

**Transcript for Research Speaker Series, Session 2, Fall 2023: A Participatory Design-Based Approach to Creating Design Principles for K–12 Online Learning in Canada (October 31, 2023)
BCcampus event hosted October 31, 2023**

Host: Gwen Nguyen

Facilitator: Elizabeth Childs

GWEN NGUYEN:

Welcome everyone to the Research Speaker Series, Session number 2, featuring the topic, A Participatory Design-Based Approach to Creating Design Principles for K–12 Online Learning. Thank you very much for choosing to be with us on a Halloween research speaker session. My name is Gwen and I'm a learning and teaching advisor with BCcampus. A few housekeeping items that I would like to go over first. The session will be recorded and you're welcome to keep your camera off. And feel free to rename yourself to "participant". Live captioning has also been enabled for this session. I would like to express my special thank you to my colleague Paula Gaube, who has provided very wonderful support behind the scenes, especially through all the hustle of October and November learning events at BCcampus.

Before we dive into the session, I would like to start with the territorial acknowledgment. I'm a Southeast Asian middle-aged woman of colour, a wife, a mother of two beautiful children, and the first-generation immigrant to Canada. So as a woman scholar, having lived and worked in multiple countries, I realized that I have become the outsider of both new cultures and home culture. But I'm so sorry... [laughs] sorry that I stumbled a bit on my slides, but I realized that this photo captures the vibrant fall in Victoria, Canada. Since I came to Canada in 2015, I live every day here with much gratitude. Because my family and I actually come from a country with the summer vibe all year round. Having a chance to live in a place with four beautiful seasons has been a remarkable experience for all of us. I'm joining everybody today from my home office situated in the traditional territories of the Lekwungen speaking people, including the Songhees, Esquimalt and W̱SÁNEĆ people. You're welcome to share your introduction as well as territorial acknowledgement in the chat if you wish.

Typically, we share the survey link, because we would like your feedback on the session, at the end of the session. But recognizing that many of us might have tight schedules, I'd like to mention this up front. We invite you to participate in this anonymous survey and Paula will help me pop the link in the chat. We hope that you will help with your feedback so we plan future events that aim to support professional development in higher education.

And let's circle back to our topic today, design-based approach to research. It's very fascinating to reflect on how design intertwines with our everyday life. From the moment that we wake up to the end of the day, we are actually interacting with things that are by designers. Why are we interested in this but not that? Actually sometimes they do the same thing. I myself find it's very interesting to understand the interplay of design and research in a way that how can we bring more accessibility, inclusion, and diversity lens into research. I'm very honoured today to

introduce Dr. Elizabeth Childs, a professor and a program head from the School of Education and Technology at Royal Roads University. Our teaching and learning team at BCcampus are all fans of Elizabeth. Because Dr. Elizabeth Childs is known for the design, the creation, the implementation of flexible online learning environments that empowers the learners with more choice and voice. Today, I'm very fortunate to have Dr. Childs joining us and share her insights on the design-based research project. So I know that she has a very, you know, like full and engaging session for all of us today. So without further delay, let's welcome Dr. Elizabeth Childs to guide us on this exploration. The floors are yours, Dr. Elizabeth Childs.

ELIZABETH CHILDS:

Thank you so much, Gwen, for such a lovely introduction and welcome everybody. I am now going to put my very heavy pumpkin, happy Halloween, down so that we can get into the session. It's lovely to be able to be here and to join with you today to talk a little bit about some of this design-based research we've been doing. I come to you also from the lands of the Lekwungen-speaking ancestors and families and specifically Royal Roads campus. Just wanted to raise my hands and thanks for all of you taking the time out of your day on Halloween, which is already an amped up day for many, to come together and spend some time listening and hopefully asking lots of questions and thinking, maybe some different thoughts as we go through this session around participatory design, and particularly in the K–12 online space. I'm very grateful to be able to live, learn, work, raise my family, and be situated in my little garden office on these lands of the Lekwungen-speaking ancestors and families. I'm very thankful to also be in this space with all of you.

One of the things that we talk about with our Heron People at Royal Roads and the Elders that help guide and inform us is that notion of protocol. Royal Roads sits on, the nautical term for Royal Roads, the strait. People would come from away and they would ask permission to come onto the lands to feast, to share, to share knowledge, to share crafts, to share in the opportunities that lands provided. And then they would give thanks as they would leave. For me, working a lot in this virtual space and being in a Zoom box for a long time, decades actually, before Zoom came around. For me, one of the things that I really connect with in the physical land acknowledgment is bringing it into these virtual spaces. What is it about what we co-create in these virtual spaces that will cause others who come after us to raise their hands in thanks for the safety, the diversity, the inclusive practices we are about building in these virtual spaces. Thank you so much for coming together today, for taking a moment to ground yourself in the land.

Now I'm going to invite you to just do a little random question around your experience as an educator and what was your lived experience coming into online education during the pandemic? I'm going to ask us to step back three-plus years. Think about one word that captures that experience for you. Pop it into the chat. And I'm just going to pull up our chat here, so I can see it too. I know for so many of us, it seems like a lifetime ago. But context is everything, right? So when we think about this research that I'm going to share with you and

both the approach of the research and also what we found, it's really important to remember the time frame with which it took place. And it took place during years 1, 2 and where we are now in the pandemic. And so it was really interesting in that time frame, right? It was that early stages... as people are getting their one-word answer and taking time to think about it there.

It's now generally accepted, it wasn't the case at the time, but now it's generally accepted that K–12 education, where we are in the pandemic and as others move more post pandemic, has some degree, shape, or form of online learning in practice. So K–12 educators, whether that's using Google Classroom in a more embedded way in their work, whether it's teaching fully online or in hybrid or HyFlex settings, that's become more of the norm now. Whereas prior to the pandemic, having been in this space for a long time, it was a second option. It was a different option for students. One of the things that colleagues and I embarking on this work and really pondering was why in such a rich history country as Canada in distance education and online learning, we go back over 100 years in terms of our ability to reach people and help create learning spaces for them at a distance. We're thwarted by geography at every turn across the country. Even in British Columbia, we have seven mountain ranges. We had this robust system of distance education prior to the pandemic and for many, many decades prior.

And yet, I love this notion of the word pivoting, the overused now word for many. When that switch happened and we moved to emergency remote learning, why was not that history consulted? Why was it a knee-jerk reaction in many cases? Was it a time factor? Was it a lack of awareness of the depth of the field and the research done in Canada to date? One of the reasons that we really started undertaking this work was really to get a sense of how was that such a miss? How could we not dive into those deep, rich learnings from decades of experience in this space?

What I'd like to share and talk a little bit about with all of you today. And feel free to pop things in the chat as we're going. I'm happy to, if you have a question, we'll have questions and answers at the end. Well, maybe answers, definitely questions. Feel free to also prompt them in here because I can speak to them as we go. What I'd like to share with you is a three-phase research project that really has taken place since February 2021 all the way through to February of this year. The first phase was really, we were working with the Ministry of Education around quality assurance online. The pandemic started in March 2020, and so that first February 2021 was really going out and finding out from educators, some educators who were new in the K–12 space in online learning, most of them, and some who had been doing it for a while, about what was their lived experience? Hence, my question to you to get us prompting and thinking back in time, but also pulling it forward. We then went back out in November of 2021 through into February to look at the design principles that came out of that first phase of research from educators and how did they sit nationally? Was this just a BC phenomenon? Or was it something that resonated for K–12 educators across Canada? Then, the third phase of the work, which has been ongoing since last November, was looking at, okay, we're in a different spot now with the pandemic. We're in a different spot with respect to K–12 education and how

we're using online. Did these still hold up anymore? Were the design principles a moment in time and useful and now we can move on? Or are these something that are worth keeping, worth honing, worth cultivating, and how are they being used? Those are the three broad areas of what we were examining in this research.

For some of you who are looking at research designs and a research approach, I thought I would dive in a little bit to, okay, how do we do this stuff? The initial study, all three studies were constructed around a Design Thinking approach. You can see for those of you who are not familiar with Design Thinking, it's on the left-hand side of the screen. Always when the models get put out like that, they look so linear, and it's anything but. In my experience, it is quite a cobweb [laughs] of back-and-forth, spider tracks. What we tried to do and what this table tries to do is put the aspects and the components of the research that we did through the Design Thinking approach. In some participatory designs, you would have the co-creation of the research approach with participants. We were not in a position to do that. However, in this participatory design, we adapted the approach based on the participants.

The initial piece here, the empathizing piece, the real trying to step into the shoes of your participant and really understand that deeply. In the very first study, we did a survey to do that. We had such an overwhelming response to that survey. Remember February 2021, right? So people had been working in the online space for about anywhere from 9 months to 10 months. We had such an overwhelming response that we had to refine how we were then going to continue the research just based on researcher availability and capacity. We used the responses from the survey, both the qualitative and quantitative pieces, to then inform what we called conversation groups. The conversation groups were representative of remote, remote rural, urban, the range of socioeconomic across those demographics. And really trying to get also a sense of elementary through, so K-12 in its full scope. It was quite a matrix for those conversation groups.

Of course, because of what came out of that first survey, we're now in the "Ideate" part here in the column, but it didn't ever fall in a column. You're constantly doing this [circular motion with hands] when you're doing it. Design conversation, questions, and prompts were created. The important part, I think, with this work is we did not go into the survey, having done a fulsome literature review prior and used the lit to craft the questions for the survey, or use the literature to craft the design principles. We went in in a much more open space, really with the essence of Design Thinking behind us. The people that are best to find the problems and then work to iterate and solve those problems are the people experiencing them. We went in with that openness around, there is a wealth of expertise in educators in the first study in B.C. Let's tap into that. The design principles that came out of the first study really came from the participants. Then we delve into the literature, and we're able to see, okay, yes, this is supported, this is an extension. Remember in those days, sounds like I'm talking about the way back. But three years ago, there was literature in online learning, blended learning, all that good stuff. And then there was the emergency remote response learning and literature that

was coming up from that. It was really interesting timing around what you could draw on, where the educators were getting information from that informed their conversations with us. And then the literature and how it backed some of what they were saying. The prototype part of the Design Thinking process in this initial study was really taken up by going back to the survey responses, going back to the design conversations, and drafting these initial design principles. Then they went back out to all that had participated for feedback via a survey. That was a really powerful piece because they went back for comment, and then a smaller subset came back to talk again about them and refine them even further. You can see in this approach to participatory design, there was a responsiveness to what was coming in initially from participants. And then there was that continual embodiment involvement of participants throughout the research.

Coming out of the first phase of this study, there were eight draft design principles that emerged. Then the question was later that fall, as everyone started their second school year of the COVID pandemic restrictions with more technology under their belts, perhaps. Did this play out nationally or was this a B.C. piece? We know that Ontario had very different restrictions than we did for the first two years of the pandemic. Alberta as well, the Maritimes and the North were extremely different experiences. We really wanted to get a sense of whether these principles were useful across Canada. Knowing that in K–12 in Canada, education is provincially funded, right? There's not a national body of education. We really wanted to get a sense. Pan-Canadian did these hang together?

We worked with CANeLearn and their board members to send out as the survey, a revised survey from the first one, to all the board members and their plus-ones, so someone that they thought, oh, yeah, this would be a really good person to tap. It ranged again in terms of scopes. We did look for remote, rural/remote, urban. We looked across the demographic, age, and stage of teachers. We did it in both English and French. This study, the national one, did not have design conversations. It was an opportunity for people to comment on those design principles through a survey and through qualitative narrative comments on the relevance, the accuracy, how they were interpreting the design principles and any revisions. The Define, Iterate, Ideate, and Prototype cycle in this was a little tighter because we didn't have the conversations. But what we ended up getting back was not only how did the principles resonate, but also, okay, now what? What do you, what can we do with these? That was very powerful. And there were several recommendations, which I'll speak to that came out of that. We then thought, okay, that's great. What about now, let's go back to British Columbia. Let's go back and see, are they still useful three years on. And how are people using them? Because often, and this applies in all kinds of areas, not just K–12, but often the impetus to change, and the actual change that can happen in a system, are either quite time limited or there's a moment where it has then passed and change is taken up very slowly. We really wanted to see how do you impact and how do you foster systemic change? In this case, the B.C. K–12 education system. Has it continued on? That was the focus of the third phase of this research. Was taking a look at, okay, what are you doing with these now? Are they still relevant? A very

similar... We modelled it after the national study. And then did a little twist, because we went back to the original list of B.C. educators from phase one. We invited all of them to come back and consider participating.

This Third phase was done under Tri-Council ethics. The first two were done as part of CANeLearn experience, they were done as part of a broader scope. The third phase was done under ethic approval. We really wanted to have not just people who taught online. Initial responders in the first phase were people by and large who taught in the online space, and some people who had just come to online. But those people were exhausted. Remember, they were just trying to get up to speed on everything. So we really wanted in the third phase to get some people who perhaps in year one and two were quite new to the online experience, because there were so many fabulous ideas and people taking interesting risks to create these learning spaces in the absence of not knowing necessarily the research or the past history. We really wanted to tap into some of those creative pieces as well. The survey happened for the third phase, as well as design conversations, again, across that stratified group sample. All of the analysis was done using descriptive stats for the survey quantitative data and then a thematic analysis for the qualitative data.

This chart gives you a sense of numbers. I'm just going to pop the chat to see if there's anything. Gwen, thank you for putting all those things in. That's great. You can see it quite a large, as far as surveys go, especially what would be 10 months into a pandemic, quite a large response rate for those two surveys. Then a nice number of design conversations that happened in that first group. The National Validation Study, we had hoped the response rate would be higher because we were going pan-Canadian. However, the timing was the second year of a pandemic when everybody thought we would be done now, but we're not done. I think the backdrop to all of the pandemic research that I'm hearing at conferences that I've been to this year. You do need to remember the actual human physicality of what was happening in the world and their ability to participate in research in these spaces. And you'll see some of that when we get into findings.

This last round, phase two, we had the survey that went out around the principles. A nice collection of folks commenting and then almost equal in terms of the design conversations with educators. What did some of them say? What did we find here? I put on here things that I thought were quite interesting actually. So when we look at age and stage, in K–12, there's a great work done by Steffy and colleagues around age and stage of the K–12 educator, early 2000s work. It's really held together nicely and it's a nice frame to look at this work. That's where you see this notion of expert or distinguished teacher. It comes from Steffy's work. But the majority of both the last two studies, national validation and the expanded study, were mid-career high school educators. In the beginning study, we did have more of a mix of elementary, but in these last two, not as many elementary responses. Some middle school, for sure. I think the interesting part is that little or no formal preparations. So we had... 71% of them taught themselves how to teach online. 50% received no formal training on how to teach

online. They were out there doing this work by and large, self-taught. Some did professional development, structured formal professional development. But most were out there self-taught or learning from their peers and colleagues. Two things that were really interesting in the middle bullet point. There seemed to be a... a crossover or equality given to. If I'm good with technology, then I'm also very good with online pedagogy. For us, as we were looking at the data and unpacking that a bit in the design conversations, it suggested a little lack of understanding of what is good online pedagogy as opposed to, I can do this in an LMS or in Google Classroom, or I can make this happen and that, and add all these resources. So it's that step from technology literacy and fluency into online pedagogy literacy and fluency that we saw was conflated in some of the responses. And we asked quite directly around design principles.

While several did understand the concept of a design principle representing that accumulated wisdom of research and practitioners, many of them actually substituted out design principle for universal design for learning and got into accessibility of learning design as opposed to design principles, which frame the container that you're working in. The last point, I completely understand, given the time that the surveys were done and the conversations happened, there was a tension. People really wanted to be part of a professional community. They really wanted to connect with others. They wanted to see what others were doing. They wanted to share examples. They wanted to have a place to come together. But there was a real lack of personal capacity to contribute to the community. They were full, busy and full. Some of these, when we looked at the design conversations, the first one speaks to that community piece. They really wanted to share. Folks that had been working in this space for so long, really wanted to share what they did and their learnings with others. People that were new to this environment were really excited to learn, but they also wanted to share some of the things they were doing and vice versa. They were the disruptors. They were, "oh well, you've done it this way for a long time. What if we did this?" and many of those creative lightbulb moments, they weren't able to really share them more broadly than just their peers.

As we all know, people that are in their field doing their work by and large are generally very passionate about it. Folks that had been in this space for a long time and had a history really wanted to find ways to do peer mentoring. To be able to reach out and form drop-in community groups or drop-in Zoom sessions. We're really trying to find that conduit, trying to find the BCcampus for K–12 educators in B.C. Lots of comments around meeting some sustained and supported professional learning opportunities that were informed by research and good practice. They could really both learn from each other, but then also see what these design principles could be in action. Then the last two there, we heard a lot from people about how the world of K–12 work as an educator is changing. It is increasingly challenging, increasingly more complex, and so finding ways to support the health and well-being of themselves, of their students, and parents and families they support. They were seeing that as part of their job now. Definitely now that they were more in that online space. What we saw through the National Validation study, and then this expanded study that we've just finished, was educators did feel that the design principles reflected real-world processes. They did

provide a framework for effective practice and wanted to see and had many suggestions about how to take those up in practice. We'll get to some of those, but before we do, I just wanted to show you...

I know this slide is full and messy, and busy, and probably doesn't follow any of the graphic design requirements. But I wanted to just highlight a few quotes for you. The one at the top, in the centre, that is what it was like in that second study time frame, right? So you're looking at November of 2021 into 2022, right? "If you're a good teacher, you'll use these principles." "Doesn't matter if you're online or face to face, but I can't write anymore on this. I am too burnt out." We saw that, we felt that. And I'm sure all of you in your work, when you think back to that time frame or either window side of that, you have felt that as well. Some of the things that came out light and clear, and folks that had been working in this space for a long time knew this. But people new to the environment were really struck by how important relationships were in an online space. That comment in the middle is about we need the technology, but we really need the relationships to grow and learn. How do we do that well? How can we build relationships well? How can we build that as part of how we... one person used onboarding a student, so that you can connect with them. Pieces of the work that came up, and you can see the changing nature of work for K–12 educators on either side of the screen. One is that notion of vulnerability. There's an increased vulnerability with students and parents and families. Then also that recognition that, wow, I'm doing everything now. I am the help desk, I am a mini registrar. I'm trying to get them connected to social community supports. I'm doing much more than what I used to do in my K–12 space. Then of course, just the straight on technology one about, wow, it's really nice to have everything in one spot instead of having to hunt, pack, and find this binder in my class and I just know where it is. For us, one of the things coming out of this, before I jump into the principles is, well, maybe I'll go here first. Then I'll tie back to that.

These are the eight that came out. I think there's an infographic that we're going to put in the chat so that you can have them and use them. The links to both the first two reports are up on the CANeLearn site and we're just working at doing the knowledge dissemination for the final phase of the research and writing it up. The infographic, the first attempt at that. It's the first piece and then there'll be more. But the principles when you read them, for many of you, I think will hopefully resonate as just, yeah, that makes sense. Access to models, how do we know how to do this? How do we know how to do it well? Is there ongoing professional learning for me to be able to really tap in where I am in my career and my age and stage, and what I need from this space? Principle three, this deep understanding of forms of engagement. What does engagement look like in the online space? People struggle with that a lot in many sectors. What does engagement look like? And countering that assumption that when you're face to face, students are engaged. Because we know from research that that's not always the case either. Principle four was one that came out loud and clear across all three groups. And you see it embedded in the literature. The best part about principle four is this is what distance educators have done well for decades. Foster relationships, get connected, find relatedness

with their students in all these different ways. That's a good educator. And so for many of the educators that looked at these principles, and that one comment on the earlier slide, you can see why they would say, yeah, if you're going to teach, if you're going to be an educator, of course you would do all of these because this is core to the work.

Not surprisingly, one was around technology support. And really being able to understand that the technologies don't dictate, they support effective teaching and learning. Principle six is the one I was going to mention, this notion of intentional professional preparation. There were a lot of comments across all three around just an absence of this type of learning in their BEd programs, in their teacher prep programs. And a real gap there for teacher prep programs to step into around the online pedagogy piece. Not just how to use Google Classroom or technologies for using tech with your class, but what is online pedagogy? What is the pedagogy of care? How does that translate from your face-to-face into your online space? A real call out for bachelor of ed programs to integrate this into their work, as well as in the professional development cycle for K–12. Then one around, of course, the importance of research. We did hear from people that, wow, I had no idea that Canada actually had been doing this for a long time and had researched in this space. Some were not aware they had schools that were online. And distance ed schools in their district that they could reach out to. So just that awareness and communication and also being able to bring that research forward. Then the last one, around that principle of well-being and a focus on wellness, not just for the educators. There was quite an emphasis on the entire school community needing that and not just having it rest or be part of what happens with one segment of that community.

I feel like I've been talking a long time. You're all very patient. Please feel free if you're pondering or thinking, pop some questions in the chat. I'm almost done rambling on here, then I'm really looking forward to hearing your thoughts and your questions. These were some of the recommendations coming out of this work and using them to guide the work. What could that look like? Well, it could be that school districts take these principles up and decide these are our principles of practice. This is how we're going to undertake teaching and learning in our district. It's our signature pedagogy. So they could take it up that way. There could be a way that BEd programs incorporate them into the design of their BEd programs. It could be that the BCTC incorporates this into teacher regulations as of... Right now, there are two words in the teacher regulations that reference online learning. There's no separate piece of it designated as part of the work. There's work to do there. Of course, creating a showcase, ways of examples. How do we showcase the work that's being done? The creative work that's being done? How do we form that community in a way that is valuable to its membership, but not resource heavy on its membership? Right, that's just enough, just in time. What could that look like? And what could those professional learning opportunities look like? Is it a mentorship opportunity? Is it a peer-to-peer mentoring approach? Is it regional or geographical? Could that be helpful? I've mentioned the change in pre-service and professional development education. Then one of the things I think can we learn, is well positioned to do, should they choose to, is to take on this notion of a national conversation of design principles. And I know they have some ongoing

work that they're working towards in that way, but really continuing this conversation. And often what happens in any change initiative that I've been a part of, but definitely in education systems, K–12, higher ed, is there's this push and the theme of the year or this theme of a couple of years, and then it drops up and then we're onto something totally different. There's a need to think about how we sustain this. And what the data is showing is that people want a chance to talk. They would like a chance to come together and have these conversations and dialogue. And then talking, that last one is really that work on the leadership level, right? Those who certify teachers, those who are responsible for the recertification, the regulatory bodies. How are we going to put or position online learning and online pedagogy into those conversations so that they're part of the conversation and something that is included as opposed to what it currently is.

As with all good research, we had way more questions than the answers that came out. What I've done here is try to capture them here as questions to consider going forward, right? Questions around the fundamental nature of the work changing and what does that mean, knowing that it will continue to change. Questions around that post- secondary piece and how do we actually build in resilience in the system when we know that future disruptions to the K–12 system will happen. How do we go into technology competencies and online pedagogical expertise and experience? For those of you who are looking for research questions, here's some. We would love for you to consider taking some of them up and playing them out in a way that makes sense to you.

This is the infographic that I mentioned that came out of the start of the knowledge dissemination for phase three. What it tries to do is basically summarize over the three years of conversations with K–12 educators in Canada around design principles for online learning. It attempts to summarize it, so it speaks to what the principles are, but it also talks about recommendations, findings. It links to the other reports. We can pop that in the chat so you have it. It will also go out after this as part of the package with the slides and everything as well.

Then I would be very remiss if I did not expressed my sincere gratitude. None of this would have happened if those educators hadn't responded to the first survey and said yeah, we would love to talk about this. In a time when people were really trying to navigate their day to day and make decisions in a very local and charged climate because of where we were in the pandemic, it was such an honour to be able to talk to these educators who came forward and shared their practice. Really recognizing, as with all good participatory design, it's not my voice here. I'm the spokesperson for what has happened in this instance. But those principles that I pulled up on the slide are from those educators. And they're backed and informed by literature after the fact, but initially they came from them. And for me, that's such a lovely way for that Design Thinking process and cycle to really come full circle and get ready for the next iteration, right? It's the hope that these principles are useful, that they'll continue to guide practice. Of course, a big thank you to Ellen Kinsell who did all the logistics for the surveys CANeLearn for their support. My co-researcher and dear colleague Dr. Susan Creighton, who really laid heavily the

structure and worked together to inform how we were going to frame this entire research and the findings that have come out of it and the work we're doing to share those findings more broadly. Of course, Royal Roads. This last phase of the research because we were running it through ethics, we were also very successful in getting an internal research grant that allowed us to go in and do that detailed consultation with people. So that is, I think... That is, I'm not wooden. I do have a pumpkin head today, apparently though. This is where you can find me. This is the link where you can find the first two reports, phase one and phase two. Then of course the infographic will be shared. We're hoping to perhaps get that out and circulated more broadly, perhaps on the CANeLearn site. And then we're also working on conference presentations and there'll be a journal article in the works. It's one of those things that just takes a little more time. Thank you very much for coming, for listening, for being ready to actually start chatting now, I'm sure. I'm going to maybe stop sharing here. I can put my email in the chat late. I'd love to hear what kind of questions you have or how this resonated with you. I'm going to turn it over to Gwen and the floor.

GWEN:

Thanks, Elizabeth. Such a wonderful session. Thank you for sharing the eight principles of the design-based, the online learning. Actually, there's one question from Dominique in the chat related to the language that we use for the survey, I think on slide 6. Because we have such a small group, if you don't mind, you can also unmute yourself and then share your question as well. But I will start with Dominique's question here. We mentioned, yeah. Phase one of the study. The plus one is in English. Dominique is wondering why it's only in English but not in French.

ELIZABETH:

I love the question, Dominique. Thank you so much. And it was a resourcing thing. We didn't have the ability to do the full translation. The cost of it made it prohibitive, just from the size of the grant that we received. But that is, of course, the next one, right? That's the next space. It was really interesting, actually. We were able to... When we did the national study, we were able to tap into a board member on the CANeLearn side who had a colleague who worked with us on the translation for the survey questions. Because one of the challenges with survey questions is, even as helpful as deepL and all those other tools are, is the survey question, you really need it from a research perspective. You really have to do that validity check with potential respondents to make sure that it's being read and received in the way you intended so that you can actually get the data that you're looking for, right? You're not asking for oranges, but they read it and they think you want to know about apples. With the translation software, you can get close, but you can't get 100%. While my daughter is in French immersion, I wasn't quite ready to let her be the one who was the decider. She's young. Whether or not we had the translation correct, so unfortunately, for the expanded B.C. study, we did have to limit it to English only at this point. But depending on where we are able to go next with respect to the pre- service programs and some of the work we're doing with our regulatory bodies, I'm really hopeful that we can make it much more broad. Thank you for the question.

GWEN:

Thank you, Elizabeth. I'm wondering if there are any other questions in the room. I'm sure that is a lot of information in such a limited time, but I myself would like to hear more about the five design, the five stages of the Design Thinking process in research. Any challenges that you and your team faced during the time that you tried to apply this framework into this project?

ELIZABETH:

Yes. Thank you, Gwen, for your question. It's part of the Design Thinking approach that it is quite iterative, right? What we found in that first study was we had to really iterate and change gears in a different way than we'd thought, just because of the response, the overwhelming response, which was great. And in order to honour all the voices of participants, the last thing you want to do is to go out and ask people to share and then not be able to do anything with the data. That's just, in my books, that's not okay. So to be able to honour all those voices. We really had to go back to the Design Thinking process. Think about, okay, how can we iterate in a way that's going to allow us to bring those voices forward, both in a respectful way and also in a way that allows us to feed the data forward that can be analyzed by the team, the resources on the team. I think the Design Thinking process gave us that flexibility. And it's applied action research, right? You're adapting in the moment. And it gave us that flexibility as opposed to adopting more of a structured research method where you have to follow the stages in the steps.

GWEN:

Thanks. I think Jenny, are you having a question? I saw the camera on Jenny.

JENNY:

Thank you, Gwen. Thank you, Dr. Elizabeth Childs. I'm in a higher education post-secondary context but I'm pretty interested in this research methodology. I think my question goes to, one is going to already cover the challenges. And also I'm thinking what are some prerequisites or factors you consider when you decide to use this method? And do you think there is a need for some theoretical framework when you do the research? And also how do you prepare the participants? Sorry, more than one question.

ELIZABETH:

Those are great questions

JENNY:

Because I'm thinking of the participants. Not every teacher, I mean educator, engaged in the way you're expected, right? And do you just let them express themselves or reflect on their practice or do you give them some support to prepare them to be participatory or actively participatory in your research? Yeah. So those are some considerations regarding this methodology.

ELIZABETH:

They are really good questions. I'll go with the preparations for participants first because I think you're absolutely correct. What you don't want to have is a methodology that favours extroverts or people that are comfortable jumping into conversations and continuing conversations. You want to have a methodology that allows you to get all of the voices forward. And so sometimes you would do that through a survey and focus groups, survey and interviews. What this method allowed us to do was have these design conversations. In those design conversations, we were able to really mix the groups. In their demographics on this survey, we had them identify location, geographic, age and stage of career, current teaching, years current teaching, all of those things. We did manipulate the groups in the sense that we tried to get group representation that would facilitate space that was safe for conversation. That's as much as we could control. The other part we could control was the set up when we met them. So welcome to the design conversation. Here's why we're here.

There's a whole preamble you would do at any research. But then we did talk about how, once we get through the ethics part, then we talked about how this space is what counts as a safe space here. What do each of you need before we start the conversation to feel comfortable in this space to share your experiences in this method? I've used it a few times now in different studies. And you do have to create that transition in time for participants. You can't just expect them to come in and, okay, here's our study, here's what we're doing. Everybody, consent, check. All right, question one. It's not that way.

We spent some time with the set up and went around the group to see what would make them comfortable to share. And I don't think we formalized them as much as guidelines, but it was just, these are our conversation framework. Then we really did frame it as a conversation. That for me, was the hardest part because I had all these questions I wanted to ask, and I had to let go of that. I had to cede the conversation, right? So I could ask... We talked a lot, Susan and I, about what's our first question going to be? We had our list of questions, but then you just don't know where it's going to go. You really had to trust the process that the conversation itself would bring forward what was important to the educators as opposed to having that lens of the researcher who's read the literature already.

Okay, let's probe a little bit more there. In some ways it is almost that a bit of a grounded theory approach. That would be how I answered the participant question. Some of the challenges, I think, for this approach, there's lots of design-based research approaches. I was watching an earlier research series session someone did on participatory design. It was fabulous, so that has a deep and solid history with associated theoretical frameworks. So connecting into that is easily done. I think some of the challenges of any research approach is you get stuck in the model. I think another challenge I would say is when we made the decision to do the national study and then the expanded study, we decided to keep the same structure that you saw in those tables for how we were going to set it up. But even the two of us, do we

really want to do that this time? [laughs] Why are we doing it this time? [laughs] I think there is that giving yourself some permission to re-evaluate the structure that you're using, given what's changed in the context to see, is this still the best method and the best approach going forward? Does that answer your question ?

JENNY:

For sure. I very much appreciate that and also the background story, right, behind the scenes because when I graduated, got our PhD from UVic, I'm doing qualitative research. I'm thinking like we always say that the researcher is the tool, right, itself. But the nuances and how much you get involved in the whole process is not always being understood. Or especially, you have co-researchers doing the same thing. I'm sorry, I have my colleagues here. We love it because they are dressing up to join the costume competition. I will join them later. Yeah, Thank you so much. I like it. I thought you were such a great researcher with storytellings. Also, I can see your thinking process when you're telling that. Yeah, thank you. Thank you.

ELIZABETH:

Thank you for that feedback, Jenny. Dominique, I see your question. Yeah. It's really interesting. And that's one of the things I found so fascinating because the 60%, those are educators who specifically chose to teach online but also didn't necessarily have the skills to teach online. So 71% of them taught themselves how to teach online, and 60% of them chose actually to teach online. We haven't broken it down to see. Okay, of that 60% how many actually identified that they had the skills or understood online pedagogy and how many are in that category of I chose to teach online. I don't have the skills but I still chose to teach online. The other piece is we also don't know, and this is the innuendo in the survey question design. We don't know how people interpreted the word "chose" because in 2020, not many people had a choice, right? They were teaching online because that's what happened. In 2021, there was a little more differentiation. Well, 2021, when they first responded. 2022, there's a little more differentiation. That's where I think when you look at some of the cracks in the survey questions, that's one of them that we've definitely seen because the people that specifically chose to teach online.

Many of those who came to the design conversation, some of them in the design conversation said, "Oh yeah, I'm part of an online school, I chose to be here. We've got access to online teaching resources. There's so many people that have taken courses from us. I've got peers to support me." Then we had people in the design conversation who chose to teach online because at the beginning of the pandemic, it was the first time they'd done it and they liked it. And so they chose then, when we went back in the second phase and third phase, they chose to stick with it because they actually quite liked it, but they didn't have the necessary competencies yet to be in that space. Some of those people were working in a setting where it was an online school or a DE school and others were not and were working in an independent school, for example. They had chosen to take an online teaching position at an independent school, who was just starting to build their online programming. I love your questions, Dominique, because when you start to really get down into the weeds of what the data is

saying and what the gaps are, that's where we really see that there's much more we could know about this and that's worth investigating. I hope that answers your question.

GWEN:

Well, thank you very much. Thank you so much for the questions and also your presentation as well as your answers, Dr. Elizabeth Childs. It's such, I love all of those because it helps us go back to the human-centre approach to teaching and learning. I love how all those principles take us back to the engagement, supporting the relationship, mentorship as well as wellness in teaching and learning. Actually, this session today has more than 105 registrants. But we know that the schedule is very tight, and we appreciate so much that you attend and be with us till now with your questions and engagement. We will share the session recordings as well as the slide after this session. We are very excited for the upcoming sessions in November and early December, so stay with those sessions. Don't forget that we have the call for proposal BCcampus research fellows. We can use some of the questions that Dr. Elizabeth Childs posed today answering for those proposals. Your feedback is very important for us, so we look forward to connecting with you all in our future learning events. Thank you very much again, everyone. And happy Halloween again. Yeah, we'll see you again. Thank you.

ELIZABETH:

Thank you, all. Have a great rest of your day, Happy Halloween. Thanks so much.