# Record of Observation or Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed: Filmmaking I: Introduction to the filmmaking production stages. Preproduction – MA Global (Online session)

Size of student group: 16 (8 students from UAL and 8 from Kyoto Institute of Technology)

Observer: Frederik Andersson

Observee: Sara Massieu

##### 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 OneObservee 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 for the Year 1 students of the MA Global Collaborate Design Practice. Which is a hybrid 2 year Master's program between UAL and the Kyoto Institute of Technology in Japan.

This is the first session of a four-week sprint course I designed on an introduction to filmmaking. I responded to the students' brief, "Designing for Transitions." The brief consists of Mapping the wicked problem of consumption and waste, identifying intervention points, co-creating prototypes, and curating action ecosystems to design for transitions. One of the outcomes of this project is a proof-of-concept prototype that intervenes in the consumption and waste problem, presented through a short film.

The first session will be an introduction to filmmaking. It will cover the three filmmaking production stages, and it will focus on the preproduction stage. It will also cover a brief introduction to Adobe After Effects.

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

I have worked with this year group since their first term with another sprint 5 week minicourse I designed "Introduction to Editorial Design".

This was a hybrid course as the first 2 sessions were online, and the middle 2 were on site, as the Japanese students were in London. The last week of tutorials was online.

**What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?**

1. Production Stages of filmmaking:

- Introduction to what the Preproduction, production and postproduction stages cover.

2. Preproduction

- Concept

- Research

- Calendarization

- Moodboards

- Storyboard

3. Production

- Format

- Composition

- Style

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

During the session, the tasks are designed to help them kick off the production of their film

**Tasks:**

- Answer the basic questions about What their film is and how it looks. And what is it made of?

- Have the creative summary

- Generate a tagline

- Write the first draft of the plot

I will also give them tasks to complete and upload to the Padlet to prepare for the second session.

- Do the moodboard

- Work on their storyboard, at least for one of the scenes, or thumbnails

- Bring materials to work on the second session (clips, drawings, audio files, visual assets, etc.)

**Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?**

I'm concerned that I haven´t got any update from the academic team, so I'm not sure at what stage of the brief they are, I'm worried that it's not relevant for students in the stage they are at. (Last year students were glad they had it, but still)

I am also a bit worried about the amount of information and if I'm making the session cognitive load heavy. I hope is dynamic enough for an online session and that the tasks help students with their film and to absorb the information better.

**How will students be informed of the observation/review?**

I will mention that I´m doing the Pg.Cert. And that I will send the recording to a college to review my performance. I will make it clear that it is not to evaluate them in any way, but that if they feel uncomfortable, they should let me know so I can make the proper adjustments.

**What would you particularly like feedback on?**

I think I would like feedback on the overall session. But also on the cognitive load, and if it feels too heavy.

I also wanted to know if I am doing the sessions too fast, as my brain is usually running at 200km/h.

As well if you have suggestions on how to make the tasks better, I´m more than happy to take them.

**How will feedback be exchanged?**

We had a Teams call to share our respective notes, and then sent the ROT form by email

## Part Two

### Observer to note down observations, suggestions and questions:

Good introductions check in with students to cover for academic team not getting back to you on time.

**Opening slide looks professional.**

I wonder if there are too many tasks for 2 hours. Looking at the to do list for the session and it being online, I would probably edit down what needs to happen in the workshop.

You are very good at talking and providing context and instructions. The practical tone is very helpful. Also setting boundaries around your availability and capacity for support, regarding them making assets on their own time.

**Basic Questions:**

Really nice examples mentioned of “how does it looks”. Maybe add visuals of these styles so people can see the difference?

**You are very generous with all the practical information. Even showing how to log into Padlet.** It feels like you aren't leaving anything up to chance in terms of sharing information, which is excellent as a lot of students need that support. However, I think this is another argument for editing down the content so that students aren't too bombarded?

Basically, everything you are relaying is super clearly communicated, but is it too much at once? I think this is more about the lack of space in the course rather than your ability.

I think it is great that they create a shared resource with the Padlet as the workshop goes on. Often, I feel students do not share ideas after workshops. So, you handle that well.

Since it is a group project, it might be good to make use of breakout rooms for some sections. And instead of Padlet maybe they could all work on shared PowerPoint to create a small pitch deck for their films? They can be colour coded for groups and labelled 1 pager per task. That way they could drop some reference photos into it and create a more dynamic mood board and presentation than a Padlet allows?

* I think the workshop could be structure to have specific sections that uses breakout rooms and sections where you address the whole group.

Are they doing other workshops to help define the actual idea? Or is this workshop also intended for idea generation? Maybe 3 min per task is not enough time for a group to collaborate online like this?

I think to combat that people are not using their webcams you could add a section at the start asking everyone to turn on their cameras and wave and say hi. I would do a round of names, pronouns and some ice breaker, maybe just what group they are in? It adds another task, but it does a lot to improve the mood during online workshops.

You are very good at talking to students. It feels very light in the mood and despite people not having their cameras on for most of it.

**Since the student asked for the previous slide during the workshop, I would just send them the slides beforehand,** so they have them in case they need to use anything as a reference. This also helps second language students to copy paste and translate blocks of text.

For the plot section, maybe add the dramatic curve as an example for plot structures?

The break is good!

**Main takeaway:**

You have a very charismatic delivery. And it feels very welcoming. You never talk about a topic in a way that feels inaccessible. Your use of language around the topic is very good.

To solve potential overflow in information and tasks for 2 hours, I think some tasks can be sent to the groups to prepare before the workshop, so you can have more space for the groups to share what they have generated. This way you can give them more time for other tasks.

Then some exercises should be done through breakout rooms so that the groups can communicate amongst each other easier, and you can jump between the rooms to check in. Usually, I would give breakout rooms 15-20 min to make sure they can land in the separate space before getting on with the tasks.

All your references and the actual content of the workshop is very good. It is clear you have made a careful selection, and you know how to communicate your ideas to the group.

## Part Three

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

As I mentioned in the “requested” feedback, I was interested to know if the session was content heavy. In the meeting, Fred noted that the session was designed to address gaps in areas that should be covered in other contexts.

In my practice, commonly, the academic team designs briefs for the students unaware of what it takes to achieve the desired outcomes. As a result, students arrive at technical sessions lacking the necessary "academic" knowledge for their projects. While the intended outcome for the students is to produce a film, I’m the only one on the teaching staff supporting them in the process. This reflects the general context summary and explains why it aims to fill gaps in knowledge and support.

I believe the suggestion to send some tasks in advance is a great idea. By providing the students with more time to complete these tasks, rather than the mere 3-5 minutes I usually allocate during sessions, they will have the opportunity to think about them more thoroughly. This approach will also help make the session lighter, and editing it should be easier.

However, a couple of concerns come to mind regarding this suggestion. Students will not have the actual teaching for each task. Additionally, although I know it’s beyond my control, there is always the chance that some students may not complete the pre-workshop tasks.

Because of this, I think it would be good to design and plan the pre-workshop tasks carefully.

When planning the tasks for my sessions, I aim to incorporate a trial-and-error approach known as "random generate and test" (Sweller, 2011). Given that our working memory is quite limited, we can only process a small amount of new information at one time. Therefore, I design the tasks to generate potential solutions or ideas, which can then be tested. I utilize Padlet as a tool to help students organize the outcomes of these tasks in an "information store" (Sweller, 2011). This approach allows students to tackle complex tasks without overwhelming their working memory, helping to ensure that knowledge is embedded into their long-term memory.

The second functionality of the Padlet, is that I want it to be a live thing that students can also make their own, and that they can go back to it if they need. If the aim is to create learning resources for students, involve them wherever it is needed (Aspery, 2023). At the end of the sessions, I try to populate it with other related sources, so it can become a repository.

I’m happy to hear that even with the heavy content, I managed to make the session welcoming and that the information didn’t feel inaccessible. In the feedback, it was mentioned that the mood of the session felt very light despite students not having their cameras on. I think this is a very important thing for me, as I mentioned in Case Study 1. I think it´s important to create safe spaces for students in online environments without needing to have the cameras on. However, I must admit that I feel reluctant to try breakout rooms unless I have a compelling reason, and a dynamic task prepared. In my experience as both a student and teacher, breakout rooms have often felt disorganised and have not worked well for me.

In conclusion, I am very happy with the feedback I received. I found it to be incredibly useful and it prompted me to reflect on key points for reorganising my sessions and the tasks within them.