

**Transcript for Institutional Adoption of Blended Courses: A Multi-Year Pilot at SFU  
2024 ETUG Spring Workshop: Digital Literacy Today – Day 2, May 10, 2024  
Educational Technology Users Group  
Presenter: Brian Lorraine**

BRITT DZIOBA:

So next, we have a presentation from Brian Lorraine. Brian is from SFU, where he's an instructional designer in online and blended learning. Over to you, Brian.

BRIAN LORRAINE:

Thank you very much Good morning, everybody. I hope you've had your coffee and you're somewhere between that point of just right and maybe a little bit buzzing. I've got a lot of information to share on Institutional Adoption of Blended Courses, a multi-year pilot at SFU. So buckle up, maybe a little bit like students who put the video on 1.5 or 2 times speed. So I'm going to go through things quite quickly. But I hope to have some time for questions and a bit of discussion as we can. As Britt mentioned, I'm Brian Lorraine. I work at the Centre for Educational Excellence at SFU.

And I just wanted to take a moment to express my gratitude to the host nations here on the unceded Coast Salish lands, the Musqueam, Squamish, Tsleil-Waututh and Kwikwetlem up on Burnaby campus where my work is located on SFU's main campus there. And for those of you who are interested, native-land.ca is a really helpful resource if you ever want to take a look at the kind of rich diversity and of all of the overlapping, Indigenous nations that span Turtle Island. So I just wanted to take a moment to. Yeah, I was really grateful to Reeva yesterday morning for welcoming us here. It's a strange thing to think about being an uninvited guest on these territories. I have a tangled. My ancestry is a tangled colonial mix. I have Irish and English farming settlers on my mother's side and on my father's side, French and Métis, and I just wanted to say that my father was separated from his native mom at a young age by the CFS, the Child and Family Services. And only to say that just to remind everybody that folks are still searching for their families and folks are still reconnecting to their families. And that's a long process. It's still a journey for us and our family. And I think it's a lot more common in our society than maybe we think about. And so I just wanted to share that as a way of keeping in our minds the importance of giving time and as people try to reconnect with who they are and where they're from.

All right. As I said, we are here to talk about blended learning adoption. We're going on Trefor's advice yesterday for those of you who are here, we're going to have a little bit of a hook. Talk about the current landscape. We're going to identify the problem. It's always been blended learning. And hopefully, the whole rest of that will lead to some kind of resolution as I share a little bit about what we've been doing over the past three years at SFU. And we'll walk through kind of the way that blended learning kind of launched at SFU, the way that the Centre for Educational Excellence has been supporting instructors and institutional adoption of these courses overall. And a little bit of the findings, we'll stop, take 5 minutes, and then we'll go

through some of the evaluation that's been ongoing just in terms of looking at, you know, what we did and hopefully how well we did it or things that we can improve moving forward.

All right. Quick show of hands, quick thumbs up in the chat. How many of you are at institutions where there are blended courses? Great. Keep those hands up. That looks like most people in here. And are they a specific course code designation when students go to register? Is that the case? Okay? A few less hands there. Yeah. Some of this going on. Well, that kind of speaks to the landscape, right? There is blended learning happening in all shapes and forms. Some of it is, you know, formalized in a particular way and some of it is ad hoc. And so we kind of want to dig in to that a little bit further. For those of you who read or are familiar with the Canadian Digital Learning Research Association, Nicole Johnson's work, shout out there. The report that most recently came out talks about respondents, about 80% of respondents saying that blended and hybrid learning will increase, and at the same time, about less than half, only 42% reported that all or most faculty have the skills or knowledge to effectively teach partially online. That reduced even more for fully online courses. 61% identified faculty digital literacy as a pressing issue in their institution. And it was great to have not only been given a little bit of background on Digital Learning Strategy from the province. As somebody who moved here from Manitoba. I can tell you it's extremely helpful to have the Ministry of Education working closely with BCcampus, who's working closely with the post-secondary institutions, that close collaboration integration is very helpful. It's not the same in other provinces, even though those structures may exist, the actual collaboration here, from my perspective, anyway, is quite strong, and that's great. The importance of a structured approach. So as we saw, lots of hands up for blended learning and maybe not as many hands for formalized, course classification around blended courses. So one of the things that will be a running theme as I go through, is this structured approach and the intentionality behind it. You know, we do need to remember that this three-year project as we'll see, it really began coming out of remote instruction. And people were very burnt out, people are still very burnt out. And so having this intentional approach really keeps well-being at the forefront, and I think that's something that we know, faculty, staff, students, everybody involved. That really matters. And one thing I wanted to say is that sharing is caring. I'm, you know, here to talk about all the things that we did, the good, the bad, and the ugly and everything that happened, and I think the more of that folks are just willing to share information and be transparent about what's going on, it can only help in terms of this intentionality and having a structured approach. All right.

Let's go back to early blended learning. It was fun to hear yesterday when Amanda was speaking just on the 30-year anniversary of ETUG and some of those flashbacks to 1994. Um, some of the earliest definitions of blended learning. These citations are 2010, but it all came from early 2000s, you know, the initial combination or a "thoughtful integration of complementary online and face-to-face approaches." That's from Norm Vaughn, Randy Garrison, Martha Cleveland-Inness, and that was, of course, facilitated by, you can all say it with me. The information superhighway. Yes. Some additions to that definition, Picciano, you know, this kind of "planned and pedagogically valuable." And this is important. "Where a portion of the face-to-face time is replaced by that online component" via the information

superhighway. Okay. So that was kind of early definitions of blended learning. And this is where the initial body of literature really developed around, you know, how you could have these courses that were and I should mention, a mix of asynchronous online learning and retaining some kind of in-person component, and institutions had various definitions about specifying how much time would be spent in each modality. So

Some of the issues around terminology that we've seen particularly in the last few years coming out of remote instruction where everybody was kind of doing a bit of a free for all of whatever they were able to do to keep kind of higher ed rolling. That's led to a little bit of inconsistency. And so you know, it's a little bit of I don't know, contentious or maybe confusing that the Canadian Digital Learning Research Association, Tony Bates, other leaders in the field have begun to use hybrid, which seemed to come from the ground up as a word that people maybe new to the field started using hybrid a lot more. I don't know if it was a sexier term. It sounded like hybrid car or something like that, but that became a word that was thrown about much more commonly. But the practice of what hybrid learning is, seems to be different in different places. And so some people are using hybrid to refer to concurrent delivery of in-person and online. And so you've got your student audience divided into two different modalities, that in-person location and then spread over other locations remotely. That is, you know, a very different thing from the original blended learning. And so that concurrent delivery is also a very different experience for an instructor. Very different in terms of the types of tools you might be using and all sorts of implications. It also has implications in the body of research where all of the research that had kind of the traditional blended learning, mix of asynchronous and in person that everybody moved through together, moving through that rotation together in a sequence, you know, a lot of the research around that, talked about improved student performance, lower attrition, those types of things. We can't really, you know, have those kinds of impacts if we're not clear on exactly what the format is and how it's being done. So what the terminology is and how that matches with practice. So we're seeing a little bit of yeah, just kind of mixing of all sorts of configurations, and I think that's leading to, you know, just a little bit of inconsistency, and that impacts our understandings and our ability to really build theory-informed practice. So we don't have anything standardized. I was just talking about that. And also this emergence of these significant differences in practice, synchronous online learning. A lot of people would have been doing Zoom lectures, that type of thing during remote instruction. And a lot of the practices that emerged at that time were very different from what were established as good practices of online learning prior to the pandemic. And so that's had kind of an impact as well.

I'm going to advocate for consistency in terminology, consistency in practice, and transparency in sharing so that folks can be clear about this is what we did. This is how we did it. This is how it went, and we can kind of build a little bit more effectively in terms of how we move forward with this range of modalities and mixes of modalities that are currently happening. I really identify with Tanya Joos's dimensions of blended learning, looking at the technological, the temporal, the spatial, and the pedagogical. And so when folks ask, well, what is being blended? This is what's happening, right? That no technology on one end to rich technology on the other,

real time or synchronous to asynchronous on the other so blending that. Spatial sharing presence versus being asynchronous or remote. And in terms of pedagogy, moving from instructor centred delivery of content to act of or student centred. That's kind of the goal that we're looking at. So great definition there. And if you haven't This report called "Planning for a Blended Future" for those of you who are interested, Tanya Joos<sup>10</sup> and a number of folks from. It's available in the Online Learning Consortium, if anybody is familiar with those folks, "Planning for a Blended Learning Future," fantastic report, lots of great background and info in there.

All right. So that was a long bit of context on blended learning in general and a bit of a soapbox for me on terminology and practice. But here's what we did at SFU. It was a replacement model that we adopted. And again, that idea of rotation between asynchronous online activities and face-to-face in-person classes. And so you know, this graphic kind of helps. If you think of your traditional three-credit hour course, having about three hours per week of lecture and tutorial, lecture, and lab, whatever it might be, and then an additional , you know, 70% or five to seven hours of kind of study time per week. You know, that's what a traditional university course experience would be, and then looking at blended where that in-person time is being further divided and a portion of it is online. And so what becomes tricky is that independent study time that's always been there really mixes with what's happening asynchronously online. And so that can be, that was something that we really focused on with supporting faculty, is trying to make sure you're targeting what you're designing so that it's not getting overwhelming for students so that your total amount of time is staying the same. Your expectations of students is staying roughly the same to what an in-person course would be. And we'll get into that a little bit more.

The definition. So all of you who had your hands up for blended learning, blended courses at your institutions, does your institution have a definition? Okay. There's a few of you. SFU's definition was very much logistical, procedural, if you want to say. It is just specifying, at least one-quarter and no more than three-quarters of student learning integral to the course occurring online and replacing in-person instruction. So you get that replacement model there. And what's important here is that that is directly tied to the scheduling patterns. So the scheduling patterns that were available for blended courses. Students, you know, they would see in the course code, it would identify as a blended course. Only the in-person portion was scheduled. And this is another important reason why having the online component asynchronous mattered because logistically, nothing was being scheduled for that online component. So only the in-person component got scheduled and there was a list of available options. Faculty could either choose to have a blend within the week where their weekly lecture, lab, tutorial time would be reduced, or they could partner with another course sharing the same campus space, and their blend would then be every other week. And so they would alternate in person one week online the next. That one was logistically tricky, especially as things were kind of scaling up. I'll talk about that a little bit later as well.

Okay. First some context in the timeline. First, I'm just going to talk about the far side of the timeline, planning and rationale and the formal adoption and launch. I don't want to spend too

much time on that. Really, there was a report on a task force on flexible education at SFU, and there were a number of recommendations. There were a number of changes that resulted from that, not all that were good. But one of the things that came from that was this initiative for blended courses. Of course, then you see that break in January of 2020, there was a report, and then the University Senate passed the definition that we just saw. So that all happened right before pandemic lockdown. So, you know, this CEE report, the Centre for Educational Excellence report that was looking at other institutions with blended courses, doing a lot of the background, kind of environmental scan, and then the development of a definition, that all happened. And then emergency remote instruction started and everything kind of went on pause for a year. So when we came back, early in 2021 is when the preparation, the planning stages for blended really started. Communication was circulated to the faculties and departments and the spring of 2022 is when blended courses were going to be made available. But of course, in the meantime, people had developed a lot of conceptions about what online learning is based on their experiences with remote instruction. So a lot of those things were, as we'll see, creating confusion with blended learning in general. I'm going to go through these timelines in a bit.

I just want to talk about the context. Any kind of educational intervention, we're working in these large complex systems. And these spheres, you know, working with faculty staff, students at the individual level, and the faculty and department level, you know, institution wide, the whole organization, and the community, the wider post-secondary sector. So thinking about kind of change in these spheres is really important as we're trying to introduce an intervention like this.

And then just in terms of supporting blended learning, educational folks will recognize these things, the consideration of all developmental aspects, the cognitive knowledge, the affective of attitudes, identity, role, fears, motivation, and all those kind of things. And psychomotor. So the kind of development of learning tech skills and building capacity with the types of tools that would be used to facilitate blended approaches.

All right. We're getting into the fun stuff. So this was the original Centre pilot to support blended learning. We wanted to make sure we had all of our bases covered. So I'm going to talk a lot about the 10-week blended learning design course. So the cohort model that came up a little bit yesterday in some comments after a session. And the other thing that we had, we had a workshop series for instructors that maybe didn't have as much time, wouldn't be able to do a full 10-week cohort. Then we had events, a blended learning speaker series. I'll talk a little bit about that. On demand resources, just development of tip sheets and infographics and things like that on our website that folks could access as they liked. And conference funding for folks who finished the cohort, you know, worked with us in production to develop their blended course and then actually taught it. And so that was one of the few incentives we were able to offer for a full cohort program. But this was kind of the high-level view of our strategy of supporting blended learning.

So I'll come back to these timelines now. You can see from summer of 2021, every semester we had this kind of running all of the different initiatives that were happening. You would have a cohort, maybe a speaker series event. So every semester, a cohort would have the 10-week course. In the following semester, they would have production support. They would collaborate with the Centre, actually building the course in Canvas, and then the third semester would be the delivery of that blended course. So I had a nice timeline. And the events, the speaker series were kind of meant to knit a bit of a community of practice. Bring folks from different cohorts, instructors from different cohorts together. And that way, yeah, we're just trying to foster a bit of community across the university around blended learning. So you can see every semester, there were different phases of different cohorts happening. There were workshop series happening, and there were also blended speaker events happening, and that kind of has been what we've been offering over the last few years.

All right. I'm going to talk a little bit about the cohort model, and then we'll take a five-minute break. Just to identify some takeaways. So, as I said, the cohorts were, like, a semester of capacity building and actual course design in that 10-week cohort, and then a semester of collaborative production with the Centre. The Centre has a media team, a course production team, different specialists that would be able to work on different elements of the blended course. And then the third semester would be delivery. So we were trying to get instructors, at least two semesters out from when they were delivering their blended course so that we could kind of make sure that it was intentionally designed, right? There was some capacity building in terms of knowledge and skills and hopefully that led to a better experience all around. The blended design course itself. You know, it was delivered as a blended experience. We talked about that yesterday, putting instructors in the student role in Canvas. So they were actually experiencing what a blended course was like. They would do asynchronous tasks working on little design tasks as they worked through the process of revising their course and, you know, discussion, construction of knowledge around blended pedagogy, different teaching approaches, application of course design tasks, and practise using the tools. So, you know, folks would actually facilitate a little asynchronous activity that others would participate in just to get some practice with using, whether it was H5P or creating a screencast or whatever it might be just to kind of build some skills and efficiency with EdTech. At the end, we would have a plan for the course production, that second semester where we would work together to build the course in Canvas.

The actual 10-week series itself, it really worked from high level course level redesign, drilling down to the module level to the activity level, and then facilitating practice, as I said.

And the structure, again, a mix of these one-hour asynchronous pre-session, an hour and 15 minute synchronous session, and an hour post-session asynchronous work. So it ended up being about a 30-hour commitment for instructors across the term. And one of the things that folks really enjoyed was having that experience across the semester as opposed to one-off workshops. Sort of being a student across the duration of a semester was really important just in terms of raising the understanding of what it was like to be in a blended course, what it was

like to have to finish asynchronous tasks before synchronous sessions happened, that kind of thing because they were going to be needing to use those strategies with their students in their own courses. So it was a "learn by doing" type of situation. And if you can see on the side here, we would have those synchronous sessions, we would often have specialist workshops. So we would have Tilt is the department that does the SOTL, scholarship of teaching and learning. So if folks were interested in doing kind of a study of the impact of their course revision, they would get oriented to that process. Canvas workshops just to develop capacity with Canvas. OER, we had a whole week focusing on open educational resources. Tour of our media studio. Also, folks could record their own welcome introduction to the course that they would be able to use. H5P workshop, and then we had folks who would help facilitate or coach as the instructors facilitated activities for each other. So that was kind of the cohort, and we were able to really drill into the cohort more than any of the other things that we did. So a lot of the data is focused on the cohort because that's where we could really gather the most information. That's where we were working more closely with instructors.

Workshop series was basically a distilled version of the cohort, but without the second semester of production. So it was mostly just built on, you know, knowledge development, I guess. And these would happen once per month, each term. So they would be one month apart. They were meant as a series, but folks could take them as a standalone. And then we would offer support in between if they wanted a consultation or something in between the workshops, they could reach out to us as well. So that was a little bit about the workshop series.

And the speaker series, I'm just going to run through all these very quickly. We would either have invited expert speakers or a panel discussion with instructors who had gone through the cohort, who had taught their blended courses, and they would share. We also had a panel that had students, so we could hear from student voices about their experience in a blended course. And over the last few years, these are the speaker series events we had, OER, inclusion, panel discussions from instructors of blended courses, a guest speaker from Waterloo talking about blended courses there, and then a wrap-up session just what's next as the two-year pilot of blended courses ended and blended courses became a permanent offering at SFU. All right. Let's take a five-minute break there. Just at your tables and for folks on Zoom in the chat, if you just want to take a minute. One takeaway so far, discuss with your table, note something down for the Q&A that we're going to have in a moment. I have a bunch more information to share with you, but I want to take a break and let people chat. So 5 minutes, and then we'll be back.

So as far as the engagement, just kind of the total numbers of what happened. I'll just run through it very quickly. So you can see, we had five cohorts 2021-2023. 48 attendees in the cohorts, workshop sessions, less than double. Blended learning events, consultations. So those were just individual consultations, maybe group consultations with departments, department heads, Faculty and staff together, that kind of thing. And then external sessions, a little bit of that community, sharing some of the early observations out to others.

So I wanted to show a little bit of the profile of attendees. The workshops, you can see quite a large spread, and you can see other units across the university. So library, you know, lifelong learning, that type of thing. Same with the consultations. You can see kind of a spread, not just the faculties and departments, but other units across the university as well. So it was a bit unwieldy to kind of explore or investigate, you know, in terms of workshops and consultations. But with the cohorts, because we were working closely with these groups, we were really able to collect a lot of data, and that analysis is ongoing. So we're still working through analysis of focus groups that we ran. I'll talk a little bit about that in a moment. Ten points for anybody who can see the faculty that isn't here. So this is the spread. It's not really surprising arts and social science is by far the largest faculty at SFU and then kind of a healthy mix of all the others. Ten points. Anybody see the faculty that's missing? What? Education. Let me make a plea for closer collaboration between teaching and learning centres and faculty of education folks. Please. It would be amazing. Typically, there would be some, you know, specialists within each faculty as well, so likely doing their own type of faculty support for course redesign.

Just the roles. So it's not surprising that we had more teaching faculty in the cohorts, less research faculty. Most of the courses were undergraduate level and most of the courses were already existing. There were a few folks developing from scratch and there were some folks at the graduate level.

The success rate. A little bit about success rate here> This is just purely numbers who went forward to deliver their course using the blended course format. This isn't touching on the success of capacity building or any of those other things. We're using the survey data and focus group data to really investigate instructor perception of success. But in terms of the raw numbers, you know, over the cohorts, we had 48 folks, and of the 48, 23 instructors moved forward with delivering their blended course. You could imagine that's quite a bit of work to do to not deliver your course in a blended format. Some of the factors. There were a number of courses not approved by the Ministry, so a program that didn't move forward, for example, and needed more time. Professional accreditation. Some engineering courses only give teaching credit for in-person contact hours. And so for any folks in engineering who ran a blended course, they were going to get less recognition of the teaching of their course. That was an issue. Departmental scheduling, lots of logistical issues around that. And for any of you who are at institutions trying to roll out scheduling of different formats. Yeah. So there's a central scheduling department, and then each faculty or department would have their own scheduling as well. So you could imagine the logistics involved. So nearly half that were unsuccessful were due to logistical barriers.

Production support, just quickly. We tried to put things into buckets of high, medium, and low intensity just for the Centre to be able to scope what our support would be of these courses. And so high intensity would be the full meal deal: media, assessment, redesign, H5P, learning activities, you know, everything that we might be working on. Medium intensity would be consultations and maybe just graphics or, you know, a couple of components in the course, and low intensity would just be consultations only, and the faculty and instructor was happy to do



the rest of the build on their own. You know, they had good Canvas chops, they were comfortable doing their own work. So you can see that most folks either were in the high or medium intensity in terms of getting that support after the semester after the cohort.

This was interesting to look at just in terms of, you know, success rate, and one of the aims was increasing capacity with learning technology. And because the Centre maintains and supports H5P, it was something that we had access to the back-end data, so we could look at the analytics and see what's happening, a shout out to our developer at the Centre, Jake Wang, who built an integration with Canvas. So we do have H5P directly in Canvas, which is very helpful. And what you can see, from May of 2021, you can see there's 531 H5P content items. That was prior to the first blended learning cohort, and you can see to present, there's nearly 4,000. And so certainly that's not all from the cohort, but these numbers share a little bit. So, in that time from 2021 to present, there was 3,400 new content items, and of those, the cohort participants accounted for about 20%. So considering the number of users we have and that it's available across the university for such a small number to contribute 20%, that's quite significant. And of those cohort participants, you know, more than half created H5P during the kind of dedicated H5P session that we held. And what's notable is that almost half created more than one activity. So it wasn't just the one that they built together in that workshop. We can see that folks are actually continuing to build H5P beyond what they did with us in the cohort. So yeah, it's helpful to kind of look at that and just see aside from just purely whether they move forward with a blended course, looking at the actual capacity-building with learning technology, at least in terms of H5P numbers. Okay. We already did that.

The evaluation. This is something that's ongoing and we're running short of time, so I have a whole bunch of data. I don't really want to get into all of it, but our research question, the evaluation that we're doing, what has been the impact of the Blended Learning Design cohort, and then sub questions, looking at that cognitive psychomotor and affective, the knowledge, skills, and attitudes. How did the cohort experience impact instructors in those ways, and also the multi-disciplinary nature of the cohort. So this faculty learning community model, you know, what was it like for folks to be with other faculty members and instructors from different disciplines, and you know, how did that go for folks?

So in some of the survey data, you can see that there's kind of a stronger perception of knowledge development than skills and attitudes, but generally pretty positive. And then we paired that with some of the survey data. I'm not going to go through all of the qualitative, we're kind of out of time here, but it was interesting to see what instructors had to say. And so, you know, pairing the qualitative data with what we're seeing from the surveys, we use the survey data to we coded it myself and separately, a research assistant coded all of that survey data to develop themes out of that. Those themes were what we used to generate focus group questions. And then we held focus groups with different members of the cohorts who were part of a different cohort, but had a similar experience. They did move forward with their blended course. They didn't move forward with their course, that kind of thing. And so currently what we're doing is the analysis of all that focus group data and just trying to dig into

a little bit more you know, what went well, what didn't go well? How can we support instructors better? You know, what can the university do better and all sorts of those things? I want to save the last 5 minutes for Q&A. So I'm not going to go through all this information on the evaluation, but I'm happy to share slides. I'm happy to share information. I also want to shout out. OTESSA Thank you to the organizers of ETUG and OTESSA for not overlapping this year. Last year, it was at the same time. I'm going to be sharing more of this evaluation and analysis at OTESSA in June, if anybody's going. So I look forward to that and highly recommend as well. It's a lot of the same folks, a lot of EdTech folks doing really interesting things. So for those of you who want to hear more, OTESSA or feel free to reach out directly.

There was a question about, and I'm going to take questions here in one minute. There was a question on the chat about resources and how big was the team. And I need to give a shout out and a big thanks to everybody who was involved. The Centre, you know, as you can see, research and consultation, there's a mix of leadership folks, of educational development, instructional design folks who did a lot of the research and consultation, a research assistant who helped with all of the data analysis. We had a programming team who helped with all of the events, promoting, coordinating everything. Several folks helped develop the blended design Canvas shell. You know, on and on and on. There were quite a number of people. The co-facilitators, the guest facilitators. So as you can see, there was quite a lot of support behind this and something that, you know, for me, I really tried to make sure there was all the different teams and different folks from the Centre involved in this. And it's been a very rich experience because of that. So the inconsistencies, we can get into that, but I do want to stop and take questions for a few minutes. So I'll open it up to the floor.

PARTICIPANT:

Thanks, Brian. I have a couple of questions. So one, yeah, I was around the resources. So it looked like over five cohorts, you had 48 people. And I think that's kind of what I was alluding to yesterday. I think we have a lot of really great resources in place to support digital literacy, but we have the, you know, the usual suspects coming through. So how do we actually get more people? And maybe that's something you're struggling, just kind of look at that. The second part is, so it looked like in 2020, your senate kind of passed the definition. So did you not have a definition before that and then was part of this impetus coming from, you know, we need to save space, and we're going to have you know, like leadership kind of pushing people through for blended. Because that would, you know, I think help get people.

BRIAN:

Absolutely. Yeah. So both good questions. I'll answer the second one first. So the Task Force on Flexible Education gathered data from students and students were asking for more flexibility in their courses. There's also a space crunch at the university, so this was something that was aimed at both of those things, increasing flexibility and more efficient use of space. You know, there are a lot of as I said, there were things that were problematic with that whole report and some of the changes that came, but the definition, the second report that came from the Centre looked at four universities in Canada who had blended learning definitions, who had

been doing blended courses for close to 10 years. And so that institutional implementation of blended learning report from the Centre was really what guided senate in terms of the definition. The second part of your question, yeah, getting folks out. You're exactly right. All of the early adopters, all the keeners showed up to the first cohorts and maintaining interest and registration to the cohort. You know, as much as we want to advertise and things, the best real help there was word of mouth and just, you know, instructors that had a really good experience would tell their departments, tell their peers, and that's how we would get more people involved. But we really struggled. The workshops, especially. I think everybody is probably feeling this. It's hard to get people out to anything. Everybody's so burnt out. So again, I think, like a multi-faceted strategy and just continuing to offer things and see what hits.

PARTICIPANT:

I just had a more technical question. You said teams, which kind of scared me. So how many people were involved on said teams in supporting this just out of curiosity?

BRIAN:

The number of people involved. I mean, if I go back to these. Yeah.

PARTICIPANT:

The breakdown of the high involvement and media involved, that was partially answering my question, I guess.

BRIAN:

Yeah. So I think the consultation part, this was not as close involvement. Certainly, these folks programming. So every offering that we had every semester, they would be helping coordinate, promote these things. So there would be, you know, two or three folks in the programming team. The Canvas shell, once it was built the first time, so those folks mostly. It was just the first offering of the Canvas shell. Since then, we've been obviously making revisions, but less involvement after it was initially built. I don't know how to attach exact numbers. But yeah, there would be probably a team of, you know, Three of us kind of working on facilitating things every term and the kind of extra support in the background. Yeah.

PARTICIPANT:

In some way, this comment is a little bit irrelevant for us here, but do you think that there is an issue with getting people to develop these courses because we have an increasing amount of sessional lecturers in general that don't have dedicated time allotted to these developments and fewer faculty? Is that something you can see in your data? I saw you distinguish between lecturer and I forget what the second category was, but.

BRIAN:

Yes. Yeah. And that's extremely problematic. Sessional is probably you know, their employment probably starts a couple of weeks before course launch, so they're not going to be able to get in on these types of support resources. They might be able to get in on on-demand resources,

maybe the workshops during the term. But that is very much a problem. Unless a faculty member is kind enough to kind of share, you know, their course and kind of coach them into teaching it. But there were definitely sessional, I can think of one or two right now off the top of my head, who just didn't move forward because they didn't have any certainty around what they would be teaching, So, yeah. And as you say, this is just one small problem among many of having far more sessionals than continuing folks. Yeah. Comment in the chat. "And that means more departmental work goes to faculty too, so they're overwhelmed as well." Yes, absolutely. Faculty are doing far more work with far less resources. It's time and money is a crunch, and so, it's having implications all around.

PARTICIPANT:

Just around timing of your workshops like when do you schedule the in-person part so people can attend. Sorry. You know, people teach at the time that we offer stop, right? Like, This is another huge barrier to people attending. We're able to kind of figure that out at all?

BRIAN:

With the cohorts, what we ended up doing, we wanted them to have a blended experience, so we wanted them to have that mix of asynchronous and in-person. Campus was not really open for the first cohort, so the synchronous sessions ended up being online, but we tried to as much as possible get those synchronous sessions happening in-person. Each cohort, we would survey them as soon as they had as soon as we had formed the cohort, you know, a week or two in advance of start, we would survey them and just get, you know, a time that would work for everybody to be on campus and come. So, it also brought home the point of you need to make the in-person session highly valuable, high impact. And that's also something for instructors to think about when students are going to be commuting for that small in-person portion has to be really worth their while.

BRITT:

All right. So I think for the sake of time, we have to move on, but thank you so much, Brian. That was an excellent presentation.

BRIAN: Thanks, everybody.