

NCHC PRESENTATION
NCHC CONVENTION 2018
BOSTON, MA
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 12:00 – 12:50 P.M.

INTRODUCTION

RICH: Welcome, and we invite you to the world of our honors seminar, "Forever Home," where transgression is lurking around every corner; rule-breaking is a way of life; and stepping over the line only improves your footwork. I'm Rich Holt, the instructor, this is Paige Wright, and this is Brian Yu. Those with digital devices (which is seemingly everyone!) can visit our website right now at richcourses.com, that's "r-i-c-h-c-o-u-r-s-e-s," under the menu "NCHC PRESENT," where you can find out what other mischief we have been up to.

Before I get into the details of the course, I want to open with a very good quotation which surveys the possible ways transgression intersects with education. Throughout my extensive reading, I've never seen a summary of potential transgressions more comprehensive and well-stated as this one, from Lotz-Sisitka, Arjen, Wals, Kronlid, and McGarry: (:35)

PAIGE: "...people everywhere will need to learn how to cross disciplinary boundaries, expand epistemological horizons, transgress stubborn research and education routines and hegemonic powers, and transcend mono-cultural practices in order to create new forms of human activity and new social systems that are more sustainable and socially just." (:20)

RICH: That takes on even more significance when you realize that these folks specialize in sustainability science, which probes interactions among global, social, and human systems, the complex mechanisms that lead to degradation of these systems, and concomitant risks to human well-being. One can hardly imagine a more challenging or socially beneficial realm in which to apply transgressional strategies. (:22)

PAIGE: And of course, this quote also points to the fact that transgressive pedagogy, following the clarion call of Paolo Freire and others, ultimately aims at education serving the goals of positive social change. Freire, for example, argued that resistance is constitutive of his entire model of 'pedagogy of the oppressed.' A pedagogy of the oppressed is to empower individuals toward awareness of and resistance to their class position within a socio-economic hierarchy. (p. 260) (:28)

RICH: I crossed into transgressive territory, quite by accident, in the spring of 2006, when I felt compelled, by student reaction, to gradually convert my very traditional graduate class in external organizational communication to a simulation class. Now, at that time, even though, like many of us, I'd been thoroughly transfixed and inspired by bell hooks and Paolo Friere, I did not think of what I was doing as transgressive, *per se*. (:25)

I did know that I was having to unlearn what little training in teaching I'd gotten in grad school and replace it with practices that I really, truly thought might be wrong! Since that time, I have done 13 more simulations, including the one starring Mirelia Chavez (I mean, Paige), and repeating only one (the one that featured Cricket Beauchamp, I mean, Brian), emphasizing an extensive, semester-long simulated solution to a problem with far-reaching implications for social justice. (:30)

RICH: As these simulations have taken over my life :-), I have come to use the lessons I learned through them in all my classes. One of those classes was called, "Forever Home." (:12)

PAIGE: To explore intersections among honors curriculum, experiential learning, and transgression, Rich analyzed in depth this one-credit honors seminar, Fall semester, 2017, at a large eastern university (hereafter, LEU) with a substantial honors college of over 400 students.

The course dealt with pet adoption and external organizational communication (that is, how organizations present themselves to external stakeholders, mostly through advertising, marketing, public relations, and sales).

BRIAN: The name of the course comes from the ideal result where a pet adopter provides a home, the "forever home," for the rest of the adopted pet's life. (:40)

PAIGE: For the experiential portion of this course, three teams of six students each approached three organizations in the pet adoption sector, offering help as consultants to improve chances of pets finding a "forever home."

BRIAN: Two teams (hereafter, Teams 1 and 2) failed to fully connect with their targets, while a third (Team 3) made contact but performed the assignment via a different service (not consultancy, but fund-raising).

PAIGE: Rich viewed these results as displays of transgression, uniting them in a five-level model (the *THERE* model) to use in sharpening our conception of how transgression can invigorate a course in an established honors curriculum. (:40)

RICH: We begin with the idea of transgression. As I researched the various conceptions of this word, I was struck by how many of them have an individualistic flavor. Of course, many notions of transgression come from religion, that is, primarily individuals flouting the rules laid down by the clergy, and presumably, a deity.

PAIGE: But even a little thought reveals that transgression of "normal" classroom procedure is an example *par excellence* of a multiplex set of activities, situated in complex circumstantial domains. The paths trod by transgressions are never linear, never predicable, and are even paradoxical. (:35)

RICH: I thought it might be more useful to summarize some elements of transgression into a single model, not with a view to segregating these elements into categories, but to cause us to keep in mind at all times their ever-present, interactive effects.

In other words, I was looking for a set of lenses that would remind me that when I focused on, say, a teacher's transgressive "rule-breaking" behavior, I would have to keep in mind its place in fashioning, say, a zone of proximal development. Thus, I present what is very much a "work in progress": what I call the *THERE* model, where the "T" stands, of course, for "transgression." (:35)

RICH: 1. Innermost level, [T1] Teacher as Outlaw.
 2. Next out level, [T2] Honors Courses Fit.
 3. Next, [T3] Expansion of Problem Space.
 4. Next, [T4] Revelation of ZOPED.
 5. Finally, [T5] Engagement of Real World).
 (:20)

BRIAN: The "*THERE*" mnemonic suggests at least two meanings. Transgression as "getting there," and that transgression, in pedagogy, is always the "there," there. The "direction" (if any exists) is both from inside to outside, or outside to inside (see the bidirectional arrows), or among any or all of the levels. It is seldom simple and never linear. (:25)

RICH: The innermost level is T1, the teacher as outlaw. We are accustomed to seeing teachers as, more or less, controlling the classroom. However, once we let transgression out of the bottle, control, in the traditional sense, is difficult, if not impossible. (:18)

RICH: "Forever Home" was immediately transgressive, thrown into a mix of defined offerings in a major honors program. Though I've taught for thirty years (the last eight as full professor), I was on sabbatical from my home university. My teaching (emphasizing precision recall from technical scholarly sources, plus extensive experiential learning) seemed ill-suited to the honors curriculum of the university I was visiting.

BRIAN: Honors students (the top five percent of LEU undergrads) were acclimated to courses emphasizing reading from disciplinary specializations; membership on "real-world" research teams; and seminar classes by ranking professors from students' major departments. (:40)

RICH: In my experience honors students tend to resist transgression (contrarily, nontraditional returning adults seem most comfortable with it), possibly because honors undergrads have won the academic game largely by *not* transgressing beyond conventional instruction. According to traditional measures (like examinations and writing), they have excelled. (:20)

BRIAN: However, every teacher, designing a new class (or adapting an extant one), is already an outlaw, venturing into novel realms guided only by experience and instinct. A key to using transgression lies in accepting this, thus actualizing a powerful pedagogical instrument. As bell put it, (:20)

PAIGE: "Teaching is a performative act...that offers the space for change, invention, spontaneous shifts, that can serve as a catalyst drawing out the unique elements in each classroom." (:12)

RICH: Oh, and by the way, if you're uncomfortable with that word "outlaw," here's another great way to conceive it; Parker Palmer, who can turn a phrase like no one else, describes the "woke" teacher: (:12)

PAIGE: "Good teachers join self, subject, and students in the fabric of life because they teach from an integral and undivided self; they manifest in their own lives, and evoke in their students, a 'capacity for connectedness.'" (:15)

RICH: "Capacity for connectedness"--damn, that's good! It also sets up a more inviting way to weave together the strands of transgression.

Next level, and of course one of special interest to this audience, is T2, Honors Courses Fit. (:18)

BRIAN: Honors students are known for their focus on, and success at, work leading to academic esteem, so that they choose courses demanding greater outlay of time and energy. One might speculate that honors students avoid atypical courses that lie outside their often customarily well-defined career paths. (:20)

PAIGE: "Forever Home" lies firmly in this "atypical" category: a one-hour, eight-week course that in workload was nearly equal to sixteen weeks in non-honors courses, with eight readings of high difficulty; four objective exams; and a group project targeting an extant organization. For only one credit hour, that can be a hard sell to students with very precise plans about their education. (:25)

RICH: I had taught this course four times before, for three credits over 16 weeks, at a large midwestern public university, to a mix of non-tracked students, few of whom would be honors level. Thus, from the outset, I saw opportunities overflowing with transgressive potential, some specified (hence, inescapable), others unanticipated (hence, surfeit with transgressive possibilities). (:25)

RICH: The next level is closer to the ground, pedagogically speaking: T3, "expand problem space."

PAIGE: Problem spaces hold resources to shape solutions. Expanding problem spaces means recasting problems to involve more (or reconfigured) resources, especially those that are at first veiled or emerge as solutions develop.

RICH: For those familiar with Yrjo Engeström, problem spaces resemble the object node in his triangle of activity, "raw material" where activity is directed, adjustable by physical or symbolic tools as internal or external mediating instruments. (:35)

RICH: Next is something probably even better known to all educators, the fourth level, the "R" of the *THERE* model: "Reveal ZOPED." Lev Vygotsky's well-known Zone of Proximal Development (ZOPED or ZPD) is (and here comes that quote, you all know which one!) (:20)

BRIAN: "The distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with capable peers."
(:15)

RICH: Ahh, the classics never grow old! The ZPD is shown clearly in "Forever Home," defined in three ways:

(1) Setting up contact between teams and target organizations (pre-mastery state is little familiarity with organizational protocol; post-mastery, experiences [admittedly, not entirely pleasant], clarifying relations between fledgling students and formal organizations). (:20)

(2) Honing teams' ability to use Hymes' SPEAKING model to aid initial contact with target organizations (all three teams) and follow-up analysis, after failing to connect with the target (Teams 1 and 2) (pre-mastery, lack of familiarity with Hymes' work, post-mastery, demonstrated facility with the SPEAKING model as an analytical tool). (:22)

(3) Offering, through my experience in consulting as well as proficiency with activity theory and the ZPD, guidance to lead team members from their actual developmental level to the desired level by responding to idiosyncratic experiences with targets (pre-mastery defined as a mish-mash of experiences, readings, and unfamiliar method [the Hymes method], post-mastery as a unified view drafted in class and continuing in my paper). Each "move" necessitated breaching boundaries by engaging in, what?--go on, you can say it, it starts with a "t"--TRANSGRESSION. (:35)

RICH: Let's now go to the outer level (T5, "Engage Real World") which brings us to (what is amusingly labeled) "reality," obviously a spurious term, implying separation between the outermost level and the "real world" activity comprising it. Clearly, "real world" is both the goal of "Forever Home" and the source of all one needs to attain that goal. We'll reserve more thorough explanation of this level for when we know more about results of the analysis of student performances in "Forever Home." We turn now to some specific transgressions by individuals and teams. (:32)

PAIGE: When Rich first explained "Forever Home" to me, I was hesitant. I was already involved in one of his simulations, and was I really sure I was ready to take on another one? I then learned I would need two more 1-credit honors courses, and suddenly the class had a new appeal. While my original motivation to take the course may have been skewed due to academic requirements, the experiences and knowledge I gained from the class continue to be some of the most beneficial. (:26)

PAIGE: I was a member of Team 1, or as stated in Rich's paper, *Episode 1: The Case of the Missing Contacts*. My group seemed to have the best start to the assignment--albeit maybe a false one. My group had a clear plan and we knew exactly what we wanted to do. We found our target organization after the very first class and before the next class we had already sent our first email. Everything seemed to be going extraordinarily well, and we were all convinced that we would have a solution to the problem at hand in no time. We were, however, mistaken. (:32)

PAIGE: In the paper, Rich suggests that our group may perhaps have been over-confident. While I do not believe that statement to be false, it also is not necessarily true. Our group was proactive, professional, and truly excited to come to a solution. However, we should have had a back-up plan. That is something my group never even considered we would need. After all, we were the first group to have a plan. We wrongly decided that we had "won" the game before it had ever started. I think this mindset came from past classroom experiences, traditional classroom experiences. (:35)

RICH: So true, Paige, and what a mature and insightful observation: the transgressive classroom champions the systems concept of EQUIFINALITY, the idea that in an open system--of which "Forever Home" is a prime example--a given end state can be reached by many potential paths. (:18)

RICH: And, by the way, my suggestion about over-confidence is as much a criticism of your target organization as of your group. If they can't handle the idea of a confident team of elite students, fully prepared, just coming to talk to them, that's on them. Maybe you just intimidated them! (:18)

PAIGE: Going back to my group's false start, our first two encounters went great. We had two meetings and were finally beginning to formulate a plan to help this organization. Alas, we needed more information--information that everyone said could only be obtained from the CEO. We had a meeting set, had prepared questions, and were ready to finally come to a solution. (:20)

PAIGE: On the day of the meeting we were stood up and we never had our final questions answered. To say our group was panicking would be an understatement. All of us, maybe wrongfully so, were terrified of how this outcome would affect our grades.

This may have been one of our group's flaws. In trying to present such a perfect solution to therefore receive a perfect grade, we had no contingency plans. We tried to schedule another meeting, but we were met with resistance. At this point it was time to tell Rich the outcome--we could not finish the project. (:32)

PAIGE: While most honors classes seem to allow creativity, the requirements are often rigid. In Rich's classes, failure, while not expected, is allowed for, and instead of receiving an "F" you are simply asked to pick yourself back up and reinvent your solution to the problem at hand. When my group failed, we only had a few class sessions left; in most courses we would have not passed. However, Rich rolled with the punches as much as we did and helped us work towards a solution. (:28)

RICH: Parenthetically, I doubt you'd have failed, since your group absolutely killed on the four objective exams...but, you are right, striving for excellence means you'd not be comfortable with less than the best grade. (:12)

PAIGE: Rich told us that we would be able to, in essence, reinvent our cancelled meeting, that we could redesign our outcome. My group was perplexed, but being ambitious honors students, we created two complete enactments to reenact not only the unfortunate meeting, but also a dramatic depiction to describe how we wanted (or expected) it to go. My group utilized the Hymes SPEAKING Model (Rich will get into this model in a bit) to try to communicate with Rich and our peers that we truly had tried to remain professional. I think what we failed to realize when enacting the scenarios and describing our use of the Hymes model was that the two interacting groups were not equal. (:40)

RICH: Professional candor compels me to say that the analytical paper that accompanied the two scripts by Team 1 is one of the most well-developed, thorough, scholarly papers I have ever encountered. The best part is that I really didn't specify that a fully fledged paper accompany the scripts. These folks just did that on their own. (:18)

RICH: See how transgression works? Seeing an "out" from a possibly failed assignment, Team 1 calls out its big guns, producing a truly remarkable paper. In other words, they're saying, "we ain't just 'one trick ponies.'" I'm serious: I've taught graduate courses in communication where students writing *required* assignments could have learned something from Team 1's efforts. (:22)

PAIGE: This experience helped my group realize that not everything in the classroom needs to be perfect. There will be mistakes, and sometimes you won't know things. However, with a professor like Rich--a true outlaw--it allows students to have the creativity and freedom to, instead of dreading their failures, reinvent them. (:20)

PAIGE: Was it easy? No. Was the product we created worth it and the skills we learned crucial? Yes. My group may not have realized we were in an act of transgression at the time, but looking back, I feel confident that every member of my group would agree that we were transgressing at every step of the process. (:18)

BRIAN: Moving on to Team 2, or as stated in Rich's paper, *Episode 2: Anyone else I can speak to?* Unfortunately, a representative from that group was unable to join us today--so I hope Paige and I will suffice. (:15)

PAIGE: Team 2 began with the ambitious plan to change the LEU's policy on allowing pets in on-campus apartments. They chose this route, as they believed by allowing a large number of students the option to have a pet this would then, in turn, increase pet adoption. (:16)

RICH: Another reason I love transgressive, experiential learning: this *never even occurred to me*, yet now it seems so logical and appropriate! (:08)

PAIGE: Multiple factors played into this rationale. Research from the readings completed in class did show that landlords, or in this case Residential Life, do inhibit people from adopting pets. The students also used their own mindsets to come to this conclusion. Many of them knew people, some of them speaking from personal experience, who would adopt pets if they could keep them on campus. (:22)

BRIAN: Unfortunately, this team had little success in convincing Residential Life to change their policy. One reason for this was the communication channels they chose to go through. Residential Life gets so many emails a day, it was probably hard to take a group of students doing work for an assignment seriously, especially since the request was relayed via email. (:22)

RICH: Moreover, this was a case where I deliberately transgressed, holding back important information from the team. In most cases, conventional pedagogical wisdom is that teachers should provide students, openly and freely, information relevant to the lesson they're learning.

Now, after about four decades of experience, I knew what everyone in this room knows: you stand a better chance of taking a weekend trip to Mars and back, than for students to get a university to change a policy on anything, especially something as controversial as having pets in the dorms. But I didn't tell them that. It was a superb opportunity for them to see the "brick wall" reality behind LEU's often boilerplate pronouncements on policy. Besides: they might have succeeded! (:42)

BRIAN: However, even though the team did not succeed in a traditional manner, due to the transgressive learning environment, they had the opportunity to reflect on and describe their experience for the benefit of the class. (:12)

RICH: To provide Teams 1 and 2 with an option to replicate the amount of work Team 3 was doing, I was looking for a framework that would allow the two teams to both realistically examine what happened and to describe how this might have been improved. (:15)

PAIGE: Before we approached our targets, we were introduced to Dell Hymes' famous SPEAKING model, the formalization of his ethnography of speaking approach to communication. We were asked to analyze our upcoming contacts according to this model, which pinpoints eight factors in the sociocultural environment that make communication understandable. (:20)

RICH: Of course, Hymes argued that to understand any communication, one had to go beyond the linguistic code to learn the context of communication. So, I asked (and when I say "asked," I mean precisely that: we talked about this in class, and approving it was a collaborative process) all three teams to provide an analysis of their upcoming meeting with their target organizations based on the SPEAKING model. (:25)

BRIAN: The eight letters in the word "SPEAKING" is a mnemonic identifying the eight elements Hymes thought told about communication context.

- "S" stands for "setting or scene"
- "P" for "participants"
- "E" for "ends" (or goals) (:15)

PAIGE:

- "A" stands for "act sequence"
- "K" for "key" (the cues participants offer each other)
- "I" for "instrumentalities" (or channels through which communication is done) (:12)

RICH: Finally,

- "N" stands for "Norms" (oh, I'm sorry, this is Boston, home of "Cheers"! We have to say it this way: "NORM!")
- "G" stands for "Genre" (:12)

RICH: The teams did so well with their SPEAKING model analyses of their contacts that another transgression occurred to me: instead of faulting the "failed" contacts (and again, these are not really failures), I seized upon this as a teaching moment: take the so-called "failure" and make it an occasion for personal growth. (:20)

PAIGE: Teams 1 and 2 utilized the SPEAKING model to show, first, how their real interaction went, and then, second, how their desired interaction would have gone, had they had ideal exploitation of Hymes' eight elements. Team 2 put on a rather impromptu performance, sans script, as they believed this helped to capture the brevity of their conversations with the Residential Life Staff. (:22)

BRIAN: Team 2 started with the most ambitious goal, and while their final project clearly laid out what had gone wrong, the team still forgot to account for one thing. Before they transgressed, they should have taken more time to survey and potentially utilize different resources before going to Residential Life--via email--with their inquiries and demand for change. (:22)

RICH: Absolutely, Brian: excellent observation! I look at these two so-called "failed" assignments and I marvel at how, as we all kept to the transgressive mode, the "failure" presents a precious opportunity for several teaching moments that provoke honors students to truly go beyond the traditional learning process. Think about it:

- First, you let the students experience setbacks in the "real world" that you *could* have warned them about, but didn't.
- Then you challenge the idea of what constitutes "failure."
- Then you show them, in a classic example of the Zone of Proximal Development (T4), the way to master a rich, complex, and useful tool such as Hymes' SPEAKING model.
- Then you turn them into teachers as they present two very different interpretations of both the actual contact and its ideal realization, to the class.

RICH: Does anyone see any failures here, because I don't! As bell said, (:56)

PAIGE: "Educating is always a vocation rooted in hopefulness. As teachers we believe that learning is possible, that nothing can keep an open mind from seeking after knowledge and finding a way to know." (:14)

BRIAN: Being a part of the "Forever Home" course was an experience unlike any other. My initial thought about this class was, "Oh, we're just going to learn about pets." Little did I know what I was getting myself into. I had no idea that by the end of the course, I'd be a part of a group of fellow classmates and friends who were able to fundraise over \$150 for our organization. (:22)

BRIAN: As you all have probably guessed by now, I was a member of Team 3, the team that made it through, but in a weird way. Before I begin talking about my experience with "Forever Home," let me add that I wasn't as hands-on with the communication between the organization and the group as other members were. However, we did discuss a lot of it in the group chat that we had with each other. (:22)

BRIAN: I looked back at this group chat, and it was nice to see how our progression went. From getting denied the opportunity to help with their website/media presence, or their adoption process, to accepting our proposal to host a fundraiser, I'd say the way we went about this was fair. We were determined to help this organization and we weren't going to take "no" for an answer. (:22)

BRIAN: It's crazy to think about the things we did in this class, for this class. It was something I've never done in a college course, albeit only being my first semester. But, having to contact an outside organization, to communicate with them and then host a fundraiser for them. It's just amazing to think that we were able to do that, not for a school organization, not for an event, but for a class. You'd never imagine hosting a fundraiser for a class would be a thing--or at least I wouldn't. (:28)

RICH: In all candor, hosting a fundraiser wasn't really in my wheelhouse, either! But that's the great--and really, kind of scary--thing about transgression. Once out of the bottle, the transgression "genie" pops like an unruly pinball throughout the levels of the *THERE* model, opening up great vistas of creative solutions. In addition to affecting *individuals* operating in a system, this leads to unexpected *group* dynamics that exponentially raises the number of possible paths to solutions. (:30)

There's a great concept from CHAT (cultural-historical activity theory) that really drives this home:

It's called *relational agency*. Paige will tell you how the author of a really good article by Anne Edwards, "Relational agency: Learning to be a resourceful practitioner," puts it: (:18)

PAIGE: "In CHAT terms relational agency is a capacity to work with others to expand the object that one is working on and trying to transform by recognising and accessing the resources that others bring to bear as they interpret and respond to the object. It is a capacity which involves recognising that another person may be a resource and that work needs to be done to elicit, recognise and negotiate the use of that resource in order to align oneself in joint action on the object." (:30)

RICH: Dr. Edwards continues: "In joint action a wider range of concepts or other resources are likely to be deployed on the object or problem space than is the case with individual action and it is more likely that the object is expanded." (:16)

BRIAN: Through this course, I learned a lot about how things can go against the grain. This course never felt like any ordinary course I was taking at the same time. It wasn't all academic-based. It was more experience-based. And what I mean by experience-based is that Rich wanted us to do more than just get good grades. He wanted us to reach out, get out of the norm of college classes, and experience other things that can benefit us in the long term. (:25)

BRIAN: As Paige said, this course also wasn't like any other *honors* course. From what I've gathered from peers and my own experience with honors courses, "Forever Home" was way more hands-on and innovative. I'd like to reiterate what Paige said earlier, that failure was inevitable. I say it again because that's something you don't see everyday. Failure commonly results in an end to things. But in this case, failure just meant we had to take another path, explore another method. And that's one *transgressive* thing that made this class unique. (:32)

BRIAN: At the start, the beginning of the class was like any regular class. We had notes, we went over our topics and took tests. One thing we learned/used that I didn't see often were mnemonics. Rich stressed mnemonics heavily, and I liked that. Of course, it was just curriculum, but it was a way of teaching that I've never experienced before. (:20)

BRIAN: The way we set up our fundraiser was pretty generic, if I do say so myself. We contacted our local Blaze pizza which customarily hosts fundraisers for organizations, and were able to establish a date to start the fundraiser. Fortunately, there weren't any bumps on the road when it came to setting up and hosting the fundraiser. Each member of the group posted the flier of our fundraiser on our social media and on campus. We also, obviously, spread the news through word of mouth. (:28)

RICH: It's also worth mentioning that Group 3 engaged in a superb example of the transgressive process in education, something I've nicknamed "chain transgression."

What makes this an especially valuable example is that Team 3 revisited expanding the problem space repeatedly, upon being shut out of their target's operations twice. (:22)

BRIAN: Rejection of each request (in the unruly world of T5), even as it blocked the progress of one transgression, invited another! (:10)

RICH: With each reformulation came an opportunity to instigate another transgression, from offering help with media (failed); to volunteering for the process of pet adoption (failed); to fund-raising (succeeded). (:14)

PAIGE: Nor did the "outlaw" teacher achieve this by monitoring and guiding Team 3's progress through its three-tiered trek; rather, he wrote the assignment so the team could conceive of this outcome, among others. Although repeated frustration followed by transgression was not forecast, in this design it was an alluring possibility. (:20)

BRIAN: "Forever Home" was a course that broadened our views on how a course can be run. It made us realize that class doesn't just have to be about reading a textbook, going over notes or doing webassigns. Because of this course, we were able to understand that you can learn a lot by doing things out of the ordinary. By being transgressive, we opened up worlds of possibility, a few of which we could pursue, many more which we didn't, but which remain in our memories as possibilities for the future. (:28)

RICH: So what did everyone, including me, learn from "Forever Home"? Obviously, much more than can be encapsulated in a journal article. But let's look to the three teams, to each provide a piece of advice for those who plan to transgress in the classroom. (:18)

PAIGE: We start with *Episode 1: The Case of the Missing Contacts* (Team 1). (:06)

RICH: As Paige has explained, Team 1 achieved a remarkably quick and surprisingly obstacle-free approach to the target.

Not to claim prescience, I must say that when I was first told how this "perfect" encounter was arranged, I was suspicious. In my consulting experience, I had never seen such quick rapport between students and organization administrators. (:20)

PAIGE: Pondering this and looking to the THERE model, one nexus of transgression levels stands out: T1 ("teacher as outlaw") ties to T4 ("reveal ZOPED") and T5 ("engage real world"), focusing on Team 1's chief transgression in the table in the paper, "acting on presumption of equality with target." (:20)

RICH: Lesson for transgression? *Be circumspect about your self-presentation, approach your target carefully.*

PAIGE: We continue with *Episode 2: Anyone else I can talk to?* (Team 2). (:08)

BRIAN: As we've pointed out, Team 2 failed to achieve functional contact with targets in LEU housing. (:10)

RICH: Applying the *THERE* model to detect reasons why Team 2 was thwarted, one level stands out: T3 ("expand problem space"). To understand T3 as transgression frame, one should remember that Team 2 approached the officials by email. As Paige tells about this, please note Team 2's careful application of the elements of the *SPEAKING* model. (:16)

PAIGE: Quoting from Team 2's paper, "The tone of this email interaction was...professional, formal, and hopeful. We adhered to typical professional business practices like addressing him formally and using clean, professional, respectful language.

PAIGE: The outcome of this speech event was a reply from Mr. W----- stating that he does not think this is the right endeavor to pursue because the Commons is a part of the [LEU] campus and therefore must adhere to campus policy as stated by the university itself. This led to us reaching out to someone directly in charge of the university apartments. (:34)

RICH: As I point out in the paper, that reply sounds suspiciously like a "stock answer" to a common question. Moreover, the subsequent approach to higher level officials likely failed not only because everyone in an organization knows the stock answers, but because the email could have been (and probably was) cc'd to these officials (or their administrative staff) as a matter of routine. Earlier, Brian correctly cited a failure on the part of Team 2 to thoroughly survey the possibilities available to them. (:28)

BRIAN: The utility of T3 is clear. Using the SPEAKING model (plus common sense) shows numerous ways to expand the problem space, so Team 2's preference for email (according to research, shared by most undergraduates) betrays a limited view of resources to expand the problem space. (:18)

PAIGE: In fact, one could have obtained that stock response from any number of undergraduate students in the housing system: floor supervisors, resident assistants, housing service interns, and so on. A "reality check" with such students, who live and work with team members, might have hinted at taking a more nuanced view of their task. (:18)

RICH: This is not to say that, had these suggestions been followed, LEU administrators would have responded differently, but "inside" information from associates might have provoked different goals (expansion of the problem space), from the frontal assault on embedded procedures to something more circumspect. (:18)

PAIGE: One might propose workshops for administrators and students to discuss pets in housing, scholarly attention to which has been seriously deficient. One might try, via websites or social media, to draw attention to facts about pets in rented housing, countering exaggerated fears (issues addressed in our class readings). There are few more fertile ZPDs (T4) connecting "real world" (T5) and "problem space" (T3) than that spanning what is believed about pets and rental properties, versus what is known. (:34)

BRIAN: Lesson for transgression? *Before you transgress, take the time to survey, and use, as much of your entire array of resources as you can.* (:12)

PAIGE: Episode 3: *We're fine here!* (Team 3). (:06)

RICH: As Brian told you, Team 3 achieved a consultancy (of sorts) with their target organization, creating a successful fund-raising event, after being turned down regarding offers of help with media presence, and then with the process of improving chances for pet adoption. (:16)

As to the first claim, that they needed "no help" with media, I can only say that their website, which can charitably be described as unsophisticated, needs *considerable* work. So the rejection of the offer for help with media by the director of the organization was a bit premature. (:18)

BRIAN: Which is quite ironic, considering how skillfully we used social media to promote the fund-raising event! (:08)

RICH: As to other point, about needing no help with the adoption process, they were 100% on the money. (:08)

PAIGE: From public presentations and the director, we learned that extensive effort had been put into a complex process for matching dogs (their specialty) and adopters. Their procedure tackled every obstacle to pet adoption any of us knew, from adopter commitment to veterinarian involvement to landlord approval to participation of every family member in the adoptee's first home visit! (:24)

BRIAN: Obviously, our fledgling team had little to offer this process, making their subsequent moves less surprising than they might have been. (:10)

RICH: How do these transgressive realities map onto the *THERE* model? Of several possibilities, what happened to Team 3 (and what they caused to happen) involves T3("expand problem space") and of course T5 ("engage real world").

RICH: (Although this necessarily spans T4 ["reveal ZOPED"], that is not the focus here. Instead, attention is on the restrictive, but realistic, adoption environment perfected by the target organization.) (:26)

PAIGE: A final key to success was encouragement from LEU's Honors College. From Team 3's final report, (:08)

BRIAN: "...perhaps the most successful [element] was the Honors College. We were able to coordinate with [the] Dean, who agreed to making it an honors event for students to reach their requirements for Honors College housing. This greatly contributed to the fundraiser, as the majority of the funds that were raised came from Honors College students." (:20)

PAIGE: So, Rich, is there a lesson we can draw from Team 3's pattern of try-deter-try-deter-try-succeed? (:10)

RICH: Why, yes, Paige, there is! I'm so glad you asked! Lesson for Transgression? *Repeated applications of transgressive activities (such as expansion of problem space) can refine views of process, benefiting all levels.* Or, less stuffy, is Brian's phrasing: (:14)

BRIAN: Don't take "no" for an answer!

To conclude, let us speak to the utility of, and possible areas of expansion from, the *THERE* model. (:08)

RICH: Analyzing "Forever Home" through the *THERE* model moves us from seeing transgression as random and impulsive (hence, often fruitless) resistance, to situating it in an inclusive map--grounded in critical pedagogy--to propose rational, deliberate, sweeping struggles to make things better.

RICH: Not to diminish the point, but using transgression to help humans is certainly as viable as using it to help companion animals.

Instead of viewing transgression as thoughtless, embryonic rebellion, the *THERE* model unites cold-blooded reason with ardent passion. (:40)

PAIGE: Using the *THERE* model as conceptual mnemonic leads one to ask, "where can I best situate acts of transgression, and how can I use it to more fruitfully direct transgression by pinpointing particular domains of activity and their interaction?" (:16)

BRIAN: Although there is far more to be discovered, a valuable, practical program can be based simply on those lessons we derived earlier:

PAIGE: Be circumspect about your self-representation...

RICH: Survey and use as many resources as you can...

BRIAN: Refine process by constant, repetitive transgression, and practice. (:18)

RICH: That can be the basis of a practical program to motivate us to confront even the most wide-ranging and complex problems crying out for social justice.

Add to this the model's defined levels, with the insight that there is substantial freedom of movement in linking the levels with, and across, each other, plus the fallback that being stymied in transgressing at one point only means you have numerous other avenues to correct that problem, and you have an extraordinarily potent tool, not an end goal but ground zero in the battle for freedom from stale pedagogical convention. (:34)

PAIGE: Finally, doubtless audience members will have noticed intersections of the *THERE* model with findings with numerous thinkers doing brave and courageous work with transgression and education. (:12)

RICH: We trust this will stimulate you to further vivify the *THERE* model, bringing insight concerning your learning and experience to praise, vilify, verify, contradict, support, plead for, reject, and/or ignore this modest first attempt at a unified field theory of pedagogical transgression. (:18)

PAIGE: Standing on the shoulders of champions of critical pedagogy, heroes like Freire, Giroux, hooks, and many others, we look forward to the day when transgression is no longer outlandish or rare, but will find a resting place... (:14)

BRIAN: But not too comfortable! (:04)

RICH: In "woke" classrooms in our respected honors programs, their "Forever Home." (:08)