

## Lecturing Observation: Name

**Department:**

**The Course:**

**Lecture Topic: Purposes and Principles of ...**

**Date and duration:**

**First hour is a lecture; second a tutorial**

**Students: Masters level, 24 enrolled; 19 in this class**

**Context** (what you stated at the pre-observation meeting):

**What is important to you as a teacher?**

- Blinded, but copied from pre-observation form

**What have been your successes (or what works)?**

- Blinded, but copied from pre-observation form

**What have been your challenges?**

- Blinded, but copied from pre-observation form

**Feedback:**

**Aspects of your teaching that you wanted feedback on:**

- How to get engagement
- What your teaching looks like to an objective academic observer

**Part 1: Running record:**

Time	What I saw	What I thought
8.50	As students arrive, NAME is friendly and relaxed with them—chats	NAME sets a good atmosphere at the start
9.00	Only 5 students, NAME decides to wait another couple of minutes—	Reasonable choice, & nice relaxed humour

	opens the door for one, slightly spoofing as the porter	
9.05	Starts lecture. First slide, words run over the UoA logo so hard to read	Maybe ditch the logo—its endorsement and status not worth its clutter? Or is it? Could do initial slide explaining structure of lecture. My hunch is it would go something like this, sort of funnel-shaped, broad to local, to specific: Description of what is covered, blinded here.
9.10	16 students—Traffic noise quite high in back row, and NAME talks quite quickly, tending sometimes to drop his tone at the ends of sentences.	Sometimes could emphasise points more—think of the lecture as ‘performance’—e.g, more emphasis on punchline—and link—‘this point comes back later, and is really relevant for practice.’
9.12	NAME skipped the first slide which had recap and any questions, but cuts back to it pausing and asking at around 9.15 when the class is fuller	Good teaching practice to have pp that allows for things to be raised but to ‘work’ it according to what is actually happening—pp not a domination over teaching in response to class
	Introduction slide raises some of the tensions of the topic	Could be a point for interactive discussion—in pairs, what do you think about X, y, and z
	2 fundamental models slides good slow emphatic unpacking	This is made to seem important, underpinning everything else, which I think is the case.
		Could have separate slide unpacking what is distinctive about NZ model—Actually, could do comparison slide with a chart like this of two columns, NZ on one side and UK on the other, and differences listed, along the lines of More bureaucratic / More flexible Outcome predicable / Outcomes less predictable What else was there? Issues round risk and freedom, measurable versus non-measurable
	The 3 steps slide	When you put in (issues), you could use that term—“so the issues behind this are....”—or take it out if it is just a prompt to yourself
	Students are taking notes, attentive	NAME is covering material students want to know about.
	NAME runs through the processes, noting twice “this is what you guys do”	Good way to bring students in—could use this strategy more often because it gives the reason why they should be following closely
	Practice slide	This is where that question above cuts in—really strong lecture moment where NAME’s work-based experience is added to the literature.
	NAME adds his 2 more steps to the 3 step model	Good use of practical tangible world example to show the importance of stepping back at the end for a more holistic view of what worked or didn’t and why.
	Who benefits? Who loses? Who pays?	NAME raises great questions for practice and expands on them well.
9.30	NAME gives one definition of practitioners and discusses it	Suspect this is relevant to assignment—could make conscious use of student anxiety about assignments

	analytically	and exams to keep them feeling the lecture is completely relevant by, deliberately, every 15 minutes or so, planting something of use to them for their assessment tasks.
	NAME walks across to the edge of the room away from the lectern, down the side of the room to address the guys in the third row	Could remember to make eye contact and address the folk at the back of the room regularly—it helps to make them aware that you are talking to <i>them</i> .
	NAME unpacks “that’s what really worries me...”	Really good demonstration of personal engagement with the issues.
	Discussion of legislation	NAME overtly links particular bits of legislation to the issues/problems/tensions—helpful.
	“No such thing as a free lunch” “People don’t act rationally” NAME stresses <i>community</i> ownership of overall task	Great explicit ‘wising up’ points for students thinking about the reality and responsibility of working in the actual world.
	“No one is ever actually impartial” points to several students—likely to have different values, perspective	Makes use of the class room dynamic, showing how the negotiation of law is always from different perspectives, values
	10 am a five minute break, then offer of 20 minute or so tutorial to talk about assignment	
	NAME frames assignment issues	Generates some discussion round different aspects of the assignment
	Younger male student (one of three blokesy looking boys who stick together) asks does the assignment need literature or just practical suggestions?	This is a short terse question, bringing focus back to students’ need to write the assignment—the young men in the class seem generally reluctant to engage directly, so this shows a need here.
	NAME responds, and asks for any more questions about the assignment. One older student raises a good question which prompts NAME to use the white board well with a time line, explaining how real practice works. He hints at a bit of legislation that is the big clue in solving the assignment puzzle, perhaps...	NAME extremely willing to respond well to questions—but not all students are willing to ask them, or to ask the right questions. Tends to be two or three older students who ask questions, and younger ones don’t risk it. Student unwillingness to be conspicuous may be the issue?  Good at Masters level to make it a bit of a detective scenario: find and follow the clues...  Good use of white board to explain the relationship between rules, objectives and practice.
	Class closes with no more questions at around 10.20, but four students linger for another ten minutes to ask pertinent questions, the sort that would have been good for everyone in the class to hear discussion about.	More could have been done to drive the questions out of the thickets. The tutorial could be structured, active, students in groups of four with specific questions about the assignment, and then having to come back to the whole group with what they think and lead whole class discussion. NAME agrees that there is scope to do more

## Part 2: Overall:

### **Strengths**

- Relaxed, open, friendly
- Awareness of the grey areas in practice: experience in work situations an enormous strength—points out theoretical framework and tensions between theory and practice really well
- Responsive to students' questions—wide range of knowledge so confident moving into any area of inquiry, a great resource for students
- Well prepared, on time, well scheduled break

### **Areas for improvement**

- Could use performance techniques to emphasise the most important things covered in lecture
- Could make better use of the tutorial time by planning, structuring, and ensuring that all students talk
- Could draw more deliberate attention to the analytical work that NAME does so strongly in front of students—could probably come up with some of the critical questions at each stage of the process of consent for example. NAME does this along the way, but could develop probably publishable material from the wealth of his own knowledge and experience

### **Concluding remarks:**

NAME makes a strong teaching contribution to the university. His knowledge and experience are a huge asset. His openness to what theory has to offer these students is critically tempered by the realities of practice—he is teaching critical engagement in the process of teaching his topic. The topic is undercut by conflicts of interest and tensions between the different frameworks that scaffold it; NAME is able to move across these frameworks confidently. He could use student anxiety about assignments and exams to hook them in more, e.g., 'for the assignment, you probably need at least a short section considering X' type of comment.

NAME could more consciously have moments when he refers back to their future challenges—"this is where as a practitioner you'll need to consider..." It is a complex topic that is fraught with contradictions and tensions, but if it were possible to plan for 3 to 7 main points to come through emphatically in each lecture, this would help students to get their heads round the complexity. Legislation needs to be explained in a complicated context, but inviting students to choose likely options, or state how many things they would need to consider etc. could hook their engagement more systematically.

NAME clearly plans carefully for class content, but could plan just as carefully for class activity, especially in the tutorial half of the two hour time slot. Taking his comfortable, content-rich classes into higher engagement by organising students into pairs or groups and setting them discussion exercises would enable a firmer anchoring of the wisdom he has himself in the students. They obviously value his knowledge, but could be pushed into

internalising it through facilitated discussion. This would be likely to be of benefit to them as they head for practice.

NAME could consider also breaking up cliques by shifting students round groups for some exercises—I'd probably do this regularly because I think that there are advantages for future work skills in pushing them to work with everyone in the class. You could even designate some of the grade (5-10%) for participation in the tutorial at Masters level, since they are approaching release into the wilds of practice where they will need to be able to work with different types of people.

**Dr Susan Carter**  
Senior Lecturer  
Centre for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education  
The University of Auckland