Transcript for The PRISM Framework as Multi-Institutional Strategy
BCcampus FLO Friday webinar recorded on November 7, 2025
Panelists: Anita Chaudhuri, Jannik Eikenaar, Jennifer Walsh Marr, Jing Li, Jordan Stouck, Naeem Nedaee, Ru Yao, Steve Marshall
Host: Helena Prins

ANITA CHAUDHURI:
Thank you so much for joining us for this workshop in collaboration with BCcampus. Very excited for this partnership. This workshop on the PRISM Framework as Multi-Institutional Strategy is part of our Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada-funded project on Plurality, Linguistic Justice, and Decolonization.

And I begin today with the territorial acknowledgment, and we respectfully acknowledge the Syilx Okanagan Nation and their peoples in whose traditional ancestral unceded territory, UBC Okanagan is situated. I also recognize that all of you are joining us from near and far and welcome you to share your territorial acknowledgment using Zoom chat. I have here with me some wonderful colleagues.

I am Anita Chaudhuri, of course, associate professor of teaching at the Department of English and Cultural Studies, University of British Columbia's Okanagan campus. Dr. Jordan Stouck joins me. She's the head and professor of teaching at the Department of English and Cultural Studies at UBC Okanagan. Dr. Steve Marshall is a professor at the Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University, and Dr. Jing Li is lecturer with the School of Engineering at UBC's Okanagan campus. I'm also happy to have our graduate and undergraduate research assistants join us this morning, named Naeem Nedaee, Ru Yao, Harper Kerstens, and Marcus Hobkirk.

Next, I wanted to just bring up a little bit of a backdrop with the project, the SCHRCC project that we are working on. Briefly speaking, we are really looking at linguistic equity in first year writing classrooms. We are attempting as a team to map a multi-dimensional Canadian experience on linguistic justice and decolonization so with the project and in our attempt to advance conversation on linguistic justice or linguistic equity. In the summer of 2025, we organized a speaker series, and briefly we'll soon share our project, our website link with you. But we invited Canadian researchers who spoke on the topic and some of those recordings are available on our site, and in speaking to them, we began to recognize teaching and assessment approaches that would value multilingual and multicultural perspectives. Our hope is to build measures in research and pedagogy to advance equity, inclusion, and integrity in multilingual student experience in first year writing classrooms. Now bring it back to the workshop, this workshop for today, and we are planning to develop in some measure, foundational knowledge and match the PRISM Framework to design activities that are culturally and linguistically responsive. We hope to further understanding of linguistic diversity and justice possibilities when responding to student writing and finally, reflect on the PRISM Framework as a research-based frame to relation, professional identities, and to rethink our practice.

We have invited talks from Dr. Steve Marshall and Ru Yao, Dr. Jannik Eikenaar, who is the academic director of the Centre for Teaching and Learning and associate professor of Teaching at the School of Engineering at UBC Okanagan and Jennifer Walsh Marr, who is a lecturer at UBC Vantage College, with the three invited speakers taking the conversation forward, we hope that the engagement brings your ideas and perspectives and that we are able to include and incorporate them as part of the PRISM Framework. And therefore, I wanted to mention that after each speaker we'll take a moment to stop and reflect and take your questions. So we'll have the 5 minutes, approximately 5 minutes after each speaker, to take on a few questions and, of course, time at the end of today's session to take on a few more questions. This session, of course, is being recorded as Helena mentioned, and you are welcome to engage with us further as we move ahead with the project. With that, I'm going to hand it over to my colleague Jing to talk more about the PRISM Framework.

JING LI:
Thank you, Anita. Thank you, everyone, for joining us today. Before turning it over to our guest speakers, let me take a moment to introduce the PRISM Framework and give you a quick introduction to our website.

So as Anita mentioned, the PRISM Framework really emerged from our ongoing conversation on how teaching and assessment approaches truly reflect and value linguistic equity and justice and decolonizing perspectives. Four facets of the PRISM Framework were to position multilingual students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds as an asset rather than deficit. So our goal of developing this new framework is really to advance both theoretical and practical understandings of linguistic equity in university writing classrooms and also to support diverse perspectives and lived experiences of linguistic justice and decolonization in writing classroom in the Canadian context. Here, I keep talking about mentioning the concept of linguistic justice. Maybe it's important for us to understand what this concept is really about.

When we talk about linguistic justice, we are talking about valuing all languages and varieties as equally, legitimate, and meaningful. For instance, this could mean seeing a student's Mandarin-influenced English, Punjabi phrasing, or Caribbean rhythm of speech, not as errors to correct, but as expressions of identity and knowledge. Linguistic justice really asks us to move away from the idea that only one kind of English, one accent is correct. Instead, it invites us to recognize multilingualism and multiculturalism as an asset and urges us to critically examine the biases that have long privileged standard academic English. The idea is to affirm students' right to use their own language and the dialects as part of who they are, not something to hide or fix. In this sense, linguistic justice calls us to reimagine our classrooms, not as a basis for repairing or fixing language, but as spaces for acknowledging plural voices and understanding how power shapes whose language gets valued and whose doesn't. This is particularly relevant in Canadian higher education where immigrant, multilingual, and international students bring rich linguistic repertoires that are too often measured against monolingual norms. So coming back to the framework, since the public speaker series this summer, past summer, our team has been working to synthesize key insights, gather resources, and refine the framework. The PRISM

Framework now integrates learning from our presenters, scholarly dialogues, and classroom practices.

It offers both theoretical grounding and practical tools for educators and practitioners who want to design culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and assessments. And we use the idea of a PRISM, like a PRISM that refracts light into multiple colors. This framework reveals how linguistic justice is not one dimensional. It's refracted through plurality, visual linguistics, Indigenous knowledges and social justice, the four facets of the framework. And each facet not only highlights a different lens of equity, but also offers an entry point for reflection and action. Together, they form an integrated framework educators and writing instructors can use to inform curriculum design, classroom dialogue, and institutional policy. We have been working on developing the PRISM Framework website, IP scan the QR code and navigate the website. You will see each of the four facets. Under each of the four facets, there is a concise summary and conceptual overview. There are theoretical stances drawn from our speakers and key scholars in the field, and there are also sample teaching practices that translate these ideas into classroom activities, as well as recommended resources for further exploration. So ultimately, PRISM is both a theoretical lens and also a practical tool set. It helps educators recognize how language, identity, and justice intersect in every classroom interaction. This is an ongoing project as we continue to refine the framework, or hope is that it will inspire and inform educators to design learning experiences that truly reflect the plurality of teaching and learning in writing classrooms.

So with that foundation in mind, today's workshop is an opportunity to see how these ideas take shape in practice. And as you participate, everyone participates in today's workshop and engages with our guest speakers. I would invite you to think about what would work in your educational context, and what would you use and what would you like more information on?

Without further ado, let me first invite our speakers, Dr. Steve Marshall and Yao Ru to share their insights on plurilingualism. Again, as we engage in today's workshop, I want to invite you to keep in mind those guiding questions. If you'd like to share your thoughts, ask questions, please leave them in chat. We'll have a brief Q&A after each presentation. Hand it over to you, Steve and Ru.

RU YAO:
Thank you, Jing, for your excellent explanation and thank you, everyone, for coming to our session. My name is Ru. I am a PhD student from Simon Fraser University. I'll present the plurilingulism part with my supervisor, Steve, and I'll begin by briefly introducing the concept of plurilingualism. Plurilingualism comes from the Common European Framework of Reference, CEFR. On this slide, we see six defining features of plurilingualism, and I'll go through them quickly. First, use of multiple languages in interactions. This means learners often shift between languages in natural conversation or learning. For example, combining English and Mandarin in a study group. Second, languages as hybrid rather than discrete. That is because languages are not separate systems; they overlap, mix, and influence one another in practice. Third,

plurilingual or pluricultural competence as uneven. This means most learners don't have equal skills across all their languages. They may write formally in English, but prefer another language for discussion. Fourth, plurilingual or plurilcultural competence as changing. This means language reporters evolve with contacts, experiences, and needs, and students may strengthen or lose their abilities over time. Fifth, the plurilingual speaker as a social agent. This means learners actively use their languages to navigate academic culture and social spaces. Six, mediation. Students use one language to help themselves or peers understand another, such as translating in a study group or explaining a concept across languages. Together, these features highlight why plurilingualism matters in higher education. It affirms students for linguistic reporters as resources rather than the fix. I'll hand it over to Steve.

STEVE:
Thank you. What we're going to do now is we're going to look at some excerpts of data from several different studies that we've carried out in Western Canada that I've carried out with different researchers and research teams. They're really representing those six characteristics of plurilingualism in different ways. When we look at them, I'd like you to think about their meaning, particularly in terms of an inclusive classroom. Who is included, and how does language play a role in our understanding of this inclusion? I'd like you to look here at an excerpt from two students, Ivan and Yi. They're in an academic writing class and they're working together on a task, which is looking at how to change and improve style in academic writing. Please have a look at what you see and think about what's going on there. If you have any observations about it, please put your comments in the chat. I'll just leave it for 10 or 20 seconds. Let's look at the translation. What's going on here is this is an example of students using multiple languages, mixing languages quite freely in the learning process. What we found in our research is that there's often a very plurilingual process in the stages of creating the final monolingual product. The question here is that this is an example of plurilingualism. It's two students mixing English and Chinese as they're learning. The important thing here is that looking at if you're an English instructor and you don't understand what they're talking about, you can see here that they're using their language as a tool for learning. It's a resource to engage with the content. The other thing to think about here is why are they using Chinese in this way in the class? Is it because their English isn't good enough? In this case, no, both of these students spent many years in school in Canada, it's because they choose to. So we've got a comment from Victoria. They refer to academic writing always in English. To me, this means that academic writing is a concept that's tied to English for these students. Definitely, the interesting point that you raise is that the end goal is academic English. They must perform in that powerful hegemonic code of the institution, but they use languages other than English to negotiate meaning. From Celinda, code switching seems natural to these speakers, perhaps a reflection from their home life too. That's another great observation. Thank you, that this may indeed be how they use languages at home but also in their peer groups.

Let's move on to the next slide. So not everyone that we've worked with across these different universities, spaces where we're doing the research, not everyone is happy to have a class made up of students speaking multiple languages that they don't understand. Let me tell you a

bit about Raj. Raj is a well- established professor teaching a first year lab in Applied Sciences. The students are working together to create a circuit board that can perform certain technical functions. We went into the class and there were lots of different languages being spoken during the class observation, and we interviewed Raj after. Please have a look at the excerpt. What we have here is Raj saying that he goes and tells students to speak in English. He's discouraging them from using any languages other than English. But he says, of course, as soon as he disappears, they revert back to speaking and mixing other languages. What's interesting for us is when we delve deeper into these interactions with colleagues across the university, we try to, respectfully, dialogue with them. We learned quite a lot of interesting things. It would seem here that Raj is really promoting the English- only classroom, the typical historical monolingual lens of university learning. But at the same time, we learnt that Raj did this for a reason. Raj's concern was that for these students in applied sciences, this was specifically engineering, the workplace is looming large. Raj told us that he was really concerned that these students, if they go to do a work co-op or in their future careers, they're not going to be able to communicate engineering knowledge effectively in the workplace and that could have real repercussions for them. He encourages only English in his classes to actually give his students an advantage for the future in his mind, and at the same time, he employs plurilingual teaching assistants. In this class, they were teaching assistants who spoke Chinese, Farsi, and Korean. These students in the English only environment, they go around helping and quietly engaging in different languages at the same time. It's a really complex space. So even though Raj would appear like a dissenter, he shows a lot of let's say reflexivity about how languages are being used.

Let's move to the next slide. Thank you. This is another class. This is a linguistics class, second year linguistics class, I believe, if I remember correctly. With this class, what we did is one of the research assistants went into the class, got to know the students, sat with them, and did a typical ethnographic immersion in the learning environment, really pretty much a participant observer. And when we go into these classes, we leave recording devices on the desks and tables because we really like to see how students are communicating. Two students here are talking about aspects of linguistics and phonetics, which I personally don't understand, unboundedness, exhaustedness, extrametric, etc. But what's really interesting for me is the highlighted areas. The first one is in English only headedness of something is left-headed. I assume that's to do with the linear aspect of language. Then the next interaction by Chen is mixing Chinese and English. There's an English term inserted into the Chinese utterance. Then in the third one, Chen is speaking Chinese only. This is really interesting from a linguistic perspective, how does this happen? How is it structured? When do they use which language, etc. But in applied linguistics or educational sociolinguistics or in the field of education and the field that we're working with it, we're more interested in the reasons why this happens rather than how it's structured.

On the next slide, we can see some responses from interviews. So after the class, we interviewed students and we asked them, why aren't you using English to study? This is really interesting to understand the role that the languages other than English play in the class in

terms of including these students. We can see highlighted here, it improves our studies. They also talk about study groups above. In the study group, we also use mandarin to discuss problems. It creates a sense of closeness. It's easier for understanding each other. The next one was really interesting. In a group discussion, if I sit with native speakers, I feel stress, I can't catch up with them. I feel more comfortable, more confident, it helps my study. What we see is that the use of languages other than English when it's given a space for learning in these classes is actually something that not only helps students with learning key course content, but also it helps their sense of belonging, their sense of safety and comfort in the learning spaces. We'll go through the comments in the chat at the end. When Ru was defining plurilingualism according to the Common European Framework of Reference earlier, 0.6 was mediation. As Ru stated, mediation takes place when in interactions, there are gaps in comprehension. On one level, this is just translating and helping people understand in groups where different languages are taking place. But on another level, it's also when individuals act as mediators to engage with course content when there are gaps in understanding. Ashley was the same instructor for the linguistics class that I showed you above, and she told us I suddenly noticed that students of the same language background tend to sit together. Sometimes I hear them talking to each other in mostly Mandarin. I've definitely had students come to office hours in pairs or groups where one is a translator for the rest, which is interesting. Students having study groups in their native language seems reasonable to me. One of them gets a concept a little bit better and can help explain it to the others. That seems great. However, Ashley also expressed a real concern that she has. This is really the key tension in a lot of plurilingualism-inspired educational pedagogies, let's call them that, is that her concern was that will these students be able to translate this knowledge that they're negotiating in languages other than English in academic English for their assessments. Her question was, is it beneficial for them to pass the course and get good grades? To be using languages other than English in the learning process. I don't have an answer to that question, but that's part of the complex situation that we're looking at. Okay, I think we're ready to go to the next slide.

That's really just been a taster of some of the issues, some of the data that we come across in these research projects. We have instructors who actively embrace plurilingualism and diversity in their classes and we have others who try to rein it in. But not necessarily rejecting the use of languages other than English all the time, but trying to figure out ways to allow and encourage language use that's good for everyone. What are the implications of what we've been talking about for practice in higher education? Well, there are many implications and we could talk about these in a 4 or 5-hour session. But we've put down a few questions to consider. The first one if we're instructors, should we tolerate, encourage, or discourage students' use of languages other than English in our classes? Is it always beneficial for us to create these plurilingual friendly spaces in our classes? Some colleagues feel that this is doing students a disservice if we're encouraging everyone to use English. After all, English is the medium of instruction of the university. There's a real tension there. Next question, does it matter if instructors and students don't understand all of the languages being used in their classes? Is this taking inclusion too far? The issue here is sometimes instructors, but also students have said, sometimes I'm a bit uncomfortable in the class because we've got groups of students

speaking this language and that language, and I'm on my own or I'm with a couple of other students. We don't have I only speak English or my language, there's no one else who speaks it in the class. I feel that this is excluding me from the group learning experience. The question is, should we draw a line somewhere? Is it a moving line? How can we facilitate and encourage inclusion for everyone under this framework of plurilingualism and the broader PRISM Framework? Because there are classroom realities that we always have to take into account. In what context can we accept partial competence in our teaching and assessment? Are we looking for native speaker level competence in academic English? Should instructors proactively or reactively respond to linguistic diversity in classes, and how can they do this? I think we've got around 4 minutes, 3 or 4 minutes for questions. I'll hand it over to Jordan, who's going to look after the Q&A.

JORDAN STOUCK:
Sure. Thank you so much, Ru and Steve and I see there have been a couple of great comments in the chat which Ru and Steve have already picked up on, but please feel free to contribute others. Perhaps to get this started, I can add a thought. Since I have recently taken on some administrative roles, I've been thinking about how some of these issues might, you know, are intertwined, I guess, is a way of putting it with administrative aspects. And I know some of the instructors I talked to have concerns about doing their job and preparing students for next stages of their education and of course, you know, how administrative oversight might impact that. I don't know if Steve or Ru you might have more to say about that sense of, I guess, responsibility that instructors feel in moving the plurilingual conversation forward.

STEVE:
So I can start off the response to that. The instructors we've worked with are so different. We've had instructors saying, Look, I'm not an ESL teacher, I'm not doing anything related to language. This is a content course. We've always got the distinction between language and content, which has different representations in a biology class than in a world literature class, for example. We've also engaged with instructors who think that students in their class, if they're not using English, they're losing out on the chance to become proficient English speakers. But often they don't realize that these students who are speaking, I don't know, Chinese or Korean or Punjabi, they were born in Canada or they've done 10 years of school in Canada, so it's not a matter that they cannot speak English. It's often a matter of they choose not to for numerous reasons. The first thing is really from administrative perspectives and working with instructors and trying to give guidelines and advice. It's so complex the sociolinguistic situation in our classes that our roles as administrators is to respectfully engage with colleagues and try to not necessarily educate them but have discussions about the meanings and the reasons for what's going on in their classes and advise them on how they might want to respond to it. But I would never go against or look down on instructors who say, we're only using English in this class. Use your languages other than English outside of the classroom. That's their decision, that's their academic space, but I would tell them why I think it's wrong, respectfully. It's a dialogic, ongoing discussion, but we have to be respectful. We can't really as applied linguists or educationalists, or English language and literature and culture

experts, we can't go in and say this is the way to do it because people have reasons for doing things in their own way.
JORDAN:
Thank you. I appreciate that idea of having these conversations at the administrative level as well as the instructor level. I don't see any further questions at this point.

STEVE:
Oh, sorry. I just want to raise one final thing about Celinda's comment about code switching seeming natural to these speakers. So just one theoretical issue that's in the field of plurilingual education is that, there's the argument that code switching suggests that these languages are separate and discrete and people are moving between separate languages. Whereas the plurilingual perspective, suggests that this type of language use is more hybrid-like translanguaging, and what I find in the data collection is that it can be both. That's my final comment. Thank you.

JORDAN:
Thanks, Steve. I actually see Celinda has put another comment in suggesting, I wonder if faculty could take a UDL approach. For example, the language of instruction is English. But when in pairs, groups, or solo work, students could be free to choose the language they prefer for best communication to ensure cohesion shares could be done in English for the whole class understanding.

STEVE:
That's a fantastic comment because one of the things that I do in my work with colleagues across the different disciplines is I talk about creating plurilingual spaces. Sure, you're using only English for most of the class, but you've got a rich resource of other languages, give them 10 minutes to arrange themselves as they like and to discuss key concepts in any language they like, and then space to translate it back to everyone. That's a really good comment and I fully agree and it's something that we actually work on promoting. Great comment from Celinda for us to end on and to hand over to the next speaker. Thank you.

JORDAN: Thank you.

ANITA:
Okay, thank you so much. We are turning the PRISM and looking at another facet here really briefly, but moving from plurilingualism to raciolinguistic perspectives is not a complete break, but rather something that we take the considerations of the different students, the diversity that sits in our classroom, the UDL approach that you mentioned, and utilizing it also to consider how race and language are interrelated. So with the consideration towards raciolinguistic perspectives, we are together, thinking about how the PRISM lens can be utilized to address the discomfort or the uncomfortable quietude of marginalized voices. I take from what Steve just mentioned in terms of students who choose not to for numerous reasons, speak in a certain language at a certain point in time or in discussions, they could switch into

certain other languages and choose to maybe replenish themselves, just, you know, from the expectations of speaking and performing academic English or the very many other reasons that they are moving and laying low on the use of English and what that means from how they occupy spaces in the classroom, really. Can we allow marginalized voices in the writing classrooms to feel that space, that conceptualization of safe space so that diversity and social cultural experiences, their individual histories, their individual and community practices can come to the fore and can become part of the classroom dialogue. This facet of linguistic perspective, of course, aligns very well with Elim's work in, in this area, which recognizes and I quote "a racialization as a process of socialization in and through language as a continuous project of becoming as opposed to being." So in being part of our classrooms, can we allow within our pedagogical practices room for people to come in and inform us how they learn better and the experiences that they have carried and learned through their lives to become part of the learning process as well. Now, how would we strategize such a diverse mix of experiences? How would we utilize this diversity as a privilege as something we can utilize towards the learning towards the core syllabus that we have put into practice. Some of the things I mentioned here are really recognizing racial identity, their perceptions, personal and emotional experiences of teachers, and not just students to see how those influence pedagogy. Really highlighting on the fact that we as individuals, we go in as instructors or come in as teaching assistants, students, and we carry along with us this body of this body of experience, but this body of knowledge as well that ties in that we are quite able to transfer from one course to another, from one, you know, experience in the community into another space and learn together. So can we create assignments and think about leaving a bit of room for that individuality to come together and how? So therefore, in selection of material that could show, in our assessment practices, we allow room for that dialogic moment to come alive. And that's where linguistic or raciolinguistic perspective, in particular, comes to the fore, where there is a sense of harmony that we are attempting at may not be successful at every point or every classroom, but we are performing with the agenda with the recognition that there are these differences that we can perhaps bring to fore. Jordan, did you want to talk about Sara Humphrey's work really briefly? JORDAN: Sure. Thank you, Anita. Yes, I'd like to also draw people's attention to the work that Dr. Sarah Humphreys and her team have recently done at the University of Victoria in thinking through writing and power relating to some of the issues that Anita was just mentioning and particularly in relation to Canadian institutions where we haven't had some of these position statements in the way that have existed in the US through the Four Seas, for example. So the link on this slide, which of course, you'll be receiving connects to their policy document, which talks about supports for writing and instruction and changing perceptions, particularly in relation to writing faculty who are sometimes precariously employed and therefore, that sort of limits their ability to make change. I'd also like to draw your attention to the work of Angelica Golante who's linked in our website, and Angelica's work really asks us to rethink how we understand language and power around some administrative decisions like entrance requirements that are based on linguistic proficiency and also around support and funding for multi and plurilingual students. And so two really valuable sets of research. Okay. I think we are ready for our next speaker, though.

ANITA:
So I'm going to hand it over to you, Jannik here. So we bring in the Indigenous world views into play as well, so Jannik over to you.

JANNIK EIKENAAR:
Thank you, and thanks for the opportunity. I think I'm bringing a different kind of work into the discussion here and I'm actually quite very much looking forward to any of the comments or questions that might come out of this. A little bit of introduction and context. So, I teach in the School of Engineering at UBC Okanagan. I'm not an engineer. I come out of humanities, so in the school, I'm a little bit of maybe an intruder, so I have a slightly different perspective on engineering education and I work quite closely with Jing, who I think shares that perspective, and it's been a wonderfully productive partnership. I'm going to talk about a specific curricular initiative, focusing on a program and a course, and the curricular initiative started before, actually, if you can just hold back on that previous slide for a second. I'm sorry. Thank you. The curricular initiative started before I became aware of the PRISM work and it's just been a wonderful opportunity for me to rethink what I'm doing, what my colleagues are doing, and note the points of alignment and opportunity they are occurring. As a little bit of explanation of this slide. The big red E is a symbol of the engineering students. The big red E sits across from the engineering building on our campus. It was designed, built, and eventually moved by students, and it used to just stay red as a symbol of the Engineering Student Union. In the last few years though, that's changed, it changes colour throughout the year. In December it's painted white. You can see that in the middle photo and it's painted white as part of the National Day for recognizing and I need to make sure I get this correct, the National Day of Remembrance and Action on Violence Against Women. It's part of the December 6 remembrance there. In September, we painted orange and we painted orange as a symbol of our commitment and support for the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation. I just want to point out one more thing about the big E and its changing colours is that if you look closely, you can actually see four letters inscribed in the concrete below the E. They are E R T W. This used to be the slogan of the UBC engineers. Engineers rule the world. And I'm optimistic that that has changed. I think it remains there as a reminder, but I do want to connect back to that and what that means for maybe the curricular initiative that we're pursuing just because I don't think we actually are still working in that mindset. So if we could go to the next slide now, that'd be great. Thank you.

So by way of a little bit of context here, the engineering undergraduate program, as many of you will know, is an accredited program. It's overseen by a national body, as well as a provincial body, and it is a path to professional licensure. I think that's important to remember when we're thinking about particular practice and identities and maybe as we rethink both the experiences of students and the instructors in the program. Undergraduate students specialize. They will take mechanical, civil, electrical, or other similar specializations, but there are core courses throughout the program, and that includes two communication courses. That's part of what I'm going to talk about here in a little bit more detail. The other curricular context that I want to highlight is that of the decolonizing or Indigenizing context here. We work from the

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Truth and Reconciliation Calls to Action, as well as the provincial legislation around the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. We also work within other contexts. Engineers and Geoscientists BC and Engineers Canada have both produced recommendations or guidelines around how engineers should engage with Indigenous communities in their practice. And at UBC and within the faculty of Applied Science and within the School of Engineering, we work with action plans and strategic documents. Those include UBC's Indigenous Strategic Plan and the faculties and the school's own Indigenous Engagement Plans. There's a lot of context that goes into the curricular initiative that I think might be on the next slide, if I remember correctly.

Yes. Okay. Thanks, Anita. Within the undergraduate engineering program, about 7 or 8 years ago, we designed this curricular pathway. The goal of the pathway is to support students' understanding of how and why to engage with Indigenous communities in Canada in the context of engineering practice. And here we mean study, research, and professional practice. Because the students have core courses, we were able to build this into almost every student's degree program. It starts in first year with a course on sustainable design, scaffolds into a second year course on technical communication that Jing and I actually both teach regularly, builds then into a third year course in project management and a fourth year course finally in law and ethics. I want to highlight some of the work done in that second year course, technical communication. If you go to the next slide.

The course, some of the learning outcomes here include being able to communicate ethically and effectively in a variety of situations, apply principles of intercultural communication, and collaborate effectively in communication contexts. As the course has developed over the last 10 years or so, one of the pieces that has gained more emphasis is something we call the Indigenous Community Communication Project or the ICCP. This is a team-based semi-fictional course project. It's semi-fictional because we make up a company and we assign the students a fictional project usually in the field of sustainable energy engineering. But we assign them an actual Indigenous community to research that they might then think about developing an engagement and communication strategy with. The goal of the project within this semi-fictional context is for the students to prepare their fictional company to engage with the community, including by developing a communication strategy. If we could go to the next slide,

I just want to sort of map out how the project started and what some of the engineering context was by highlighting those communication pieces. So many of you will be familiar perhaps with the consultation approach to engagement with Indigenous communities. This was not limited to engineering, but it certainly was a defining element of how engineers were expected to work with Indigenous communities. This is very much a checklist approach and it was a product of the federal government's fiduciary duty regarding Indigenous communities in the country. And again, as some of you may be familiar, this regularly failed, and it regularly failed for a number of reasons. But a couple of that I want to highlight here were that it was a very, very paternalistic approach, we might say, where engineering companies and engineers would approach Indigenous communities with an idea of how to help them or how to save

them or how to intervene and provide expertise and of course, that led to all kinds of spectacular failures even within this checkbox approach of consultation. That approach has shifted, and now there's a better understanding that this should be more of an engagement approach and obviously there are implications for communication there. The key idea here that we work with is this phrase, Nothing about us, without us. Which is, I think, very common in a number of equity-focused communication strategies, but particularly important in this one because it signals what is a crucial change in communication practice and engineering practice. That's a result of changing legal and ethical contexts both nationally and provincially and actually internationally as well as UNDRIP has become better understood. We work with our students to help them understand this shift in approach and the implications there for communication. But now we're also working with this idea of knowledge mobilization or how we might move past a decolonizing approach to an Indigenizing approach in this fictional project, but also within the larger curricular initiative. There I'm thinking about a couple of specific things. One is that idea of trying to incorporate Indigenous ways of knowing and being or Indigenous world views within our teaching and learning and what that might mean eventually for engineering study and practice. We're also working with this idea of building capacity. Building capacity here, I'm thinking of three different groups. One is within the students or the learners in our classes. How do we build capacity within that group to better understand the communication approaches that are required to mobilize knowledge and engage effectively with Indigenous communities. Another group that I'm thinking about is those Indigenous communities themselves. We're working with a cohort of Indigenous PhD students who are working towards capacity-building strategies within specifically First Nation communities in Alberta and British Columbia. There's an idea there of how we consider that and what that means for, again, our communication instruction. And finally, and this one is just as important is how do we build capacity within our instructor group? We know anecdotally and through some scholarship that one of the greatest barriers to this kind of approach, this shifting from decolonization to Indigenization, is instructor confidence and competence. So we're really strategically thinking about how to build capacity within that group to move forward.

One last slide, and I just want to share this as a specific example of how we might rethink identities and rethink practice within this alignment with the prior PRISM Framework. I have two images on screen. One is of Dr. Jeanette Armstrong, who is just an incredible resource and faculty member at UBC Okanagan. Dr. Armstrong's initial work was very much in the area of language, linguistics, and translation and interpretation, specifically with Syilx knowledge and language. The other image I have on screen is of a coiled fibre rope that is actually made from a plant that grows in this area. The reason that I have these images up is because I've learned through Dr. Armstrong that Syilx or the Syilx language, the Syilx people, the Syilx word actually can be translated as the ones who coil. Similarly, there is a word that roughly can be interpreted as a leader or a chief in some kind within the Syilx language, yilmixʷm, which can be “the one who coils” or “the one who brings together people to participate in this coiling.” I think this is a wonderful way into rethinking perhaps how communicators approach this kind of activity. We're working specifically within engineering education and practice, but I think there

are also broader implications for how we might then think through how we shift from decolonizing to Indigenizing our practices and the implications that might result. I'm going to stop there. I think I did okay for time, Anita, I hope so. But I do very much look forward to your comments or questions on this initiative.

JORDAN:
Thank you, Jannik. Thank you for that valuable case study on incorporating Indigenous perspectives, which of course is a third element of the framework. I just reposted the guiding questions for our workshop today and we'll take, as before, a few minutes for questions or thoughts, specifically for Jannik. As I was listening to your talk, I actually wondered if you could talk a little bit more about what specifically you do in 201 and what kind of assignments. I was just curious about the specifics.

JANNIK:
Yeah, thanks, Jordan, and I really appreciate the question. So the work we do in 201 builds on work that the students have done in their first year courses, both in the sustainable design course, where they do start to learn a little bit about alternatives to, sort of very Western European ideas of engineering design, and what it might mean to approach design differently through different world views and different practices. We also build on some work that we do around accessibility in communication in our first year communication course. And there we do some basic instruction on things like plain language, that idea of anticipating what knowledge mobilization could look like as they move through the program. Then within the second year course, we have both individual and team-based assessments or learning points. And there we'll do things like how best to use visual communication elements. We will do a lot of reflection on learning. So what might it mean to develop a communication strategy in working with an Indigenous community in the context of, for example, engineering guidelines, TRC Calls to Action, and perhaps even local imperatives that are implicit in things like Dr. Armstrong's work. The students are expected to both write and create sort of alternative media products. Some of them, depending on their classes and their instructors, will do presentations, others will put together short videos where they're capturing the work that's been done, and to me, one of the great things about this is we're constantly thinking about how best to support students' learning towards these kinds of outcomes. I think there was a previous comment in the chat that was aligned this way. It was the idea that we don't want to be too prescriptive in designing and assessing. Instead, we do want to create that flexibility within the approaches and the possibilities that we are reaching those outcomes in a more inclusive way. I hope that answered the question, Jordan.

JORDAN:
Yes, thank you. Victoria in the chat has put up I think a comment we're all thinking in terms of how valuable it is that this is woven throughout the whole program, as you were saying, it's following up on the, I think it was a first year course, rather than what sometimes happens in curriculum development, which is that initiatives appear in one course but are not followed

through. So that I agree is a valuable aspect. I also appreciated the reflective piece that you were just mentioning as well. Okay. Well, thank you so much for that.

And now, I think we're actually ready to move on to our third speaker, Dr. Jennifer Walsh Marr, who is, I believe I saw her, just joined us to talk about social justice and multilingual student writing, which is our fourth component of the framework. So welcome, Jennifer.

JENNIFER WALSH MARR:
Thank you for your patience, everybody. My name is Jennifer Walsh Marr. My pronouns are she, her, hers, and I'm coming to you from Musqueam Territory at UBC Vancouver this morning. And I want to talk about linguistic equity and the idea of language as access. I'm sorry. I'm just struggling, as I say, I ran from class and I've got too many tabs open. I apologize. This is the one I want. All right. There we are. Language is access. Students in British Columbia have a tremendous linguistic repertoire. We have thousands of multilingual international students studying here, but not to mention the linguistic diversity within all of our communities. Regardless of where our students come from, I believe that all deserve support, and I believe that language is a key aspect of that support.

But some instructors across disciplines have pushed back against this need for development support stating that they're not teaching English as a second language. Others take a more critical approach within their fields indicating that they believe that there's a moral obligation admitting students and saying that they're ready to go, that that actually is a reasonable threshold for students to join and that they will be successful. And further, that others touch on the institutional context, that they're not necessarily supported to help students navigate the dilemma of their language development.

Part of that context is the admissions requirement for multilingual students coming into the university. Institutions across Canada typically set their entrance at 6.5 for direct entry, meaning that they're bypassing any English for academic purposes or further language support. And we can see the band here at a 6.5 that indicates that English study is needed for linguistically demanding academic courses. I would suggest that listening to lectures and writing papers is linguistically demanding, for which study, let alone support is recommended. Further, research scholarship has recommended that university staff and instructors enhance their language assessment literacy and become more familiar with these entrances that the students have been told, you're ready to go.

Further, all students are learning to speak in the discipline, most of which have their own values and features. What does it mean to sound like or to write like any of these disciplines? Regardless of students' first language, academic or disciplinary language is no one's mother tongue. So it's incumbent upon us as instructors to not only help students learn it, but to actually teach it.

We can't rely on outsourcing assistance. Many instructors said they send students to the writing centre, but the writing centres say that they don't edit, they don't proofread or do grammar. They engage in non-directive feedback. They also very often limit the number or the duration of weekly appointments lest any one student have an unfair advantage. Many, many writing centres hire peer tutors that are not the guarantee that they'll have the same communication conventions of a particular discipline. And so Natarajan et al. say that viewed through an anti-racist lens, these race and disability neutral policies actually can really negatively and disproportionately negatively affect minoritized writers and tutors. This practice may vary, but the messaging is pretty consistent across Canada that these are the standards that we set and they're fair and equal, but not necessarily equitable. The recommendation is that shifting policy rationales from what to who, who's writing the policy, and to whom does it apply?

If you contrast these policies and practices with students' perspectives, that they want concrete suggestions and language support to be provided within courses rather than asking students to rely on campus support services.

So a powerful way we can do this within our own courses is through deconstruction, taking texts apart to see how they're organized, the language features, and ultimately the values within them. We can help students read their classes. What are the goals of this course and of this discipline? Asking the right questions of texts themselves. How are they structured and the language features within. We might also look at assignment sheets as genres themselves. But there's a caveat that students don't actually see many samples of student writing. It's very much an occluded genre of what they're supposed to write. Gardner and Nesi's work made differences really clear about the research genres that many of us write to persuade the reader of the validity of findings, and then the students are also exposed to textbooks that aim to explain or instruct. But instead, what we're assigning is that we want the students to demonstrate the acquisition of required skills and accepted knowledge. Again, I think that exposure isn't enough. We need to draw on principled attention to the values of our texts and what the expectations are.

We can take a more critical look at lore we've received and potentially passed on over the years. There's some pretty bad advice floating around about writing like you speak or that the passive voice is somehow evil and that big nouns are zombies. Instead, I think we have to interrogate how we really communicate within our disciplines. Asking questions such as, does a paper in your discipline typically begin with an example or anecdote and something really concrete or does it begin with a theory and then exemplify it? Then how much and what type of detail does each require? Do we write in full paragraphs or in dot point? Does a closing sentence summarize, synthesize, provoke, or preview? What's put in the past? What's present, and how do we talk about what might be?

A surprising feature that many of us expect without necessarily realizing is definitions. They function as an opportunity to articulate foundational knowledge and establish frames of

reference. This is why they're so common in exam short answer questions. Further, the ability to define words makes a unique contribution to the quality of students' writing, even if we remove other factors such as grammar or fluency or accuracy. As instructors, this means establishing that shared understanding of terminology.

One way that we can do this is through the assessment criteria. What are you looking for other than thinking that you'll know it when you see it? Deconstruct some strong examples. For the valued features that they have within them. But also deconstruct those weak examples. What are the common pitfalls that students make? And then use those to make a user friendly rubric. By user friendly, I mean for ourselves as instructors and maybe any TAs that we might have marking, but primarily for students planning their assignments. Also establishing a rubric like this can also help us re-evaluate what our priorities are in our pedagogy.

Another way to foster student inclusion and equity is through community building.

Most of us think of community building as sharing space in a class, but with hybrid models of instruction and engagement, there's opportunity for community building in the margins of assignment readings. Instead of summarizing just the main points and trying to come up with a pointed observation each week for a discussion board, which is pretty easily outsourced to generative AI. Social annotation allows for more relational dialogue with questions and responses and even attention to turns of phrase and how those key terms are used within course texts.

We might also engage in supporting peer review, supporting the how and the why of peer review, giving students additional perspectives. These are quotes from another research project where students are saying, it really helped them to learn others perspectives and exchange opinions and getting inspiration from talking with one another. The content, but also the community.

And training and education aren't purely for employment. Ultimately, we are working not only with but for community. So public or civic writing takes writing into the real world, perhaps in a typical essay being the endpoint, students might rework their research project into something, a correspondence, email, advocacy to someone who might be able to do something about it, reworking their essays into outreach, blog posts, letter to the editor, somehow taking the knowledge that they've brought in the class, rejigging the features of it for a different audience, and then taking it to the community. Thinking of Margaret Mead, who said that Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world.

Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has. So advocating for engaging in disruptive practice, recognizing difference is an important antidote to universalisms that really erase or assimilate values. Others in values can generate intercultural learning, mutual respect, expanded realms of understanding. In our current context of internationalized higher education, that awareness of different cultural values and ideal types can really expand our pedagogical practices and

getting us all closer to broaden world views. Wrote that critical thinkers are committed to change required for continued humanization. I believe that this is really an important aspect of the work regardless of the disciplines in which we're working. And engaging in these access, making language more explicit and accessible, we are opening up the realms of what the standardized forms are, what the broadened forms are, who the different audiences are, and really expanding on that further and broadening it. So not only disrupting the white listening subject that Flores and Rosa talked about in terms of raciolinguistics, but also the reader as well and expanding beyond just the normative context of academic writing.

Thank you. I have some references that anybody is welcome to take a look at in the recording after.

JORDAN:
Many thanks for that. Jennifer, I particularly appreciated the teaching strategies that you shared and particularly around assessment. Part of our work with this project has of course been to connect the theory to classroom practice. And so I really appreciated that aspect of your presentation. And so yes, thank you. And I think we're at the point in the session where we'd like to open it up for discussion, and of course, we've had guiding questions asking people to think a little bit about what works in their educational contexts and of course, what questions and what they would like more information on. And I see actually in the chat, Celinda had posted a question that I think is really directed to all the panelists, asking from the perspective of nursing and health sciences where communication is critical to patient care. Celinda is wondering if the panel has good recommendations that would foster diverse linguistic spaces while ensuring the learning goals are met. Asking as faculty and nursing often want to promote diversity, but feel restricted at times by accreditation and licensing bodies, and it's something I have also been thinking about recently. How do we get policy to better align with pedagogy? I'm wondering if the speakers would like to suggest some answers or resources.

JENNIFER:
I have a question to ask. In terms of the learning goals and the accreditation, is a particular version of language expected? Do they stipulate it must only happen in this particular flavour of English, or are there broader learning goals for professional conduct? The reason I'm asking is maybe not everything needs to be in the narrow channel of English all the time and only, because that really can flatten the diversity right out of the gates as opposed to bringing and welcoming that diversity, getting through the knowledge, and then building on that and the language.

STEVE:
Can I add a comment? It's not really a follow on, but it is in a way. It's looking at the different data that we've looked at. The question about nursing education, it reminded me once when I was presenting and someone in the audience said, Well, you're showing data from an academic writing class and you're showing data from engineering and you're showing data, I didn't show

data and they said, my research is in the field of medical education in English language. They said, in your writing class, no one's going to die, right, if you get it wrong? And it was a light-hearted comment, but the point they were raising was that there are very different stakes in the future workplace, in the minds of the instructors. For the applied science professor that I showed earlier, it was a really big concern that ineffective communication in formal English, in the future workplace could have serious repercussions for that person. I don't know how that really fits into our framework, but what it says to me is that in these different disciplinary areas where we're doing our research, the mindsets and the goals and the concerns of the instructors and the ambitions of the students can be quite different in terms of how they're positioning their view on the need for English language and this native speaker competence. So I just thought I'd share that because it was intended as a light-hearted comment, but it was actually quite deep for me. I'm curious if anyone has any comments about that.

JORDAN:
Thank you, Steve. I hope I also saw.

JING:
Sorry, Jordan, for interruption. I just want to add a follow up sought to respond to selling this question, I think this is a wonderful and really thoughtful question. As a communication instructor in engineering, I definitely feel the same. Sometimes, on the one hand, we want to promote this diversity and linguistic justice. On the other hand, we may feel restricted because of the accreditation or licensing bodies. When take a look at the different facets of the PRISM Framework about plurality, about linguistic justice, I think these concepts are not really about turning every course into a language class. It's about recognizing that language is the medium through which all knowledge is created, shared, and communicated. This is part of the core of our communication courses in engineering. So every field depends on communication. Either it is in social sciences and humanities, in engineering, stat fields, whether it is about explaining a process, writing lab reports. So I think applying the PRISM Framework is about moving from fostering linguistic spaces also to foster many making spaces while utilizing our students, including multilingual students, linguistic, culture, and transnational assets. I happened to come across a very interesting article lately. It's called Justice-Centred STEM Education with Multilingual Learners to Address Societal Challenges. The authors of this article, they proposed the idea justice centred STEM education and it frames them as a tool not only for solving technical problems, but also for addressing systemic inequities. The framework envisions STEM classrooms as a space where diverse students use their full linguistic and cultural as well as their transnational repertoires and experiences to analyze, model, and design a more just world. I think this is a very interesting perspective that really aligns with and informs our framework.

JORDAN: Thank you, Jing, and for sharing that resource. I see Jennifer's hand up as well.

JENNIFER:

I just wanted to offer a friendly retort to Steve and point taken by the medical context of death and that. But we also deal with chemistry students in our labs, and there really is the risk of explosions and the like. I think, I think as everybody is saying, it's not either/or, and I think that by not saying, you know, we're only going to do this in English, we're essentially tying a hand behind the student's back. If this is about fostering the meaning making, then let's make the meaning of those terms, the processes, make them clear. This is what we're going to be working on. Take a look. This is what we're working on next class. Take a look at these key terms and make sure that you're comfortable with them because we're going to be using them. Using back and forth, I don't think that a little bit of extra language necessarily impedes the development of the learning of the content and the English for those terms, it doesn't slow the class down tremendously. I also think it's important to talk about the idea of inclusion and exclusion because there can be one or two students who don't understand a shared language of another group. I think that is worth addressing and fostering language for communication in community but we also need to recognize that our communities in which those medical students or nursing students or any of us are working are not exclusively monolingual English, and in fact, that plurilingual competence might really be an asset for them in their careers as well.

JORDAN:
Well said, Jennifer. I see another comment has just come up, so I'm just going to read it from Shirley. I have a question for Jannik. How do graduates from other countries and cultures take and apply the knowledge they acquire about Indigenous culture and Indigenous world views when they return to their home countries? I don't know, Jannik, if you've had a chance to see some of the impacts of your curricular changes so far.

JANNIK:
So short answer, Shirley and Jordan is, I don't know. We haven't studied this. A slightly longer answer would be that I think we could speculate based on international students' experience of the program and the curriculum. And I think that there are a number of responses that come to mind. But the one that we tend to focus on is that we are preparing our students for practice in Canada. And so we're working within a particular legal and ethical context there. Students come with incredibly varied experiences and knowledge of Indigeneity, whether they are domestic or international students. But it would certainly be interesting to see what the impact is not just for students who are then maybe returning to, I think Shirley, you phrased as home countries. But we're also really interested in the impact is domestically. Sorry, Shirley, I don't have a really definitive answer for you. But there's a number of really interesting factors that go into this.

JORDAN:
Thank you for that answer. I'm not seeing anything else in the chat right now. Anita, maybe we should introduce the CFP, give people a minute to, you know, think of any final questions and then we can pick up on any last comments as they come in. Anita, would you like to speak to the CFP for a minute?

ANITA:
Sure. So the idea behind putting together this edited collection on addressing current issues in teaching first year writing to multilingual learners and the plurality, linguistic justice, and the decolonization aspects that we have been talking about in this session, but also that have come up in previous discussions we have had with researchers in different conferences, we are trying to capture that. This is knowledge that I think in the Canadian context is important for us to put together, compile and this publication is an attempt to do that. We hope that it will impact the research community's efforts to move forward theory into practice because theorizing and listening in and understanding research and putting that research in practice and how we are doing it differently is an opportunity for all of us to share and inform just the Canadian context and reality. This book is really wanting to do that. What are the ways to promote more equitable multilingual and multicultural teaching practices and understand linguistic diversity and justice possibilities? So to address this want to move from theory to practice and the Canadian context, we have planned for this edited collection to be structured in three sections, looking into theory, the practical context of examples, innovative practices that you are utilizing and/or actionable strategies that you have implemented, the program changes, or the program development work that Jannik talked about, for example. And assessment, how are or how should we be assessing students differently to encourage or enhance that linguistic justice and decolonization efforts. So the QR code should lead you to the CFP, which includes the recommended topics. It includes a link to our website as well, the way we are approaching the PRISM Framework. But it really opens up, the invitation to see, to learn from you in terms of how you're responding to different student needs, the policies that monitor control, inform how we teach students, and so on and so forth. At this point, by January 4, we are looking for a shorter chapter proposal, 1,000 to 2,000 words to really understand where you are coming from, the concern, the mission of your work. And there on, we will get back to you and the final work needs to come together by sometime in May for review and such to continue on. Did I miss something, Jordan Jing, Steve, that you'd like to add? Please go ahead.

STEVE:
Nothing to add for me. Thank you. I think you covered everything. And thanks everyone for attending today. Really appreciate your comments and engagement. It's been a really nice session. Thank you.

JORDAN:
Yes. Victoria also just before we leave, had a resource which I believe she has just shared, I see in the chat. It just came up. Ru also made, I think, a really great comment about her experience as an international student just to draw your attention to that. But I realize we're out of time and thank you so much, everybody, for your participation and for the wonderful discussion today.