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From consumers to creators
From knowledge source to knowledge guide
Studies on open pedagogy have:

• Mostly been outside Canada
• Mostly had small sample sizes
• Explored only 1 or 2 OP practices at a time
Open pedagogy seems to have a positive impact on students and instructors, but additional supports are often needed.
How can faculty support students?  
How can faculty help themselves?  
How can institutions play a supporting role?

- How can we allocate resources to faculty who want to engage in OP?  
- What PD opportunities are needed?  
- What educational technologies are needed?  
- What administrative supports or financial supports are needed?  
- How can OP opportunities for students be structured and constructed to increase the likelihood of success and provide a positive experience?  
- How can the focus on the content and learning that is intended be maintained, rather than shifting to what’s learned from how an OP project has been planned or offered?
Building capacity of stakeholders to create, access, re-use, adapt, and redistribute OER
Q1. What are the perceptions of faculty towards open pedagogy?

Q2. What are the perceptions of students towards open pedagogy?
Do the experiences of faculty and students align?
Faculty

- Teaching at KPU in the spring and/or summer 2021 semesters and using open pedagogy in one or more classes
- Data collection via survey
- Mix of closed and open-ended questions

67 → 11
Students

- Students in classes using open pedagogy with an instructor who consented to participate in the study
- Data collection via survey
- Mix of open-ended and closed questions
- Distributed survey in spring and summer 2021 semesters
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domestic students</th>
<th>International students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64% are multilingual</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% first generation students</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% work 10+ hours / week</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% full-time students</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [KPU, 2021](#)
“Open pedagogy can include students creating or co-creating open resources, open content, H5P resources, or open textbooks; students creating resources for a community or client; students creating teachable content or resources for other students; students blogging; students podcasting; or students creating or students and faculty co-creating rubrics.”

Traditional learning activities include essays, quizzes, and exams.
**Students:**
Hilton et al. (2019) and Hilton and Wiley (2018)

**Faculty:**
Bliss et al. (2013), Paskevicius and Irvine (2019), and Hilton et al. (2019)
Faculty

- N = 8
- 4 – 30 years of experience teaching at post-secondary level
  - Mean = 13.4 years
- 1 – 10 years of experience using open pedagogy
  - Mean = 4.9 years
- 7 respondents use multiple OP practices
- All use OERs
- 75% report needing more prep time for OP
What prompted faculty to start using OP

Top themes

1. Beliefs about OP providing an improved experience for students (5 respondents)
2. Costs (4 respondents)
3. Access/equity/inclusion/social justice (4 respondents)
What motivates faculty to keep using OP

*Top themes*

1. Improved experience for students (4)
2. Students sharing their work beyond the instructor to other audiences (4)
3. Issues relating to equity, access, and social justice (4)
4. Alignment of OP with an instructor’s teaching practices, philosophies, pedagogies, and interests (4)
What benefits faculty have experienced when using OP

*Top themes*

1. How OP led to improved quality of students’ work/assignments and their engagement in the course (5)
2. How OP positively changes the dynamic/relationship of students and their instructor (4)
What challenges faculty have experienced when using OP

Top themes

1. Issues with time (4)
2. Challenges in finding partners/building partnerships (2)
3. Lack of funding/compensation/recognition for OP work (2 respondents)
4. Overcoming student anxiety to OP projects/process and getting student buy-in (2)
5. Lack of support from colleagues (2)
Student responses

- N = 55
## Perceptions of value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>85.5%</th>
<th>of student respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that open pedagogy is more valuable to their learning than traditional learning activities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>of student respondents felt that their engagement in their learning increased a lot or somewhat while engaging in open pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>of student respondents felt that their creativity increased a lot or somewhat by engaging in open pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>of student respondents felt that their engagement in their learning increased a lot or somewhat while engaging in open pedagogy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions of experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Compared to traditional learning activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0% of student respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that open pedagogy is</td>
<td>more rewarding / enjoyable to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>more motivating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>more difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>more stressful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception of time requirements

- 43.6% of respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that open pedagogy was more time-consuming.
  - 29.1% of respondents strongly or somewhat disagreed with that statement.

- 61.8% of respondents felt the time to complete open pedagogy course work increased a lot or somewhat.
  - 30.9% of respondents felt the time to complete open pedagogy course work was about the same.
Perceptions of impacts on learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Of student respondents strongly or somewhat agreed that participating in open pedagogy helped them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>Master more of the core academic content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Become more of a collaborative learner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>Become a better critical thinker and better problem-solver.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>Become a better communicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learn more effectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

than traditional learning activities.
## What students liked about engaging in OP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># respondents</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>how open pedagogy had improved their creativity or allowed them to use more creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>how open pedagogy offered more flexibility and choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>open pedagogy was more interesting/fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>because of the opportunity to collaborate with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What students found challenging about engaging in OP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># respondents</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>time-management / the amount of time required to complete assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>feeling uncomfortable with the process, assignment flexibility, and assignment choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>collaborating and working with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they found open pedagogy to be more cognitively demanding technology problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some limitations

- Sample sizes
- Self-reported data
- Uneven participation between the classes
- Potential differences in timing of survey distribution
- We’re still in a pandemic!
- Unknown transferability
Students feel that OP helps them learn.
Everyone is short on time.

Students could benefit from more time to work on OP projects / practices.

Faculty could build in more time for OP projects / practices.
Students could benefit from more up-front discussions about OP process and other uncertainties.

Faculty could build in more checkpoints and/or discussions to help with scaffolding.
Faculty could provide more flexibility and choice, as well as opportunities for students to collaborate with each other.
Institutions could provide opportunities and support for networking, PD, and faculty collaboration.
Institutions could provide recognition for faculty who engage in OP, such as administrative supports, resources, and funding / compensation.
Thank you

- Dr. Rajiv Jhangiani, Urooj Nizami, and the KPU Open Education Office
- KPU Open Education Working Group
- Dr. Tara Lyons, Dr. Farhad Dastur, and other members of the KPU REB
- Foluso Fagbamiye, Cathy Parlee, and the KPU Office of Research Services
- KPU Teaching & Learning Commons
- Student survey reviewers
- Faculty and student survey participants
- And you!