

PEER

PROCESSING EXTERNAL EXISTENCE OF REALITY

INSTITUTIONAL WORKSHOP PROPOSAL

An educational framework for practical thinking, evidence-based reflection,
and more deliberate decision-making

Prepared for Georgia reentry, workforce development, community service, and correctional education organizations.

Prepared by A. Napoleon Kirby | Founder, PEER

peer@anapoleonkirby.com | www.anapoleonkirby.com

Proposal date: October 2026 | Discussion draft - subject to institutional review

01 | Executive Overview

An educational complement to existing reentry services

PEER (Processing External Existence of Reality) is a proposed educational workshop framework that helps adult participants examine how they interpret events, distinguish facts from assumptions, evaluate available information, and choose considered responses.

Reentry organizations already address essential needs such as employment, housing, education, community connection, and access to services. PEER is designed to complement - not replace - those supports with structured opportunities to practice practical thinking and decision-making.

Institutional value proposition

- A clear four-principle structure that facilitators can explain and participants can practice.
- Interactive scenarios relevant to work, family, community interactions, and reintegration.
- Flexible delivery formats, from introductory workshops to multi-session programs.
- Simple process measures and participant feedback to support local evaluation.

Scope: PEER is educational, not clinical treatment, legal advice, a correctional certification, or an evidence-based recidivism intervention. No outcome or accreditation claim is made in this proposal.

02 | The PEER Framework

Four linked practices for interpreting reality

01 | PERCEPTION

Notice the initial interpretation: what did I observe, and what meaning did I assign?

02 | EXAMINATION

Separate direct observations from assumptions, predictions, and emotional reactions.

03 | EVALUATION

Consider alternative explanations, relevant evidence, potential consequences, and available options.

04 | REALITY AUTHENTICATION

Check the interpretation against verifiable information, seek clarification where appropriate, and select a response proportionate to what is known.

Illustrative learning cycle

Situation → Initial interpretation → Fact/assumption check → Options review → Evidence check → Deliberate response.

The model is taught as a repeatable learning exercise. It does not assume that participants can always obtain complete information or that all decisions have a single correct answer.

03 | Learning Objectives

What participants should be able to practice

- Describe the four PEER principles in their own words.
- Identify at least two assumptions within a realistic scenario.
- Distinguish observed facts from inferred motives or future predictions.
- Generate more than one plausible explanation for an ambiguous event.
- Compare potential responses using likely consequences and available evidence.
- Demonstrate a simple pause-check-respond routine in a role-play.

Example scenarios

- Employment: A supervisor sends a brief message that feels dismissive. What is known, what is assumed, and how could clarification change the response?
- Family: A relative does not respond immediately. How can multiple interpretations be considered before conflict escalates?
- Services: A requested appointment is delayed. Which facts should be verified, and what practical next step is available?

Scenarios are adaptable to institutional policies and participant circumstances.

04 | Curriculum & Session Design

A practical, facilitated learning experience

Module	Illustrative activities
Introduction & orientation	Purpose, group norms, voluntary participation expectations, and framework overview.
Perception & examination	Observation-versus-interpretation exercise; small-group fact/assumption sorting.
Evaluation	Scenario alternatives, consequence mapping, and option comparison.
Reality authentication	Clarification prompts, evidence check, and guided role-play.
Application & reflection	Personal action plan, recap, and participant feedback.

Teaching approach

Short instruction segments, facilitated discussion, scenario-based practice, optional paired activities, and individual reflection. Facilitators should avoid requiring disclosure of trauma, criminal history, or sensitive personal information.

05 | Workshop Formats & Pricing

Proposed introductory institutional rates

Format	Illustrative scope	Price
Introduction	60-90 minutes; overview and one applied scenario.	\$750
Half-day	Approximately 3-4 hours; guided practice across four principles.	\$1,500
Full-day	Approximately 6 hours of instruction plus breaks; expanded practice.	\$2,500
Four-session program	Four structured sessions; progressive exercises and reflection.	\$4,500
Custom partnership	Multi-site, specialized audience, or tailored curriculum.	Quoted

These are proposed starting prices, not a binding quote. Final scope, cohort size, travel, materials, site requirements, accessibility, and scheduling will be agreed in writing. Taxes or reimbursable expenses, if applicable, are specified in the final agreement.

Possible add-ons

- Institution-specific scenario adaptation and facilitator planning meeting.
- Participant workbook or handout customization.
- Additional cohorts, follow-up session, or staff orientation.

06 | Implementation Roadmap

From initial consultation to post-workshop review

1 | Discovery

Discuss audience, institutional goals, delivery format, access requirements, scheduling, and staff expectations.

2 | Scope confirmation

Agree on learning objectives, participant numbers, curriculum adaptation, fees, cancellation terms, and points of contact.

3 | Preparation

Finalize agenda, participant materials, accessibility arrangements, technology needs, and site-specific guidelines.

4 | Delivery

Facilitate the agreed educational sessions with clear boundaries and respectful engagement.

5 | Evaluation & closeout

Collect non-sensitive participant feedback and share an agreed summary of delivery and learning indicators.

Illustrative timeline: a single workshop may be scheduled within approximately 2-4 weeks after scope approval, depending on calendars, procurement, and facility access. This is a planning estimate, not a guarantee.

07 | Measurement & Quality

Transparent learning indicators - without overstating impact

Suggested measures

- Delivery: sessions completed, attendance totals, and material distribution.
- Learning: short optional pre/post scenario responses or knowledge checks.
- Engagement: participation in exercises, where appropriate and non-punitive.
- Experience: anonymous usefulness, clarity, and relevance feedback.
- Improvement: facilitator notes on pacing, accessibility, and scenario fit.

Interpretation limits

Workshop attendance, satisfaction, or immediate knowledge gains do not establish long-term behavior change, employment outcomes, or reduced recidivism. Any later outcome study would require an appropriate evaluation design, institutional approval, and responsible data practices.

08 | Safeguards & Delivery Requirements

Respectful implementation in institutional settings

- Educational boundaries: No diagnosis, treatment, counseling, or promises of clinical benefit.
- Privacy: Do not solicit personal case details; collect only agreed minimum evaluation information.
- Participation: Provide alternatives to speaking publicly or sharing sensitive experiences.
- Accessibility: Confirm reading level, disability accommodations, and interpretation needs in advance.
- Facility coordination: Follow visitor rules, staff supervision requirements, and approved material/technology procedures.
- Materials: Clarify ownership, reproduction permissions, and institution-specific modifications in the service agreement.

Institution provides

Appropriate room or virtual access, participant scheduling, an institutional liaison, required approvals, and agreed accessibility support. Additional logistics are established during discovery.

09 | Founder & Partnership

Institutional collaboration led by A. Napoleon Kirby

A. Napoleon Kirby is the founder of PEER and the point of contact for institutional workshops and partnership development. PEER is presented here as a founder-led educational initiative.

The proposal intentionally does not claim professional clinical licensure, academic accreditation, correctional approval, or independent evidence of program effectiveness. Specific credentials, experience summaries, insurance documentation, references, and required vendor information can be supplied and verified during procurement as applicable.

Potential partners

- Reentry and transitional service organizations.
- Community-based nonprofits and mentoring programs.
- Workforce development and adult education providers.
- Correctional education and community supervision programs, subject to agency authorization.

Partnership discussion

A discovery conversation can determine whether PEER fits the organization's objectives, participant needs, and operating requirements.

10 | Next Steps & Contact

Discuss a PEER workshop for your organization

PEER welcomes exploratory conversations with Georgia institutions interested in practical decision-making education as a complement to existing services.

Proposed next steps

- Select a preferred workshop format or describe your desired outcomes.
- Share anticipated audience size, setting, and potential dates.
- Schedule a discussion to review curriculum fit, logistics, and a final written quote.

CONTACT

A. Napoleon Kirby

Founder | PEER

Email: peer@anapoleonkirby.com

Website: www.anapoleonkirby.com

To request a consultation, email with the subject: PEER Institutional Workshop Inquiry.

Proposal status: informational and non-binding. Services are subject to mutually agreed written terms.