Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed:
Size of student group:
Reviewee: Adriano Digaudio
Reviewer: George Rayner Law
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 artefact is a proposal for light-touch professional practice interventions designed to support MA Fine Art students at Chelsea in relation to exhibitions, public moments and sustaining practice beyond the course. It is intended to sit alongside existing teaching rather than replace it. The proposal frames exhibitions and SHOW not simply as endpoints, but as learning environments in which students can develop audience awareness, public engagement, writing, contextual understanding and longer-term sustainability.

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

I work across CCW as Professional Practice Lead and Graduate Show Manager. In that role, I support courses and students through professional practice development, public-facing activity and exhibition planning. My relationship to this group is therefore through curriculum enhancement, pedagogic support and the design of interventions that strengthen students' learning through public and exhibition contexts.

What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?

Students will develop a better understanding of exhibitions and public moments as sites of learning, exchange and ongoing relationship rather than isolated endpoints. They will build greater awareness of the publics their work engages, strengthen their ability to articulate practice across different audiences and contexts, and consider how practice can be sustained beyond London and across transnational contexts.

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

Students may identify and map audiences for their work, test low-stakes forms of public engagement, produce short pieces of writing for different readers and contexts, and approach SHOW and other public moments with more intentionality, confidence and agency.

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?

A key challenge is ensuring that professional practice support is experienced as Fine Art-led and critically relevant rather than instrumental or overly vocational. Another is making sure the interventions remain light-touch and supportive rather than burdensome. I would also welcome feedback on whether the proposal responds clearly and appropriately to a diverse and international cohort.

How will students be informed of the observation/review?

As this is an artefact-based review rather than a live observation, students will not be directly involved in the review process. The review focuses on the pedagogic design and clarity of the proposal itself.

What would you particularly like feedback on?

I would particularly value feedback on whether the pedagogic intention is clear, whether the proposal meaningfully supports student learning through exhibitions and public moments, whether it responds appropriately to diverse learners, and whether the balance between Fine Art values and professional practice feels appropriate.

How will feedback be exchanged?

Written feedback via this form or call as you prefer, followed by email if clarification is needed. Thank you!

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

I found this a very interesting proposal to read, especially given our shared working history, and my own identification of some of these same issues/tensions in my own PGCert work. I completely agree that a kind of 'BA Show 2.0' model does not serve our MA students best, for reasons of scale and student body makeup, as you identify.

To address your specific feedback requests in turn, I firstly think the pedagogic intention is clear, of having professional practice learning as parallel to taught/course structure. I think the language used was also clear about what this concretely means in a way that would be understandable to both staff and students not familiar with language, terms or discussions around professional practice. In terms of meaningfully supporting student learning, my main questions would be around facilitation, session timings, and advertising to students.
I think the proposal is very solid but would need to be sufficiently resourced for students to be able to learn lessons from the sessions. A comparative example is the hanging workshop sessions our team has run - due to student drop out or disengagement, these have sometimes required a high staffing commitment and multiple sessions running in order to penetrate through the student body.
In terms of supporting diverse learners, the focus on how we support international students was great to see. As you identify, not every student is looking for, or able to, sustain a career in London / the UK after graduating, and skills education is a key way to help these students in their future careers.
Finally, in terms of the balance between Fine Art values and professional practice, I think that isn't too much of an issue given that this is a proposal for a series of optional sessions. If there were students who feel that this offer clashes with what they see as fine art values, they would presumably stop engaging with this process, or not engage to begin with. The greater challenge may be with convincing Fine Art staff of the utility of this offer, but I think the invitation section at the end is very clear, open and warm in it's language and would encourage positive and constructive staff engagement.

The only question I would have of this proposal is around the parallels with what skills and practices are developed on the the MA Curating & Collections (C&C) course at Chelsea, that shows in parallel to MA Fine Art. Elements of this proposed structure, such as considering publications, marketing and the varied nature of publics are part of the work that the C&C cohort put into their show. I wonder if there is a way to study what pre-existing work has been done by the C&C team, and potentially any pitfalls of approach that they have experienced that they can share.

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.

To keep the review process balanced, I used the same artefact my tutor reviewed, "Proposal MA Fine Art Audience Intervention". I felt this would be helpful because it allowed me to consider the same piece of work through a different lens, and to reflect more carefully on what I have been developing and what still needs thinking through.

George's feedback was useful because it confirmed that the pedagogic intention of the proposal is coming through clearly, especially in how professional practice is being positioned alongside, rather than against, course teaching. I also found it reassuring that he felt the language was accessible, as one of my concerns has been making this kind of offer legible to staff and students who may not already be familiar with professional practice discourse.

What was most helpful, though, was that his feedback pushed me beyond the principle of the idea and into the realities of delivery. His comments about facilitation, timings, resourcing and student engagement made me think more carefully about what would actually be needed for this to work well in practice. I also valued his point about international students and the reminder that not all students are imagining futures in London or the UK. That reinforced for me that this work is not only about employability in a narrow sense, but about helping students think about how practice might travel across different contexts.

What I am taking from this is the need to think more carefully about how the offer is resourced, communicated and timed if it is to have real reach. I also want to follow up his suggestion to look at work already happening within MA Curating & Collections, both to understand what overlaps exist and to learn from any difficulties they may already have encountered. I took the following questions from George's review;

- How would this be delivered well in practice?
- Will it be resourced enough to reach students meaningfully?
- How will students know about it and engage with it?
- What can be learned from related work already happening in MA Curating & Collections?

I'll be using these to shape the next iteration. His feedback helped me see that the proposal's strength lies not only in its rationale, but in how carefully the conditions for engagement need to be designed.