**Sam Barber, peer observer feedback**

**Key insights learned**

* High levels of engagement and curiosity on the format and content of the teaching session from students.  Evidenced by the energy in the room and the quality of discussion within the groups
* the comparative nature of the teaching session stimulated conversation and dialogue (see academic reference below that I'm using on comparative methods for teaching. might be useful for you too if you need it)
* Some students have access to the AI (mid-journey) already which indicates an existing level of interest in the tool and its use, there may be some capability and they are already using it.  Students are 'hungry' for teaching methods and discussions around the topic of AI and its use in design contexts.  UAL feels behind the curve on this issue.
* The intervention created learning on several levels - criticality on AI and its limitations and opportunities for design and in educational use for the course, the use and importance of imagery in narrative development, and the opportunities to use more creative methods in design research.
* Using an artefact/tool such as mid-journey can create a focal point for multiple levels of learning

**What worked**

* the intervention was tailored to an assignment they were working on
* energy in the room was great
* setting the pre-work of coming up with insights from their assignment homework - created a deadline for secondary research to be synthesised so secondary benefits of creating momentum for the assignment

**Opportunities for next time**

* Ensuring technology is more widely available within the groups and the set-up of the tech, I think this was partly a time-available issue. Whilst it worked ok in the session, I can see how if we repeated it, we could make that element run more smoothly
* More time would have been great, I can see the opportunity for a full-day workshop combining it with other elements of visual communication and visual narratives