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| --- | --- |
| Name: **Dr Davide Filingeri** | Date: **19/11/2018** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School/Department:**  **Design School** | **Subject:**  Vision and light | **Module/Course Unit:**  BSc User Centred Design  DSA206 – Environment of use |
| **Assessor:**  **Dr Sarah Mills** | **Session Length** (Hrs/Mins)**:**  **1h** | **Observation Length** (Hrs/Mins)**:**  1h |
| **Level/Year:**  Part A | **Mode** (FT/PT)**:**  **FT** | **Number of Students/Participants:**  25 |
| Type of Activity:  **Lecture** | **Topic/Title:**  Introduction to vision and light | **Composition of Group:**  Nothing to report |

**Purpose and Aim of the Session**

The overall purpose/aim of the session is:

To provide a fundamental and applied overview of vision and of the physics of light

**Specific Learning Objectives (eg objectives linked to knowledge and understanding; subject specific skills; generic skills)**

The students/participants should be able to:

* Understand the problem of perception
* Identify the 3 main components of the visual problem
* Describe light as the physical stimulus for vision
* Characterize the spectral sensitivity of the eye

**Role of Learn pre- and post-session**

Learn is used to support student learning for the observed session as follows:

* Access to suggested reading (available pre-session)
* Access to PPT slides of the lecture (available post-session)
* Access to the software used for simulations (available post-session)
* Access to visual illusions webpage (available post-session)

**Relationship of Learning Objectives to Module Learning Outcomes**

The learning objectives of this session support the following module learning outcomes:

The aim of this module is to provide a fundamental understanding of how users respond to the

physical environment, in principle and application. Give a background to how people respond to

environmental stimuli; sound, temperature and light, in terms of physical, physiological and

perceptual responses. Then how this knowledge can be applied to aid the design and

optimisation of products and space for the user.

The proposed ILOs for the current session relate to the following MLOs:

a) Knowledge and Understanding:   
On successful completion of this module, the students should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of: The physical environment and the sensory interaction of users with that environment. How the environment can impact on the user and the design of artefacts and systems.

b) Subject specific skills:   
(i) Intellectual/cognitive skills:   
On successful completion of this module, the students should be able to: demonstrate an understanding of how the physical (sensorial) environment can impact upon both user and design requirements. 

**Use of Learn**

Learn is used to support the module in the following ways:

* Providing information relevant for students’ progression through the module (i.e. module guide, coursework and assessment, lecture slides and supporting material, Turnitin submission);
* Providing access to students for online submission of relevant coursework;
* Composition of groups for group assessment (e.g. e-poster)
* Discussion forum and notice board for peer and student-teacher communications

**Practice Areas and Commentary (including strengths/weaknesses):**

|  |
| --- |
| **1 Clarity of purpose/aim and learning objectives**  The session had a clear aim and purpose, with four ILOs. These were revised slightly from the original pre-observation resource sent through, after our discussion in that meeting, and were improved by Davide for delivery to the students. A strength of this teaching session is that the ILOs were returned to in the final slide and used as a prompt to gauge learning i.e. “identify the three main components – what are they?” and students responded well. Other ILOs were more difficult to do that type of quick ‘check’, and so reference to the *assessment* at that stage would have been helpful i.e. “the exam may ask you to demonstrate that you can characterize the spectral…” as this is not possible in final minutes of a lecture but there would be scope to usefully reference assessment points. |
| **2 Planning and organisation**  The session was very well planned and organised. The lecture was well-timed, structured and delivered and the materials were well prepared in advance. |
| **3 Learning and teaching methods**  A range of methods were used: trying to relate to the student’s everyday lives or experiences (radio/frequency; menthol/chilli) and providing entry-points to some complex topics. There were good references to previous weeks and where this session ‘sat’, although the ‘why does this matter to user-centred design?’ element was a little sandwiched in the middle of the session, rather than reflected on in the conclusion i.e. the module and its focus and relevance. This could help move the more complex graph material a little earlier into the session too, when students are slightly more engaged. There was also a good quick hint of “community of practice” too i.e. “an MSc student shared this with me” which helps the students see themselves as part of that wider learning community (in Design School / University). |
| **4 Presentation**  Davide’s presentation was confident, with good pace, and high energy levels. He moved around the room in a commanding yet approachable way, engaging students (asking their names when they answered a question) and he used no notes during his session. Overall, the presentation was to a very high standard indeed. |
| **5 Content**  Content of the session ranged from introductory entry-points with small exercises/questions all the way to more complex concepts and ideas i.e. graphs and experimentations in the field of vision. As hinted above, the structure could be edited slightly to ensure the more complex graphical illustrations appeared at the c.30 minute mark rather than c.40 minute mark at peak student engagement/understanding, ending with the ‘why relevant’ examples (design/train/elderly) instead of the most complex graph. Although a Part A lecture, the group composition involves those who have done sciences/physics as well as those who have not, so it is a difficult context but one that Davide navigated very well indeed, with strong explanation skills. |
| **6 Student engagement and/or participation**  The students – to Davide’s credit – were engaged throughout. I observed no distracted students, but rather this group of c.20 students were listening and taking notes.  There were high levels of opportunities for student participation. Some of these were group based for the whole class i.e. “raise your hand when you see the vertical red line” with a range of small, quick and interesting visualisations and illusions used effectively. Other participatory techniques were questions out to the class that were seeking an individual answer. There were a lot of these, and whilst 3-4 students regularly answered them (and well), there were a lot, and only those 3-4 more confident students were involved. Taking one of those examples i.e. “what experiment could we do?” could be approached in the future by asking everyone to pair up and just discuss a few options, before then asking a pair to share with rest of class or selecting a pair that had not yet contributed. Or, not all the opportunities where a question was asked requires a ‘question out’ to class i.e. “who is this?” - Issac Newton – with a follow-up ‘would you agree with that?’ is it? OK”  Davide was not afraid of the silences after asking a question out to the class and did get answers each time which demonstrates the students were engaged and listening, but this did tend to be the same 3-4 students. However, the earlier opportunities and visualisations created good student engagement across the whole class, and these were really accessible and supported learning very well. |
| **7 Impact of accommodation and learning resources**  The PowerPoint slides and visual aids used in class were of a high quality. The learning resources were well sign-posted i.e. three key readings (one was emphasised again later in the session) and weblinks on Learn or within slides were highlighted to class well. Free software was briefly demonstrated and the resources used had clear links to students’ learning or wider support.  In terms of accommodation, the room is not ideal in that a loud fan is whirring at the back (!) but this is beyond Davide’s control. |

**Summary of the overall quality of the session in terms of the learning objectives sought.**

NB: *This section should identify any key areas of practice for future enhancement activity and highlight areas of effective/innovative practice which may be appropriate to share with colleagues.*

|  |
| --- |
| Davide’s session was very well delivered and was a highly satisfactory learning experience for Part A students on this topic. He made the content interesting and engaging, with a rationale for why this mattered (although a little more on this, or returned to at the end, would have been great). He was confident yet accessible in sharing this expertise on ‘vision’, and there were plentiful opportunities for student participation. At times, these were a little too frequent or similar in style via “questions out to the class” (discussed above), so with just a little more variation there for a range of different students, the session or future sessions could improve further still. Overall this was a really interesting and well-prepared session where Davide had the students focused, listening and engaged. The learning objectives were achieved, and the standard across practice areas was very good indeed. Well done! |

|  |
| --- |
| *Please tick the box ✓ if you agree to elements of effective/innovative practice identified being shared ✓* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor’s Evaluation** | **✓** |
| **Excellent:** Very high standards across all practice areas: learning objectives achieved. |  |
| **Highly Satisfactory:** Generally very good though scope for minor improvements in one or two practice areas: learning objectives achieved. | X |
| **Satisfactory:** Acceptable standards across all practice areas though scope for improvement in some areas: learning objectives achieved. |  |
| **Requires attention:** Acceptable standards in most practice areas though one or two areas in need of significant improvement: some objectives not achieved. |  |
| **Unsatisfactory:** Poor. Unacceptable standards in over three areas of practice with wide scope for major improvement: the majority of objectives not achieved. |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessor’s signature:** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Candidate’s comments (optional)**  The entire observation process (i.e. pre- and post-observation meetings) has been a very useful and enjoyable experience and has provided numerous opportunities for maximizing the effectiveness of my teaching practice. The Assessors have provided thorough and critical feedback that has further stimulated my reflective practice, and I wish to thank them for such an important contribution to my development as an effective teacher.  **Candidate’s signature:** |