

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:

Zero

Date:

16-Jan-21

Social org:

Whole group in IT suite, introductions and expectations.

Intent:

Briefings on conduct, ethics, permissions, withdrawal

Preparation:

AV data:

20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session zero

Participant briefing sheets, consent forms, typical concerns from previous sessions

Brought forward from last session:

NA

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Introductions	NA	NA	NA	All to complete workbook exercises - disturbances and initial mirror material.
		Confidentiality, power, sustenance and commitments				
		Why we're here, around the room				
	15	Expectation management for the results of the intervention				
		Context, ends, ways and means				
		Describe format of sessions and likely flow to drive change:				
1400	30	• Evidence for failure, tensions, values and standards.				
		• Anxiety, irritation, questioning each other's evidence.				
		• Facing, soul searching, judging, moralizing.				
	45	Describe workbooks, other resources and support				
		Describe psychological contracts between all in the room				
		Discuss challenges of later withdrawal, embedded data				
1430	60	Describe points of contact, MODREC and LUMS REC				
		Identify challenges for equitable contribution				
	75	Discuss support for discomfort, coercion, tensions				
		Introduce notions of stimuli and mirror data - look forward				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Collect in consent forms and signpost ongoing support. Inform Teresa of preferred formats.

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number: 1st Date: 01-Feb-21 Social org: Group of learners in Rm L2-021. First sessions conducted in separate sub-groups prior to plenary, due to politically charged problems. Intent: 1. Question activity (small groups of learners)

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 1_2_3

Gantt chart for sessions. Blank models of activity systems. Expansive cycles. Last five years of SARs, QIPs, RSME Plan. DSAT operational performance statements.

Brought forward from last session:

Discuss highlights from pre-CL workshop on conceptions of TEL and activity. Avoid contaminating and compromising "other" first sessions, FOREGROUND that separate groups are undergoing the first session before a joint session.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Sessions, layout and psychological contract				
		Explain mirror, ideas/tools, developing nature of models				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 3, present 1st stimulus				
	15	Q: Why are we here? Images, AV of BSN and Ebola unit				
		Discuss requirement for outside expertise in TEL				
		Models/visions, ideas/tools, mirror, explain re-introduction				
1400	30	Q: What "need" do we satisfy as a group? Pairs then plenary	What drives current activity for TEL and boundary learning?	Illustrate problems with current activity: images from recent tasks; AV of TEL activity involving all participants; AV of failures implicating current activity.	Templates of group activity and individual action; models of how artefacts mediate and the satisfaction of need.	Completed models of production in workbooks; perceived problems with activity.
		Five whys, then predict other sub-groups' "need" responses:				
		• Object (discuss WRT objective) and artefacts				
	45	Introduce other elements and review mirror material:	What are the sub-group's problems?	Ethnographic data: constructing BSN, TAQ attack on BSN, infra images, site diaries, TEL policies and cases, task reports, tactical infrastructure reconnaissance reports, post-operational and post-exercise reports.	Delineate own group activity. Models of production for the collaborative remediation of WTW infra and for PEW's boundary learning.	All to complete workbook exercises - operations, actions and activity.
		• Rules - identify potential for aggravation				
		• Community - identify potential for aggravation				
		• Division of labour - identify potential for aggravation				
1430	60	Review model of production for WTW		AV: BSN video of construction and BSN video of attack; relate to external expertise and current ways of engaging. Images of HN infra for TEL.		Prepare to contribute to ideas and tools: disturbances in current activity from own perspective
	75	Review model of production for boundary learning				
		Introduce activity, actions and operations - look forward				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

For session 4 - some doubt regarding whether the effect balances with effort; FIRSTLY normalise doubts, then examine as intro with all participants

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

See cooccurrence tables and code-document-table reports from Sessions 1, 2 and 3 for intersections of "questioning" with "elements of activity", the exhibition of transformative agency and dialectics

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:

2nd

Date:

15-Feb-21

Social org:

Group of managers in Rm L2-021. First sessions conducted in separate sub-groups prior to plenary, due to politically charged problems.

Intent:

1. Question activity (small groups of lecturers)

Preparation:

AV data:

20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 1_2_3

Blank models of activity systems. Expansive cycles. Last five years of SARs, QIPs, RSME Plan. University liaison reports. Job Specifications and organigrams.

Brought forward from last session:

Discuss highlights from pre-CL workshop on conceptions of TEL and activity. Avoid contaminating and compromising "other" first sessions, FOREGROUND that separate groups are undergoing the first session before a joint session.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Sessions, layout and psychological contract				
		Explain developmental nature of models				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 3, present 1st stimulus				
	15	Q: Why are we here? Images, AV of BSN and Ebola unit		Illustrate problems with current activity: images from recent tasks; AV of TEL activity involving all participants; AV of failures implicating current activity.	Templates of group activity and individual action; models of how artefacts mediate and the satisfaction of need.	Completed models of production in workbooks; perceived problems with activity.
		Discuss requirement for outside expertise in TEL				
		Models/visions, ideas/tools, mirror, explain re-introduction				
1400	30	Q: What "need" do we satisfy as a group? Pairs then plenary	What drives current activity for TEL and boundary learning?	Ethnographic data: site diaries, TEL policies and cases, task reports, tactical infrastructure reconnaissance reports, post-operational and post-exercise reports.		All to complete workbook exercises - operations, actions and activity.
		Five whys, then predict other sub-groups' "need" responses:				
		• Object (discuss WRT objective) and artefacts				
	45	Introduce other elements and review mirror material:	What are the sub-group's problems?		Delineate own group activity. Models of production for the collaborative remediation of WTW infra and for PEW's boundary learning.	Prepare to contribute to ideas and tools: disturbances in current activity from own perspective.
		• Rules - identify potential for aggravation				
		• Community - identify potential for aggravation				
		• Division of labour - identify potential for aggravation				
1430	60	Review model of production for WTW		AV: BSN video of construction and BSN video of attack; relate to external expertise and current ways of engaging. Images of HN infra for TEL.		
	75	Review model of production for boundary learning				
		Introduce activity, actions and operations - look forward				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook Pg 8, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Constructing an "assembled" model of activity system delayed to session 4

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

See cooccurrence tables and code-document-table reports from Sessions 1, 2 and 3 for intersections of "questioning" with "elements of activity", the exhibition of transformative agency and dialectics

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

- Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.
- Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.
- Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.
- Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.
- Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number: 3rd Date: 01-Mar-21 Social org: Group of academics in Rm L2-021. First sessions conducted in separate sub-groups prior to plenary, due to politically charged problems. Intent: 1. Question activity (small groups of managers)

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 1_2_3

Blank models of activity systems. Expansive cycles. Last five years of SARs, QIPs, RSME Plan. University liaison reports. Engineering council reports.

Brought forward from last session:

Discuss highlights from pre-CL workshop on conceptions of TEL and activity. Avoid contaminating and compromising "other" first sessions, FOREGROUND that separate groups are undergoing the first session before a joint session.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Sessions, layout and psychological contract				
		Explain developmental nature of models				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 3, present 1st stimulus				
	15	Q: Why are we here? Images, AV of BSN and Ebola unit				
		Discuss requirement for outside expertise in TEL				
		Models/visions, ideas/tools, mirror, explain re-introduction				
1400	30	Q: What "need" do we satisfy as a group? Pairs then plenary	What drives current activity for TEL and boundary learning?	Illustrate problems with current activity: images from recent tasks; AV of TEL activity involving all participants; AV of failures implicating current activity.	Templates of group activity and individual action; models of how artefacts mediate and the satisfaction of need.	Completed models of production in workbooks; perceived problems with activity.
		Five whys, then predict other sub-groups' "need" responses:				
		• Object (discuss WRT objective) and artefacts				
	45	Introduce other elements and review mirror material:	What are the sub-group's problems?	Ethnographic data: site diaries, TEL policies and cases, task reports, tactical infrastructure reconnaissance reports, post-operational and post-exercise reports.	Delineate own group activity. Models of production for the collaborative remediation of WTW infra and for PEW's boundary learning.	All to complete workbook exercises - operations, actions and activity.
		• Rules - identify potential for aggravation				
		• Community - identify potential for aggravation				
		• Division of labour - identify potential for aggravation				
1430	60	Review model of production for WTW & discuss shortfalls		AV: BSN video of construction and BSN video of attack; relate to external expertise and current ways of engaging. Images of HN infra for TEL.		Prepare to contribute to ideas and tools: disturbances in current activity from own perspective
	75	Review model for boundary learning & discuss shortfalls				
		Introduce activity, actions and operations - look forward				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Constructing an "assembled" model of activity system delayed to session 4

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

See cooccurrence tables and code-document-table reports from Sessions 1, 2 and 3 for intersections of "questioning" with "elements of activity", the exhibition of transformative agency and dialectics

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

- Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.
- Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.
- Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.
- Kapteinlin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.
- Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number: 4th Date: 15-Mar-21 Social org: Whole group in IT suite. Sub-group and plenary work. First pan-group session: legitimisation of social antagonism, blame, and critique. Intent: 1. Question activity (whole group)

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 4

AF2020 and Carter's models of contingency, INVAL and EXVAL points, comments from Technical Symposium. For aggravation of contradictions see 20200111_Moffitt_CL_coding on ATLAS.ti files for potential areas to explore regarding dialectical contradictions.

Brought forward from last session:

As a group, first compile organic interpretation for equitable contribution and privacy. From sub-groups to whole-group perceptions and conceptions of activity.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout				
		Psychological contracts for pan-group participation				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 8, group critique				
	15	AV of HN infra in AFG - ID problems, external expertise & TEL		Illustrate problems with current activity: images from recent tasks; AV of TEL activity involving all participants; AV of failures implicating current activity.	Complete activity system model.	Completed models of production in workbooks; perceived problems with activity.
		Discuss requirement for outside expertise				
		Develop production into activity system WRT media & PEW				
1400	30	Re-present previous session media for whole group	What drives current activity for TEL and boundary learning?	Ethnographic data and AV of previous sub-group sessions to provoke whole-group dialectics.	Models of motive, goals and conditions for activity, actions and operations.	All to complete workbook exercises - from activity to historical analysis.
		Q: Is PEW's TEL part of the solution or part of the problem?				
		Workbook Pg 8 & 9 in pairs - activity, action, operation				
	45	Workbook Pg 8 & 9 in pairs - Motives, goals and conditions	What are the whole group's problems?	AV: AFG video of rebuilding infra and problems with engaging across boundaries; how could TEL activity at the PEW be contributing to the problem?	Scanlon and Issroff 5 factors for artefact mediation.	Prepare to contribute to mirror material: evidence of disturbances in current activity from own perspective.
		Discuss workbook exercises as plenary				
		Q: What does "good" look like? Scanlon & Issroff factors				
1430	60	Voting buttons on Spiral to prioritise factors				
		Compare to current model for PEW's TEL				
	75	Q: how would this have assisted colleagues in the video?				
		Introduce expansive cycle and create SMAAART criteria.				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

From Session 1 - some doubt regarding whether the effect balances the effort; FIRSTLY normalise their doubts, then examine as intro with all participants.

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

See cocurrence tables and code-document-table reports from Sessions 1, 2 and 3 for intersections of "questioning" with "elements of activity", the exhibition of transformative agency and dialectics

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	5th	Date:	29-Mar-21	Social org:	Whole group in IT suite, sub-group exercises and plenary, introducing small group tasks with syndicates formed from different participant groups.	Intent:	2a. Historical analyses
-----------------	-----	-------	-----------	-------------	---	---------	-------------------------

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 5

DIO and MOD audits. RE Journal and Sapper Telegraph. RE Lessons Identified Database. Operational back-briefs.

Brought forward from last session:

Tensions with activity and with CL; monitor input and control of participants.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout Psychological contracts and anonymity Progress on workbook exercises Pg 10, relate to session		Exhibit evolution of activity: AV data showing participant involvement; TEL from Afghanistan, South Sudan and Sierra Leone to expose historical problem.	Building up activity from the satisfaction of need, to consider evolving rules, community and division of labour.	Lessons identified from personal experiences; problems in objects and historical contradictions.
	15	From Balkans to Sierra Leone; TEL and external experts Discuss as plenary evolution of TEL policy ETUs and policy; compare "ground truth" to "good news"				
1400	30	Four field analyses: past, present, future: Compare and contrast perceptions; aggravate control Four field analyses: past, present, future:	What or who are the main problems with our current activity?	Ethnographic data: site diaries, TEL policies and cases, task reports, tactical infrastructure reconnaissance reports, post-operational and post-exercise reports.	Four-field templates of past, present and future forms of control for the PEW.	Workbook exercises - from historical analyses to actual-empirical analyses.
	45	Compare and contrast priorities and foci; aggravate Timeline of evolving object; re-present from workbook Four field analyses; breadth and openness in threes	How did we get to this point?			
1430	60	Four field analyses; breadth and openness as plenary Introduce large grid for evolving elements in pairs		AV: The Balkans and reliance on external sources of expertise (this time HN staff) on infra show that this isn't new; how did we get to this point?	Timelines and the tabulated historical development of activity's elements.	Prepare to contribute to mirror material: moving from disturbances to contradictions, and modes of failure. Failure as impetus for change.
	75	Populate large grid as plenary Critique and select potential zones for further work				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

--

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

--

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number: 6th Date: 12-Apr-21 Social org: Whole group in PEW Seminar room, sub-group exercises and plenary, small group tasks with syndicates formed from different participant groups. Intent: 2b. Actual-empirical analyses

Preparation: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 6

DIO and MOD audits. Operational lessons identified. RE Journal and Sapper Telegraph.

Brought forward from last session:

Historically evolving tensions may unintentionally emasculate less experienced members.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout				
		Recap of previous session; move to actual-empirical		Re-present AV data, wiki and hard copies. Four-		
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 13; now "bound" activity		field model of historical evolution, mapped to		
	15	Re-present work on large grid and compare to ETUs		actual-empirical evidence "how we got here".		
		Discuss as plenary boundary work and TEL for ETUs		Operational and task failure data, group	Templates of activity with	
		Discuss policy's effect on "ground truth" and "good news"		models.	primary and secondary	Exercises on the control of activity; proposals for
					contradictions .	changes to how activity is delineated.
1400	30	Discuss as plenary past, present and future for ETUs	What are the			
		Compare perceptions across the group	requirements for	Graphical data of contradictions and their	Systemic levels and	
		Relate large grid to current TEL activity system	change?	effects on stakeholders. Provoke progression	orientation templates for	Workbook exercises - springboards for new activity.
				to actual-empirical analyses; AV data of	operation, action and	
	45	Discuss our own actions and operations (MATT 5 example)	How do our actions	participants contributing to the object;	activity.	Prepare to contribute to ideas and tools: "What? So
		Discuss goals and conditions (MATT 5 example)	align with our activity?	graphical exhibition of inner contradictions.		what? Now what? How did we get here?" Complete
		Relate actions and operations to boundary work				change matrix.
1430	60	Relate goals and conditions to boundary work		AV: Ebola Treatment Units in Sierra Leone;	Use versus exchange value	
		Discuss mediating artefacts and TEL; define technology		compare the "ground truth" with "the good	for SERE examples.	
	75	Introduce SERE examples of use versus exchange		news". What needs to change? What about		
		Relate (generally) use, exchange value, contradictions		our actions?		
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number: 7th Date: 26-Apr-21 Social org: Whole group in PEW Seminar room, sub-group exercises and plenary, small group tasks with syndicates formed from different participant groups. Intent: 3. Modelling

Preparation: AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 7

Policy and practice; evidence for re-presentation and discussion including from previous sessions. Flip charts 1 per pair + 1.

Brought forward from last session:

Politically contentious territory for managers in presence of learners, and for managers in presence of lecturers.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout Recap of previous session; move to modelling Progress on workbook exercises Pg 17 & 18				
	15	AV Consider production for TEL, boundary work, Kajaki Dam Q: How do we model current activity's success & failure? Consider previous definitions of what "good" looks like.		Illustrate old elements to help model new activity: video interview of previous cohort on experiences of inner contradictions; challenges and opportunities from peers.	Exchange, distribution & consumption; new and old activity; tertiary contradictions.	Reflections on previous TEL experiences related to "old rules and new tools" contradictions.
1400	30	Model activity's production introduced in Session 1, 2 & 3: • Subject - directly involved in production • Object (discuss WRT objective) and outcome	What does the new object need to be?	Re-present AV data, evidence of contradictions from ETUs in Sierra Leone as springboard.	SWOT and DEEPLIST assessment templates, partial model for redesigning a military ZPD.	Consider, from a personal perspective, how contradictions can be a positive impetus for change. Pareto analysis of future issues.
	45	• Artefacts (here and now, look forward to aspirational) Introduce other elements and review KJI mirror material: • Rules - identify potential for aggravation	What do the new mediating artefacts need to be?	AV: Reports and discussions of consistent failure to install Kajaki Dam turbines. Any thoughts on the object and artefacts?	Residual disturbances in poorly modelled historical activity; ID role of artefacts and objects.	Workbook exercises - Examining the redesigned activity.
1430	60	• Community - identify potential for aggravation • Division of labour - identify potential for aggravation				
	75	Review exchange, distribution, consumption Relate (generally) SWOT and DEEPLIST to TEL activity				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	8th	Date:	10-May-21	Social org:	Whole group in IT suite L2-036, sub-group exercises and plenary, small group tasks with syndicates formed from different participant groups.	Intent:	4. Examining
-----------------	-----	-------	-----------	-------------	--	---------	--------------

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 8

Dependent upon re-presentation of previous session on modelling. AV edited as mirror material.

Brought forward from last session:

Provocation of different perceptions from modelling, affecting the trial.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout				
		Recap of previous session; move to examining (iterative)				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 21				
	15	Review AV Project ANEMOI		Promote intersubjective ownership of new model and its contradictions: participants' jointly compiled model of new activity; proposals for all contradictions.	Interacting activities; expansive cycle; quaternary contradictions.	
		Discuss examination, trials and sustenance on ANEMOI				
		Contemporary images of tasks - nature of TEL				
1400	30	Nature of boundary work and TEL on tasks	How will our new model be trialled?		Exercise: "Redesigning the military ZPD" and the template for "old rules and new tools".	Reflections on previous TEL experiences of "old division of labour and new tools" contradictions.
		Suitable trials and the "elephant in the room"				
		Identify and aggravate contradictions in pairs		Provoke reflection: re-present a synopsis of all previous mirror material and stimuli in chronological order of the intervention.		
	45	Identify and aggravate contradictions in plenary	What are the key areas of concern for its sustenance?			
		Old rules and new tools - evidence from ANEMOI				
		How does this affect a trial of activity				
1430	60	Systemic reverberations of the object and the artefacts		AV: Project ANEMOI. How can trials influence activity? What aspects inform future sustenance?	Evolution of collaboration and contextualization through time.	Workbook exercises - experimental implementation.
		Model past, present, future and organizational culture				
	75	Key concerns for sustenance				
		Agree configuration of trials and plot progress on cycle				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

--

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

--

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	9th	Date:	24-May-21	Social org:	Sub-groups in IT suite L2-036. Implementation discussions conducted in separate sub-groups prior to plenary, due to politically charged problems.	Intent:	5. Implementing new activity (small groups)
-----------------	-----	-------	-----------	-------------	---	---------	---

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 9_10_11

Prepare to discuss trialled implementation, including deconfliction with CoC in PEW and HQ RSME.

Brought forward from last session:

Contrast of realization of areas of concern for sustenance.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout (sub-groups)				
		Recap of previous session; move to implementing				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 23				
	15	AV Discuss experimental implementation and AAR		Prepare for a strategic trial: re-present the	Completed activity	
		Iterations and Deming cycles - prioritise activity		completed model of activity; re-examine its real	system; neighbouring	
		From workbooks discuss additional support		and potential contradictions.	systems.	
1400	30	From workbooks discuss residual / stubborn problems	How will the sub-	Re-present models and concrete examples.	Deming PDCA cycle from	Diary entries of problems experienced during
		From workbooks discuss mirror material for plenary	group's trialled	Four field model of organizational culture WRT	Libya and Uganda.	implementation, disturbance diaries and completion of
		Consider internal contradictions - use v exchange	implementation of the	change. Overlay aggregated responses to	Exercises: "old rules and	definitions.
	45	What might other sub-groups be saying?	model change the	discuss outliers.	new tools" and "Old	
		Consider rules-artefact contradictions	model?		divisions of labour and	
		What might other sub-groups be saying?		AV: After Action Review and PDCA from Uganda	new tools".	
1430	60	Consider division of labour - artefact contradictions		/ Libya; how to change activity for military TEL?		
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
	75	Complete grid for plenary				
1500	90	Continue disturbance diaries for implementation				
		Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	10th	Date:	07-Jun-21	Social org:	Sub-groups in IT suite L2-036. Implementation discussions conducted in separate sub-groups prior to plenary, due to politically charged problems.	Intent:	5. Implementing new activity (small groups)
-----------------	------	-------	-----------	-------------	---	---------	---

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 9_10_11

Prepare to discuss trialled implementation, including deconfliction with CoC in PEW and HQ RSME.

Brought forward from last session:

Contrast of realization of areas of concern for sustenance.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout (sub-groups)				
		Recap of previous session; move to implementing				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 23				
	15	AV Discuss experimental implementation and AAR		Prepare for a strategic trial: re-present the completed model of activity; re-examine its real and potential contradictions.	Completed activity system; neighbouring systems.	
		Iterations and Deming cycles - prioritise activity				
		From workbooks discuss additional support				
1400	30	From workbooks discuss residual / stubborn problems	How will the sub-group's trialled implementation of the model change the model?	Re-present models and concrete examples. Four field model of organizational culture WRT change. Overlay aggregated responses to discuss outliers.	Deming PDCA cycle from Libya and Uganda.	Diary entries of problems experienced during implementation, disturbance diaries and completion of definitions.
	45	Consider internal contradictions - use v exchange				
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
		Consider rules-artefact contradictions				
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
1430	60	Consider division of labour - artefact contradictions		AV: After Action Review and PDCA from Uganda / Libya; how to change activity for military TEL?	Exercises: "old rules and new tools" and "Old divisions of labour and new tools".	
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
	75	Complete grid for plenary				
		Continue disturbance diaries for implementation				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

--

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

--

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	11th	Date:	21-Jun-21	Social org:	Sub-groups in IT suite L2-036. Implementation discussions conducted in separate sub-groups prior to plenary, due to politically charged problems.	Intent:	5. Implementing new activity (small groups)
-----------------	------	-------	-----------	-------------	---	---------	---

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 9_10_11

Prepare to discuss trialled implementation, including deconfliction with CoC in PEW and HQ RSME.

Brought forward from last session:

Contrast of realization of areas of concern for sustenance.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout (sub-groups)				
		Recap of previous session; move to implementing				
		Progress on workbook exercises Pg 23				
	15	AV Discuss experimental implementation and AAR		Prepare for a strategic trial: re-present the	Completed activity	
		Iterations and Deming cycles - prioritise activity		completed model of activity; re-examine its real	system; neighbouring	
		From workbooks discuss additional support		and potential contradictions.	systems.	
1400	30	From workbooks discuss residual / stubborn problems	How will the sub-	Re-present models and concrete examples.	Deming PDCA cycle from	Diary entries of problems experienced during
		From workbooks discuss mirror material for plenary	group's trialled	Four field model of organizational culture WRT	Libya and Uganda.	implementation, disturbance diaries and completion of
		Consider internal contradictions - use v exchange	implementation of the	change. Overlay aggregated responses to	Exercises: "old rules and	definitions.
	45	What might other sub-groups be saying?	model change the	discuss outliers.	new tools" and "Old	
		Consider rules-artefact contradictions	model?		divisions of labour and	
		What might other sub-groups be saying?		AV: After Action Review and PDCA from Uganda	new tools".	
1430	60	Consider division of labour - artefact contradictions		/ Libya; how to change activity for military TEL?		
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
	75	Complete grid for plenary				
1500	90	Continue disturbance diaries for implementation				
		Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	12th	Date:	05-Jul-21	Social org:	Whole group in IT suite L2-036, following sub-groups. Blame and responsibility for sustenance / reversal are likely to be discussed.	Intent:	5. Implementing new activity (whole group)
-----------------	------	-------	-----------	-------------	--	---------	--

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 12

Assemble signposts to / from previous three sessions. Prepare to discuss trialled implementation as a whole group, including deconfliction with CoC in PEW and HQ RSME.

Brought forward from last session:

Contrast of realization of areas of concern for sustenance.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout				
		Recap; move to whole-group implementing			Completed activity system; neighbouring systems.	
		Progress on workbook disturbance diaries				
	15	AV Discuss challenges with policy and coping strategies		Prepare for a strategic trial: re-present the completed model of activity; re-examine its real and potential contradictions.		
		Discuss populated whole-group grid of issues				
		Aggravate issues into contradictions			Deming PDCA cycle from Libya and Uganda.	Locate the CL progress on the expansive cycle.
1400	30	From workbooks discuss residual / stubborn problems	How will the whole group's trialled implementation of the model change the model?	Re-present models and concrete examples. Four field model of organizational culture WRT change. Overlay aggregated responses to discuss outliers.	Policies, doctrine and strategies for RSME, PEW and Tech Trg.	Continue with disturbance diaries for aggravation of contradictions.
	45	Consider internal contradictions - use v exchange				
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
		Consider rules-artefact contradictions				
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
1430	60	Consider division of labour - artefact contradictions		AV: Interviews with peer group, on issues with defence TEL policy and defence strategy for ICT. Challenges for BIM in defence.	Exercises and group grid: "support" "residual and stubborn disturbances" and see also re-presented mirror material.	Relate disturbances to specific contradictions.
		What might other sub-groups be saying?				
	75	Complete grid as plenary and map contradictions				
		Map progress on expansive cycle; next steps				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

--

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

--

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). *Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design*. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	13th	Date:	19-Jul-21	Social org:	Whole group in PEW Seminar room. Consider sensitivity to cyclicalty and temporality of roles: lecturers serve longest, then managers, then learners.	Intent:	6. Reflecting
-----------------	------	-------	-----------	-------------	--	---------	---------------

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 13_14

All previous AV data from CL sessions and mirror material.

Brought forward from last session:

Issues with peer group focus on reflection and consolidation.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout Recap; move to whole-group reflecting and assessing Define reflection				
	15	AV Discuss remaining challenges; what next? Review and critique 4-field model past, present, future Plenary review changes to PEW organization PDCA				
1400	30	Plenary review changes to doctrine and policy Plenary review activity, action, operation Pairs review contradictions and sustenance	What would you pass on to the next cohort for a similar intervention?	Provoke reflection: re-present a synopsis of all previous mirror material and stimuli in chronological order of the intervention. Archives of all previous mirror data to be available.	Expansive cycle to re-iterate the back-and-forth nature of change . Whole-group SWOT and DEEPLIST model of change, AAR frameworks and 7 Questions analyses: "Lessons learned in TEL".	Points for After-action review and reflections on effects of transformative agency. Complete a DEEPLIST and SWOT analysis of progress to date in CL sessions.
1430	45	Plenary review contradictions and sustenance Consider all contradictions as impetus for change Q: What did we expect that <i>didn't</i> materialise?		AV: Command Group interview. Challenges for RSME and PEW policies, strategies and SOPs.		
	60	Q: What did we not expect that <i>did</i> materialise? Pairs critique 4-field model of organizational culture				
	75	Pairs review evidence of expansive cycle Plenary review evidence of expansive cycle				
1500	90	Closedown, workbook, look forward, questions				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Project: Expansive redesign of teaching and learning activity, in synthetic environments, across organisational boundaries

Session number:	14th	Date:	02-Aug-21	Social org:	Whole group in PEW Seminar room. Transferral of ownership of consolidation; researcher-interventionists are leaving.	Intent:	7. Consolidating
-----------------	------	-------	-----------	-------------	--	---------	------------------

Preparation:

AV data: 20201111 Moffitt CL models tools mirror session 13_14

All previous AV data from CL sessions and mirror material.

Brought forward from last session:

Assurance of ongoing support for agentic outcomes.

Time:	Min:	Themes:	First stimulus:	Mirror data:	Second stimulus:	Participant data:
1330	0	Configuration of sessions and layout Recap; move to whole-group reflecting and assessing Progress on workbook disturbance diaries				
	15	AV Discuss challenges with strategic policy and coping AV of interviews with Chain of Command on outcomes Discuss hopes and dreams of sustenance				
1400	30	Re-define "from the abstract to the concrete" Re-define dialectical change Re-define contradictions as impetus for change	How do we influence PEW and RSME policies for sustenance?	Provoke consolidation: all previous mirror material and lessons identified from implementation to be available. Archives of all previous mirror data to be available.	RSME QA plans; PEW directives; Deming cycle . Exercise: "What was not learned?" .	Reflections on what was expected and what was unexpected. AAR and anonymised LI survey. Note availability of follow-up support and how to access it.
1430	60	Re-present from Session 4: What does "good" look like What is needed to consolidate "good" Allocate roles to consolidation				
	75	Define the dimensions of our own ZPD Predict the dimensions of our continuing ZPD Discuss contradictions as push Discuss future-oriented concept as pull				
1500	90	Discuss ownership of change and access to future support				

Participants' points raised for next CL session:

Action and information for researcher-interventionist:

Lead references for consideration when designing the session:

Bligh, B., & Flood, M. (2015). The Change Laboratory in Higher Education: Research-Intervention Using Activity Theory. In J. Huisman & M. Tight (Eds.), *Theory and Method in Higher Education Research: Volume 1* (pp. 141–168). Emerald.

Engeström, Y. (2015). Toward an expansive methodology. The cycle of cultural-historical methodology: Vygotsky, Scribner, and Cole. In *Learning by Expanding: an* (pp. 249–257). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Engeström, Y. (2016). *Studies in Expansive Learning: Learning What is Not Yet There*. Cambridge University Press.

Foot, K., & Groleau, C. (2011). Contradictions, transitions, and materiality in organizing processes: An activity theory perspective. *First Monday*, 16(6), 1–19.

Kaptelinin, V., & Nardi, B. A. (2006). Acting with technology: Activity theory and interactional design. MIT Press.

Virkkunen, J., & Newnham, S.D. (2013). Preparing and Carrying Out Change Laboratory Sessions. In *The Change Laboratory: a Tool for Collaborative Development of Work and Education* (pp. 79–115). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.