

Virginia State University Innovation Panel**Session Plan** *(submitted by Steve Beyerlein)*

Hello, I am very excited you are on the Innovation Panel that will conclude the Process Education Conference this week. Thank you very much! The Innovation Panel will be from 2:50-3:40 in Hunter-McDaniel room 150 on this Saturday (June 27).

Fifteen minutes of that time will be used for the Conference evaluation, so time will be tight (35 minutes!) Because of that (and to embrace Process Education principles), I would like to propose a format that maximizes audience engagement with you in minimum time. To that end, I am giving you some homework.

Instead of the usual few minutes per panelist to introduce themselves and their perspective, I'd like you to write that introduction down and submit it to me by Wednesday night, so we can distribute it to the conference attendees before (or at least at the beginning of) the Panel session. I will give you a LITTLE time to introduce yourself to the audience as a whole (less than a minute!), but I want them to read your intros and learn about your unique perspective beforehand, so you (and they) can go straight into the details and get some deep learning in. (I'll be coordinating at the event, but the whole format I'm proposing is described at the end of this email so you know what you're in for.)

Furthermore, I'd like your intro to emphasize two things: what YOU really want to talk about at this panel and YOUR unique perspective. The intention is to get high-quality questions from the audience, and a high-quality experience for you as well as them. You might be thinking, how do I know what's unique about my perspective?

Remember the poll I asked you to respond to when you agreed to be on the panel? Here's some of the results of that poll: In ranking the PE features from most important to least important to you, only one person ranked "more assessment, less evaluation" last and "Performance Criteria" first. Everyone else had "more assessment, less evaluation" first and "Performance Criteria" either 5, 6, or 7 (out of 8). So if you think Performance Criteria are most important, that is a distinctive perspective that you should highlight. If you think "more assessment, less evaluation" is most important, you don't have to put it in your intro - it is a common factor, not something that sets your perspective apart from the other panelists. Of the others, 2 ranked the Learning Process Methodology highly, while the other 2 ranked cooperative learning activities highly. So it's worth mentioning in your intro which of those is more important to you.

Other near-even splits included how much PE implementation you've done this year, and whether you see PE was a collection of best practices, many of which you did already. So, based on these and my own predilections, my intro is this:

"Bob Wieman (mathematics) emphasizes the importance of cooperative learning activities, and has implemented them on a weekly basis in college algebra. He has introduced assessment in the form of formal SII reports for these activities, and informal SII responses to students in class. He wonders what the next steps would be to move toward an assessment culture — especially how to shift student focus from the test grades and toward learning. In addition to the assessment model, the PE principle of teaching Learning Skills along with content is new to him, and he welcomes suggestions on how to

implement this in his math courses.

Bob has two particular interests that color his approach to Process Education: first, he is deeply interested in games, game analysis, and game design, and hopes to find ways to use those as vehicles for teaching math in a Process Education form. Secondly, he is interested in “open mode” thinking and creativity, and seeks a way to incorporate blue-sky thinking into Process Education, which seems to focus on purpose-driven, time-pressured, explicit criteria for performance.”

This intro is not meant to constrain you — if, by the end of the conference, you want to talk about something completely different, you can tell the audience that in your SHORT oral introduction at the beginning of the Innovation Panel.

Once again, thank you VERY much for participating!

What follows are the plan for the panel, as I sent it to the conference organizers earlier. (this my interest you, but is not required reading.) I want to emphasize elements of active learning and audience autonomy, even in this short timeframe. I also want to convey a sense of “don’t tell the students what they can read.” Therefore, my proposal for the event is that each panelist have a _short_ profile (2-5 sentences) of what they’ve done, what their sense of Process Education is, and what they want to talk about, which we provide to the audience as soon as possible (ideally, let them know where to read it online at the start of the conference; not ideally but acceptably, just hand it out at the start of the panel.) Then give a brief overview of common themes (1 min), and give each panelist a VERY short period (1 min x 6 panelists) to give their “elevator pitch” to connect the person to the profile in the audience’s mind. Then split the panelists, each into one area of the room (HM 150 is big, so if attendance is 100 or less, this is not hard to do: 3 min), and each one be like a mini-class, where the panelist elaborates on their topic and gets questions from the audience members who came to them. This can be a 15 minute exercise, followed by joining the panelists up at the end (3 min) and asking an audience member from each group to summarize highlights from their experience of the event (6 min). Then 1 minute to wrap up and thank the panel and the audience and segue to the 15 minute conference evaluation form. I think this is essentially “show’n’tell”, but with more of a PE flavor, where audience members get a bit more time and opportunity to hear and ask questions about what interests them the most, and are called upon to share their specialized knowledge. I recognize that this is a tight timeframe. The 15 minute “mini-classes” might have to be pared down to 10. What’s the structure of the conference evaluation? I would love to give that to the audience at the beginning of the panel, and have them fill it out in the timeframe that suits them, so that the ones who want to take longer can, and the ones who finish it quickly can spend more time in q&a. One foreseeable facilitation intervention that might be required is if the groups attaching to each panelist are drastically different in size...particularly if there are panelists with no audience. The facilitator (me) should “read the room” during the 3-minute break-out, and regroup less-popular panelists into groups if that’s the case. (If the attendance of the event as a whole is between 20 and 40, the facilitator should coordinate making the groups to force them to be comparable; if the attendance is below 20, there’s no point in splitting, and it’ll just be regular show’n’tell.)