

**Title:**                    **The good teaching project: making good teaching explicit**

**Presenters:**        **Jaki Lilly and Mark Warnes**  
Anglia Ruskin University

### **Abstract:**

#### **Session Learning Outcomes**

By the end of this session, delegates will be able to:

- Distinguish between what good teaching is, and how good teaching is carried out.
- Distinguish between elements of good teaching and factors which are out of the individual's control, and can cloud judgement ('hygiene' factors).
- Analyse a teaching vignette for aspects of good teaching practice.

#### **Session Outline**

Key issues to be addressed are:

##### **How is good teaching practice carried out?**

Good teaching practice has been widely studied and discussed (Entwistle, 2009; Hartley, Woods and Pill, 2005; Ramsden, 2003) and multiple resources are available, such as those found through the online portal of the Teaching and Learning Research Programme. Despite the wealth of work and resources in the area, current research generally focuses on describing **what** good teaching practice is, rather than demonstrating **how** good teaching practice is carried out. How do you teach to promote critical thinking?

##### **What are the observable characteristics of good teaching?**

In the first instance we interviewed a range of faculty colleagues who might be considered to have a view of what good teaching is, and where it was taking place in the faculty. Through the analysis of these interviews we determined the Components and Elements of Good Teaching, and the hygiene factors (Hertzberg, 2003) which can cloud the judgement of good teaching, and which are outside of the control of the individual teacher.

##### **In order to facilitate the sharing of good practice, how can we make conscious and explicit, the unconscious and implicit competence of expert teaching practitioners?**

Our interviewees indicated where good teaching was taking place in their faculty, and the name of the relevant teaching practitioner. We approached each nominated individual for permission to film them in action. During the filming we made notes of the good practice we observed. We edited the clips producing short vignettes (3 to 4 minutes) which we analysed for good practice. We invited each practitioner to view his/her vignettes and produce a reflective commentary on his/her practice in each. The vignettes have been uploaded to the website and are available to view with or without the reflective commentary and our analysis.

## **Session Activities and Approximate Timings**

Introduction to our project: 20 minutes  
Viewing teaching vignette 1: 5 minutes  
Analysis of teaching vignette in groups: 20 minutes  
Viewing teaching vignette 2: 5 minutes  
Analysis of teaching vignette in groups: 20 minutes  
Plenary and Discussion: 20 minutes.

## **References**

- Entwistle, N. J., 2009. *Teaching for understanding at university: Deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hartley, P., Woods, A. and Pill, M., 2005. *Enhancing teaching in higher education: new approaches for improving student learning*. London: Routledge.
- Herzberg, F., 2003. One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, January, pp.87-96. (This paper was originally published in the HBR in 1968)
- Ramsden, P., 2003. *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge Falmer.