

Evidence, Feasibility & Readiness Analysis

Before the Route: Volition and the Assumption Beneath From Project to Presence

Patricia Silva

Department of Educational Leadership, Lamar University

EDLD 5320: Synthesis of Digital Learning & Leadership

Dr. Jennifer Roble

November 8, 2026

Before the Route: Volition and the Assumption Beneath From Project to Presence

Opening: The Innovation and Its Context

From Project to Presence is an eight-day individualized intensive for adults who already have a completed project. Its purpose is to help them present that work in a way they choose. Each day would include approximately thirty minutes of instruction and modeling, followed by thirty minutes of applied project activity. There would also be three consultations across the eight days. The program would run online and asynchronously, outside any single institution, with me as the only facilitator. At this point, it is a prototype. Leadership City, the learning environment I created, is built and online, and the lessons are written. However, no participants have been recruited, the environment has not been tested with participants, and no evaluation instrument exists. This analysis asks whether the program is ready to advance, considering the available evidence and the conditions that exist today.

There is a moment most graduates never name. The diploma is framed, the degree is conferred, and the project that carried the learning stays exactly where it was last saved: in a folder, on a shelf, on a drive nobody will open again. I have watched that happen for thirty years. I called it a bottleneck — the distance between completing something and allowing it to exist in the world.

The design has three spaces: a private process folder, Leadership City, and an optional public showcase entered only with separate consent. Its organizing principle is coherence without conformity — participants should be able to explain why their choices fit their project, purpose, audience, context, and values.

The word I could not place

Then I returned to my own three check-ins and found something I had not examined. I had designed a journey for people who were already willing to take it. I had investigated how people learn. I had assumed they would choose to begin.

The word *presence* in my own title turns out to have two meanings, and I had built the program on only one of them. There is the visibility of a project. And before that, there is the presence of the person who owns it. For a project to have presence, the person has to be present — and present does not mean sitting in the room.

What does presence require first — the visibility of a project, or the presence of the person who owns it?

I began writing about volition. I was asking whether an adult with a finished project wants to develop it or make it visible at all. And I could not find the literature that would answer me. I looked for months, before the second module arrived, and the question stayed open. When the module arrived, the question became precise — but the answer did not.

Current Evidence

The available evidence does not support every part of this proposal equally. The strength of that evidence matters more here than its volume. The OECD (2025a), a Module 3 resource, explains that research evidence varies in strength and that educators need to interpret findings before applying them. The OECD (2024) also emphasizes that access to digital tools is not enough; educators need to understand their pedagogical value. In my context, Leadership City exists, but I cannot yet demonstrate its pedagogical value because no participants have tested it.

Research on action control helps explain the process I want to address. Motivation concerns forming and directing a goal, while volition concerns maintaining and carrying out an intention when other demands interfere (Heckhausen & Gollwitzer, 1987; Kuhl, 1985). Koole et

al. (2023) describe the transition from intention to action as a universal problem. This evidence provides a strong explanation of the process. However, it comes from a theoretical review, not from testing my program.

From this perspective, I can recognize coherence between the design and established principles of teaching and learning (OECD, 2025a). However, the program itself remains untested. I cannot yet say that it works, that eight days is the appropriate duration, or that adults with completed projects want this support.

How I found the literature

The Module 3 resources were read as instruments, not as citations to satisfy. Read that way, they produce a coherent standard for reasoning and a sharp limit on what I may claim.

I was already writing this document when I found it. I had searched for a long period without locating the literature — not because the literature is thin, but because I was asking in the wrong vocabulary. The question was answered only once it was stated precisely and the search was redirected.

The field has studied this for over a century. The distinction I had arrived at from my own observation — that wanting and beginning are two different things — is the founding distinction of a research line that, as Koole et al. (2023) review, runs from Ach and Lewin in the early twentieth century through Kuhl's Action Control Theory to the present.

Koole et al. (2023) observe that people differ in how readily they enact their intentions. Some carry out very difficult intentions, such as writing a book or starting a business, under demanding circumstances; others struggle to enact even mundane ones.

Read that observation carefully, because it names my population. The example of a difficult self-directed intention is not a thesis or an assignment. It is a book, or a business — the designed object of a person who decided to make something and then had to carry it alone.

What follows from the chapter is the part I needed most. The deficit is volitional, not motivational: state-oriented people are not less motivated to act, they are less able to initiate (Kuhl, 1985). Increasing incentives does not resolve this, because incentives press a mechanism that is not the one failing.

What the chapter changes in my analysis

Table A

What the Chapter Establishes, and What It Changes in My Work

What the source establishes	What it changes in my work
The intention-behavior gap is a universal problem, documented across periods and cultures (Koole et al., 2023)	The shelf is not a personal failure of my design or of a participant. It is the ordinary condition of self-directed work.
Historically the gap was read as a moral failure before it became a psychological problem (Koole et al., 2023)	This is the assumption I inherited. My original design was built on the same moral reading — that an adult with a project needs discipline, structure, or encouragement.
State orientation is a stable disposition, but more than half of the variation is situational (Koole et al., 2023)	The disposition is durable and the conditions are the lever. If this were fixed, no program could change anything. Because it is largely situational, designing conditions is defensible work.
Education is one of the major arenas where people are expected to form and enact difficult intentions; the first study in the line was run on students' after-school activities (Koole et al., 2023)	My problem sits inside the field rather than beside it. Volition in learning was the founding case of this research, not an analogy borrowed from it.
Action-oriented students monitor their learning, manage time better, and exert more effort despite distraction — and this accounts for their better grades (Koole et al., 2023)	The mechanism is teachable self-regulation, not encouragement. It supports a phase that develops regulation rather than a phase that motivates.
Action-oriented students delay strategically as well as procrastinating less (Koole et al., 2023)	A warning for my measurement design. Strategic delay and detachment look identical in the record. A pause cannot be read as stagnation, or as engagement, without asking the learner.

What the source establishes	What it changes in my work
The chapter is an integrative review and does not test an intervention	It justifies the problem and the mechanism. It cannot validate my design, and no reading of it would let me claim that it does.

Sources that could not carry the analysis

An earlier version of this work rested on sources whose scope exceeded the claims they were asked to support. I name them here because the correction belongs to the analysis.

Table B

Sources That Could Not Carry the Analysis, and Why

Source previously used	What it actually is	Why it cannot carry this analysis
A UNESCO IITE report on smart education	A supplemental Module 4 resource on system-level digital transformation	It addresses institution-wide transformation. This innovation is one small intensive on a platform not yet tested with participants. Using it would import a scale of analysis the design does not have.
An OECD report on measuring innovation in education	A supplemental Module 3 resource on studying innovation institutionally	It helps an institution judge whether a practice is meaningful change. It says nothing about individual participants, which is what my claims concern.
A Brookings guide to scaling principles	A supplemental resource on expansion and sustainability	It answers a question I am not yet entitled to ask. This analysis concludes the program should not launch at full scale yet, so scaling is premature.
An unverified page-range attribution	A claim attributed to a specific passage	I could not locate the passage in any document available to me. Attributing a claim to a page I cannot verify is a fabrication risk whether or not the idea is correct.

A systems report cannot evidence one classroom. A scaling framework cannot evidence readiness. Using them would have produced a document that looked well-sourced and argued nothing.

Evidence vs. Assumptions

The main uncertainty comes from an assumption I made: adults with completed projects would want help developing or presenting them. I observed valuable work sitting unused and interpreted that as a need. However, my perception alone does not establish that people want this

support. A project may be intentionally private, already complete for its author, waiting for resources, or simply not a current priority. I designed this program from my own desire to develop, improve, and show my work. I assumed others would want the same. I also assumed they had left their projects behind because they lacked skills, such as art technique or marketing, that I could teach. Perhaps the main issue is their willingness to participate, rather than the eight days or the skills offered. Not everyone shares my interest.

Broek et al. (2023) identify a similar assumption in adult learning research: focusing on barriers can presuppose that all adults naturally want to learn. The OECD (2025b) explains that much of the research on barriers reflects the experience of motivated adults who have already chosen to learn. It also reports that approximately half of adults neither participate in nor express interest in adult learning. These sources help me understand the limitations of the evidence I considered. The literature reports how many adults do not want to participate, but it does not explain those individuals' decisions or tell me how to respond to them.

My Experience Teaching Adults (1999–2026)

(In the online version, a video presents selected moments from my experience teaching adult learners between 1999 and 2026, highlighting five years dedicated exclusively to adult education. In this version, two photographs take its place.)

These experiences show that I have delivered educational programs. However, they do not demonstrate the effectiveness of this proposed innovation or explain why some adults choose not to participate. My experience can support my capacity to facilitate the course, but it does not establish who wants it.

Figure 1

Professional Qualification Course Delivered in Partnership With Sesi, 1999



Note. Personal archive of the author.

Figure 2

Workshop Series and Community Work Delivered With SESI, 1999



Note. Personal archive of the author.

Table 1

A Short Separation of Claim From Assumption, With the Risk Each Carries

Statement in the design	Evidence or assumption?	What supports it, or what is missing	Risk if wrong
Adults with finished projects want help developing or showing them	Assumption — untested	Nothing direct. Broek et al. (2023) and OECD (2025b) show that barrier research reflects self-selected motivated learners.	The premise of the program fails; recruitment yields no participants
A private folder plus optional showcase will address exposure concerns	Assumption — plausible	Designed from reflection, not from participant data	A different concern drives the decision, and the program answers the wrong one
An eight-day format suits self-directed creative work	Assumption — untested	No evidence on duration; the format is a design choice	Attrition or shallow engagement that looks like completion

Transfer to Context

Another limitation concerns how much of the evidence applies to my context. The OECD Evidence Web for Education (OECD, n.d.) explains that useful research is available, but it is fragmented and difficult to transfer between settings.

Table 2

Where the Evidence Was Produced, and Where This Innovation Would Live

Aspect	Where the evidence was produced	My context	Does it transfer?
Participants	Large aggregated or self-selected groups of motivated adult learners	A few adults holding completed projects, not a cohort	Only in part
Scale and format	Courses, semesters, workplace training programs	Eight-day individualized intensive, asynchronously delivered	Weakly
Technology	Established institutional platforms	Leadership City, built but untested with participants	Not yet
Language and culture	Mostly monolingual, European and North American settings	Multilingual and mixed, largely freelance participants	Only in part

My program also has no institutional support structure: no department, registrar, or support desk. Nevertheless, one finding is more applicable to this context. Koole et al. (2023) report that more than half of the variation in self-directed action is situational rather than dispositional. This suggests that the conditions in which people act matter, and I can consider those conditions in my own setting. Overall, the evidence transfers only in part. It supports my understanding of the problem and the process involved, but it does not validate this specific design or demonstrate that my context is ready for implementation.

Feasibility (Is This Possible to Do?)

Several practical conditions affect whether I can implement the program. Time is one concern. Although delivery would take eight days, preparation requires more work because the evaluation instrument does not exist and the alternative routes have not been tested. The clearest

concern is that I am responsible for design, facilitation, technical support, and evaluation.

Technology is a strength because Leadership City is built and includes tools for interaction. Cost remains fragile in the original proposal: I fund the recurring tools, and there is no financial model beyond one cohort. Demand is the least certain condition. Half of adults show no interest in adult learning (OECD, 2025b), and the other half is not automatically my audience. Only some may want this course, and fewer may already have a completed project. Depending on where I offer it, even a well-designed course could attract only one or two participants, or fewer. The scope is manageable because the design is small.

Readiness (Are the People, Systems, and Organization Ready?)

To assess readiness, I used the required Module 4 resources to examine the conditions already in place. The Essential Conditions of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE, n.d.) guided this assessment.

Table 3

Readiness Assessed With the ISTE Essential Conditions (ISTE, n.d.), Against What Exists Today

ISTE Essential Condition	In my context today	Strong / weak / absent
Shared Vision	The vision exists in one document and with me; no partner has reviewed it	Weak
Implementation Planning	The design is complete; no schedule, no risk register, no pilot plan	Weak
Equitable Access	Adjusted routes are designed but never reviewed or tested	Weak
Prepared Educators	I am prepared on the environment I built; there is no second educator	Weak
Skilled and Sufficient Technical Support	I am the only technical support; not sufficient for a group	Weak
High-Quality Learning Activities and Content	Sequence, principle, and lessons are complete and written	Strong

ISTE Essential Condition	In my context today	Strong / weak / absent
Ongoing Evaluation	Judgment based on my experience with prior courses; no learners yet, and no instrument for this new course	Weak

Although the platform and lessons are strong, a course without participants does not work. The problem is not the lesson or the delivery. It is whether people come.

The Education Endowment Foundation (2024) explains that implementation should be treated as a process. In my proposal, I have not yet defined when evidence will be reviewed, when adjustments will be made, or who would review the evidence besides me. The Australian Education Research Organisation (2025) also emphasizes shared implementation leadership with defined roles. In my context, one person still holds all responsibility. Therefore, I need to develop the capacity to evaluate and adjust the program, as well as to facilitate it. The platform and lessons are prepared, and my intention is clear. However, the conditions involving people and organization are not yet ready.

Barriers, Supports, Equity, and Responsible Digital Use

I revised the barrier table after the literature changed my understanding of the design. Initially, I had planned responses for people who were already participating. I had not considered those who might never choose to enter the program.

Table 4

Barriers, the Early Signal That Would Reveal Them, and the Planned Response

Barrier	Early signal	Planned response
The need is untested	People say no, or ask for something else	Change the course to what they need, or pause it until the need is clear
Only one facilitator	I am unavailable, or the technology fails during class	Pause the class; find a second person before enrollment

Barrier	Early signal	Planned response
Access problems	A participant cannot open the platform or a tool	Offer another way in; record the problem to fix it
Different starting points	A participant struggles to create images or video	Show more examples and another path; change the teaching, not the person
Worries about privacy or AI	A participant asks about AI, data, or who owns the work	Explain what AI does and does not do; AI is always optional

Some supports are already part of the design. Participants would arrive with an existing project, removing a common source of disengagement in professional learning. The private folder is the default, so they can develop their work without exposing it. Participation is currently free. The asynchronous environment also supports adults whose working hours are unpredictable.

However, I cannot yet say that the design provides equitable participation. A visual indication of progress must describe the activity, never label the person. Participants without reliable access to creative software need a physical, non-AI alternative through the same content. Those working with sensitive professional material must not be required to upload it to a third-party service. Two gaps remain. First, participation requires reliable internet and a comparable level of literacy in English or Portuguese. I have not surveyed these conditions, so I do not yet know who would be excluded or why. Second, the environment has no stated data retention period, access rule, or consent record, although it collects work that participants may consider private. Until these conditions are addressed, equity remains an intention that has not been verified.

The limit of my own intervention

This raises the ethical question I cannot answer by design. How far may I provoke a person? I can provoke someone who has a dream asleep — someone for whom the intention exists and has not been enacted. That person has a purpose and lacks a route, and naming what

they already carry is legitimate. What I may not do is manufacture desire in someone who does not have it. And the literature now tells me why: the deficit in the person who does not begin is volitional, not motivational. No amount of provocation reaches it.

Perhaps that is the most important leadership finding in this document. My earlier barrier planning began after enrollment: it prepared responses for people who were already inside. The learner who never entered was never in my plan at all.

I designed a route for people who were already moving. Now I must question what I assumed about those who had not yet taken the first step.

Professional Judgment and Next Steps

Based on the evidence and my context, From Project to Presence needs additional preparation before beginning on a smaller scale. Preparation comes first because the readiness gaps concern the conditions for implementation. A smaller test would then help me understand whether adults with completed projects actually want this support.

Three reasons support this decision. The premise remains untested (Broek et al., 2023; OECD, 2025b). The existing conditions are weak because they depend on one person (ISTE, n.d.; Education Endowment Foundation, 2024). The evidence also transfers only partly to this context.

Before recruiting participants for the program, I need to complete three steps. First, develop a discovery instrument and use it with five to eight adults who have completed projects, including at least two who are expected to decline. Their reasons may help me understand what the literature cannot explain about my prospective participants. Second, test one part of Leadership City with two volunteers before delivering the full program, using their accounts of what they could and could not do. Third, establish data and consent rules covering what is stored,

where, for how long, who can access it, and how participants can withdraw material they have submitted.

As the smaller-scale test, I have already redesigned the first offering as a one-day workshop of eight hours, equivalent to a full working day. Adults would use a completed project to create a 30-second animated vignette, a logo, and a cover. Lack of time is a common barrier for adults (OECD, 2025b). In my interpretation, committing to eight consecutive days may be part of that barrier. For that reason, I concentrated the first offering into one day. A one-day commitment asks for less, and that may matter more than the content itself. The workshop would test that assumption. The cost also changes at this scale. Participants use the free plans of each tool, and my cost is about US\$25 a month, which I can sustain. A full lesson plan for this workshop has been drafted.

I would consider the full program ready for the next step when three conditions are met: a majority of respondents identify a need the program actually addresses, rather than one I assumed; an evaluation instrument shows a clearly interpretable difference between the first and second consultations; and a second qualified adult agrees to a defined role in delivery and evaluation. Until then, the program should remain a proposal. This analysis is based on the literature and my own experience. Evidence from participants may change my conclusion, and using that evidence to adjust the program is part of how I intend it to work.

The instruments I would build

What follows is a proposal, not a result. No participant has been recruited, no response has been collected, and no claim of effectiveness is made.

The discovery instrument is designed to be answerable by someone who does not want to participate — which is its whole purpose, since the existing research measures only people who

already chose to learn. It routes on the decision before it asks about format: a respondent who does not want this is never asked about duration, cost, or rhythm. Two items carry the design. One asks what would make a person say no. The other, in the interview protocol, gives permission to a truthful refusal in a single sentence, spoken exactly as written.

The second instrument is the one the literature now demands: a way to read movement from the learner's own starting point rather than from activity, and to ask the learner about a pause instead of inferring its meaning from a record.

Principles that guide what should be done

The chapter does not propose an intervention. It is a review of theory, and it establishes the mechanism without prescribing the remedy. What it gives me is enough to state a direction rather than a method — and the difference matters, because this remains a hypothesis to test rather than a result to report.

1. Teach the path before teaching the representation. The route begins in the mind, in reasoning. Language, form, and positioning come after there is something to represent.
2. Work on conditions, not on will. If more than half of the variation is situational, the conditions around the learner are where design has leverage.
3. Do not answer a volitional deficit with incentive. Encouragement, clearer benefits, and stronger motivation press a mechanism that is not the one failing.
4. Replace initiation with a plan. The chapter's account of intention memory points to explicit action plans that carry an intention when the person cannot initiate it unaided.
5. Do not read a pause as failure. Strategic delay and detachment are indistinguishable in a record. What the learner says about the gap is the evidence.

6. Read the midpoint for the break in reasoning. The second consultation is the only place where a discontinuity in reasoning can still be seen and retuned — before the end of the route turns it into a result. A system may organize the comparison between the first and second consultations; reading its meaning remains a human judgment.
7. Keep the judgment human. A trace can be organized by a system; the meaning of a learner's movement cannot be assigned by one.

Leadership reflection: volition, evolution, and what comes before the route

A leader reflects on decisions, not only on results. The decision I must reconsider is not whether my eight-day route is well designed. It is whether I had the standing to design it before I understood who would walk it.

The sequence I had inverted

I can now state the chain I had wrong. Volition precedes evolution: a person must want to begin before they can unfold. Evolution must hold for the whole process, not only its opening: if it stops, the person does not return to neutral, they become detached — present in the room, stalled inside the route. And presence is the outcome, never the starting point.

Table C

The Stages of the Route, and What Each One Hides

Stage	The state	What the school sees	What the school misses
Before the route	Volition absent — the person never begins	Nothing. Non-participation is invisible	That a decision was made at all
During the route	Evolution active — the person unfolds	Attendance, clicks, completion	Whether anything unfolded
During the route (failure)	Detached — attached to the course, stagnant in the route	Participation. It looks like success	The stagnation, because activity indicators cannot see it

Stage	The state	What the school sees	What the school misses
After the route	Presence — the project visible and alive	Course completion	Whether it stayed alive

The term *detached* is mine, and I want to be precise about what it names. Theory of action control already distinguishes action orientation from state orientation, and Kuhl (1985) established that this is a volitional difficulty, not a motivational one. I am not renaming a psychological construct. What I am naming is a situation — a learner held inside a course by design while the route itself has stopped unfolding — which engagement indicators cannot detect, and therefore reward.

Why the shelf is stagnation, not failure

The etymology explains my own metaphor with uncomfortable accuracy. *Stagnate* comes from the Latin *stagnum*, standing water: not water that has disappeared, but water that exists and does not move. A project on a shelf is not destroyed. It keeps its shape, and it loses its current. *Evolution* comes from *evolvere*, to roll outward, the way a scroll is unrolled. *Presence* comes from *praeesse*, to be before — to stand in front of someone.

The shelf is not an accident at the end of a process. It is the default state. Keep a project intact and give it no current, and it stagnates.

The three movements of the route, and the one I omitted

If methodology is a route, then it has three movements, not two. There is the route toward arriving — before the course, where volition either exists or does not. There is the route I conduct — the course itself. And there is the route that continues — after the course.

What the field offers is a follow-up, and a follow-up is not that third movement.

Table D

Follow-Up and Backup: Two Different Answers to What Happens After the Course

	Follow-up	Backup
The question it asks	“Did you do what the course proposed?”	“Is the route still moving?”
Direction	From the program toward the learner	Alongside the learner, after the program
Unit of attention	The task that was assigned	The project the learner owns
Ends when	The assignment is checked	Never — it is the condition that keeps evolution alive
If the learner stops	Recorded as non-completion	Treated as a signal to retune, or to accept a stop
Who holds it	The facilitator’s schedule	The learner’s own record, with support available

One checks on the learner; the other holds the current. Without the third movement, what the school calls course completion is stagnation with perfect attendance.

References

- Australian Education Research Organisation. (2025, October 16). *Building and operating an effective implementation team at Mount Hutton Public School* [Video].
<https://www.edresearch.edu.au/guides-resources/videos/building-and-operating-effective-implementation-team-mount-hutton-public-school>
- Broek, S., van der Linden, J., Kuijpers, M. A. C. T., & Semeijn, J. H. (2023). What makes adults choose to learn: Factors that stimulate or prevent adults from learning. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 29(2), 620–642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14779714231169684>
- Education Endowment Foundation. (2024). *A school's guide to implementation* (3rd ed.).
<https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/guidance-reports/implementation>
- Heckhausen, H., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1987). Thought contents and cognitive functioning in motivational versus volitional states of mind. *Motivation and Emotion*, 11(2), 101–120.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00992338>
- International Society for Technology in Education. (n.d.). *Essential conditions for effective tech use in schools*. <https://iste.org/essential-conditions-for-effective-tech-use-in-schools>
- Koole, S. L., Jostmann, N. B., & Baumann, N. (2023). From intentions to action: An integrative review of action control theory and research. In B. Gawronski (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 68, pp. 291–375). Elsevier.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.aesp.2023.07.001>
- Kuhl, J. (1985). Volitional mediators of cognition–behavior consistency: Self-regulatory processes and action versus state orientation. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action*

control: From cognition to behavior (pp. 101–128). Springer.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-69746-3_6

OECD. (2024). *Education policy outlook 2024: Reshaping teaching into a thriving profession from ABCs to AI*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/dd5140e4-en>

OECD. (2025a). *Unlocking high-quality teaching*. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/f5b82176-en>

OECD. (2025b). *Trends in adult learning*. OECD Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.1787/ec0624a6-en>

OECD. (n.d.). *Evidence Web for Education*.
<https://www.oecd.org/en/about/projects/evidence-web-for-education1.html>

AI Use Disclosure

AI was used as a thought partner at Level 3. It was used to question my assumptions, to locate sources, to organize evidence, and to suggest cuts for length and flow. All evidence and every source were read by me. The problem of practice, the interpretation, the decision to combine additional preparation with a smaller first test, and the professional judgment in this document are my own.

This is a little extra for you, Dr. Roble — an invitation to play with me. After all this serious analysis, I need a little joy. I need to play. And if you have a little hope, just like I do, come play with me. I also added an Author’s Note after the game!

Let’s make a TOUCHDOWN!

<https://boonneck-uncork-your-project.ai.studio/>

One more thing, Dr. Roble. In one of your earlier feedbacks, you told me that eight consecutive days would be hard. I insisted. You were right. It was not my main problem, but it was one more. Point for you, Dr. Roble. This touchdown is yours too.

Author's Note

This is not part of the analysis above. It is written for myself, and left here on purpose, so that when I read this again — and when I carry this work into the next assignment — I remember how I thought, what I questioned, and which idea was the one that moved everything. The questions below were mine. The search was interdisciplinary, and the brainstorm came from places I did not expect.

To remember...

For thirty years, I have watched people finish something meaningful and leave it behind. A project, a course, a community initiative, an educational resource. Something that required time, effort, and knowledge, only to end up in a folder or on a shelf. I kept seeing the same thing. The work was finished, but somehow, its journey was not.

I called it a bottleneck, the distance between completing something and allowing it to exist in the world. That observation stayed with me long enough to become From Project to Presence, an eight-day intensive designed to help adults move their completed projects toward a presence they choose for themselves. I thought I was addressing a problem I had understood for years. However, while examining the evidence for this assignment, I encountered a question I had not asked myself before.

What if the person does not want to move forward?

I had spent so much time looking at the projects that remained on the shelf that I had not sufficiently considered the people who left them there. The research made this distinction difficult to ignore. Heckhausen and Gollwitzer (1987) and Kuhl (1985) helped me understand that wanting to accomplish something and actually taking action are not the same process. Koole et al. (2023) further examined this distance between intention and action.

But then I encountered something that changed my perspective. According to the OECD (2025b), approximately half of adults neither participate in nor express interest in adult learning. Half.

I had been designing a pathway for people to move forward without first establishing whether they wanted to take that pathway. And I began to question something else. When research examines barriers to adult learning, whose barriers are we actually studying? Broek et al. (2023) helped me consider the factors influencing adults' decisions to learn. Yet the people who do not want to participate may remain insufficiently represented in the evidence informing my design.

Perhaps the bottleneck was not exactly where I thought it was. I continued examining the program, and another contradiction became visible. I wanted to help people move their work beyond a single point of dependence, yet almost every operational responsibility in my own program depended on me. The implementation guidance from the Education Endowment Foundation (2024) and the Australian Education Research Organisation (2025) helped me recognize that I had designed an experience without establishing all the conditions necessary to sustain it. Even the platform had never been tested with participants. At this point, I had to distinguish between what I believed, what I had designed, and what I could demonstrate.

I still believe there is value in helping completed work find its place in the world. Thirty years of observation did not disappear because I encountered evidence that challenged my assumptions. But those observations cannot tell me whether a particular adult wants my help, whether eight days will be sufficient, or whether the program is ready to operate responsibly.

That is why my decision is not yet.

I need to listen to adults who have completed projects, including those who would refuse my offer. I need to test the platform, establish consent and data protection procedures, and ensure that implementation does not depend entirely on one person. So I made the first step smaller. One day. Eight hours, like a full working day, not eight days in a row. If time is part of the barrier, perhaps one day is a door people can open. The workshop will tell me. I began this work asking whether my program was ready to help someone cross a bottleneck. I ended it asking whether I had understood the person standing before it. And probably, that is the most important change in my thinking.

I was measuring readiness in the program when I also needed to understand readiness in the person. The evidence did not ask me to abandon my idea. It asked me to examine what I had assumed before deciding to move forward.

For me, that is what makes this decision meaningful. I can recognize the value of what I have designed and still acknowledge what I do not know. Sometimes, the most responsible way to move forward is to understand why we are not ready yet.

Danny Gregory (Sketchbook Skool, 2022) says creativity has three steps — ready, fire, aim — and that the process can be taught. He is right, but all three assume the person has already decided to begin. Nobody teaches that first door, and that is exactly what my analysis found missing: not another lesson inside the eight days, but a small place before them where an adult can discover whether this is for them at all, and where “no” is a complete answer.

Fellini's $8\frac{1}{2}$, as Terry Gilliam discusses it (James Whale Bake Sale, 2024), came to mind while I was writing this. Its main character, a film director, chose something and never finished it, and I recognized the shape of that before I recognized the reason. Sometimes a person does

not fail to finish what they chose. They stop, and we call it block, when it may already be an answer.

References for the Note

James Whale Bake Sale. (2024, January 12). *Terry Gilliam on 8½* [Video]. YouTube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JED27P7iSog>

Sketchbook Skool. (2022, December 6). *The creative process: 3 steps to unlock your hidden potential* [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fTFRdPSw4G0>