

2005

## The COERSEA Model for Interactive Presentations

T. Koppi

*University of New South Wales*

E. Pearson

*University of Teesside, UK*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp>

---

### Recommended Citation

Koppi, T. and Pearson, E., The COERSEA Model for Interactive Presentations, *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 2(2), 2005.

Available at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol2/iss2/5>

---

## The COERSEA Model for Interactive Presentations

### Abstract

A commonly accepted theoretical paradigm in the research and practice of effective learning and teaching is constructivist. Researchers and practitioners in the higher education community attend educational technology focused conferences to share their findings, seek feedback and collaboration, or challenge. Although researchers may espouse constructivist methods in their learning designs, this model is not adopted in their presentations. Often a more traditional transmission approach is used with the presenter inflicting many content heavy slides on an increasingly passive audience. The COERSEA model (context, outcomes, engagement, resources, support, evaluation, alignment) comprises seven principles that can be applied to the design of any presentation be it a lecture, seminar or conference paper. The model compliments current trends in online learning design and represents a constructivist approach to presentations that engages participants in a shared learning experience. The model has been successfully applied to a number of topics and contexts at conferences, seminars and workshops.

# The COERSEA Model for Interactive Presentations

**Tony Koppi**

University of New South Wales

[t.koppi@unsw.edu.au](mailto:t.koppi@unsw.edu.au)

**Elaine Pearson**

University of Teesside

[e.pearson@tees.ac.uk](mailto:e.pearson@tees.ac.uk)

## Abstract

*A commonly accepted theoretical paradigm in the research and practice of effective learning and teaching is constructivist. Researchers and practitioners in the higher education community attend educational technology focused conferences to share their findings, seek feedback and collaboration, or challenge. Although researchers may espouse constructivist methods in their learning designs, this model is not adopted in their presentations. Often a more traditional transmission approach is used with the presenter inflicting many content heavy slides on an increasingly passive audience. The COERSEA model (context, outcomes, engagement, resources, support, evaluation, alignment) comprises seven principles that can be applied to the design of any presentation be it a lecture, seminar or conference paper. The model compliments current trends in online learning design and represents a constructivist approach to presentations that engages participants in a shared learning experience. The model has been successfully applied to a number of topics and contexts at conferences, seminars and workshops.*

---



## Introduction

Those of us in the higher education community engaged in the research and practice of effective learning and teaching attend conferences, seminars and workshops to share, disseminate, learn and seek feedback, from our colleagues. Many of these presentations are concerned with developing strategies and competencies for student centred learning based on constructivist and cognitive theories of learning and teaching (e.g. Jonassen et al., 1993; Duffy and Cunningham, 1996; Grabinger, 2000; Herrington and Oliver, 2000). Central to these theories is the premise that learning is process and not product oriented (Laurillard 2002) and that learning is an active and not a passive experience.

A 'presentation' in this context refers to a learning event involving a presenter and an audience. The event may be a lecture, seminar, or conference paper presentation, or, indeed, an online activity. The 'audience' may be a class of students or conference delegates.

Unfortunately, most conference presentations and many of their component seminars and 'workshops' demonstrate a model that is the opposite of what we propose for our students, and often involve the adoption of a transmission approach. Conventional attitudes to the presentation of research needs to be challenged just as the re-thinking of pedagogies for online learning (Kirkpatrick, 2002; Stacey and Rice, 2002) has had to be addressed.

The COERSEA model (context, outcomes, engagement, resources, support, evaluation, alignment) is designed to meet this challenge (Koppi and Pearson, 2003).

*"Scholars attend conferences to learn about new work in their fields, to get responses and gauge reaction to their work in progress, to engage in formal and informal live exchange with scholars working in their area, to make and maintain (sometimes over many years) contacts and friendships" (Richardson, 2001).*

The value of conferences is often said to be realised outside of the formal sessions (e.g., Barker & Rebelsky, 2002) where interaction and dialogue takes place between presenters and individual attendees. The COERSEA model attempts to bring some of that dialogue into the formal session for the benefit of all attendees.

## Theory, Practice, and Approaches to Teaching

The prevailing educational paradigm can be described as constructivist in nature. This presupposes that practitioners of the philosophy engage their audience in learning activities rather than talking at them for extended periods, and that the outcomes are aligned with the activities (Biggs, 1999). How can we claim to be practising constructivists if we don't practise what we preach?

The teacher may adopt different approaches to teaching depending on the particular setting (Prosser and Trigwell, 1999). He or she may also design and construct an active online learning environment and give an instructivist lecture during the same course. In the same way, also depending on context, the student may adopt a different approach (surface or deep) towards learning (Marton and Säljö, 1976, 1997). Depending on the purpose of the learning event it might be appropriate to give it in the form of a lecture or a presentation, but if the purpose is to challenge or engage the student then other kinds of activities could be considered (Bransford et al., 2000). If the value of a conference presentation is in the conferring then it might be appropriate to incorporate the opportunity for reflection and dialogue into the event.

## **Traditional Views on Presentations**

A survey of the literature on guidelines and advice for giving presentations (e.g., Radel, 1999; Heinen, 2000; Richardson, 2001) reveals a very traditional view that does not appear to have changed in line with the development of theories relating to education.

Typical advice includes:

- Organise a series of points, from the most to the least important;
- Attempt to identify problems or questions and address them in the talk, before the audience has a chance to think of these things themselves;
- Work out the best way to present the material;
- The earlier you start on the visuals, the better they will be;
- Rehearsal is the most important preparation factor; and
- Include only the information that is essential for the presentation.

Davis (1993) suggests similar guidelines for the preparation and delivery of lectures but also suggests that lectures can be varied and identifies different types of lecture including expository (traditional), interactive (orderly brainstorming), problem solving (posing a question), case study (demonstration) and discussion framed by short lecture presentations. Activities during lectures have long been seen as promoting reflection and learning (e.g. Gibbs, Habeshaw and Habeshaw, 1984), but the techniques do not seem to have been transferred to the conference setting. In recognising the lack of interaction and the passive nature for the audience of traditional lecture settings, Draper et al. (2002) propose a method of making lectures more interactive through a voting system to offer opportunities for feedback, build a community and provide a means of formative assessment.

Sitting and actively listening may be enough for some audience members if the topic is personally meaningful (Jonassen, 1999) and the attendees have an expert knowledge base to draw on (Bransford, 2000). However, at conferences (and lectures) attendees may not be expert in an area and are attending because they want to learn something about the topic. Despite having a knowledge base to draw on, being a passive listener is often not enough to hold one's attention for extended periods whatever the topic.

## **Challenge to the Traditional Approach**

An alternative approach to the traditional presentation is to explore more effective ways of representing our ideas to participants (who can read the paper anyway in the conference proceedings), encourage other perspectives on the paper and initiate feedback and reflection. The presentation need not be a summary or repetition of the paper, but can more profitably be used via discourse to develop ideas, arguments, theories, strategies arising from the paper, and to seek input and opinions from participants. Through discourse new conceptual understanding can be developed (Vygotsky, 1978) for both presenter and participants. The written paper represents the author's perspective whereas the presentation can be more concerned with exposing and refining the multiple perspectives of the participants. We are proposing a model that can be adapted for the classroom setting as an alternative to the traditional lecture or presentation, one that will compliment current trends in online learning design.

## Models of Presentation

A variety of models is possible depending on the context and the presenter. Broadly, there may be two extremes of approach adopted by the presenter: one where the audience is given a passive role (watch and listen which does not preclude engagement by active listening) and an active role where the audience is engaged in tasks designed to meet one or more outcomes. Some features of these approaches are outlined in Table 1 below.

<b>Presenter Centred</b>		<b>Audience Centred</b>
Aims	↔	Outcomes
Presenter talking	↔	Audience participating
Presenter experiences	↔	Audience experiences
Predictable	↔	Unpredictable
Low risk	↔	High risk
Highly structured (inflexible)	↔	Highly structured (flexible)
Low interaction	↔	High interaction
Pre-planned (results predictable)	↔	Pre-planned (results unpredictable)

**Table 1: Dimensions of Presentations**

These approaches relate broadly to the pedagogical dimensions of interactive learning systems identified by Reeves (1997) in respect of factors including philosophy, teacher roles and learner control. Approaches on the presenter centred end of the spectrum tend to reflect instructivist, behavioural, abstract dimensions with low levels of learner control, activity or cooperation. Conversely approaches on the audience centred end of the spectrum reflect constructivist, cognitive, contextual dimensions with high levels of learner control, activity and collaboration. Both approaches are highly structured, require a high degree of presenter involvement and can be intrinsically motivating.

## **Presentation Principles – the COERSEA Model**

As with any learning event, there should be an alignment of aims, outcomes, and activities (Biggs, 1999). We suggest seven principles similar to those one might use for any learner centred activity that can be applied to the design of any presentation. The principles mirror some of those applied by Oliver and Herrington (2001) in the design of online learning environments.

### **Context**

The context explains the background and purpose of the presentation, the premise upon which the session is based, and the rationale. In the case of a conference presentation, this is in relation to the paper published in the conference proceedings, and draws upon the arguments and conclusions of the paper. The intention is not to duplicate the paper but to identify the key issues for elaboration in the activities.

When designing a presentation one must consider both the context of the presentation *and* the environmental context in which it is being delivered. This includes the nature of the audience and their expected level of knowledge or expertise in the subject being addressed; the number of expected participants; the amount of time allocated; the physical environment; how the outcomes will be achieved, and how the support and resources can be arranged. An interactive environment is not loose and uncontrolled; it is structured and highly controlled. Careful preparation and good organisation is essential. One needs to take an analytical approach to the design of a presentation beginning with the paper on which it is based. In a short presentation it is essential that the presenter is clear about the central point they wish to communicate (Church, 2003).

### **Outcomes**

Just as in the design of learning materials, if outcomes are not defined for the participants, then the design of the presentation becomes “mere exposition” (Laurillard, 2002).

The presenter’s specific contextual aims are translated into the intended learning outcomes for the audience (who will become participants) to enable the participants to formulate their own relevant meaning. It normally starts with: “At the end of this session, you will be able to...”. The intention is for the participants to acquire ownership of the particular issues being addressed rather than simply being told the presenter’s conceptions of the issues. The importance of learning outcomes in this context is that participants are able to construct and refine new meaning (Boyle, 2000).

The level and number of outcomes need to be tailored to take account of the limited timeframe of the conference presentation or the lecture period. Bloom’s (1956) Taxonomy ranges from lower level competencies such as knowledge (with descriptors like tell, describe, identify), to higher levels such as evaluation (with descriptors such as assess, select, judge, support, conclude, compare, summarise). To aim for some learning outcomes is certainly better than having none. Even low level learning outcomes can give a higher outcome for participants than in a purely transmission approach. The participants are given the opportunity to construct an assimilated knowledge.

A skilled listener may be able to perform reflection and engagement tasks while listening but by giving the opportunity for more social interaction, it is possible to elicit multiple perspectives rather than only those of the presenter and listener. The audience centred presentation creates these opportunities deliberately rather than leave it to chance in a brief question time at the end or further discussion in the corridor. The outcomes are achieved through engagement.

There should also be outcomes for the presenter – what he or she will be able to do as a result of the presentation. This might include being able to evaluate, refine, confirm, modify, explain (higher level descriptors) their research or theory or case as a result of interactions with the participants. We believe that presenters should be able to elicit high level outcomes for themselves because the brainpower in the room can be brought to bear on key issues or problem areas. Having determined the outcomes for the audience and presenter, the appropriate methods of engagement can be devised.

### **Engagement**

To facilitate discourse and encourage scholarly argument, the participants must be engaged either through activities or by being involved as individuals in a structured way. As indicated by Bransford et al. (2000), the prior conceptions and experience of the audience could be a starting point.

The engagement process can be both informal (usually brief) and formal. Even the few moments it takes for setting up can be utilised through an informal engagement process to shift the mindset of the audience into the sphere of the presentation. For example, this can be achieved by asking a question designed to elicit existing knowledge – only one or two responses need to be sought.

Having shared the intended outcomes with the audience, formal engagement might include: a task to analyse a set of propositions; a role-play where the audience participates; or small group discussion around a particular problem. An important consideration for these activities is that they are authentic in the sense that they deal with real and relevant issues identified in the paper and are not simply some device for giving the audience something to do.

We appreciate that authentic tasks are complex, ill-defined and extend over time (Herrington and Herrington, 1998; Herrington and Oliver, 2000) but in this case the complexity will be limited because of the time and space constraints. Nevertheless the tasks can be made real and meaningful by involving the participants in the genuine problems the author is dealing with.

Carefully designed substantial activities that challenge the participants and help them focus their collective brainpower to meet the outcomes for both the audience and presenter will require the use of resources.

### **Resources**

A substantial activity needs to be focused and requires relevant, specific and succinct resources to be utilised within a limited timeframe. Resources can be suitably adapted extracts from critical parts of the paper. These resources may include a PowerPoint slide, and/or paper handout, or a video trigger. It is helpful for the presenter to consider her/himself as a resource in support of the activity. The participants can also be considered as resources when sharing their knowledge, experiences and opinions.



Resources need to be designed and prepared in advance and, in the case of paper-based handouts, requires an estimation of approximate numbers. They must be flexible enough to enable the activity to be adaptable to cope with a larger or smaller than expected audience. PowerPoint slides or other overhead resources should also be succinct and serve as a reference point for the participants. A slide displaying a scenario or key points can remain onscreen as a support throughout the activity.

### **Support**

In relation to the arguments and conclusions of the paper, the primary support role of the presenter is to bring out the issues identified by the participants, to clarify concepts and misconceptions, and to facilitate the discussion. The presenter orchestrates the discussion from the participant contributions whilst adding personal perspectives and interpretations to further stimulate the debate.

Support systems and procedural scaffolds are essential to the learning process (McLoughlin, and Marshall, 2000). Procedural scaffolding includes careful time management, and clear articulation of the central purpose, context and outcomes. Time is a crucial factor in a short presentation and it is essential that the presenter ensures that there is sufficient opportunity to carry out the activities, receive feedback and enable some form of reflection and evaluation. A highly structured approach with well-defined activities and clear deliverables is necessary to achieve the intended outcomes within a restricted environment.

### **Evaluation**

Evaluation is concerned with providing feedback to both presenter and participants, and occurs throughout the session. During discussions, the presenter receives commentary from the participants on the key ideas and arguments given in the paper. At the end of the session, participants reflect on whether or not they have achieved the stated outcomes. To accomplish this, participants must have time for reflection and be provided with the means to convey their reflections, e.g., a short questionnaire or verbal appraisal. In addition, the presenter can gather information as to the appropriateness of the structure and activities for future application which can occur through the same process.

### **Alignment**

The context, outcomes, engagement method, resources, support and evaluation should be aligned with one another to provide an integrated learning event. This alignment ensures that the conditions are created to exchange ideas, challenge, inform, learn and obtain feedback from our colleagues, and more importantly, participants will leave the presentation with some ownership of the concepts having had the opportunity for active engagement.

### **Examples of Use**

The COERSEA model has been used in a number of contexts and situations to develop and present workshops, seminars and conference presentations on a variety of research areas including: accessibility and online learning; online course design; designing a learning management system for students with severe disabilities; evaluation of a staff development course; and a learning resource catalogue.

Different forms of engagement were used to meet the outcomes for each particular situation including:

- A role play where the whole audience took on the role of an accessibility expert in order to elicit the audience's current level of knowledge and to determine what they would expect to find in a particular online course.
- A brief exposition of the problems with achieving critical mass with a learning resource catalogue followed by a full group discussion.
- A workshop comprising a seminar and hands on computer based activities where participants considered the problems people with particular disabilities might have accessing the computer and ways in which they can be supported.

In each case, resources were designed to support the activity such as a video, a PowerPoint slide presenting a scenario, paper based evaluations and the presenters themselves as resources (for example in the role play). The engagement activities were all authentic in that the issues or problems were open-ended. The presenters did not have all the answers and were genuinely seeking audience input. Importantly, the engagement activities were directly related to the intended outcomes, and were not simply devices for giving the audience something to do for the sake of participation.

Three examples follow where there are a number of variables, different topics are covered, in a variety of situations, the size of the audience and the timeframe are all different, the outcomes are different and the forms of engagement varied. The examples illustrate how the model is used to design an audience centred presentation, where the main 'content' is derived from the participants and yet the sessions remain highly structured and the context, engagement and outcomes are all aligned.

## **Example One: Online Course in Accessibility**

In this example, in a presentation to the EDMEDIA conference 2002 (Pearson and Koppi, 2002) the central concept was an analysis of an online course designed to teach academic staff how to create accessible digital resources to meet the needs of students with disabilities. This course was the outcome of research into ways of supporting disabled students through technology. There were approximately fifty participants in this session, we were not able to gain access to the room before hand and this was the second of two presentations.

### **Context**

The context of the presentation was that the course was designed for academics from all disciplines who are engaged in some way in the development or delivery of online courseware. The participants in the session were also people likely to be involved in either the design of online courses, in staff development or in teaching about accessibility. That being the case, the presenters wished to draw on the experience of the participants to determine whether the design of the course would meet their expectations of an online course for academics to learn about accessibility.

The following key points were given on a slide and elaborated briefly:

- In designing and developing online courses academic staff need to be aware of accessibility issues and to have the relevant skills.

- Accessibility is for all students including those with cognitive, physical, and sensory disabilities.
- Made online course for academics and others to learn the necessary skills.

### **Outcomes**

The outcomes, closely related to the context, were designed to ascertain whether as a result of the session, the participants' awareness of the main issues concerning accessibility in online course design had been raised; whether the themes introduced were relevant and if there were important elements missing from the course that should be included. The outcomes were presented on a slide and describe a range of competencies as described in Bloom's Taxonomy.

At the end of this session, you will be able to:

- Identify the main issues concerned with accessible course design.
- Discuss the relevance of the issues in designing online courses.
- Appreciate the learners' perspective.
- Evaluate the validity of the themes used in the online course we developed.

And we will be able to:

- Improve the online course as a result of your input.

### **Engagement**

The following scenario was presented on a slide and a role-play was initiated where TK played the role of a belligerent academic and EP played the role of the accessibility advisor.

Scenario: Consider the problems a typical academic might face on discovering that he has students with disabilities who are complaining that his online course isn't accessible

To engage the participants, the whole audience joined in the role of the accessibility advisor. The role-play unfolded from where TK complained to EP that a couple of students found his course was inaccessible. EP then invited the audience to advise him. Out of this participation, the legal, ethical, and quality considerations were brought out as the first issue. The structured dialogue continued in the same way until the participants had elicited and discussed the five key themes (an intended outcome), namely:

- Legal, ethical and quality issues
- Guidelines for developing accessible websites
- Assistive technologies
- Accessible digital document design
- Tools for checking accessibility

The reason for the role play was to draw on the expertise and knowledge that the participants brought to the session. Rather than simply relate the features of the course, the whole group (including the presenters) were able to build a picture of it, thereby enabling the participants to begin to identify elements that may be missing or could be improved.

## **Resources**

The design of the role-play was the main resource. Both the presenters and the participants were themselves resources; the issues were derived through the participants input. During the role-play, TK asked how a student who is blind could possibly read any online document, and after participants had identified and discussed screen readers, EP played a 4-minute video of a student who is blind using a screen reader to access an online course and various documents. This resource added to the engagement of the participants, most of whom had never seen how a screen reader could be used so efficiently by a blind student and how certain PDF documents could be so problematic. We used PowerPoint slides to structure the events, display the scenario, and summarise the issues.

## **Support**

While the presenters worked with the participants to help bring out the issues with prompts and questions, the role-play providing the structural support. This included clarification of issues and enabled different participants to provide different points of view. The short video clip illustrating how a student who is blind is able to carry out online learning tasks and show that PDF documents are often inaccessible by a screen reader helped the participants to appreciate the learner's perspective (an intended outcome).

## **Evaluation**

Feedback was given by the participants throughout the session during the discussion of the issues. Time was also reserved for the participants to reflect on the issues, think about any omissions and provide the presenters with additional feedback. A final slide presented two questions:

Do these five themes cover all the issues?

Is there something missing?

On this occasion feedback was verbal with one presenter taking notes while the other responded to the contributions. These few minutes enabled the presenters to confirm that our peers considered that all the relevant issues had been covered and the participants were able to offer some useful advice for improvement.

## **Alignment**

Within the given context of the presentation, the engagement activities were aligned with the outcomes and the resources and support enabled the participants to be involved in discussion of the issues and to consider several different views and perspectives. The evaluation comments indicated that we had covered wide-ranging issues and had achieved our intended outcomes.

## **Example 2: Learning Resource Catalogue**

The second example is taken from a paper for a one day international symposium on learning objects (Koppi and Lavitt, 2003). There were approximately eighty participants, eight of whom had been invited to present a short (ten minute) contribution as members of small panels. The participants all had some expertise in the field of learning objects and digital repositories. The room was arranged in round table style and there was no opportunity for access beforehand.

### **Context**

The context here was that the presenter (TK) heads a development team responsible for a Learning Resource Catalogue (LRC) that helps academics to find, develop and share learning resources. The central issue in the paper was concerned with academic engagement to achieve critical mass in the number of resources available to make the LRC a rich source of learning objects. The expertise of the other participants meant that informed discussion could take place. With a view to obtaining dialogue and feedback in the limited time of 10 minutes, a decision was taken that PowerPoint slides would not be used to accompany this presentation (although others did use PowerPoint).

### **Outcomes**

The outcomes for this presentation were that the participants would be able to analyse the barriers to achieving critical mass, suggest ways of increasing uptake of the LRC and formulate methods by which the LRC and other repositories can maximise uptake.

### **Engagement**

To enable discussion within the limited time period, it was decided to speak for only five minutes with more detail being given in a handout. This handout contained key points and space for recording reflections and suggestions. Even in the short timeframe, and in subsequent panel discussions, participants responded well to the specific concerns.

### **Resources**

A three page handout had been prepared in advance (attendee numbers having been accurately predicted); the first page gave a brief description of the LRC; the second page gave a dot-point list of the problematic issues; and the third was a tear-off page that was blank other than a request for participants to write their comments and suggestions for solutions and to hand it to the presenter. Feedback was received in discussion and also via the tear-off page.

### **Support**

Support was provided by giving a summary of the key issues in a handout and structuring the time to allow for discussion immediately following speaking about the issues and in subsequent panel discussions.

## **Evaluation**

Evaluation was built into the feedback sheet in that the participants were asked to analyse and comment on the barriers to critical mass. This enabled the participants to evaluate the issues with respect to the purpose of the LRC.

## **Alignment**

The alignment was achieved in that: the summary resource handout contained the key issues the presenter spoke about; those issues were the discussion topics for engagement; and the tear-off sheet was concerned with evaluating suggestions.

## **Example Three: Accessibility Workshop**

This was a three hour workshop the first half of which was a one and half hour seminar. The COERSEA model was used to design the seminar, but the workshop activities were regarded as part of the engagement, resources, and support for the outcomes so that the whole session was an integrated experience. The session was hosted by the Educational Development and Technology Centre (EDTeC) at University of New South Wales, and took place in a training room. There was access to the room before hand, so that electronic resources could be prepared and installed, and there were twenty participants.

## **Context**

The participants in this workshop were staff involved with the support of disabled students and advising staff, but have limited experience of educational technology, and may not be directly involved with developing learning materials. The main purpose of the workshop was to give these staff a level of awareness and some knowledge of accessibility in online learning so that they can advise others. The aim was for them to develop enough knowledge to understand what kinds of problems students with disabilities might encounter in learning online; to be aware of the way students with disabilities access the computer; and to guide staff who are engaged in online learning to appropriate accessibility resources.

The intended message for these staff was that online learning can be an enabling environment for students with disabilities provided that course developers are aware of the needs of these students and design their resources to be accessible.

## **Outcomes**

The outcomes (presented on a PowerPoint slide) were directly related to the context and purpose and were intended to guide directly the development of activities.

At the end of the session you will be able to:

- Describe the problems that students with disabilities have accessing online learning.
- Understand the way students with disabilities access the computer through assistive technologies.
- Appreciate the problems barriers that learning resources can present if not designed to be inclusive.
- Identify sources of help and information to guide staff in creating accessible courses and resources.

And we will be able to:

- improve our range of support from your input.

### **Engagement**

After a brief introduction during which participants identified their background and expectations for the session, participants were asked to work in pairs. Each was given a card with a problem which required consideration of the difficulty a student with a particular disability might have in accessing online learning and asked how this might be overcome. There were five different cards covering students with motor disabilities, vision impairment, learning difficulties, hearing impairment, and cognitive impairment. After three minutes of discussion each pair fed back to the whole group and a general discussion took place. During the course of the discussion a number of problems associated with disabled students' ability to access online resources was identified. The issues were captured by one of the participants onto a PowerPoint slide as a reminder and in order to provide a post-workshop resource.

During the following workshop session, participants had the opportunity to explore a number of online simulations and practical activities designed to enhance their understanding of accessibility problems and solutions.

### **Resources**

The cards were one resource used as a means of stimulating discussion, but other resources were used as examples and quick tips for overcoming some of the problems the participants had identified. These resources included a video of a student who is blind accessing WebCT; and a number of examples of tips and techniques for creating accessible web resources.

The participants also received an extensive resource pack covering all the issues identified.

### **Support**

Once again the presenters provided support by guiding the discussion and picking out the most important factors in barriers to accessibility and means of overcoming those barriers. The hands-on workshop was designed to support the participants by providing them with practical experience of problems and solutions. In particular, the simulation of a screen reader enabled participants to experience some of the difficulties associated with the use of assistive technology to access web sites. The workshop activities also provided support by being directly related to the learning outcomes for the whole session. A third form of support was a discussion of sources of expert advice and training available within the institution and beyond.

### **Evaluation**

Five minutes were set aside for discussion at the end of the hands on session for participants to reflect on how confident they felt as a result of the session, that they had a better understanding of accessibility and online learning and what other support they might need. A short questionnaire was also circulated to determine the extent to which the participants felt they had achieved the stated learning outcomes for the session. All these questions required only a tick box answer. A final question was designed to help the presenters meet their own intended outcome: it listed potential workshops for the participants to select from. There was also space for participants to give their own comments.

## **Alignment**

By designing a seminar and workshop using the COERSEA model, the presenters are able to produce a highly interactive session with opportunities for discussion, which enables the participants to identify the important issues. The model becomes a structure around which the presenter can ascertain whether the session is achieving its intended purpose; whether the learning outcomes, resources, engagement and evaluation match. The discussions are properly supported with examples and hand outs and the activities achieve the purpose of the session. The result was a well structured participant centred session, which was closely aligned with and met the learning outcomes.

## **Conclusion**

It is possible to use strategies recommended for other aspects of the learning process to maximise discourse during presentations. Traditional lectures and presentations can be excellent ways of transmitting new information (Bransford et al., 2000) but other activities should be chosen if one is attempting to elicit feedback, seek cooperation, and test the validity of arguments.

In a presenter-centred approach challenges are concerned with the successful transmission of information and planning involves organising information into logical sequence. These presenter-centred challenges include such questions as: Will they be interested? Will I remember all the points? Are my points in the right order? Will they ask me questions I can't answer? Will I get through all my points in time?

By adopting a more audience-centred approach, different types of challenges are encountered. Have I designed the best activities? Will the participants engage with the learning activities? Are the activities well-structured? Will the audience participation take me to unexpected places? Will the participants have enough time to complete the activities? Will they achieve my intended outcomes? These audience-centred challenges are concerned with learning processes and outcomes, and planning is concerned with organising structure, taking into account audience reaction, participation and feedback.

The COERSEA (context, outcomes, engagement, resources, support, evaluation and alignment) model presented here follows constructivist principles that most of us already use in some (or all) approaches to our teaching. It is consistent with the pedagogical approaches taken to online learning and could also encourage teachers to consider alternatives to moving their lectures online. The alignment of the components of the model ensures that the conditions are created to exchange ideas, challenge, inform, learn and obtain feedback from our colleagues, and more importantly, participants will leave the presentation or lecture with some ownership of the concepts having had the opportunity for active engagement.



## References

- Barker, P. and Rebelsky, S.A. (2002). (Eds), Preface, *Proceedings of EDMEDIA 2002*, Denver, Colorado, USA
- Biggs, J. (1999). What the Student Does: Teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, Vol. 18, No. 1., pp 57–75.
- Bloom, B.S. (Ed.) (1956) *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook I, cognitive domain*. New York ; Toronto: Longmans, Green.
- Boyle, T. (2000). Constructivism: A suitable pedagogy for information and computing science? Proceedings of 1st Annual Conference of the LTSN, Centre for Information and Computer Sciences, August, Heriot-Watt, Edinburgh
- Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L. and Cocking, R.R. (eds). (2000). *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Expanded Edition., Washington, DC National Academy Press.
- Church, M. (2003) “The Cicero Project: The Art of Oration”, <http://www.ciceroproject.com>, accessed (24/11/03)
- Davis, B.D., (1993}. *Tools for Teaching*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Draper, W., Cargill, J. and Cutts, Q. (2002) Electronically Enhanced Classroom Interaction. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*. 18, 1, pp 13–23
- Duffy, T. M. and Cunningham, D. J. (1996). Constructivism: Implications for the design and delivery of instruction. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*. New York: Scholastic
- Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, S. Y. and Habeshaw, T. (1984) 53 Interesting Things to Do in your Lectures. Bristol: TES.
- Grabinger, S. and Dunlap, J.C. (2000). Rich Environments for Active Learning: A Definition. *The Changing Face of Learning Technology*, Squires, D., Conole, G., Jacobs. G.(Eds.), pp. 8–38 University of Wales Press.
- Heinen, H. (2002). “Helpful Hints for Presenters of Conference Papers” <http://www.utexas.edu/depts/german/graduate/HeinenConference.html>, updated 28/10/02, (accessed 25.11.2003)
- Herrington, J., and Herrington, A. (1998). Authentic Assessment and Multimedia: how university students respond to a model of authentic assessment. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 17, 305–322.
- Herrington, J. and Oliver, R. (2000). An instructional design framework for authentic learning environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 48 (3), 23–48.
- Jonassen, D.H., Mayes, T. and McAleese, A. (1993). A manifesto for constructivist approach to uses of technology in higher education. In T.M. Duffy, J.Lowyck and D.H. Jonassen (Eds), *Designing environments for constructivist learning* , pp. 231–247. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
- Jonassen, D.H. (1999). Designing constructivist learning environments. In Reigeluth, C.M. (Ed), *Instructional Theories and Models*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, pp215–239, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

- Kirkpatrick, D. (2002). Who owns the curriculum? Brook, B. and Gilding, A. (Eds.), *The ethics and equity of E-Learning in higher education* pp.41–46, Equity and Social Justice, Victoria University.
- Koppi, A. J. and Lavitt, N. (2003) Institutional Use of Learning Objects Three Years on: Lessons Learned and Future Directions. ED-MEDIA, Honolulu, Hawaii, 23–28 June, 2003.
- Koppi, T. and Pearson E.J. (2003). “No more death by PowerPoint” pp 1454 -1462, *ED-MEDIA, 2003*, Hawaii, USA.
- Laurillard, D. (2002). *Rethinking University Teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Routledge Falmer,
- Marton, R. and Säljö, R. (1976). On Qualitative Differences in Learning: 1–Outcome and Process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 46, 4–11
- Marton, R. and Säljö, R. (1997). Approaches to learning. In: Marton, F. and Hounsell, D. and Entwistle N. J. (Eds), *The experience of learning: implications for teaching and studying in higher education*, pp 39–58, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press.
- McLoughlin, C., & Marshall, L. (2000). Scaffolding: A model for learner support in an online teaching environment. Paper presented at the Flexible Futures in Tertiary Teaching Forum. Proceedings of the 9th annual Teaching Learning Forum, 2-4 February 2000, Perth: Curtin University of Technology.  
<http://cleo.murdoch.edu.au/confs/tlf/tlf2000/mcloughlin2.html> (accessed 25.11.2003)
- Oliver, R. and Herrington, J. (2001). *Teaching and learning online: a beginner’s guide to e-learning and e-teaching in higher education*. Centre for Research in Information Technology and Communications, Edith Cowan University, Western Australia.
- Pearson, E. and Koppi, T. (2002). Essential elements in the design and development of inclusive online courses. pp 1569–1574, *ED-MEDIA, 2002*, Denver, Colorado, USA..
- Prosser, M, and Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching: the experience in higher education*. Society for Research into Higher Education, Open University Press.
- Radel, J. (1999). “Effective Presentations” KU Medical Centre, University of Kansas, on-line tutorial series, [http://www.kumc.edu/SAH/OTEd/jradel/Preparing\\_talks/103.html](http://www.kumc.edu/SAH/OTEd/jradel/Preparing_talks/103.html) updated July 1999, (accessed 25.11.2003)
- Richardson, A. (2001). “Notes on Proposing and Giving Conference Papers”, Advanced Research Colloquium, Boston College <http://www2.bc.edu/~richarad/934ho.html>, (accessed 25.11.2003)
- Reeves, T. and Reeves, P. (1997). Effective Dimensions of Interactive Learning on the World Wide Web. Khan, B.H, (Ed.), *Web-Based Instruction*, pp 59–66, Educational Technology Publications.
- Stacey, E. and Rice, M. (2002). Evaluating an online learning environment. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 18 (3), 323–340.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. (Translated by Cole, M.M. Lopez-Morillas, Luria, A.R and Wertsch, J.). Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press