Record of Observation or Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed:

Size of student group: 40-14
Observer: Dr Rachel Marsden
Observee: Emma Hamshare

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?

This is a self-organised four day long pilot symposium that sat outside of any unit and took place during activities week titled 'Technology for Change'. As part of a global partnership event with Prof Troy Nachtigall who came over from Amsterdam to take part. It was designed for with my students (Year2 BA Fashion Design Development) upcoming unit Fashion Production Future Techniques in mind. I anticipated that student numbers would be highest for the Lecture on the Monday and would decrease throughout the week.

47 signed up for the Lecture
30 attended my Monday afternoon session on **Playful Soft Systems** directly after the lecture.
28 attended Troy's session on **'loopholes'** on the Tuesday Morning.
Around 15 attended tutorials with us on Tuesday afternoon & another 5 with me on Wednesday.
And 14 entered the project on the padlet with the only group of 3 students winning the prize.

Three main parts, Lecture, workshops & tutorials, presentations & online showcase

    1.Lecture speakers
- Emma Hamshare
- Troy Natchtigall,
- Laura Salisbury
- Alexa Pollman.

2. A Workshop / Hackathon at LCF 2 days
3. Playful soft systems on Monday Afternoon
4. Loopholes by Troy Natchtigall on Tuesday Morning
5. Tutorials with Emma & Troy on the Tuesday afternoon.

   - Create links between fashion and other industries to create potential new business models.
   - In the second part students are given the brief on problem solving using Fashion design thinking. And the 'loopholes' cards are used as prompts.
   - Loopholes, presents students with cards detailing business 'disruptors' that they can apply to their design ideas.

6. Student Presentations online showcase - BB collaborate room recording and Padlet. This is how the students present and can upload existing work that they feel fits the brief, as well as work created during the hackathon. This can be used as a teaching resource going forwards.

PADLET LINK: https://artslondon.padlet.org/ehamshare1/technolgy-for-change-textile-transitions-fashion-s-role-in-a-9csd53vf2ef8vkcw

Similar projects -
LCF hackathon https://www.arts.ac.uk/whats-on/lcf-hackathon
The Grand Challenge - https://www.rca.ac.uk/study/schools/school-design/grand-challenge/
Imperial college / Rca - https://www.imperial.ac.uk/news/190308/ways-that-imperial-fusing-science-fashion/

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

Students signed up via an Eventbrite and the event was open to the whole of UAL.
I had only worked with one or two of the students who had been on FDD previously and met a few as part of some AL marking work I did afterwards on the MA course Innovative Fashion Production. It was a majority of these students who attended the workshops afterwards as I had spoken to their course leader ahead of time and she had been able to add it in to their timetable.

What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?

LO's
1. To gain insight into how professional practitioners use new technologies in their professional practice.
2. Collaboration and knowledge exchange between participants, enhancing problem-solving.
3. Examine new possible systems that leverage fashion thinking and technology to address environmental and social issues.
4. Examine ethical entrepreneurialism to drive social and environmental change.
5. Consider the application of new technologies to current in action fashion projects for positive change.

Objectives

1. Innovation Fusion: Combining creative insights from "Loopholes" with "Playful Soft Systems" to create unique solutions for complex challenges.
2. Interdisciplinary Synergy: Promote collaboration and knowledge exchange between participants, enhancing problem-solving.
3. Online Resource Library: Create a shared digital repository to showcase students innovative collaborative projects.
4. Mentorship & Support: Offer high level guidance to participants in realising project potential.
5. Positive Impact: Encourage ethical entrepreneurialism to drive social and environmental change.
6. Widen students career options by encouraging them to use their fashion design skills in collaboration with other industries of their choosing.
7. Entrepreneurial Skills: Equip participants with skills to turn ideas into impactful ventures addressing contemporary problems. This format is similar to the Mayor's hackathon so this could be a good way for students to become accustomed to the format and go on to win funding for start-ups.
8. Updating students' knowledge on e-textiles, soft systems and disruptive fashion business models to feed into their projects.
9. Improve quality of students work bringing it into line with international standards.
10. Enabling use of playful investigative. fashion design approach to consider serious pressing contemporary problems.
11. Introducing students to fellow designers in Eindhoven via the online presentations.
12. Similar format to the mayors Design Hackathon so good practice for students at LCF who might lack skills to pitch new concepts and business ideas.

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

Students create 2 A3 boards to show their ideas, one is the system / supply chain diagram and the other any potential design outcome. They can also submit work from current projects as long as it fits the brief of using a technology for the power of positive change.

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?

These were mainly logistical, booking rooms, finding an online bb collab room that could be open to all UAL, marketing the event, working with the events team and getting our presentations to work on the screens all took far too much energy that should have been spent on the content. LCF also isn't set up well for guest lecturers.

Knowledge gap between material and information provided and student's practices.

Difference of teaching style from here to in the Netherlands. Troy mainly works with researchers

How will students be informed of the observation/review?

I am not sure they will be informed, as this will be watching a recording that has already happened. I can email the attendees if needed.

<u>What would you particularly like feedback on?</u>

My talk on my professional practice in the first 20 mins of the lecture.
The Q&A section at the end of the lecture.
My PowerPoint called 'playful soft systems'
Any ways to improve particularly looking at bringing professional practice into teaching.
Format feedback would be good but I couldn't use the LCF Slide templates for most of this though as I needed to adapt the presentation from my portfolio with video's embedded.

<u>How will feedback be exchanged?</u>

In writing or online in a tutorial or both.

Part Two
Observer to note down observations, suggestions and questions:

Thank you, Emma, for talking me through the four-day Hackathon. Congratulations on successfully getting funding for this valuable project, which you said was, in essence, about getting creative people together and applying design skills to a societal problem. You acknowledged that issues, such as Covid-19 and climate change, can feel overwhelming to individuals, who may feel powerless to tackle them. Your ambition is for students to feel empowered to solve problems, and you shared that collaboration across institutions and specialisms is a key part of this. I very much enjoyed hearing about the aspirational goals of the project, the commitment to climate, racial and social justice embedded in the project, and the excitement of working with experts from outside of the university to inspire students.

Our discussion primarily focused on the first lecture, the afternoon workshop, and Troy's loophole workshop.

Lecture

You explained that the lecture was about conveying knowledge to students about applying design skills to bigger societal problems. You brought in a range of external speakers, who could share their expertise in designing with social issues in mind. You wanted to 'open up the world' and broaden student perspectives in terms of where they can take their work in future (e.g. spacesuit projects; garments for stroke rehab; R&D).

You had a pre-meet with the external speakers, and talked their slides. You worked with them to make their work accessible to an undergraduate audience, asking them to simplify certain concerns, which I think was a sensitive approach. Your colleague's comment "But don't dumb it down" stuck with you, and you have been reflecting on how to balance this. You said that

students had questions after the lecture – "how the hell do we do this?!" – you encouraged then to start small.

Workshop

The morning lecture was followed by an afternoon workshop, which focused on ideas generation. You wanted to convey the idea that all ideas are valid at this stage, as you had the rest of the week to refine. You noted an initial reluctance for students to speak to one other, and questioned if this was a result of the pandemic. You feel that it is important that they have a space to talk to one another that isn't observed by tutors, so you did leave them to speak amongst themselves. Each group had piles of key words (the inputs and outputs) and within their groups they would each present an idea.

Loopholes game

The following morning, you did Troy's Loopholes game, which emerged from an EU project with high levels of funding). Troy gave a talk at the beginning which you thought was brilliant; Troy shared knowledges about product passports, and aspects of the fashion system that people don't think about (e.g. the impacts of washing machines in terms of energy efficiency and microplastics. You then moved into the Loopholes game. Students were given a QR code which linked to a Miro board, so each group had their own version of the board. You thought this element (QR + Miro) worked really well. However, the game itself was not so successful; it seemed overwhelming to students, particularly undergraduate students, and you thought it was too much information. You also noted that BA students were tired from there recent hand-in. You reflected that perhaps it needed more time (a whole day) instead of the allotted three hours. You also considered asking Troy how the game could be simplified in future for this audience.

Our conversation

In our review, we chatted primarily about two areas: working with external colleagues, and collaboration/group work.

In your narrative of the Hackathon, you noted a couple of times that externals didn't always pitch the content to the right level. You mitigated against this well by reviewing the externals lecture slides in advance, and also thought sensitively about not 'dumbing down' and including aspirational content. We talked about how you might brief externals in advance about what you need from them. You thought that maybe providing bullet-points or templates might work with this. You also acknowledged that, by asking externals to review their content, it might be more work for them and might result in needing a higher fee. I shared my perspective that providing clarity to externals about making sure their content is fit for purpose and accessible is really crucial. You noted that Troy's way of teaching is 'completely different' to yours; you are used to working in a student-centred way, whereas his work centres around research standards. Again, I wonder what your role might be for ensuring student-centredness when working with Troy next time. Something to reflect on!

We also talked about the importance of collaboration and group work in the Hackathon. It's clear how important you feel collaboration is, especially when responding to issues of such

complexity and importance. I noted that, in our university setting, there is quite a lot of individualism (students are, ultimately, getting graded on their work) which can make collaboration a barrier. I asked how you framed the importance of collaboration in the Hackathon. You said that you made it clear in the briefing that working together is desirable, and indeed the winning project was the only one submitted as a group. However, you also feel (and, in this context, I agree) that students should have agency about how they work. You felt that the tight timescale may make collaboration difficult, and next time you would include a day where students can work on their projects. You talked about the importance of a 'shared purpose' when collaborating, so we paused to consider ways to introduce and match students. You thought of the idea of 'speed dating', which sounds great to me! I said I would share the Disability Service [Inclusive Group Work](#) leaflet with you, but want to acknowledge that in this context (i.e. an opt-in project) much of this guidance may not apply, and I agree that student agency is important.

Part Three

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

Thank you Carys for the feedback and valuable conversation about Technology for Change. I appreciate your thoughts and you taking the time to go through and de-brief the event with me. Your feedback highlights several areas for improvement, particularly in terms of working with external colleagues and fostering collaboration among students.

Regarding collaboration and group work, I definitely agree that it is important to create a shared purpose among students. And I need to continue to facilitate meaningful connections to foster collaboration. I will explore strategies such as "speed dating" to encourage student engagement and agency in collaborative projects so that they are able to find partners with similar interests.

For next time I can certainly ask Troy how the game could be simplified in future for this audience. And thank you for helping me come to the conclusion that Troy's game perhaps it needed a longer timeframe of a day instead of three hours.

I can certainly consider how to provide some guidelines to ensure the accessibility of guest lecture content. I will consider the importance of ensuring that content is tailored to the undergraduate audience while maintaining aspirational elements. Pre-meetings with speakers and providing clear guidelines or templates could help streamline content creation and strike the right balance between accessibility and complexity.

Overall, your feedback provides valuable insights that will inform future iterations of the Hackathon, helping to create a more inclusive and collaborative learning environment. Thank you for your thoughtful input and suggestions.