ICT for Civic Data — Turin University 2025-26

Refining Your Story

Crash Course — Day 5 Afternoon

civicliteraci.es

Peer Review

> Why peer review

- You learn to **explain your work** clearly and concisely
- You get feedback on whether your **story makes sense** to someone who hasn't been inside your project
- You practice the kind of presentation you would give to a funder

The reviewers are not judging technical quality. They are evaluating whether the **story is clear and the visuals support it**.

> The review framework

When reviewing someone's presentation, consider:

1. **Do the visuals communicate the point quickly?** Can you understand what the map or chart shows without a long explanation?
2. **Is the angle clear?** Can you state in one sentence what this proposal is about?
3. **Is the case study convincing?** Does the concrete example make the broader argument feel real and grounded?
4. **Are visuals integrated into the narrative?** Or did the presenter spend too long explaining the data work instead of using it to support the argument?
5. **What's missing?** What would make this stronger? What question do you still have?

> How it works

Groups of 3–4 people.

Each person presents (5 minutes):

- Show your **landing page** or main artifact
- Explain your **angle** and your **case study**
- Walk through your **map or charts**: what does the data show?
- What would you add if you had more time?

Then: **5 minutes of feedback** from the group using the review framework.

> Exercise: present and review

Groups — 40 minutes

1. Form groups of 3–4
2. Each person presents (5 min) + receives feedback (5 min)
3. Take notes on the feedback you receive
4. After all presentations: 5 minutes to write down what you want to improve

Exam Briefing

> The exam

Respond to an RFP by building a **visual artifact** that demonstrates genuine data exploration.

You will produce:

- A **case study** anchored in a specific territory and issue
- An **angle** that connects the case study to a broader argument
- A **visual artifact** (map, dashboard, data portal) published on GitHub Pages
- A **story** that uses the data to support a convincing proposal
- A **documented process** showing how you found, cleaned, and analysed the data

> What makes a strong submission

Strong

- Specific angle, grounded in a case study
- Data that supports the argument (show, don't tell)
- Clean, well-labelled visuals with storytelling titles
- Documented sources and methodology
- Clear story: a funder could understand it in 5 minutes

Weak

- Vague angle trying to cover everything
- Describes a data approach without demonstrating it
- Complex visuals that require explanation
- No documentation of where data came from
- Technical showcase with no proposal narrative

> AI use is expected

You are expected to use AI tools. That is not the issue.

The issue is whether you can demonstrate **human-led reasoning**:

- Did you choose meaningful data sources (not just the first one AI suggested)?
- Did you verify and clean the data (not just trust the AI's output)?
- Did you make analytical choices you can explain and defend?
- Does your git history show a progression of decisions, not a single AI dump?

Your **artifact chain** (scripts, commits, sources.md) is your proof of original work.

> Timeline

- **Exam RFP**: will be shared separately
- **Deadline**: two weeks from today
- **Submission**: link to your GitHub Pages site + repository

Questions about the format?

Retrospective

> What we built this week

Day 1: Analysed the RFP, chose angles, built first maps

Day 2: Practiced Find/Get/Verify, learned precise prompting, started individual data work

Day 3: Combined datasets (flood + health facilities), learned the prompt framework, cleaned data in Google Sheets and OpenRefine

Day 4: Categorised data, built Chart.js dashboards, created landing pages, learned v0 and skills

Day 5: Refined storytelling, peer reviewed, prepared for the exam

Each day followed the data pipeline. Each day produced published artifacts on GitHub Pages.

> What did you learn?

Discussion:

- What **skill or concept** will you take away from this week?
- What was the **hardest part**?
- What would you **do differently** if you started over?
- What **surprised you** about working with AI tools?

What's Next

> Continue building

Your **Codespace**, **GitHub repo**, and **GitHub Pages site** are all still active. You can:

- Add more data layers to your maps
- Build new dashboards for different datasets
- Create tools for your organisation using self-contained HTML
- Save processes as skills and reuse them

The learning curve was steep this week. But now you have a working environment and a reference implementation.

> Build your skills library

Every process you validate is worth saving as a **skill**:

- Map building (Leaflet + GitHub Pages)
- Data cleaning (Google Sheets or OpenRefine workflows)
- Dashboard creation (Chart.js)
- Data discovery (source evaluation prompts)

Skills are portable: they work across Gemini CLI, Claude Code, and other agentic tools. Your skills library is a permanent upgrade to your baseline capability.

> Where to find data

Bookmark these for your future work:

- **HDX** (data.humdata.org) — humanitarian data by country
- **datavizcatalogue.com** — choosing the right chart
- **OpenStreetMap / Overpass** — infrastructure data worldwide
- **REST Countries API** — country-level context
- **GDACS** — real-time disaster alerts

The **disaster data sources** reference document in the crash course repo lists more.

> Thank you

You came into this week with varied backgrounds and left with:

- A published data portal on GitHub Pages
- Experience with agentic AI tools
- A structured approach to data-driven proposals
- Artifacts you can show to colleagues and employers

Good luck with the exam. Don't hesitate to reach out if you get stuck.