



Prifysgol Cymru
Y Drindod Dewi Sant
University of Wales
Trinity Saint David

MODULE CODE: ECPT6014

ASSESSMENT COMPONENT: A1
Microteach Session

STUDENT NAME: Jonas Paltanavicius-Tew

STUDENT NUMBER: 2204231

Use of Generative AI in Assessment

(Lecturer to indicate Yes or No against each element)

RESEARCH	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to support you in research, including searching for bibliography, using tools to summarise, compare and interrogate materials.	Yes ☒ No ☐
STRUCTURE	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to support you in structuring your submission, including creating a draft argument structure, identifying parts and headings, etc.	Yes ☒ No ☐
PROOFREADING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to check your own text/creation for grammatical and syntactical mistakes, including rephrasing of your own work within specific standards.	Yes ☒ No ☐
WRITING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create text for submission.	Yes ☐ No ☒
CREATIVE	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create creative materials, such as images.	Yes ☐ No ☒
PROGRAMMING	For this assessment, you can use Generative AI to create and check code.	Yes ☐ No ☒
NONE	For this assessment, you are not allowed to use any type of Generative AI support. This includes research support, structure support, writing/proofreading support and creative support.	Yes ☐ No ☒

AI Acknowledgement

I confirm that I have not used any AI tools in the research and creation of this assignment.

I confirm that I have not presented any AI generated materials as my own work.

I confirm that I have copies of my drafts, notes, and other resources I used, which I may be asked to provide in evidence.

Description

I have chosen the Gibbs reflective cycle because it is the most comprehensive reflective modality to analyse my micro teach on materiality in sculpture.

I arrived thirty minutes before the session and was unable to log into the University system and access my presentation. This delayed the start of the lesson but the IT team fixed the problem swiftly.

I began by checking whether my Mentimeter account was working as it was crucial to my formative assessment of learners' baseline understanding of the subject against which I would later assess the learners.

Even though only two out of seven learners were interested in the arts, every learner was engaged from the start and throughout the lesson. I offered each learner a piece of ceramic and aluminium. I encouraged the learners to explore ceramic and aluminium in their hands as they contributed to the word cloud on Mentimeter. I began by asking them to list physical characteristics of the materials, then broader associations with ceramic and aluminium, finally asking them what sort of people these two materials would be. I intended to arouse students' curiosity through the questions that might have puzzled them because 'humans... are naturally curious and like suspense' which is 'a powerful stimulant provided the puzzlement does not last too long and lead to frustration' (Reece and Walker, 2007, p. 77). Now that I had built suspense I knew I would soon have to provide them with a payoff for their attention.

One student was unable to access Mentimeter, so I engaged with her directly knowing her discomfort with IT and to maintain focus on the subject rather than another technical difficulty.

In her feedforward my tutor suggested asking learners what they already knew about materiality in sculpture. I would have loved to take an approach where I could have '[identified] the students' current ideas which they may well have to modify and abandon before they can construct new meaning' (Reece and Walker, 2007, p. 89) later in the session. Each student might have answered very differently with some answers being potentially very long and others being fragmented and insufficient thus making it difficult to establish a baseline against which I would have been able to assess later and could have taken too long. Mentimeter allowed me to narrow the focus and 'make what is important measurable, rather than... making what is measurable important' (Avis, Fisher and Thompson, 2010, p.165). The word cloud exercise got students on the same page with three highly specific questions. I used my own ceramic and aluminium sculpture as a gateway into understanding how materials can convey concepts as the students continued to hold the materials. This was the payoff to the suspense mentioned earlier—I was demystifying the making and the meaning of my sculpture. Since I was unable to bring an actual sculpture into the classroom I wanted the learners to experience its materiality through touch because 'the senses gather a vast amount of information' (Reece and Walker, 2007, p. 60). and I wanted to 'to help the perception process by using a variety of signals, appealing to the senses' (Reece and Walker, 2007, p. 61). such as touch so keep them present.

My sculpture acted as a gateway into materiality before I introduced students to works by Louise Bourgeois and Nicholas Pope which were thematically similar to mine but materially very different. This cognitivist approach expanded the learners' understanding of how materials can be employed as storytelling vehicles so that they can become independent learners. I disseminated my own work and later

pieces by Bourgeois and Pope for the learners to show them how they can reverse engineer concepts through materiality in the sculptures they would be conceptualising in the last part of the session.

Halfway through the lesson learners engaged in an exercise considering what sculptures they would make out of materials I had provided. This exercise helped me shift gears from a cognitivist teaching model back to a more constructivist model 'by which learners build their own mental structures' through a hands-on self-directed activities oriented towards design and discovery' (Race and Brown, 2025, p. 6).

I had planned to lay out materials I had brought in on a table allowing learners to select their own but used Schon reflection in action and instead decided to assign materials to each student which eliminated prolonged deliberation, queueing and potential conflict over access to a specific material. For a minute I could not decide whether to follow my original plan or choose materials for students while observing class dynamics in real time but also understanding that assigning materials could lead to considerable disappointment for learners. Schon believed that 'when the practitioner experiences 'puzzlement' or 'confusion' in a situation, an 'experiment' is carried out to generate a new understanding' (Avis, Fisher and Thompson, 2010, p.194)—assigning materials to learners instead of letting them choose was my experiment, and it paid off as students started the exercise right away while remaining seated.

The exercise of designing their sculpture with the materials was supplemented with a handout of questions helping learners navigate the task. After five minutes of answering the questions in the handouts students presented their ideas which were genuinely inspiring. Their mini presentations were also my summative assessment

after which I concluded that each student had achieved a basic understanding of how materials can communicate meaning in sculpture.

I had not considered how important closing remarks were in the session until I saw my classmates' microteaches, therefore, I had not planned for any conclusions.

Even though successful overall, my session ended somewhat abruptly.

Feelings

Being unable to log into the University system was stressful but I was comforted by the fact that I had printed out my presentation on A3 paper. Additionally I was worried about being unable to access Mentimeter which could have been detrimental to the formative assessment of students' understanding of materiality in sculpture.

At the beginning of the session I noticed myself speaking too fast and kept reminding myself to slow down, and learners' high level of engagement put me at ease.

Ten minutes into my session a learner arrived late. I chose to open the doors for her as the electronic locks on the classroom doors can prove difficult to open from outside thus causing unnecessary disruption. I did not feel stressed by the student's late arrival.

Evaluation

Learners engaged in the session enthusiastically and participated in each part eagerly. Because of the personal nature of my sculpture I opened up to students and they reciprocated during the exercise in designing their own sculpture during

which it was clear they had understood each part of my session. One learner reported never having an interest in art but understanding its impact after my session.

I did not entirely adhere to the professional standard to 'value and promote diversity, equality of opportunity and inclusion' (Educators Wales, 2026) by not providing a definition behind the title of my sculpture *Attrition* as some students might not have known its meaning and therefore felt excluded and their further understanding of the session might have been negatively impacted.

I did not fully 'demonstrate commitment to learners, their learning, safety and well-being' (Educators Wales, 2026) by not warning them that some of the materials I had handed them were sharp and could have caused minor injuries.

Computer screens were blocking part of the white board for a few learners which could have impacted their engagement and understanding.

Analysis

My session was based 'comprehending information, organising ideas... applying knowledge, choosing among alternatives in problem solving' (Avis, Fisher and Thompson, 2010, p. 81)—and was therefore geared towards a cognitive learning style.

I believe my overall approach was successful as my session incorporated an informal quiz, a short partially interactive lecture and a conceptualising exercise with mini presentations at the end. I hoped to appeal to as wide range learners while accepting the inevitable limitations of my strategies due to how different people learn.

Activist learners who 'learn best through brainstorming, problem-solving and other activity-based forms of learning' (Amponsah, 2020, p. 6) might have felt frustrated by the lack of actual sculpting in the session as would have pragmatists who 'enjoy new ideas and theories, and testing how these can be applied in practice'; additionally these 'learners... spend time on conceptual ideas or theories only if they can apply these to their lives' (Amponsah, 2020, p. 7) so if any of the five non-artist learners were also pragmatists, the whole session might not have appealed to them at all. Reflectors who 'learn best through paired discussions, observation activities, and interviews' (Amponsah, 2020, p. 7) would have been partially engaged by the formative assessment activity on Mentimeter but perhaps understimulated conceptualising their sculptures alone rather than in groups. Theorist learners who 'enjoy being presented with information in a logical and coherent manner' (Amponsah, 2020, p. 7) would have somewhat enjoyed the didactic part of the session but would have likely missed definitions of materiality and would have found it hard to engage in the summative assessment without understanding the tenets of materiality in sculpture.

I rehearsed my session alone numerous times which allowed me to be present during the session. I was able to reflect in action because I had a rehearsed structure to fall back upon and was therefore not rattled by a student arriving late or a learner being unable to access Mentimeter.

I opened the session with a constructivist approach testing students' current ideas on materiality through questions and having them contribute to a word cloud. I then switched to a cognitivist approach through which learners learnt how 'ideas are related to other ideas, and individual facts acquire meaning by being subsumed into broader principled structures' (Avis, Fisher and Thompson, 2010, p. 89) as I

explained the meaning of materials in my, Bourgeois' and Pope's sculptures. The constructivist element came from prompting learners to think about materials as active agents of meaning, allowing them to bring experiences from outside fine art and the classroom into their responses.

Conclusion

One of my peers and my tutor said they would have liked to have known the end goals of the session at the beginning. I, however, believe that it can be 'motivating to have [an] unexpected event so that the interest of the students is aroused' (Reece and Walker, 2007, p. 77) instead of leading students to a clearly pre-determined outcome. While I understand that 'well-expressed statement of intended learning outcomes help students to identify their own targets and work systematically towards demonstrating their achievement of these targets' (Race and Brown, 2025, p. 29) I believe that 'micro-management of learning is killing creativity' and that following objectives 'use discourages students from thinking outside the tick box' (Race and Brown, 2025, p. 30) which could be detrimental to a creative session like my microteach.

When planning the lesson I was tempted to divide learners into groups for their sculpture conceptualisation exercise so to establish collaborative relationships within the group. This, however, would have made assessment on individual progress difficult to assess.

Action plan

In the future I would arrive even earlier to ensure I have more time to log into the University system and would aim for maximum visibility of the white board. I would also bring printed copies of the presentation for each learner as a contingency. I would be more explicit about the potential for minor injury when handling certain materials.

I would not plan the session in a way that does not allow for any leeway, so that I can deliver closing remarks.

Finally I would bring a greater variety of materials to be assigned to students to encourage the creativity but not too many options which could also create a sense of overwhelm.