Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed: HOW TO PLAN DYNAMIC RISK ASSESSMENT FOR OFFSITE INSTALL - an imagined email
Size of student group: N/A
Reviewee: George Rayner-Law
Reviewer: Adriano DiGaudio

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?
- A set of instructions on best practice for ensuring an offsite show can open to the general public on time, written as handover notes for a colleague.

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

What are the intended or expected learning outcomes?
- final check of installed work.
- ensure space is safe.
- ensure space can be open to the public.

What are the anticipated outputs (anything students will make/do)?
- Students will learn safe exhibition practice.
- Students learn how to ensure their work can be displayed publicly and safely.

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?
- Clarity of instruction - would be great to get an outsider perspective on this.

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

What would you particularly like feedback on?
- Legibility of the instructions
-

How will feedback be exchanged?
- in person or via email

Part Two

Reviewer to note down observations, suggestions and questions.

George, I read this as a fellow PgCert participant first, so I'm responding to it through a lens of developing my own understanding of teaching practice and how professional knowledge gets communicated. I'm also reading it with some awareness of your role and development within the team which inevitably shapes how I see it.

What I think works well is that this feels very real. It doesn't read like a generic H&S document, or something lifted from policy language. It feels like something written by someone who knows the pace, pressure and practical reality of install, and is trying to help someone else get a show safely to opening. The imagined email format helps with that too. It makes it feel usable.

A real strength is the order of it. You're not just listing jobs; you're showing how to think through the last stages of install. For me, that's where the teaching value is. It gives a sense of what matters first, what can wait, what needs flagging, and where something becomes serious enough that it has to be escalated. It also shows that safe working in these environments is shared across students, tutors, gallery staff and producers, rather than being the responsibility of one person.

What struck me as I read it is that, although this is framed as a handover note, it's also doing something more. It makes a lot of the judgement calls visible, the "bits" students often don't understand unless someone explains them. Things like hanging points, weighting, checking mitigations in advance, or recognising when something can't be shown safely are all part of professional exhibition practice. So although it's operational, I do think it has a strong teaching function too.

From my perspective, it also reflects your development in role. One of the things we've talked about is moving away from being pulled too much into reactive support and towards having more ownership over planning, prioritising and communicating process. I think this artefact shows that shift. It feels like you're not only holding the knowledge but starting to shape it in a way that others can use.

The main question it raised for me was about audience. At some points it reads very much as a note for a colleague, but a lot of it would also be useful for students. I wondered whether you see it as doing both. If so, would it be worth signalling that more clearly at the top, or breaking it up a bit more so it can be read in that way?

It also made me think about your return and how your role can hold this kind of knowledge most usefully. For me, the next step feels like pulling more of this thinking earlier into the process, so it supports preparation and training rather than sitting mainly at final install stage. I wondered whether parts of this could become a staff/student briefing, or something used earlier with staff and students.
Overall I think it's a strong artefact. It feels credible, useful and grounded in the actual work we do. It also highlights how pedagogy is embedded, and it suggests growing confidence in balancing compliance, support and enabling the work to happen.

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.