Transcript for Research Speaker Series: Engaging in Great Practices for Research on Teaching and Learning
BCcampus Research Speaker Series session hosted on March 11, 2025
Presenter: Dr. Brett McCollum
Host: Leva Lee

LEVA LEE:
Hello, and welcome. So good morning, everyone. I'm very pleased to be welcoming you today to our Research Speaker Series presentation on the topic of Engaging in Great Practices for Research on Teaching and Learning. My name is Leva Lee, and I am a teaching advisor at BCcampus, and we are very pleased to welcome you today along with my wonderful colleagues and collaborators to this session. My colleagues, Gwen Nguyen and Kelsey Kilbey are here to support us through today's session. First, we would like to try, starting with a few housekeeping items. Please note that this presentation will be recorded and shared later on the BCcampus website. If you wish, you may change your name to "Participant" and have your camera off. Live captioning has been enabled for accessibility. Today, next slide, please.

I'm joining you from my home office, which is located in the traditional and unceded territories of the hən̓q̓əmin̓əm and Sḵwx̱wú7mesh speaking peoples, also known as Burnaby. The BCcampus office is situated on the unceded territories of the W̱SÁNEĆ and the Esquimalt, and Songhees nations of the Lekwungen peoples. In taking a moment, it's always great to situate ourselves on the land in which we live, and it's a great reminder to us of the important work that we have in continuing to learn and build relationships as we actively respond to the Truth and Reconciliation's Commission Call to Action. And I'd like to invite you to share your location in the chat if you wish. For reference, nativeland.ca is also a helpful resource for those of you that may not have seen that website resource. While you're taking a moment to do that, I'd like to share with you that last week, I was fortunate enough to hear a wonderful keynote, Carrey Newman, who was keynoting for the VCC symposium. And he's an Indigenous artist and master carver, teacher, and scholar. And he spoke about how art projects like his witness blanket engages heart, hands, and culture for learners, and it really gave me a lot to think about with regard to the Indigenous holistic approaches to learning. So I really welcome you to take a look at his work, and I think that there's a lot of a lot to take away from that. Yeah. Now, I will introduce to you today's fantastic speaker, Dr. Brett McCollum. Brett is highly accomplished here. You can see this is a big summary of some of his work. He's director for the Centre of Excellence in Teaching and Learning at Thompson Rivers University. He's got a PhD in chemistry, and he is a 3M National Teaching Fellow. Currently editor in chief at "Canadian Journal of Teaching and Learning." He's also been recognized with many awards in the areas of research supervision, open education, and teaching. So he's very enthusiastic about evidence-based scholarly teaching and creating conditions for faculty staff and students to collaborate in exceptional learning experiences. So we're very pleased to be able to welcome Dr. Brett McCollum, who will tell us more. So welcome, Brett.

BRETT MCCOLLUM: Thank you, Leva. I'm just going to share my screen here.

I do want to acknowledge that TRU's Kamloops campus is situated on the traditional lands of Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc within Secwépemc'ulucw, traditional territory of the Secwépemc people. These are beautiful lands that my family and I have felt so welcomed in, so we look forward to continuing to join in the tradition of the good stewardship of these lands that has kept them beautiful and for so many years.

Today, there's some learning outcomes that I think that we're going to try and tackle. I've listed them here, where we'll describe the spectrum of engagement with students for innovation and teaching and learning. We'll identify strategies for successful cultivation of effective research partnerships with students. We'll create and use a research learning plan with researchers who are students. I'll share that template with you so you can begin to use it in your work. We'll articulate principles of great practice in the scholarship of teaching and learning and explain the importance of describing your researches, epistemological, and ontological traditions.

Much of this work really comes from my decade and a half working as a faculty member and seeing the longstanding issues that we have within higher education. In particular, one of those issues is the adherence, in many cases, still to education's transition model of teaching, where we have faculty who are experts that are delivering content to students, rather than partnering with students in that learning process. The consequences of this involve the hierarchical structures that we see within higher education, the predetermination of learning outcomes, rather than allowing students to be partners in identifying possible learning outcomes for their programs. What is it that they want to learn? But particularly, what I found challenging was the perception of students as clients, that they were there paying for a degree, and in some cases, a feeling that they've paid for the course, so the grade should be determined by that payment rather than by the learning that's attained. And so a difference in understanding of what that relationship in the classroom was. That was really important to me. Some of the challenges that come out of this that Cook Sadler has discussed is that the transition model really promotes a passive learning environment through standardized tests where students have learned how to perform in examinations rather than to engage in curiosity, inquiry, and then demonstrate the learning that they have acquired through that passion.

There are other models for engaging students in learning. This spectrum of student engagement comes from Healey Flint & Harrington, where they look at, initially, it might be that students are being consulted. When you think of curriculum redesign, program redesign, your institution might have an expectation that you consult with students to gather feedback as part of the redesign. But students can be involved in in significantly deeper ways where you can move toward a partnership approach, which is an authentic collaboration between experts and students involving joint ownership and decision-making over both the process of that partnership and the outcomes of the partnership. We recognize not all engagement is appropriate for partnership, but not all is appropriate for consultation. We need to be comfortable moving across the spectrum depending on the activities that we're engaging in. Today, I'm going to focus on student partnership, particularly within research, and how we can

engage in that partnership in meaningful ways to support students in terms of their learning, but also to our benefit as researchers and how we can grow and expand our productivity in partnership with emerging scholars.

So I want you to take a moment and write down three characteristics, at least three, of an effective research partner. What stands out to you? What are you looking for? I'm just going to give you a minute to think of a few.

And if you're ready, I'm going to invite you to add your responses into the chat. So you can go ahead and do that now. We're starting to get some responses here: Inquisitive, collaborative, good communicator, respectful, ethical. This is great. I want you to think about which of these skills that you're seeing in the chat do you possess? And which do you desire to develop? I want you to also reflect on one characteristic that you would desire in a partner that you feel would complement your own strengths and support your weaknesses. I saw that someone actually pointed that out in their comments that they're looking for someone who has "the skills that I don't possess, but I know are needed in my team." Thanks for that, Julia. That's a great comment. This is part of why I love working with students as partners is being able to build those relationships and find individuals who can complement my own passion and skill set.

Now, as we do this work though, we need to understand the impact that emotions have in partnership. As Peter Felton has said, "We can't understand the experiences of or outcomes of individuals in partnerships without attending to emotions. And we can't understand the interactions and the relationships between individuals in partnerships without attending to emotions." Healey has extended that by making the point that emotions are connected to motivations. If we want to understand the emotional responses that we have in partnership, it's important for us to think about what are the motivations that students and faculty or staff have in engaging in partnerships.

We do have a paper from Lei & Chuang. They're at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and they asked undergraduate students and faculty about what they saw as the benefits of engaging in research together. For faculty, they identified 28 distinct benefits. Number of things that were identified were things like graduate school preparation, establishing a positive attitude toward research and development of critical thinking skills. When they asked students about what they saw as the benefit of engaging in research, there were 32 different things that students identified, and you could actually start to map some of them that both faculty and students had identified. That area of overlap included additional things such as critical thinking, skills, creative thinking, analytical thinking, and so on. But what was particularly interesting to me was the areas that didn't overlap. Faculty would identify things like developing leadership skills, improving organizational skills, and improving time management skills. Students hadn't identified those as benefits of engaging in research. In contrast, some of the things that students identified that faculty hadn't were applying ethical principles to actual research situations, improving their literature research skills, computer skills, stats, managing an entire research project. And what really stood out to me as particularly interesting was students

identified a desire to make an important research contribution. I would see this with the students that I worked with where they'd often get engaged in research and they had this desire to transform the world, to change the world in a four-month research project. I'd often have to have a conversation about what can we accomplish in four months. What can we accomplish if we continue working together for a year or two in terms of advancing knowledge? And encouraging change in practice and ensure that they could feel accomplished at the end of that partnership, even if it didn't result in transforming the world within a short period of time.

Now, tied to these benefits, there has also been identification of some challenges that faculty identify when partnering with students. Faculty have identified frustration with students who frequently arrive late or leave early. Students who are unaccustomed to the long hours or isolated research environment that can accompany academic research. And frustration with analytical skills that aren't yet developed that faculty member may desire and feel frustrated when that has to be developed before we can really dig into analysis of research data. But I assure you, we can overcome each of these challenges.

In my own work working with students. I've had two of my students here, Anna and Yuritzo, they presented in 2014 at the National Meeting of the Canadian Society for Chemistry in Vancouver and won second place in the student poster prize in our division. Pierre Jordan Hofmeister, in 2018, he earned second place in the graduate or undergraduate oral presentation division, and he was a third-year undergraduate student. Students really can make meaningful contributions and do exceptional jobs. But it's about setting them up for success and considering how do we develop partnership and how do we support students in being effective partners, particularly as it relates to research on teaching and learning?

To understand that, I looked back at my own experience as an undergraduate researcher and my graduate training. This is where I did my research. This is just right beside UBC, you have TRIUMF, Canada's national facility for particle of nuclear physics. I conducted research, collecting data here using a radioactive probe to investigate novel organocilicon materials, and I collect some data down here in the M20 beamline and up here in another beamline and sometimes over behind this wall is a third one where we recollect data. Looking at the space, it's a little daunting. To understand what makes it possible for a student to thrive in this environment and move all the way toward publishing, either co-authorship or even lead authorship.

So to investigate that, I want us to think a little about what's the difference between assistantship or apprenticeship. So take a moment and put in the chat, which of these words resonate to you or choose a word that resonates with you and indicate if you see it as associated with assistantship or partnership. As you're thinking and entering your ideas, I look at, for example, the word "power." And what do we mean by power? Do we mean authority? Do we mean shared power? That really changes the dynamic of the engagement between a faculty member and a student that they're working with. I see comments associated with equal footing, whereas assistantship seems that hierarchical structure with someone being a step

above and someone a step below. Trust and reciprocity being connected to both structures. Excellent. I see here a selection of goals, reciprocity, again, being important for partnership. It's valuable when you engage in the partnership, if that's your objective. To have this conversation, to share these words and explore what you are expecting from your partner and what they're expecting in that relationship. So they can understand the level of authority, ownership, and responsibility that you're seeking from it.

In my work, to create or to cultivate effective partnerships, I really followed these five elements. One is establishing realistic goals, starting with low stakes, while examining the big picture, because that ties back to the element of desire to have an impact to facilitate an appropriate training regime, or providing a support network, and then to engage in ongoing motivation and mentorship. As I mentioned, my background was doing radiation chemistry before I moved my research program into teaching and learning.

And this is an example of the electronics room connected to the beam control room where I'd be collecting data. Now, as a student researcher, I would look at this and it left me feeling a little daunted. Every time we had an experiment end and it switched to our beam week, my supervisor would go into this room, pull all the wires out and rewire the whole thing, that he understood what needed to go where for our experimental design. I appreciated that that was not a task assigned to me as a new researcher. Rather I would do things like sample preparation that I could help with other equipment setup under the supervision of a more experienced individual such as a PhD student or another faculty member that the goals and responsibilities assigned to me in executing the project were appropriate to the skill set that I had at that time and that over time, I could gain additional skills.

It was really tied to starting with that low stakes while understanding and engaging in conversations about the big picture with my research related to teaching and learning that my students, they'd have, they'd participate in designing the research project, but I still understood my responsibility as the faculty member to move the research ethics forward, that when we would engage in our data collection, that my students generally had not previously conducted research interviews. And so ensuring that we could talk through the design and intent of the interview, that we could do practice runs, that we could invite in someone as a simulation of an interview so that they could get some practice before we're collecting our data. And then once we were actually collecting data, they'd already moved through those low-stakes opportunities, had chances to fail and overcome that failure, while understanding the big picture that we were moving toward.

The third element is about facilitating that training regime, and Naufel at Georgia Southern University. They explored a different aspect of engaging in research experiences, focusing particularly on this element of ensuring that we design our research with students so that there is safety for the students involved in the project. In particular, there's three types of safety that are often neglected in our experimental designs.

The first is about physical safety. For example, one research study, the experimentalist wanted to understand if drivers would pass more closely to a cyclist, if that cyclist was wearing a helmet or not wearing a helmet. Did that change their behaviour? He collected his data by cycling on public roads and measured the distance at which cars passed, while wearing a helmet or not wearing a helmet. The means by which they were measuring the distance that the vehicle would come is they taped a measuring stick to the bicycle. Unfortunately, many drivers viewed that as a challenge and tried to see if they could hit that metre stick, which changed the experiment. Furthermore, the student researcher was struck by a vehicle twice before they had to change their design. Physical safety was extremely concerning in that initial design.

Then we can think about the next type, which is psychological safety. Oh, sorry, that says physiological, but psychological safety. An example of this. So researchers asked students to write about unpleasant experiences over four days, 20 minutes a day, and then they hired some research assistants who would type up the essays before they moved into data analysis. It seemed like a pretty harmless task. It was simple data transcription. While the first few narratives were interesting and provided a glimpse into someone else's thought processes, over that four-day period, the students began to write about more distressing things that had happened in their lives. And so medical scares, death, death of loved ones or highly violent experiences. As a result, the research assistants who were doing the transcription, were reading these and experiencing themselves the emotions that had been shared by the authors. As one transcriber had reported, they began to have nightmares as a result of this transcription process, and they weren't prepared for how to navigate those emotions.

The third area is social safety. So a research assistant described an experiment where their responsibility was to blend in with the study participants, that they were a plant within the process. Their role was to be a participant, playing a violent video game beside another participant. And so they would engage in socially unacceptable behaviours within the video game. And it was intended to observe how the other participants reacted to the plant's actions. Now, this research assistant reported feeling embarrassed at the tasks that they were asked to do, particularly, because he hadn't thought ahead before engaging in the research, that some of the studied participants would be his classmates. And he was worried that they were viewing him differently after the experiment, not understanding that he was actually engaging in playing out a research script. This is a situation where a simple debriefing session might have actually resolved the concerns and ensured that that student wasn't impacted beyond the study itself. Due to these different types of safety issues, Naufel has recommended that researchers adopt an RA bill of rights. And so it contains 10 articles that promote an informed safe and ethical environment for research assistants. Some of them as an example, Article 6 is that research assistants should be trained before being entrusted with research duties. An appropriate training environment requires that we understand what are the outcomes of the project. What skills does the student already have and what do they need?

For this work, I've developed a research learning plan, and I've shared that template as part of the materials that you can look at through the Invite link. It's a written document And in the

document, we explicitly are going to identify what are the duties of my research partner. What are their existing strengths and what are their training needs? This isn't something that I prepare and hand to the student, rather it's a negotiated plan that we have the conversation. We can have that conversation around what's the big picture of the project? What exactly is the data that we're going to be collecting, what is your responsibility in this partnership? And what are you already good at? What are you feeling comfortable with versus what training do you need? Who's going to deliver that training? We negotiate that training plan and understand, is this that you need to go complete an online module, such as the TCPS 2 Ethics module? Do you need to go meet with a university librarian for some training, or is it that I need to directly provide some training to you for your success? Along with that, we have the negotiated outcomes plan. I like to identify timelines of when I'm looking for an outcome to be achieved. Obviously, it's a living document, so we can return to it and have those conversations about how are we responding to the unexpected things that always happened with research. But still, having initial timelines that we set for our objectives allows us to ensure that I'm not feeling frustrated and that they aren't feeling overly burdened because they know what deadlines are coming up throughout that partnership. Finally, if the research experience is attached to course credit, then I like to ensure that we append to the document the grading scheme. Again, we've tied the conversation and the responsibilities to the assessment.

The fourth element is providing a support network. So I've worked with students where I've got one student in my research team and I've worked where I've got eight students in my team, and I find that it's really valuable when I have multiple students who are working on different projects, but they can bounce ideas off one another. They can really support one another in navigating that learning experience. This is particularly important as you think of either international students, students who have moved to the university from other places, and that's often common in graduate studies, where their normal social network has been disrupted geographically by their movement to the university. Ensuring that they have a research support network, often that creates a personal support network as well.

Then the fifth element is to continue engaging in your efforts to motivate and mentor the students. For example, here, I've got two of my students presenting at a conference where we had a project that was joined with other faculty members from the University of California Davis, as well as the University of Illinois Springfield. It was great to be able to ensure that my students are building those relationships with students and faculty at other universities to travel to present that work as a larger team, and to draw upon those relationships for their success. Both of these students have now gone on to earn their masters. One is now in medical school, and the other one is working on her PhD. Knowing that we were able to establish that love of research, even in their undergraduate work and have these two students be lead authors on a shared publication, really stands to me as an example of what we can achieve.

Many of these ideas are applicable in all areas of research that students as partners structure can be effective across the academy. It's particularly popular in areas of research related to teaching and learning. When we think about teaching and learning research, we're often

engaging in research that is multidisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, or interdisciplinary. There's dialogue across boundaries. That creates challenges, both for the students who are engaging in the work, as they have to not only develop expertise within the disciplinary traditions of their field, but they have to be able to navigate the traditions of other disciplines within the academy as they're engaging in their research. This is also true for faculty, as we try to read the literature and often there's a misinterpretation of what another research team has done in their project or their motivations because we don't understand the underlying theory that has driven that experimental design or the research design.

We do see tension within the field of SoTL, the scholarship of teaching and learning. At times, within a peer-review process, I'll see in my work as editor and chief of the Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, that reviewers might respond with comments such. In other words, they might say, you did your study wrong, which isn't useful peer feedback and often is more reflective of the fact that the reviewer doesn't understand the intended design or underlying theory behind the study. The causes of this conflict are the varied methodologies across the disciplines and those foundational differences in research paradigms. The consequences that we're experiencing is there's a lack of viewpoint diversity. There are dominant narratives within the field. In some cases, researchers in certain fields feel excluded from engaging in research and teaching and learning. In one case, Potter and Raffoul identify that SoTL is an abusive relationship as a humanities researcher because many in the community use social science methodologies and expect that to be considered the gold standard. That's not really the intention.

When we engage in the dissemination of SoTL, we do have clear criteria and they come from Glassick. It's clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, and significant results. Effective presentation and a reflective critique. That really sets a broad perspective of how we identify good scholarship. Then we apply that scholarship related to teaching and learning. As we select the strategies will employ within our study design, it's important that we recognize that SoTL is a field that is methodologically and philosophically pluralist, that we are all coming together with our own disciplinary traditions and learning to navigate in this space, gaining the benefits of seeing how other fields approach teaching and learning as well as research on teaching and learning. For myself, I've learned a lot about how nurses, psychologists, and business engage in research through my work in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Our objective here is really to think about how do we help those new entrants. Students that we're seeking to partner with or faculty who are seeking to engage in research on teaching and learning, and they were trained in disciplinary knowledge, and now they're moving into a new space and how do they navigate that new space to engage in a meaningful way? How do we support the more established scholars as well who may not be familiar with your disciplinary traditions and why you think differently than them. To guide a more successful engagement we have principles of great practice in the scholarship of teaching and learning. These originally come from Peter Felton, who wrote a paper in 2013 on principles of good practice, and he identified five practices that we had inquiry for SoTL is focused on student learning. It's grounded in context and it's methodologically sound. It should be conducted in partnership

with learners and that goes back to those models, the engagement spectrum for how we can work with students. Finally, your dissemination should be appropriately public. That it's important that we share our results beyond our individual classroom or context. To transform this into great practice, Melanie Hamilton and I have recommended one additional principle, and that's the explicit identification of your scholarly lands so that others can better appreciate where you're coming from in your design. For me, again, what's my origin?

I started working at a particle accelerator in my first year of university and then continued doing that right through my PhD. This apparatus here, it's got Jean Brodovitch's name on it. That's one of the faculty that I worked with. He designed this piece of equipment, where as an undergraduate researcher and then again, through my grad studies, I would often disassemble this, take off the snout, change my sample at the end, reattach the snout. Pull out all the air in there so that we add a vacuum. Take this and insert it here underneath the magnet so that we could have positive mulons, strike our sample. They would decay into daughter positrons, which would strike our light tube and go to a photomultiplier tube and eventually be counted as data, 10 million data points in an hour. That is not subjective research. An understanding that much of my origin and my research identity is rooted in an understanding that if I'm in a good mood or if I'm in a bad mood, the muon is going to have the same probability of behaviour. And so the objective nature of this research was foundational to the way I initially viewed knowledge.

But in my work in teaching and learning, I needed to understand that others engage in research in a very different way. Moving from quantitative research to qualitative research, going from our students selecting the right answer to how our students selecting their answer allowed me to think deeply about the nature of truth and knowledge, and how we organize that and group ourselves within the academy.

This is why Melanie and I encourage you to declare your research paradigm in your research, because it makes it more accessible to others. Identifying your philosophical lens will clarify for yourself your assumptions and your beliefs that are shaping your study and allows you to make those overt connections between your framework, methodology, methods, results and conclusions. As you think about your context, the populations that you're working with, it connects to the design, the intended outcomes of your study, and your world view, your philosophical lens. This is about ensuring that your editors, readers, and reviewers have a better understanding of what you hope to be the message of your study. To do this, there's two ideas that come from philosophy that I'll encourage you to look into further, but I'll just briefly share them.

The first is ontology, which examines our perception of reality. It applies to both the natural world and to social structures. It essentially prompts us to ask, What do we consider to be real? How do we perceive and understand the nature of the world and is reality best viewed as objective or subjective? Where I've come to is that it depends on the question you're asking, which is the best approach. Connected to your ontology is your epistemology. This is an area of

philosophy that's interested in understanding what is knowledge. How do we obtain it? How do we validate it? The answer, the ways that we organize our thinking around knowledge is shaped by our perception of reality. It also will impact how our research findings should be used. Often the challenge that we see in academic research is where a researcher has not been explicit about their ontology, their epistemology, and then they attempt to apply their findings beyond a reasonable realm of how those findings should be shaped by the rules of their philosophical lens. As we engage with students in research, it's important that we have these conversations because for myself, in all of my academic training, I had never heard the terms ontology or epistemology. Rather in my field, it was, this is the right way to do research without a good explanation of why.

These approaches really are about supporting all learners, whether it's talking about working with students in undergraduate or graduate programs or faculty members who have disciplinary training and are now seeking to move into the scholarship of teaching and learning. We at TRU, we run programs to support faculty in that transition, developing expertise in research methodologies that they didn't gain during graduate training and learning how to read literature that is beyond the traditions that they're familiar with.

And so always happy to have a conversation if you're interested more about what my team is doing in terms of great practices associated with the scholarship of teaching and learning and supporting faculty and students and working together as partners. Thank you. Happy to have any questions that you have.

LEVA:
Yeah, we welcome some questions. Thank you, Brett. People can either type in the chat or hold up your hand. That was very interesting, Brett, thank you very much. I gave us some really great ideas about how we can support students in mentorship, which is an area that BCcampus we're very interested in. So great thoughts. You have to think a lot about the ontology and epistemology, though, I have to say. And what our perspectives are and how that applies.

BRETT: I agree.

LEVA: I want to mention waiting to see if there's any more questions. Any questions is that we do have a survey that we'd like to invite you to give us some feedback on our Research Speaker Series, and will help us a lot in the planning for our future sessions. Oh we have a question here. Thank you. Manisha says, "What is the best way to train students so they can be authentic partners in research?"

BRETT:
Yeah. I think having those conversations early about what it is that you and the student are both hoping to attain as a result of the partnership is really key because often I'd find my motivation might be to move toward a publication. And the student's motivation might be just to engage in research. They didn't mind what was the project that they were working on. They

just wanted an opportunity to work with a faculty member to develop some skills. If I understand what they're looking for in that partnership, I have a better sense of how I can support them and move toward the objectives that I'm hoping for from the partnership so that we both feel like it was a useful productive relationship. Once I've had that conversation, that's where I like to use the template that I've shared, the research training document because it allows us to formalize that relationship and to have conversations about what training they need, including whether or not we need to have conversations around epistemology and ontology of the research that we're doing.

LEVA: And just a reminder to everyone. We will be sending out the recording as well as the resources. So the materials, I guess, the worksheet that Brett is referring to can be included.

BRETT: I'm happy to show that here. That's helpful.

LEVA: Another follow-up question is, "Are your sessional instructors also researchers?" From Manisha

BRETT:
We do have sessional instructors who engage in research. In the same way we aim to support them in terms of the work that they're doing, particularly if they're engaging with students. They're welcome to engage with us in the centre to gain some training on how to best work with students as partners.

LEVA:
Any other questions? I just wanted, my last thing is just a little bit of news from BCcampus, which is that there is a Call for Research Fellows on right now that's been open. It closes in the beginning of June. If those of you here may be interested or know someone who's interested in our Research Fellows Program, please take a look at our website bccampus.ca, and the call will be listed there. Also, there is a Roadshow coming up April 30 to May 7, and we're going to Northern B.C. around UNBC and colleges in the area, so catch some of the programming there. Also, Brett, maybe you want to put in a word for your conference in Kamloops.

BRETT:
Yeah. In May, we have the Thompson Okanagan Teaching and Learning Conference, and so we'd love for you to join us. Registration for the conference will open up on April 1. I'll just grab the weblink I'll grab the weblink to share with you. And so we are excited to welcome everybody into the Okanagan. Last year, it was at UBCO and this year, we're hosting at Thompson Rivers University. We have a great speaker lined up. My collaborator, Melanie Hamilton, will be speaking about engaging in the scholarship of teaching and learning and scholarly teaching in order to advance our efforts at the institutional level of great teaching and learning experiences.

LEVA:
Thank you, Brett. I guess we can give people a few minutes before lunch if there are no more questions. Thank you very much for your participation today, and thank you so much to our presenter, Dr. Brett McCollum, and we'll see you again on another future Research Speaker Series.