Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed: A series of weekly assessments + final mini-project for the unit Critical Data Analysis and Representation, for students from MSc Data Science and AI.

In the folder I have added four elements:

1. Unit and assessment description: this is part of the first class where we inform students how is the unit structured, and how do assessments work
2. and 3. Weekly tasks briefs for weeks 2 and 3, respectively (I didn't add every single weekly task for simplifying the review process).
4. Final mini-project: this was a final task that they were asked to work for the last three weeks.

Size of student group: 9
Reviewee: Teo Dannemann
Reviewer: Rachel Marsden

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
Reviewee to complete in brief and send to reviewer prior to the review

What is the context of this session/artefact within the curriculum?
For this unit, students are asked to work on weekly tasks as a way of practice with the taught topic for the week. Tasks usually have a hands-on (coding, developing a tool) and a reflective part. They are supposed to submit every single task as an entry for their websites that they host at git.arts.ac.uk.

How long have you been working with this group and in what capacity?
I am their course leader and also teach them since September 2025

What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?

1. To apply your understanding of critical and ethical approaches to data science and AI to your own practice and understand how they are shaping the field (Enquiry)
2. To demonstrate understanding of bias existing around data representation and apply ways of mitigation (Knowledge)
3. To apply big data tools and also communicate your findings through powerful visualisation techniques (Communication)

What are the anticipated outputs (anything students will make/do)?
To create, through coding, a different series of algorithms or data analyses that relate to critical aspects in programming (bias, marginalized populations, machine

learning hazards). After creating, they are faced with different questions to guide them through a reflective process.

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?
Sometimes Data Science student struggle with critical aspects such as the ones covered on these tasks. They might focus more into the efficiency aspects and how to improve the algorithm, neglecting the fact that there will always be biases.

How will students be informed of the observation/review?
Communicated in class

What would you particularly like feedback on?
Written or verbally

How will feedback be exchanged?
Email or online meeting

Part Two
Reviewer to note down observations, suggestions and questions.

On first look at all 4 Powerpoints, I notice the use of high contrast white text on a black background, with further prompts and cues stated in red font on a black background, and hyperlinks in a pale blue. In considering the accessibility of the slides / texts, longer passages of white text on black background can be harder to read. Furthermore, the use of red is considered less accessible as low contrast, making it harder to focus on the text. A lighter background with darker text might support accessibility and readability more. There is some brilliant guidance from UAL (and beyond) on developing accessible digital content, which might be of interest. These links also speak to colour contrast, text placement and alignment, paragraph spacing and heading structure and more.

- Accessibility and good design: Link (inc. Powerpoint)
- Creating accessible documents: Link (inc. Powerpoint)
- Ally: Link
- Powerpoint Accessibility (WebAIM platform)
- Word and PowerPoint Accessibility Evaluation Guide - Link
- See wider resources on the WebAIM platform

I see a mention of use of Slack in the slides. It might be useful to also think about the accessibility of this platform and whether students could be signposted to its accessibility features such as screen reader and navigation options, to enable more inclusive engagement. It makes me consider whether there's an opportunity to gain feedback on the experiences of students as to whether any changes or improvements can be made, and help required. What do you think?

Powerpoint 1, Unit and Assessment description
The overall structure is clear with the outline and key aspects of the unit communicated effectively. I wonder whether adding dates to the weekly breakdown would give students more clarity of the teaching timetable / schedule. In relation to learning outcomes (LOs), it would be useful to state whether specific weeks align to specific LOs or if they're addressed across all the weeks. On the final slide (slide 5), I would avoid using vague terms like "etc." Although useful shorthand, it can create ambiguity for students as related to expectations, particularly in an assessment context. What does "etc." mean here? The slide also introduces a presentation requirement (twice a term). Are there opportunities to consider a broader range of formats in relation to inclusive assessment practices (including as part of the **Final mini-project**)? For example, could students present through pre-recorded formats or alternative modes / forms of submission? What might this look like in the context of the unit?

Powerpoint 2, Weekly Tasks 2
This slide contains a lot of information. Therefore, I wonder if it might be beneficial to break it down into a slide for each step (also numbered?) - much like **Powerpoint 3, Weekly Task 3**. This might help students engage in the content more easily reducing cognitive load. I'm making assumptions here that you work through the first weekly task and post creation with students as an example? Tell us more about these activities. Again, I would avoid using vague terms like "etc." - make sure expectations are clear from the get go.

I'm interested to know whether you provide guidance on the use of AI within the unit. For example, are there defined boundaries on AI use or opportunities to engage in more critical and ethical conversations on AI usage? At this early stage in the unit, it might be valuable to situate AI in the broader UAL position / policy to support students to critically reflect on its role, implications and impact in creative practice and education. The book *Decentring Ethics: AI Art as Method*, edited by Vanessa Bartlett, Jasmin Pfefferkorn and Emille K. Sunde might be of interest and a useful resource(it's open access / free PDF download here).

Across the slide decks, **Weekly Tasks 2, Weekly Task 3, and Final Mini-Project,** activities are clearly stated and supported with relevant links. I wonder if there's an opportunity to make the LOs more explicit within each session, to create alignment to their overall learning on the unit – especially within the final mini-project slide deck / session. In addition, it might be helpful to consider signposting for practical support and problem solving – where do students go if they encounter any difficulties? Who should they contact or what platforms could they access? This would further support students in developing autonomy in their learning journey.

An important point relates to a statement in the **Final mini-project** slide deck, *'Assessment for this part will be made around participation and documentation.'* I wonder whether participation is being assessed here? As it does not seem to be reflected within the stated LOs. It might be helpful to ensure alignment between what

is being assessed and the LOs so that expectations are clear to students. I would also question how participation is assessed in practice as this can be difficult to measure consistently, also in consideration of equity and fairness, and how students engage differently. Therefore, it might be worth considering how this is framed in the slides and clarifying whether it is part of a formative learning process, rather than summative assessment.

Thanks for sharing this suite of learning materials Teo. It's been valuable to gain insight into a corner of your work and practice at UAL. I hope the above feedback helps to further develop and enhance the materials, whilst prompting thinking and reflection. I'm happy to discuss anything in our next tutorial.

Part Three

Reviewee to reflect on the reviewer's comments and describe how they will act on the feedback exchanged. Reviewee should return this to the reviewer once complete.

Thank you so much for such a detailed and constructive review, Rachel.
I agree that a main concern is the amount of information displayed on each slide. There are quite verbose slides that can confuse more than inform students.
The accessibility issues are greatly appreciated, I would have thought black and white was the best way to proceed because of contrast, but it is true that combined with verbose text it can be quite exhausting.
Participation assessment is also a great point. It is true that is not clearly connected with any learning outcomes, so I will have to revise the LO to see how participation can be included, as it is key for the whole course!
LO need indeed to be better connected to assessment brief. There are some points that might be a bit vague or disconnected.
Finally, about the AI usage question, we do give them guidance about how to use it and how to quote it. CCI has developed two documents for guiding them for coding and essay writing, respectively.