address this yet but I believe the more embrative of the activities and discussion the majority it, the more this subgroup may bend. I believe this will have to rely upon approach, attitude, and culture created within these PDs. Coach O also likes the overall idea and parts 3-4 of my prototype. He mentioned that having an extension for those who are already proficient but not masters yet would possibly help as well. Another very important issue Coach O brought up was what if everyone in a group is not proficient and the lessons/examples they create are not good

products. If that becomes a shared resource, then it would be confusing and misleading for those who are struggling and learning how to use technology. Therefore, I will add on to the formative check and share outs, the idea that facilitators need to provide feedback and/or edit the “bad products” prior to releasing the shared resource for the staff to access and utilize as a reference tool. There should be “If.... Then....” Statements for different cases of what might happen during this time in the session so that the support team can know how to address each possible outcome. Coach O also recommended a short survey at the end of each session to check for a pulse of the room in terms of mindset and attitude towards the learning for the day. Based on that, they can track how the PD is going and if the culture is or is not changing. The last piece of advice provided was to possibly make groups a bit smaller and break them up by not only content but also strength or comfort with technology use. This might mean that groups could change throughout the PD stint.

Prototype 2

Problem: Teachers may lack confidence in their ability to utilize new forms of technology due to the multiple negative connotations technology has developed in the education system.

Standard: Collaborator 4a- Dedicate planning time to collaborate with colleagues to create authentic learning experiences that leverage technology.

Objective: Over the course of the _____ school year, across 8 PD sessions on teacher in-service days the faculty of _____ School will demystify technology by confronting the top misconceptions of technology and then utilizing applications or practices which debunk those misconceptions.

Outcomes:

- Teachers will be able to provide reasoning behind “debunking” each excuse for why technology is not implemented the way it should be in the classroom.
- Teachers will learn the ins and outs of a tech tool, then applying it to their lesson planning.
- Teachers will be able to implement new or more technology in their instruction effectively with the help of feedback, modeling, and practice.

Preparation Steps:

1. [Survey](#) to determine top misconceptions of technology and reasons why teachers do not use it, as well as comfort level with technology should be completed by the participating staff.
2. Site Facilitator should be able to take survey responses and determine/choose who will be supporters for each PD group. Site Facilitator will then break groups up based on comfort level as well as misconceptions.
 - recommended size of groups: 6-10 people, not including support members)
 - recommended content category options: [option 1](#)- ELA, Math, Science, Social Studies, Ancillary; [option 2](#)- Humanities (ELA, History), Fine and performing arts (art, music, theater, etc.), STEM (Science, Math, engineering, technology), [option 3](#)- create categories you feel works best for your site
3. Site facilitator should meet with the support members to determine what topic will be addressed first and so on, so forth. For each topic, 3-5 resources (video, demo, podcast, article, teacher interview, etc.) should be collected to facilitate individual learning and

discussion of the topic (these should debunk the myth or excuse), as well as one or more applications should be chosen for ways to overcome the issue/excuse to not use technology. This can all be organized via a shared folder in Google Drive or Wakelets (one folder or wakelet per topic/excuse/session).

4. PD norms and expectations should be communicated to faculty by group supporters or site facilitator prior to first meeting. This should include the time, incentives, materials, etc.

Agenda:

1. Introduce topic/excuse that will be debunked during the session. (2-5 min) This should be formatted in a problem statement or question to prepare participants to think in terms of how it can be deemed a myth or how to solve the problem.
2. Introduce materials for debunking the excuse— (10-15 min) allow for teachers to choose 1-2 materials to review individually. Then provide time for partner and whole group discussion. The discussion should result in a list ([digital](#) or hard copy) of reasons and ways that the excuse can be deemed inexcusable (debunk the myth). This can include applications, practices, reasoning, rebuttals, etc.
3. Ways to Put This into Practice: (10-15 min) facilitator/support will present and model an application or practice that they find to be helpful in “fixing” the problem. While presenting tool, audience will utilize tool to follow the presentation. (Application within model)
 - Allow for questions and time for application
 - Supporters need to be monitoring and readily available for support/help

4. Planning Application Time: (15-20 min) Allow for participants to take the application they have learned and determine how they might incorporate it into a lesson. (Lesson plans should be readily available for this to work.) Teachers are given time to work and/or collaborate with colleagues, supporters, and/or facilitator to determine and outline how this application might be used in a particular lesson specific to their classroom/content. Teacher will provide basic outline of lesson plan with specifics as to how the application will be used via a [Technology Implementation Lesson Plan Template](#) shared with the group.
5. Facilitator will allow for share outs and provide meaningful feedback. Verbally and via comments on the template document (time may vary based on the needs and products; 10-15 min)
6. Reflection- Teachers will fill out [a reflection survey](#) at the end to formatively check their understanding of the application, as well as to determine each participant's needs and progress based on the first survey and the product they created.

Follow Up Steps:

1. Facilitator and supporters will review the lesson plans and reflections. They will provide feedback for each lesson plan with other options or ways to utilize the application. (Once feedback is provided and lessons are edited for full functionality, the Lesson Template folder can be released for all teachers in the group to view for future reference.)
Facilitator and supporters will check on those who communicate that they are struggling with technology more than others.

2. If needed, facilitators will work with the lower-level learners on a tech implementation plan- when and how they plan to use technology (allow for walk-throughs for meaningful and more productive feedback). This can include co-teaching lesson planning with facilitator/supporters and those struggling.
3. Take feedback from survey and plan for next PD.