

From the Editor

Editorial: Day 2-to-40. Proceedings from a Chemical Education Workshop Symposium

BRIAN P. COPPOLA

Department of Chemistry
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
bcoppola@umich.edu

*The
responsibility for
translating and
expressing the
chemical
sciences so that
more
comprehensive
educational goals
are achieved
rests squarely
with chemical
scientists:....*

This issue of *The Chemical Educator* is devoted to the *Proceedings* from a workshop symposium that I organized for the weekend of May 10–11, 1997. The two-day event was held in the Willard H. Dow Chemical Sciences laboratory building on the central campus of The University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

My introductory remarks from the opening of the meetings carry a bit more detail about this term “Day 2-to-40,” but for now I will simply include the first paragraph from the proposal I distributed to most of my generous financial donors.

The responsibility for translating and expressing the chemical sciences so that more comprehensive educational goals are achieved rests squarely with chemical scientists: no one should know how to do this better than we! We propose to organize a symposium that is centered on a challenge. We want to encourage chemical scientists, for the benefit and education of themselves and others who are interested in education, to

identify, articulate, and examine these comprehensive goals and to begin to explicitly address the connection between such goals (“Day 1” in a typical course), the subject matter of chemistry and in classroom practices during the entire term or semester (“Day 2-to-40,” for the length of an average semester). This particular conversation, we propose, should occur between front-line innovators in chemistry instruction and the broad community outside of this group that is usually concerned with developments in science education. In order to focus attention on the unique nature of this connection, we have coined the term “Day 2-to-40” (see: *J. Chem. Educ.* **1997**, 74, 74–83) as a way to promote specific discussion of the “Day 2-to-40 Challenge”: *What are your comprehensive educational goals, from the factual subject matter to how it represents an integrated facet of intellectual pursuit; by what specific classroom practices and how are these goals achieved? How do you know?*

Did we achieve this goal? I would say partially. The workshop leaders and all of the participants who generously gave up their Mother’s Day weekends to practice some chemistry lessons all had a good time, and many have asked when we were going to try it again. On that note, I am afraid that being Program Chair for the Biennial Conference on Chemical Education that we are hosting in Ann Arbor during July and August of 2000 pretty much puts that off the agenda for a while. Anyhow, my hope for this May meeting was to get faculty to think about how they achieve their educational goals through their pedagogy, which was meant to elicit a discussion about goals and their congruence with practice. We do not traditionally think too far past a list of topics and their order of presentation when we write a syllabus, and when someone asks us for our instructional goals, we usually hand over the list. On the plus side, most of the Ann Arbor classrooms were filled with groups of faculty DOING things, interacting within their groups, and attending a session that was different from their usual experience at professional meetings. That was good.

Each of the articles that comprise this issue was written by one of the group of reporters whom I asked to attend each session to take field notes and then follow up with the session leader and participants afterwards. In these reports we hoped to capture the spirit of the sessions and, by using the reporter's observations and the participants’ perspective, provide the kind of information that might give the readers of our *Proceedings* a user’s insights to the pedagogical innovation being examined. To these ends, although the group of reporters and I discussed our broad goals for the reports, I left the final decision about format up to each individual or team.

We would be delighted to receive any and all feedback from our effort.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to the generous sponsors who made this Symposium possible: The Camille and Henry Dreyfus Foundation Special Grants Program, The National Science Foundation The Huron Valley (Local) Section of the American Chemical Society, The University of Michigan Chemistry Department, The University of Michigan Office of the Vice President for Research, and The University of Michigan College of Literature, Science and Arts.

I thank all of these presentors who gave their time and weekends to this meeting. Their names appear throughout the issue.

I thank my panel of respondents for participating throughout the sessions: Robert L. Lichter, John G. Stevens, and Michael P. Doyle.

I thank my plenary speakers for the extraordinary job they did representing the true wealth and breadth of the chemical sciences: Roald Hoffmann, Dudley R. Hershbach, and, for service above and beyond the call of duty, Richard N. Zare.

I thank all of the reporters, who have authored these articles.

Finally, I thank Ms. Yvonne Barber who helped coordinate everything from hotel rooms to name badges and from busses to bagels.