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Teaching Cycle 1

"Effective interactions: presentations & debates"

The Teaching Situation

Third year students studying the BSc (Hons) in Animal Behaviour share many of their modules with students on other degrees within the biological sciences. In the 2nd and 3rd year of this degree scheme an increasing number of modules are specific to the named degree, with consequent reductions in the size of the class. I inherited a 3rd year module “Current Topics in Animal Behaviour” on being appointed to my position at Aberystwyth University. The module is taken by approximately 20 students, which is a comparatively small number for modules in the biological sciences (which can reach over 150).

The module was based on 5 “current” topics (growing areas of research in the field and/or currently of relevance to the general public) as decided by the module coordinator (myself). Each topic comprised three or four lectures by myself, a seminar by a visiting speaker and summative assessment in the form of student presentations on a given topic. Each student chose one of the five topics on which to give a presentation (10% of the module’s mark) and it is this aspect upon which my teaching cycle is based. Each student also produced a literature review (20% of the module mark) on a different topic to that upon which they gave their presentation. The remaining 70% of the module mark came from 3 examination essays at the end of the semester.

What aspects of the module needed developing in order to improve student learning?

The module required students to give PowerPoint presentations to others on the module. However, the students in the audience had previously sat through these in a passive manner, albeit encouraged to take notes. The key area that I felt required development was the interaction of the students with the presentations of their peers. The presentation was a summative assessment, marked by the module coordinator (myself) and second-marked by an independent member of staff, where possible one with specialist knowledge of the topic being studied. Students were required to conduct research beyond the content of lectures and seminars by invited speakers, reviewing the topic and identifying key “current” research (defined as having been published within the past five years) – a form of constructive alignment with the learning outcomes of this module (Biggs 2003). The marking scheme was based on that for the Honours Dissertation
Presentation that all students in the department undertake, thereby giving the students additional experience of this assessment method from the perspective of both assessor and assessed (see Appendix 1 at the end of this Teaching Cycle Report).

The key area that I wished to address was enhancing the learning experience of students during timetabled sessions dominated by assessed presentations of their peers and ensuing questions/answers. In particular, could their learning be enhanced from “chance” acquiral of knowledge (noting down interesting facts, usually only by a minority of students) to higher grades of Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy, in particular an analysis and evaluation of the material presented.

My aim was to make the sessions more interactive by engendering student contributions and active learning. In particular, I aimed to encourage students to think and to talk.

Which teaching methods were to be implemented?

I engaged two student-focused techniques, aimed at making students the instruments of their own learning (Bransford 2000) and enhancing the learning experience. Firstly I intended introducing peer-marking (Fry 1990). University regulations did not permit this marking to be summative, merely formative. However, by requiring the students to engage in an activity during each presentation, I intended that they would both pay greater attention to the content and style of the presentations and feel involved in the presentation: e.g. how would they present the same information?

Secondly, I requested non-presenting students to “think of a question” arising from each presentation and to write down at least one question for each presenter on the sheets provided (see Appendix 2). What did the presenter find most interesting or perplexing? How might they take the work forward?

Method of implementation

Presentation sessions were held fortnightly in a 2 hour slot at the beginning of the afternoon at the end of each topic covered on the module. Each session comprised from three to six presentations of ten minutes each on the given topic, allowing time for questions between presentations at the end. Teaching effectiveness is increased when the learning outcomes and procedures are explained in advance (Ramsden 1992). Students were informed that they would be engaging in the two activities described
above, during the course of the module. The reasons behind this were also explained: the aim of increasing their learning through increased interaction as well as the requirements of my PGCTHE (see Ethical Note). The marksheets provided to the students were identical to those used by the staff assessors (see Appendix 1). However, students were informed that the marks they assigned would not be used in coming to the actual assessment grade of this element of the presenter’s module mark. Nonetheless, they were told that their marksheets would be passed to the presenter, along with the actual marksheets of the staff assessors (highlighted as such).

The “think of a question” sheets were not given to the presenters. Instead, during the question session after each presentation, a minimum of five students (chosen at random after the presentation) were chosen to ask their question of the presenter. This method was employed to ensure that all listeners engaged in the task, now knowing whether or not they would be picked to ask their question. As all students were aware of the format of presentation sessions beforehand, presenters were aware of the likelihood of questions being asked of them. This may also have stimulated them to further researches in their preparation so as to be better prepared.

For the first two presentation sessions of the module, peer-marking sheets were distributed. The “think of a question” technique was employed for the third and fourth sessions while students were free to choose which they did on the fifth presentation session.

Both techniques contained an element of risk in terms of student engagement. Students, informed that the marks they awarded did not count, may have decided not to take the task seriously. Similarly, the questions provided could have been relatively inane if students came up with the simplest question merely to fulfil the requirements of the task. In fact research suggests that, when given the opportunity to interact and engage in the learning process, students do indeed take their role seriously, contributing both to their own learning and that of their peers (Harper & Quaye 2008).

Evaluation of Teaching Development

Feedback on the two forms of interaction was obtained from students towards the end of the module by means of a confidential questionnaire (see Appendix 3). The questionnaires sought to gain quantitative feedback on how students rated each type of interaction (peer-marking vs. “think of a question”) as well as qualitative feedback,
describing the reasons for their preferences. Student preference for particular types of learning, their perception of their effectiveness at enhancing learning and their enjoyment of the learning process may not equate to real increases in learning apparent in assessment. However, in general, the deeper the learning strategy (as opposed to shallower surface “knowledge” learning), the greater the correlation between student perception and actual learning achieved (Prosser & Trigwell 1990).

![Figure 1: Mean scores of student perceptions of presentation interactions](image)

Student perceptions of the two types of interaction are illustrated in Figure 1, obtained from a total of 16 returned forms. A score of 5 indicates “yes/a lot”, 3 indicates “no preference”, 1 indicates “no, very little” (see Appendix 3). There was little difference in student perceptions of either the enjoyability of peer-marking vs. “think of a question” or the usefulness of either, although all students believed they gained something from the process and the mean scores suggested that both interactions were useful, if not entirely enjoyable. Peer-marking received a higher rating than for “think of a question” but not significantly so. Perhaps more useful were the written comments received from students. Virtually all expressed positive opinions about the process and/or thoughtful suggestions for improvement. Some example statements, representative of those given by all students, are provided below:

Comments on peer-marking:
- I feel guilty marking others when I am bad at presenting myself
- It made me concentrate
- I got additional information
• Open discussion sessions would be useful

Comments on “think of a question”:
• It helped me really think about the topics
• Good for discussion skills
• Made me pay attention
• Open discussion sessions would be useful

The feedback suggests that the interactions did increase student involvement in the learning process while at the same time gaining feedback that was useful in preparation of their own presentations. This latter point raises the question of whether students presenting at the end of the module have an advantage over those presenting earlier in the series (who present without the benefit of feedback from as many of their peers). However, the nature of each topic presented unique challenges to those presenting, over and above basic style and persona, which ameliorated this effect. In addition, the assessors were able to take this into account.

One key suggestion arising from the feedback was that open discussion sessions would be a useful addition to the learning process of this module. Although some discussions arose after individual presentations, there were no formalised debates or discussions scheduled as part of the module.

Further Development of Teaching

I took the suggestion of class discussions forward in a separate module to assess its usefulness, enjoyability and practicality. Discussions, if moderated appropriately, can engender analysis of core concepts and confront learners with a range of points of view on any given topic, broadening the learning experience and moving the learning process forwards towards a synthesis of key topics (Larson 2000). Discussions can grow from pairs of individuals to small groups to eventually include whole class debates, building confidence of individuals to contribute (Lyman 1981).

Method of Implementing Discussions

The next opportunity to implement a discussion was on a 2nd year module “Advanced Vertebrate Zoology” to which I contribute 6 sessions centred around sensory systems, sperm competition and avian communication (birdsong). This is a larger class than the
3rd year module described above, with over 70 registered students. I divided my sessions into a “2 + 1” format, whereby students received lectures on a topic, followed by a discussion session. Although large group teaching can present a novel range of challenges to teaching and learning, small group teaching methodologies can often be successfully employed, enhancing student learning and enjoyment of the learning process (Brown & Atkins 1988).

Students were divided into small groups, tasked with assembling arguments for or against a given statement, with two groups working on each statement for or against. Examples are given below:

- A sperm can(not) be regarded as an independent organism
- Female birds should (not) pay attention to the song of male birds

Students were asked to organise themselves in groups of a given size (approx 6) and ten minutes was allowed for within group discussion, during which I went to each group to assess their progress, aid their discussions and provide hints as appropriate.

Each group then reported back, with groups that had the same statement being asked to list their arguments alternately. The opposing arguments were then provided by the other two groups before each group was allowed to counter the other’s points. At this stage the whole class was permitted to contribute. Discussions were limited to allow progression to other groups discussions and to maintain momentum of debate. Care was taken to ensure that all that as many students as possible contributed.

**Evaluating Discussions Sessions**

The effectiveness of this learning interaction was assessed by means of a feedback questionnaire (see Appendix 4). Student perceptions were positive, with an average score of 4 for the perceived usefulness of the discussion sessions and whether they believed they had learned anything new. Although the enjoyment scores were slightly lower than the aforementioned, they are still positive (see Figure 2).

Comments on the discussion sessions reflected the positive scores obtained. Representative comments are provided below.

What did you enjoy most?
Being able to construct an argument using information we had learned
• Made the lectures relevant & having to think about and apply it
• Discussion with my group – ideas I hadn’t thought about
• Weren’t forced to stand up in front of class but could still contribute

What did you enjoy least (NB Only a handful of responses were provided in this section):
• Would have been nice to know questions ahead of time to prepare
• Time consuming – maybe more could have been achieved
• Having to think

Figure 2: Means student response scores to discussion sessions

The general tone of the qualitative responses indicated that the learning outcomes had been met: students felt they had learned from their peers, had felt they could contribute in a non-threatening environment and that they enjoyed the process of discussion, supporting research in the education literature (Larsson 2000; Lymna 1981).

The scores and feedback suggested that the discussion sessions compared favourably with the presentation sessions of the 3rd year module (see Figure 3). The discussion session was more relaxed perhaps in part due to the absence of summative (or formative) assessment. Most importantly, students did appear to consider their responses, discuss them seriously and did contribute to the class discussion. Furthermore, their responses indicated that the discussion & debating process had aided not only their learning but, in their perception, their understanding of the core aspects of
the topics. Students engaged in the learning process and perceived themselves to have benefitted thereby, a finding evident in the wider education arena (Harper & Quaye 2008).
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**Figure 3:** Comparison of mean student response scores between discussion sessions and marking/questioning of presentations

**Reflection & Future Development**

This Teaching Cycle set out to enhance the learning experience of students during timetabled sessions dominated by assessed presentations of their peers and ensuing questions/answers. Having inherited a module, the format of which I was not permitted to change before I was expected to teach it, I was keen to ensure that the student learning experience was beneficial and enjoyable for the learners as well as myself.

Universities provide a unique teaching environment and one which offers unique opportunities for learning and teaching (Ramsden 1992). Engaging students in the learning process rather than viewing them as passive “listeners” or “recorders” can improve the educational experience and outcome, for learner and teacher alike.

This cycle introduced interactions to the classroom setting, with students encouraged to engage in the learning process by means of peer-marking, questioning of their peers and classroom discussions. Students took seriously their role as participants in this learning process, progressing not just their surface knowledge of the subject but their
deep learning, by means of analysing, synthesising and evaluating the knowledge they had acquired, akin to an elevation of their learning through Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy.

As a teacher I found the process illuminating on a number of fronts. Students did indeed engage in the interactive learning process: there is always a risk that they may not when authority for learning is delegated to learners in this manner. A valuable and unforeseen benefit was that, in facilitating the presentations, discussions and debates I was able to get to know individual students better. Students now regularly come to my door to make enquiries relating to modules, for general chats or for personal matters. Getting to know them personally has led to comments such as “Wow, someone actually knows my name” when I greeted them by name as they entered my office. A small number commented at the graduation ceremony that “You’re the only lecturer we really got to know while we were here”. This is rewarding, even if extra time is taken away from research or administrative duties. A good rapport with students is a key aspect of successful learner-teacher relationships if confidence can be passed to the learner in addition to knowledge per se and the ability to assimilate, evaluate and make use of that knowledge (Ramsden 1992) making the effort spent obtaining it a valuable investment of time and effort.

**Implementing Findings**

Having found interactions to be a useful learning process, and one that is welcomed by learners, I have now redesigned the 3rd year module to include a dedicated discussion session on each of the five topics that we cover (see Appendix 5). These discussion sessions allow discussion in small groups (3-4 students) that then report back to the class, ending with a “round” of two questions to help students share the benefits they have obtained and the learning they feel they have achieved (see Appendix 5). This is in addition to the student presentation sessions that address particular learning outcomes of the module (the ability to research, evaluate and present an area of research endeavour) and which I have maintained. The presentations are now more narrowly focussed with students required to choose and present a particular study (chosen by themselves from the peer-reviewed literature) and to provide an indication of the direction that research should be taken. As part of these presentation sessions, students are asked to mark each other as a standard procedure. Their marks and comments are generally in line with those of the staff assessors and, when given to the students at the following session (after moderation for offensive language etc), provide weight to the comments that I and my colleagues make – if their friends think that they spoke too
quickly or their choice of colours was a little too dazzling, then maybe their lecturers are onto something in their comments.

In addition, as part of a Department wide review of teaching, I have taken the opportunity to redesign aspects of this module, including a new requirement for students to write an extended abstract (subject to summative assessment) based on the talks given by the invited speakers that form a key part of this module. These abstracts are then discussed in the following timetabled session as an addition to the end-of-topic question and discussion sessions.

My own future research of this area may explore the differences in the perceptions of presenters vs. audience members in terms of the usefulness of peer-marking. Giving students the tools to improve their performance is more likely to bear fruit if the students are given subsequent opportunities to display what they have learned. This is an aspect I have incorporated in the new Animal Behaviour Field Course that I have recently designed and had approved by Faculty, as it incorporates daily (group-based) presentations and feedback over the course of a week.

The role of debate and discussion not only as a whole-session activity, but as a mid-session “break” is also something that I have introduced as a result of this cycle to a 2nd year module for which I am responsible for all teaching. Feedback to date suggests it has improved student attention, learning and enjoyment of the module.

Reflection on the Presentation of this Teaching Cycle to PGCTHE course members, their comments thereon and subsequent discussions.

The initial findings of this teaching cycle were given in a presentation (Appendix 6). Responses from PGCTHE course members, accompanying mentors and PGCTHE team members (Appendix 6) were very positive and provided me with confidence in my tackling of the remaining two Teaching Cycles, by then already underway, in addition to my ongoing attempts to improve the learning experience and environment for my students. In terms of the success of the interactions in terms of enhancing the learning experience, the most important feedback on the teaching cycle came not from those present at my talk, but from my students – it is they, after all, who benefit, or otherwise, from my teaching methods.
Observing, and commenting on, the presentations of other PGCTHE course members also provided useful ideas for approaching my own teaching in a variety of circumstances. Discussions afterwards centred on the amount of time available to University staff for teaching and the types of teaching development that were possible. In regard to the former, the requirement to undertake research, and the priority given thereto, particularly as a result of the funding that flows from it through the RAE/REF, mean that there is a limit to the time and effort that can be put into researching ideal teaching methods (a subject I return to in the Personal Commentary). In fact, there are few “ideal” teaching procedures or “correct answers” to any given teaching situation, be it large group or small, 1st year or final year. However, by being aware of the variety of possible interventions and being open to development of teaching methodology, our students can at least be assured of a high quality learning experience and environment.
Current Topics in Animal Behaviour

Presentation Mark Sheets

0 = poor, 10 = excellent

Presenter's name: ..............................................................................

Structure & Content

Introduction/context: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Organisation/explanation of material: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Clear & legible visual aids: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Critical appraisal/interpretation: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Effective ending/conclusion: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Performance

Clear, audible, confident: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Visual aids used properly: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Handling of questions: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Rapport with audience: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Timekeeping: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Total Mark: ......................................................................................

General Comments: ..............................................................................
...........................................................................................
...........................................................................................
...........................................................................................
BS 34420 – Current Topics

Parasites & Behaviour

Your name: .................................................................

Name of presenting student: ..................................................

Your Question: ........................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................

What made you ask that question?

........................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................
Current Topics - Feedback on Presentation Sessions

One of the aims of this course is to develop an ability to critically analyse and interpret findings from different areas of behavioural biology and find common themes. Student presentations are a key compulsory element of this. This questionnaire is to gauge the usefulness of the activities for the non-presenters during these fortnightly presentation sessions for each topic to help improve it for future years. All answers are confidential - please do not write your name anywhere on the paper.

For the following questions circle the appropriate answer or number, use this guide to scoring:

5  yes/a lot
4  no preference
3  no/not at all
2  1

1) Have you presented your topic yet? Yes No
2a) Do you feel you gain anything from listening to other people's presentations?  5  4  3  2  1
2b) If yes, what? ..............................................................................................................................

The peer-marking forms and the "think of a question" forms were designed both to increase your involvement in the presentations and to encourage your critical thinking.

3) Did you find the peer-marking useful?  5  4  3  2  1
4) Did you find the peer-marking enjoyable?  5  4  3  2  1
5) What did you like most/least about the peer-marking?

5) Did you find the "think of a question" forms useful?  5  4  3  2  1
6) Did you find the "think of a question" forms enjoyable?  5  4  3  2  1
5) What did you like most/least about the "think of a question"?

7) Which did you prefer? Peer Marking  "think of a question"
8) Why?

9) What would you suggest as an alternative means of encouraging discussion/questions?

10) Do you think the presentations form a useful function on this course?  5  4  3  2  1

Thankyou for completing this form.
Please place in box at end of lecture (or return to Dr Marshall's office, 207 Ed.Llwyd)
Vertebrate Zoology - Discussion Feedback

This questionnaire is to gauge the usefulness and enjoyment of the discussion session on song and sperm competition to help improve it for future years. All answers are confidential! Please do not write your name anywhere on the paper.

Which group were you in for the discussion?

☐ Song

☐ Sperm

For the following questions circle the appropriate answer or number, use this guide to scoring:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes/a lot</td>
<td>no preference</td>
<td>no/not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a) Did you enjoy the discussion session? 5 4 3 2 1

1b) What do you enjoy most?


1c) What do you enjoy least?


2) Do you feel you learned anything new? 5 4 3 2 1

3) Do you think the debate between the two sides at the end was useful? 5 4 3 2 1

4) What, if anything do you feel you got out of:
   a) your group’s discussion?


   b) the whole class debate at the end?


5) Did the discussion and debate alter your opinions on either of the questions? 5 4 3 2 1

6) Any other comments on this session?


Thankyou for completing this form. Please place in box at end of lecture (or return to Dr Marshall’s office, 207 Ed Liwyd)
Sperm Competition - Discussion Day

Discussion Topics

6 groups of 3 or 4

Each group to come up with 5 key points for consideration by the other groups

Questions to consider:

1. To what extent can individual sperm be regarded as independent organisms?
2. Are there any similarities between pre- and post-copulatory selection?
3. To what extent can sperm be regarded parasites manipulating host behaviour?
4. If a sperm has no brain, can its activity be described as "behaviour"?
5. Do females encourage sperm competition? Why?

End of Session Round:

1. "What I found most interesting about this topic was..."
2. "I would have liked to learn a little bit more about..."
Appendix 6: Teaching Cycle 1: Presentation to PGCTHE participants & Mentors

On the following pages is the slide presentation, based upon the initial outcome of Teaching Cycle 1 (Introducing Interactions: debate & discussion”).

Following these are copies of the comments and responses from audience members.

The reflection on this presentation and comments received is contained within the Report on Teaching Cycle 1 on the preceding pages.
tHE Presentation

Teaching Cycle No. 1
Introducing Interactions
Dr Rupert Marshall

Lecturer in Animal Behaviour
Institute of Biological Sciences

Background
- 3rd year undergraduate module
- Seminar & Discussion based
- Relies on further research by students
- 19 students
- 5 topics

Previously...
- Student presentations for each topic
- Kept for my first year
- Did it benefit students?
  - Did it assist the learning experience?

Constraints
- Room type
- Fixed seating
- Other fixed furniture

My Aim
Make sessions more interactive
Engender student contributions & active learning
Get students to think
Get students to talk
Enhancing the learning experience

2 techniques tested:

• Peer-marking (1st 2 sessions)
  - Content & Style
• “Think of a Question” (2nd 2 sessions)
• Either (5th session)
• Feedback from students

Student Comments - marking

“Feel guilty marking marking others when I am bad at presenting myself”

“Made me concentrate”

“Got additional information”

“Open discussion sessions would be useful”

Student Comments - Questions

“Helped me really think about the topics”

“Good for discussion skills”

“Made me pay attention”

“Open discussion sessions would be useful”

Benefits of Discussion & Debate

• Can grow from small group discussions to whole class debate
• Builds confidence to contribute
• May learn new “facts” from others
• Required to explore statements from new angles
Implementing findings

- Redesigned module to incorporate debates for each topic
- Introduced requirement to formulate "question" for visiting speakers (used in subsequent discussion sessions)
- Replaced some formal lectures with discussions on other modules

The teaching cycle:
Student Comments +ve

"Having to think about it and apply it"
"Being able to construct an argument using info that we learnt"
"We weren't forced to stand up in front of the class but could still contribute"

Matters arising

- Students did talk
- Students did think
- Students did feel they learned and understood more about a subject through debate & listening to others
- I got to know the students better

Comparisons

Implementing findings

- Redesigned module to incorporate debates for each topic
- Introduced requirement to formulate "question" for visiting speakers (used in subsequent discussion sessions)
- Replaced some formal lectures with discussions on other modules

Thank you
Presentation of First Teaching Cycle: Feedback

Please use this sheet to provide constructive comments on participants' first teaching cycle. Participants are asked to discuss comments in their portfolio, and use in constructing second and third teaching cycles.

(1) Planning the teaching cycle eg clear account of the teaching issue? clear account of intended outcomes? Connections to professional literature on learning and teaching?

(a clear indication of any context)

(2) Implementing the teaching cycle eg was the teaching practice well implemented?

(appears to have been very well planned & well implement)

(3) Participant's evaluation of impact of teaching practice eg evaluation of impact on student learning? Reflection on implications for future teaching?

(well thought out feedback evaluation evidence of excellent reflection - items from feedback have clearly been taken on board)

(4) General comments

Very well presented

Participant's name: Rupert Thrall
Presentation of First Teaching Cycle: Feedback

Please use this sheet to provide constructive comments on participants' first teaching cycle. Participants are asked to discuss comments in their portfolio, and use in constructing second and third teaching cycles.

(1) Planning the teaching cycle eg clear account of the teaching issue? clear account of intended outcomes? Connections to professional literature on learning and teaching?

- Arms + background was especially clear
- Good relation to teaching theory

(2) Implementing the teaching cycle eg was the teaching practice well implemented?

- Definitely and this was clearly reflected in the results - good to have both qualitative + quantitative (I should have done this too)

(3) Participant's evaluation of impact of teaching practice eg evaluation of impact on student learning? Reflection on implications for future teaching?

- Excellent to build on initial idea + apply to larger class - wasn't necessarily but definitely added much value to the cycle

(4) General comments

Participant's name: Rupert Marshall
Presentation of First Teaching Cycle: Feedback

Please use this sheet to provide constructive comments on participants' first teaching cycle. Participants are asked to discuss comments in their portfolio, and use in constructing second and third teaching cycles.

(1) Planning the teaching cycle eg clear account of the teaching issue? clear account of intended outcomes? Connections to professional literature on learning and teaching?

- Good clear explanation of cycle
- was just Bloom used?

(2) Implementing the teaching cycle eg was the teaching practice well implemented?

(3) Participant's evaluation of impact of teaching practice eg evaluation of impact on student learning? Reflection on implications for future teaching?

- well done on actually going away + making changes rather than thinking about maybe, possibly getting around to it at some point!

(4) General comments

Participant's name: Rupert Marshall
Presentation of First Teaching Cycle: Feedback

Please use this sheet to provide constructive comments on participants’ first teaching cycle. Participants are asked to discuss comments in their portfolio, and use in constructing second and third teaching cycles.

(1) Planning the teaching cycle eg clear account of the teaching issue? clear account of intended outcomes? Connections to professional literature on learning and teaching?

(2) Implementing the teaching cycle eg was the teaching practice well implemented?

(3) Participant’s evaluation of impact of teaching practice eg evaluation of impact on student learning? Reflection on implications for future teaching?

(4) General comments

good jokes, nice pictures, clear, nice pace, relaxed, confident. Very enjoyable indeed! Oh and the charts were impressive - can you teach me how to do them!

Participant’s name: [Signature]
Presentation of First Teaching Cycle: Feedback

Please use this sheet to provide constructive comments on participants' first teaching cycle. Participants are asked to discuss comments in their portfolio, and use in constructing second and third teaching cycles.

(1) Planning the teaching cycle eg clear account of the teaching issue? clear account of intended outcomes? Connections to professional literature on learning and teaching?

BLOOM AND DEEP LEARNING BROUGHT IN VERY APPROPRIATELY

(2) Implementing the teaching cycle eg was the teaching practice well implemented?

SEEMED TO HAVE WORKED REALLY WELL - GOOD FEEDBACK

(3) Participant's evaluation of impact of teaching practice eg evaluation of impact on student learning? Reflection on implications for future teaching?

CHANGES TO THE PROGRAMME SEEM TO BE VASTLY POSITIVE

(4) General comments

Participant's name: RUPERT MARSHALL
Presentation of First Teaching Cycle: Feedback

Please use this sheet to provide constructive comments on participants’ first teaching cycle. Participants are asked to discuss comments in their portfolio, and use in constructing second and third teaching cycles.

(1) Planning the teaching cycle eg clear account of the teaching issue? clear account of intended outcomes? Connections to professional literature on learning and teaching?

![Clear account of intended outcomes, supported by the professional literature](image)

(2) Implementing the teaching cycle eg was the teaching practice well implemented?

(3) Participant’s evaluation of impact of teaching practice eg evaluation of impact on student learning? Reflection on implications for future teaching?

Evaluation ✓
Reflection ✓
Future - redesigned module based on ‘findings’ of this Teaching Cycle

(4) General comments

Participant’s name: Rupert Marshall