

Peer's Record of Observation

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed: Cross Studio Pin-up Presentations

Size of student group: 7 students

Observer: Adrian Allen

Observee: Kuljeet Sibia

Note: This record is solely for exchanging developmental feedback between colleagues. Its reflective aspect informs PgCert and Fellowship assessment, but it is not an official evaluation of teaching and is not intended for other internal or legal applications such as probation or disciplinary action.

Part One

Observee to complete in brief and send to observer prior to the observation or review:

What is the context of this session/artefact within the curriculum?

The session is the second and final pin-up presentation ahead of the students' portfolio submission for their second design unit.

How long have you been working with this group and in what capacity?

This will be the first time I am working with the students, as we are undertaking cross-studio pin-ups, and the students will be from a mix of two studios.

What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?

The session is intended to focus on encouraging the students to work through last-minute blocks to have a resolved design they can then translate into a portfolio of work. It is a moment for fresh tutor perspectives and to hear from peers across different studios.

What are the anticipated outputs (anything students will make/do)?

A pinned-up narrative of work from enquiry to proposal, showcased through drawings and models.

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?

Attendance has historically been low with the students I am seeing, and therefore, it is expected to be low again out of the 14 students I have been allocated. Many of the students have struggled to engage with the project as per the brief expectations, and there is an expectation of low quantum and quality of work, which will require sensitivity in reviews. The focus will be to support and encourage students to present and reflect positively on their work whilst addressing any gaps to ensure they are meeting the learning outcomes in their portfolio.

How will students be informed of the observation/review?

I will introduce the observer to the students and confirm that I am being observed and not them.

What would you particularly like feedback on?

I'm open to all feedback and would appreciate notes on how well I was able to engage with the students and any thoughts on encouraging peer-to-peer feedback.

How will feedback be exchanged?

Via email

Part Two

Observer to note down observations, suggestions and questions:

As the students were meeting/being tutored by Kuljeet for the first time, with limited presentation time, and it was the first time Kuljeet saw their work, it would have been challenging to give more highly granular feedback; Kuljeet masterfully and quickly summarised their projects and delivered focused feedback based on a highly specialised, experience-based understanding of the industry, course of study and environment the students were designing for.

The symposium-style forum adopted in Kuljeet's session effectively combined feedback, social considerations, practical environmental, experiential, and spatial considerations during the students' presentation in front of the student group. Her pragmatic approach ensured that students felt supported and clearly understood the requirements and expectations of the learning outcomes and course.

Kuljeet employed a relaxed and easy-going conversational style, particularly when addressing issues such as the sometimes limited use of high-resolution models by some of the students. This approachable demeanour encouraged some open dialogue from the cohort and fostered a comfortable environment, enhancing student engagement and participation.

A significant strength of Kuljeet's session was her deliberate choice to, at times, allow students to start initial feedback discussions. This student-centred approach provided the student group ample opportunity to offer mature, considered, and constructive criticism, reinforcing critical thinking and peer-learning skills.

Kuljeet demonstrated adept skill in balancing guidance with autonomy. She stepped back appropriately to let student conversations naturally unfold while ensuring the discussion remained productive and focused. Her interventions were timely and thoughtfully considered, facilitating deeper exploration of students' ideas without overshadowing their contributions. The inclusion of additional tutors and a visiting council stakeholder added a valuable dimension to the session, providing diverse and practical viewpoints on commercial viability, social impact, and environmental sustainability. Kuljeet effectively facilitated input from these contributors, ensuring their feedback was relevant, beneficial, and integrated smoothly into the students' understanding and project development.

Attention was notably given to practical considerations such as materiality, cost-effectiveness, environmental impact, and concept appropriateness. Kuljeet provided insightful suggestions on sustainable materials and their long-term maintenance, aligning student thinking with real-world constraints and opportunities. Furthermore, discussions around incorporating traditions, cultural festivals, and human-centred design principles effectively highlighted how these elements could enrich the overall user and stakeholder experience.

The session concluded with a clear and comprehensive summary, beneficial not just to the presenting students but to the entire group. Kuljeet's summarising comments effectively encapsulated key insights and recommendations, offering general principles that students could universally and often specifically apply.

Kuljeet's teaching approach was well-balanced, thoughtful, and highly effective in promoting critical reflection, peer engagement, and practical problem-solving among students. Her calm facilitation style and clear focus on realistic and sustainable outcomes successfully empowered students to refine their projects thoughtfully.

To further refine this strong teaching approach, Kuljeet may consider the following reflective questions:

- How might the teaching team further encourage students to independently address pragmatic concerns, such as the use of models, earlier in their project development process?
- When integrating external stakeholders into the session, what methods could be employed to ensure that student voices remain predominant while still leveraging external insights effectively?
- How could the students in the group be encouraged or empowered to ask more questions and give more suggestions and feedback during the session?
- A final suggestion would be for the students to upload their work to a Miro board 24 to 48 hours in advance so Kuljeet and possibly other stakeholders could review it. Maybe (or maybe not). Also, their forum peers and platform leads could review their work so that they and Kuljeet could leave some brief notes for the students to consider before the session and have time to pre-consider advice, potential solutions, and opportunities. If budget and time were to permit.

These considerations provide additional opportunities to enhance student autonomy and deeper integrate peer expertise into the cross-platform forum sessions and general educational environment.

Part Three

Observee to reflect on the observer's comments and describe how they will act on the feedback exchanged:

Adrian's feedback provides valuable insight into the strengths of my teaching approach while also prompting reflection on how to further develop student autonomy, peer learning, and engagement with external stakeholders. I particularly appreciate the recognition of the symposium-style approach, as fostering an open, supportive, and discursive environment is central to my teaching ethos.

One key takeaway is the balance between structured guidance and allowing students to take ownership of their learning. The suggestion to encourage students to address pragmatic concerns earlier in their project development is well-placed. In response, I will explore structured check-ins where students reflect on their model-making as a developmental and not just final process of representation, reinforcing its importance within the design development cycle.

The question of ensuring student voices remain central when engaging external stakeholders is also critical. Aligned with case study 3, I will trial a brief preparatory exercise where students articulate key questions or discussion points before stakeholder sessions, ensuring their input shapes the dialogue. This aligns with Arao and Clemens' (2021) concept of "brave spaces," where students take active roles in co-constructing discussions rather than relying on tutors to mediate them.

Finally, the suggestion of using Miro for asynchronous review is intriguing. While time constraints may limit feasibility, I will test a light-touch version—inviting students to share

one key image or design question in advance, allowing for targeted feedback during sessions.

These adaptations will reinforce a student-centred approach while maintaining the critical and professional rigor necessary for their design development.

Reference:

Arao, B. and Clemens, K. (2021) *From safe spaces to brave spaces: A new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice*. 2nd edn. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
