

Reflection

Gibbs Reflective Cycle (1988)

1. Description of the Experience

This lesson was a continuation of the previous one where we discussed Smart Streets and electrical voltage. For this follow up, the focus was on energy labelling. The lesson was scheduled from 13:45 to 15:00, which is normally a tough time as students tend to be tired and less motivated. While I had planned the lesson for the full group of 11 Smart Building second year students, only three students actually showed up the rest had gone home. I adapted the lesson on the spot to fit the smaller group but kept the original structure, including vocabulary activation, jigsaw reading, a street diagram activity, and adjusted the group presentation to individual speaking activity. Although we went a bit over time, the students were engaged. Henk and Juliane observed the lesson and gave positive feedback on the materials, structure, and how the tasks built on each other. I had used authentic materials such as websites etc for the input and gathering of knowledge about the content, YouTube, and input from Louise to prepare authentic content, which Henk specifically asked about.

2. Feelings and Thoughts About the Experience

At the beginning, I felt a bit thrown off because of the low attendance. I wasn't sure how the dynamics would work with just three students. I also wondered if it was worth going ahead with a full lesson plan for such a small group. But once we got into the activities, I actually felt more at ease because the small group allowed for more focused interaction. I also felt proud that I could answer their questions confidently based on the research I did beforehand paid off. I was a bit nervous about how the observers would perceive the lesson, especially since it had to be adapted on the fly, but the feedback I got helped calm those nerves.

3. Evaluation of the Experience – Good and Bad

The small group turned out to be a plus. The students were more focused, and I could give more individual attention. The vocabulary task and jigsaw reading went smoothly, and the students were engaged despite the time of day. I was happy that they stayed on task and participated actively in the discussions. On the downside, I felt a bit rushed towards the end. Since we went over time, the speaking task was a bit squeezed in, and the optional reading activity didn't really happen. Also, I think the energy labelling drawing was the most fun to do for the students and they were happy to show us their designs and what they did even though the lesson went overtime they were happy to show us what they created.

4. Conclusions – What I Learned and What I Could've Done Differently

I learned that even with low attendance, a lesson can still be meaningful and effective if you stay flexible. I also learned that students appreciate when you're prepared and can explain things clearly especially with technical topics. The lesson planning really paid off here. However, I could've cut one activity to allow more breathing room and better pacing. Also, I think I might have need easier lesson content information especially in the jigsaw reading section as this

might have been a bit of a higher level for the other students. The students that were in attendance found the content to be challenging and engaging enough for their level of English and Henk mentioned that he thought that it might have been difficult for one or three of the other students if they had attended the lesson and to keep that in mind the next time.

5. Action Plan for the Future

Next time I'll plan a slightly shorter version of the lesson, just in case attendance is low or students are tired. I'll also have a backup "high energy" task ready maybe something like a quick Kahoot or timed challenge to energize the room. I'll continue using a mix of sources to create relevant and engaging materials. And I'll keep focusing on scaffolding, since that seems to work well both for student learning.