

## Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed: Reapproval documentation

Size of student group: N/A

Reviewee: Eric Fanghanel Santibanez

Reviewer: Joana Pereira

*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?

This is the material we have created so far for the reapproval of the course.

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

N/A

What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?

N/A

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

N/A

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?

We are particularly concerned with the move to one year and whether or not we are on the right track for that goal.

How will students be informed of the observation/review?

N/A

What would you particularly like feedback on?

Suggestions and potential points of failure

How will feedback be exchanged?

Written or orally either should be fine

---

## Part Two

**Reviewer to note down observations, suggestions and questions.**

The course aims are very well articulated with clarity and vision, while the outcomes are accessible and free from overly academic language, making them easy for students to understand.

I would suggest enhancing the course outcomes related to process and communication. The process could be framed to encompass the full student journey, starting from the initial inquiry and development of the research question. While communication already includes visual aspects, it could continue to be emphasised as a key component of student work.

The overall structure of the course and units is very cohesive and strong. The pace of units 1 and 2 appears slower compared to units 3–5. Accelerating the early units could help students select their research question in a more timely manner.

Incorporating the Double Diamond framework with divergent and convergent thinking may also support students in exploring broadly before committing, ultimately allowing more time for refined final outcomes.

Regarding project-based work, I recommend aligning the mini-projects with the various contexts outlined in the course aims. This approach would guide students towards their main research question. There may also be an opportunity to involve industry professionals in delivering mini-project briefs, providing early exposure to professional practice and helping students identify potential internship opportunities.

Finally, introducing more informal opportunities for collaboration earlier in the course would allow students to cross-pollinate ideas and practice teamwork in a lower-stakes setting before reaching unit 3.

---

## 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 for the thoughtful and constructive feedback. It is reassuring that the course aims are perceived as clear and accessible, particularly in avoiding unnecessarily academic language. That clarity is important given the diversity of backgrounds students bring to the programme.

#### 1. Strengthening Process and Communication

I agree that the learning outcomes around process and communication can be more robust. I will revise the outcomes to frame process as the full arc of enquiry: from identifying and refining a research question, through experimentation and iteration, to testing and reflection. Communication will be expanded to foreground not only visual articulation but also critical positioning, documentation, and the ability to translate work across audiences (academic, industry, public). This will ensure both are visible threads running across all units rather than implied qualities.

#### 2. Rebalancing the Pace of Early Units

The observation that Units 1 and 2 feel slower is helpful. I will review the sequencing to ensure students are encouraged to identify and articulate their research direction earlier, without sacrificing exploratory breadth. Introducing clearer interim decision points may help maintain momentum.

Embedding a more explicit Double Diamond structure (divergent exploration followed by convergent definition) could provide a shared framework for this pacing. This would support students in expanding their field of enquiry early on, before committing to a refined trajectory with sufficient time for development in later units.

#### 3. Aligning Mini-Projects with Course Contexts

The suggestion to align mini-projects more explicitly with the thematic contexts outlined in the course aims is strong. I will explore how early briefs can act as structured probes into those contexts, helping students surface their interests and move towards a coherent research question. There is also real value in inviting industry practitioners to set or co-deliver selected mini-briefs. This would strengthen professional integration early in the year and potentially scaffold internship pathways.

#### 4. Earlier Informal Collaboration

Introducing lower-stakes collaborative opportunities earlier in the course feels particularly important in a one-year format. I will consider embedding short, informal collaborative exercises in Units 1 and 2 to encourage cross-pollination of ideas and develop teamwork skills before the more formalised collaboration or internship pathways in Unit 3.