DARLENE MCLENNAN: I might start. So thank you for those who are joining us right on time. For those who don't know me, I'm Darlene McLennan. My pronouns are she/her. I manage the Australian Disability Clearinghouse on Education and Training.

Today this session is being live captioned. To activate the captions you can click on the cc button in the tool bar that is located either at the top or the bottom of your screen. We also have the captions available in your browser. So the team are putting in a link to the 1capapp now to enable you to access the captions in your browser.

ADCET is hosted on Lutruwita Aboriginal land, Tasmanian Aboriginal land. In the spirits of reconciliation, ADCET respectfully acknowledges the Lutruwita nations and also recognises the Aboriginal history and culture of the land. I want to pay my respects to Elders past and present, and to many Aboriginal people who did not make elder status. I also want to acknowledge all the countries and lands from where you are all today and acknowledge the elders and ancestors and their legacy to us, and any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People joining us today. I invite you to write in the chat I think many of you already have started you know the deal, if you would like to acknowledge where you are today.

Okay. This webinar today is called Exploring Opportunities for Reciprocal Dialogue between Faculty and Students around UDL Implementation and Inclusive Design, delivered by the wonderful Dr Frederic Fovet, and he will engage participants in exploring and discussing key themes that have emerged from the research project that explored the way stakeholder groups envisage faculty student dialogue in relation to UDL implementation across the institution.

I think in the coming months we will be having more and more webinars or sessions around UDL. For many of you in the room you probably are aware there's 3.0, UDL 3.0 that has been released by the CAST in USA. We hope to bring you some upskilling and knowledge development in the coming months on the update.

Just a couple of other housekeeping details. This webinar is being captioned, as I said, by the wonderful Helen from Bradley Reporting. You will be entering the meeting room hopefully with your camera off and audio off, but if it hasn't happened, please turn those off as we are recording. In the consultation and the work we're doing, we will invite you to turn your camera on or your sound on, if you would like, but just to be aware that as we're recording if you could keep those off. If you are having any technical difficulties, you can email us at admin@adcet.edu.au. Hopefully Frederic is going to have an engaging session for us. We have a Mentimeter coming up and a few other things. Please use the chatbox for any questions, and we will pull those out from there, because we haven't got a Q&A box. So really encourage you if you have some questions to be succinct in asking those questions and hopefully we'll be able to find those as well.

All right. I think that's it. I have done too much talking. I'm going to hand over to you, Frederic. Thank you very much.

FREDERIC FOVET: Thank you, Darlene. Welcome everyone. Good afternoon. Normally, I'm in BC but I'm speaking to you from the West Coast of Ireland, where I'm here for three weeks doing a research project. I thought I would share with you some of the outcomes from a study which I was able to carry out in 2024. This was funded by a teaching innovation grant within my own campus. It looked at exploring reciprocal dialogue between faculty and students around the notions of UDL implementations, inclusive design and particularly sustainable implementation. So we are going to do this in a sort of interactive way as much as we can and I will come back to this in a minute.

I want to do my own acknowledgement too and acknowledge the campus on which I work is located on the unceded traditional and occupied territory of Tk'emlúps te Secwépemc within Secwépemc'ulucw, and also acknowledge learning has happened on these lands for millennials before settlement.

I would stress, because we do an acknowledgment both in Australia and Canada, that beyond making land acknowledgement we need to look at how UDL serves also the needs of the colonisation. And I will do a merciless plug there, but I have got a book coming out later this fall on Decolonising UDL, where quite a few Australian scholars have contributed to that as well. Keep an eye out for that. I think it's going to be more a pressing topic as we move forward.

A little bit of introduction. For those who don't know me, I work in BC. I'm Assistant Professor School of Education at Thompson Rivers University, which is located right in the centre of BC, so far out west. My focus is on inclusion, UDL, accessibility, social justice in teaching and learning, and I'm also a consultant, both domestically and internationally, and I act as a consultant both at schools and the tertiary sector. So my UDL experience really is across sectors. I have put you a link there as well you will find on the slide which is to my institutional bio, not to overload the slides here and give you more material than is needed, but if you have questions.

I also realise I speak very fast so I will make an effort to speak very, very slowly today. Since it is 6 in the morning, it might help.

So this is a quick overview of what we will cover today. I will do a brief overview of where we are with UDL. Most of you are probably familiar with it but it's good to still level the playing field and make sure we have the same overview as we come in. Particularly within that scholarship, examine the role and the place and the importance given to student agency and student voice.

Then we will give you a quick overview of the study, but the aim is not to do a sort of top down delivery of the findings; it's more to engage you in brainstorming around the topic, and then every so often I will give some input as to what this study actually led to in terms of findings, to feed your own reflection rather than to imply what we came up with is immediately transferrable to another campus, but I think it begs a lot of questions around student faculty dialogue.

That will lead to a recap on the best practices, which we have framed around this project, and then acknowledge some of the continuing sort of ecological complexities that maybe make these ideal objectives still sometimes hard to achieve. We have to recognise the complexity of the institutions that we work in.

So the context I will spend a little bit of time here. Obviously UDL has developed very fast in the last 15 years, particularly in Australia. I think it's one of the places where we've seen, during COVID, a huge burst of energy and momentum around UDL implementation. There is lots of pockets, if you look at North America, I would say at this stage we're not looking at systemic work, but we're looking at lots of pockets of activity with some more dynamic than others. Obviously, the COVID pandemic has given all of us an opportunity for more receptiveness from faculty.

What I keep saying is, you know, during COVID most people accepted that role as designers. Before that, I found it difficult to talk to people about design and inclusive design because they would say, "I don't design, I just deliver." I think on the day of the pandemic and the online flip, we all realised that we were designers, we make good and bad decisions, and they have an impact on learning and people have become very aware of that.

So it has fed the general momentum around UDL. There is some concern in the literature at the moment that maybe that momentum wasn't sustained. Many people, particularly here in Ireland, actually, are coming up with papers and literature and studies around the fact that we are very quick to go back to the old normal and to forget the lessons of that past.

There's definitely been a widening context of the UDL implementation as well. So we're seeing a lot of work now around further education of that, as you call it in Australia, labs, work in UDL in labs, not just classroom and lecture hall, but other environments. Around experiential learning contexts, so courses that are happening outside the classroom. Within graduate supervision as well, something which hasn't so far been talked about. Within field placement, in relationship with field partners, et cetera.

Some of the concerns around the notion of sustained development, so how can we ensure that the questions that we ask ourselves actually lead us to think of UDL implementation in terms of sustainable development. A lot of what's happened so far has been around and it may come up in the slides how do we keep that momentum sustainable. I talked about pockets and pockets of different sort of intensity of momentum. How can we keep this design, this interest sustained, both in terms of across the campuses and across the Universities, and also in terms of longitudinal development. Obviously within that context, we're going to ask ourselves what roles students have to play within a sustainable development.

The other question as well, despite this growth in development, is that most of what we've seen has focused on the classroom. So changing teaching and learning, changing that individual relationship between instructor and students. But we haven't so much focused on the strategic relationship or what happens on the campus. So not just a teacher relationship to students but the teacher as an employee within an environment where they are part of the management of change process.

So this project really uses this as a base and says we've come some way, but now we have to think about sustainable development of UDL; what roles do students play in this development; and also how do we push the reflection that we have and the scholarship we have into looking at the strategic implications of development, not just in the micro of the classroom but in the wide scale.

Some UDL strategies for interaction there is a chatbox. Please feel free to use it right through. We will try and keep this interactive. There are two Menti activities coming up. At some point you will need another screen or another device. If you want to go now to Menti.com, I will generate a number when we go to presenter mode on Menti and you will be able to do a quick poll. I have also created a Padlet and the link will be shared with you in the chat. The Padlet is for normal synchronous/asynchronous interaction, asynchronous in the sense it will happen very quickly, not maybe while I talk, but as soon as I get off this I will be able to respond to any questions you have or conversations you've started. Also, I do have social media, LinkedIn and Bluesky, if you feel like you want to continue some of these questions on there, don't hesitate. And you will have my email on the slide, so feel free to email if there are questions that are more individual or personalised that you don't necessarily want to share everyone but you want an answer to.

So this was the slide I was talking about that I already started talking to. Again, sustainable development, question mark there. Involvement of students in that sustainable development. Question mark there as well. Also literature that focuses mostly on our teaching and learning reflection, but not on our strategic implications. This was really the basis for this study. It was really about how do we start looking at all this and actually bringing some of the rich themes for analysis forward, while trying to look at what this development might look like.

Again here I will talk about UX. UX is user experience. That's a term used. So this notion that in the literature so far we talk a lot about student voice, student agency, but this notion of actually going to look at students' lived experience, their rich narratives on design, and the role that they see themselves playing in the implementation of UDL is not really so far addressed.

So we are going to go to Menti now. Before I switch screens, I will give you the questions before we do the poll and generate numbers, so we will do this progressively. My question is really to gauge the room a little bit. I see there are some 60 of you online. I want to know how successful do you feel we are currently as a field so the field of education generally into taking into account student voice and student agency, and the role that students may play in UDL integration and implementation. Or even in the reflection that students may play in how we are looking at UDL integration/implementation.

So the choices you're going to have are very successful, moderately successful, starting to tackle this, behind and not catching up, or ignoring this so far. So I will let you have a look at the question: how successful do you feel we are currently as a field in taking into account student voice and agency and acknowledging the students' role in UDL integration/implementation? With five choices going down from "very successful" to "ignoring this so far".

I'm going to switch us to Menti and I will get the poll going. So it is activity 1. Let me just see. So 53423983. So 53423983. I'm going to let you vote. Obviously, the need to gauge the room is the same as the need we have in the field to get, first of all, a perception of how instructors and service providers and partners in the field, in student affairs personnel, feel about this, because whatever the reality and the facts are, we also need to see how people position themselves to the topic in the first place. Because if we're trying to gauge the desire for change and the willingness and acceptance to change, and how people want to interact with this, we've got to see how they feel that this is a topic that is first of all needed.

We've got a vast majority, so far 20, saying "starting to tackle", and 13 saying "behind and not catching up", 6 "ignoring so far". So you see we have the great majority of the room as you are voting is already thinking that this isn't something which is not given enough attention. That would be one word that would be able to describe three of the voting patterns there with a small percentage saying moderately successful.

So I will let you continue to vote on this. It was to get us started off. In the interests of time we will continue but we will share the slides afterwards, so do continue to vote if you haven't already. Back to the slides.

So the literature I will go through this very quickly but as we've said, literature evidences a paucity of student voice and agency within the UDL momentum. I've written a little bit about it. Some people have started to tackle this. As I said, so far it's mostly commentary on the absence of student voice and agency. It is more call to action, I would say, than any studies that have unearthed evidence of the voice and agency being taken into account. Obviously, we have structural issue in tertiary that makes this very challenging. We have a siloing of department services. Even if that agency of students happened, it wouldn't happen across the board because of the way that we structure our Universities and our institution.

The power dynamics definitely downplay the student voice as well. We're aware of that. A quick turnover of student population is also one of the complexities because once you get people at ease with talking, often they are graduating and moving on. Complexity of bureaucratic processes that are challenging for students to master. Even students involved in Senate, it takes them a year to understand the process of Senate before they find their voice, and often by then their term has finished.

Heavy load of student advocates. So if they are volunteering or having a voice, they are also dealing with the work loads of students which makes their role difficult in that sense because their workload is heavy. And precarious living conditions which, I think, affects students in Australia as much as learners in North America where in terms of pyramids of needs, if you are busy finding money to put food on the table and pay your fees, you are maybe not so preoccupied about having a voice and being heard on all the topics that matter to you.

Obviously, faculty departments are authentic avenues for user experience feedback on course design, but they are few and far between. We will look today as to how authentic they can be as well. I think we've looked at that.

The ecology obviously of student bodies in tertiary institutions is something I talk about a lot. Whenever you are looking at change, change within complex ecological environments is not going to happen at once. Obviously one of the problems we're seeing now with this pendulum swing after COVID is part of this. If you have a very complex institution, you are trying to trigger change. Change is difficult, and in terms of systemic theory this complex system tends to find the status quo and come back to where they are.

And also we have to talk about also neoliberalism and the marketisation of the tertiary sector. Even if you are trying as an instructor to act on transformative and participatory philosophies embedded into your teaching, the modus operandi of that business model, market model are going to be working against you. Again, the students will be the primary victims, the same casualty of this process. We will come back to this in some of the feedback from the study.

Some background of the study. This was, again, funded by a teaching innovation grant within my own University, and the aim was really to develop a community of practice around UDL, because I'm relatively new to this campus and it wasn't it's one of my objectives. Also to create a discussion circle for students in parallel to this and develop both of these bodies to carry out semi directive interviews as they were coming together and starting to take shape. And then to wrap up with an opportunity for dialogue between these two groups. This is deeply wounded in action research and the aim was to collect data and be able to draw some themes from the qualitative analysis of these interviews, but also to create lasting frameworks that would outlast the study itself. And also create within this to empower students to amplify their voice within the project itself. So both on this campus and within the literature as well, and this is what I will come back to every so often.

As we can see from right now, and I'm stressing "now", the aim which was interesting for me was to say, well, the people we're going to have listening to your practice on UDL and then this student discussion circle are not necessarily from the same faculty. They may be more willing to talk to each other because they are not necessarily people who are engaged in a classroom dynamic. So we need to look at a more ecological dimensions where we could create innovative opportunities and avenues for dialogue when these would not have been the traditional routes for communication within the classroom itself.

So we are going to go back to Menti. And because I'm going to start talking to you about this dialogue, opportunities for dialogue, I would like your feedback on to what degree do you feel student feedback, whether it's anonymous or not. Here we really want to cover course evaluations, but also whatever other polling faculty may be putting into their VLE, for example, virtual learning environment, or whatever the opportunities for dialogue and feedback they are opening in a non-anonymous way in their course. To what extent all these opportunities do you feel are truthful students are truthful when it comes to accessibility, inclusion, inclusive design.

So the rating will go from extremely truthful, mostly truthful, somewhat truthful, not candid, very cautious. We are going to go through all of these. I will give you the question: to what degree do you feel student feedback, anonymous or not, is truthful when it comes to accessibility? Let me get out of the presenter mode here. You can see the numbers there, 6265 every time the chat activates, I get blocked.

DARLENE: Sorry, I can read it. It's 62651670.

FREDERIC: Thank you so much. Obviously, this was an interesting question for us as a background, because don't forget that we actually, within the parameters of the study, were looking at because we had to limit the scope in a way of the study, we couldn't just go for the whole of the campus instructors, including people who had never heard of UDL, and the whole of the student body including people who had never heard of UDL. We were working with people who were only somewhat familiar with UDL who wanted to join a community of practice or students who had been somewhat exposed to UDL who were interested in joining this.

We had both sides where people were quite in favour of UDL, definitely already are, already interested in these topics and already interested in the notion of talking about it, but we were right away interested in saying that communication might be happening with these people who are already favourably on the side of UDL, but to what extent are they actually being truthful or candid when they talk to each other, right? So not just a notional dialogue, but meaningful, authentic dialogue that actually leads to change.

The voting has started. We've got about half say mostly truthful when it comes to accessibility. Some are saying extremely truthful. We have a percentage there. And then 8, so I would say about a quarter so far saying somewhat truthful. Obviously, you see that the concern that we have when we started asking this question and looking at the notion of authenticity and candour was that dialogue can also be a hindrance if we think that we're dialoguing but we're not dialoguing with the same understanding or with the same values or with the same frankness.

So I will continue to let you to vote and then we will come back to the slides and share them with you at the end. I will just go back to the slide deck and we will continue our reflection.

So from this point the workshop will divide into three layers because these are the layers in which we started to do the coding of the data. And the first big division in the categories were people were either talking to us about their classroom and the interaction of their students within the classroom, and that was the micro system. Similarly, students would be talking to us about the individual relationship they had with instructors within classrooms.

The second level was at faculty level. So some of the students, some of the faculty, were talking about dialogue at faculty or departmental level. Particularly some of this was formalised, so students being present on faculty council, students having a say in certain process of change happening within the faculty and the department. The last one is a campus wide reflection. Both on faculty and students’ side where people were talking to us about dialogue happening on campus at institutional level. This might be through Senate or through large body consultation where students had a part, or obviously through the student union role. The student union played quite a large role in this project and they actually hosted the student discussion cycle and they had a lot to say about this as well.

So, if we look, first of all, at the micro system of the classroom itself and if we look both at students and faculty, we would expect to see a great deal of divergence as to what these two perspectives were offering in terms of what they see again, the question was sustainable development; how do we get there; what are the priorities that we set? Again, one of the opening in the setting of divergence was there is a lot we can do with UDL, so where do we start? We can't do it all, so where do we start and what do we prioritise in terms of being really if there were to be a policy or mandate, or your setting of priorities, what would these priorities be?

We didn't see the divergence that we thought we would see there. But what we did see right away was a divergence more in the process of dialogue, right? A clash in perspectives in terms of what communication looked like, what sharing of perspective is, and what would be a process of consensus? On both sides there didn't seem to be the same notion of, well, if we are going to talk about priorities, how do we talk about priorities? Not so much a divergence of priorities, but even about engaging.

So, here it was very interesting because again we're talking with UDL advocates on the faculty side and students who are already familiar somewhat with UDL on the student side. You would have expected that they would have said "all is good and we are able to talk about this", but there was a willingness on both sides to accept that beyond that superficial reassurance that, yes, everyone who is UDL advocacy centred. Is it that simple? Is it straightforward?

There is definitely a growing dilemma, I think, amongst instructor more generally than in the study this is something I see in the field about whether we can truly envisage all of the barriers that a student is expecting through just reflection on inclusive design. Don't forget one of the great buy in on UDL is you say to instructors, "You can sit in your office with a commonsense approach, you can actually figure out where the barriers are and then you can use the UDL principles to address these barriers before you even get into the classroom."

Well, that's all good and well, but I think there is growing unrest that it's a good starting point, but as we go into more sustained development of UDL, is that enough or do you need the students there to talk to you about their lived experience and the problems that they actually are having, the barriers they are actually encountering before you can fully grasp where the points of tensions are in your course?

What I'm saying is even with the best of intention, if you sit on your own without that contact of lived experience of students, can you really envisage the full scope of what that redesign looks like?

And we definitely had some of that candour come in and a lot of the faculty members who talked to us during the several days, she actually said, "I gave a lot of opportunities for dialogue. I'm not sure that they actually are truthful or grasping these opportunities with full authenticity." I think on both sides, both stakeholder groups were very aware of the power dynamics that make any dialogue about design very challenging. We had very authentic feedback from students saying, basically, "I'm in the course and someone is interested in UDL. I'm not necessarily going to tell them what they are doing is not enough, because I'm supportive of what they are doing. I want to be encouraging. I don't want to be frank and abrupt in the way I say, 'that design doesn't work', 'that assignment did not work for me', 'you should get rid of this, this doesn't work for most of the class’.

So we have an issue there because that authenticity, even though the micro level is not necessarily there, and I think a question we have to ask ourselves is, you know, the etiquette of classroom is such that can we have any authentic dialogue? We can have some encouraging dialogue and set the basis for that, but we've got to really think if we are going to talk about student agency, about saying to a student, "Okay, you've got the full floor here; tell me what is wrong with my design", they are not necessarily actually grasping that.

Another element to this is the complexity of the cultural dimension barriers. We had some students were international and they very strongly said, you know, "it would be really counterintuitive for me to say to a Professor who has that role there is something fundamentally wrong with the way you are approaching part of your delivery or part of your assignment", et cetera. That was very, very marked from the international students who were, perhaps, even less likely than domestic students to actually be honest about the feedback that they would like to give someone.

And there was a likeness and kindness. Again, on this side you are talking about people who are advocates on both sides, and saying, "At least you are engaging with this. We don't want to make you feel like it's not being successful." But for us, the purpose of saying, you know, what are going to be our indicators that we have to go further than the design is successful or not successful, et cetera, it begs a question of how will we be able to get that feedback if we're not getting it through these classroom discussions?

The second degree is the department and faculty scale. So here, you know, both sides were fairly in accord in saying, well, what we are looking for, that authentic feedback, that agency, that genuine role being played in a user experience, sort of exploration, is not happening. There are definitely lots of mechanisms for consultation. Here we had some of the participants had sat on faculty council or might be student representatives on school meetings, monthly school meetings, et cetera.

We had several students participating in wider sort of student representation on accessibility committees, on teaching and learning committees, on some Senate bodies which still would have been departmental in scale. And all of those students in those roles said that, really, they felt it was tokenism. That, really, they were asked to be in the room but whenever it came to crucial questions to be honest, they said when it came to crucial questions, they felt the debate around teaching and learning was limited in scope, anyway. Even in faculty it didn't seem like people were encouraged to be honest, you know, and frank about the needs that exist around reform and, you know, the need for transformative practices, for more accessibility, for more student-centred practices, et cetera. But they felt definitely that they were a nodding role, they were present in the committee but, really, there was never an opportunity for them to be frank and honest.

Again, the power dynamics. Sometimes you are the only student in the room, there are 30 people in the room. Even if the open to you is given, to what extent are you really expected to take the floor and represent all of the student body of that faculty when you are present for five minutes and given the floor for five minutes. So the fear, too, of opening those doors, but to what extent is it really a call for genuine feedback?

The faculty were equally candid about saying we're not seeing much engagement with students at that level. It is more information sharing that they are there and they actually access that information, they are able to go back to the student body and explain why changes are made, why changes are not made, et cetera.

So definitely a lot of reflection here needed in terms of how do we engage students at department or faculty level. We give them these roles but to what extent are these roles genuine and authentic. There is also a turnover issue that comes up later. With the notion of turnover, a lot of these roles on committees are one year, so if you meet nine times during the academic year, it takes you a couple of meetings to get used to the routine and the etiquette of the meetings. You know, we all wrap up at the end of the academic year, so you really have six monthly meetings there where you can sort of spread your wings and start to get a role. Most students felt they didn't manage to get a role within that.

And faculty were equally, as I said, transparent, candid and, you know, dubious as to whether this represented any significant engagement. Again, interestingly, the students themselves say, "Well, we're not sure faculty are given much voice either in terms of teaching and learning accessibility and UDL within these bodies anyway."

I think I have covered most of this, so I'm going to skip this one, and we are going to go to the third one. The third one was the campus wide role. Here the student union was involved from the get go, was really interested in this project and, as I said, hosted the student circle and was interested in the sustainable development of that group, and we will, hopefully, in September will start again and be involved in this beyond the study. They were definitely formal roles that the unions and the student body as a whole had within campus to amplify voice, et cetera, create avenues for organic dialogue.

Lots of points coming up here. First of all, students were highly aware and I found this really interesting that in this time, so in this time of marketisation of tertiary business model of tertiary, they were actually worried the critical mass of the students they represented would not necessarily be in favour of UDL, and they had a really significant fear that, really, in this sort of market approach and business approach to delivery, most students were actually quite at ease with the notion of expediency of "I register, I take my course, I get my exam, I leave", and a fair proportion of the student body would actually see UDL as extra work, and that deep engagement authentic learning was not actually something that appealing.

So they were afraid even if they went to their stakeholder group for an agenda to move forward, there might be pushback from a critical mass of learners that are actually quite comfortable in this process of the banking model, let's call it, going back to this notion that "I'm on a conveyor belt but I don't care because I'm out of there faster if I don't ask questions."

I think for us, that's a really interesting point, that so many of our students have integrated internalised this model of, you know, well, it's not necessarily student centred or informative, but I don't care, I just want to get on with it and create some leave that when you are trying to create the student role it might be problematic to get a critical mass of these students actually saying, "No, this is something we are interested in and we want our student representative to actually act on it."

Now, this is interesting on many levels. I keep talking about the notion of transitional friction, that we may be able to awaken UDL to say, "Oh, if we offer this to students, we are going to see immediate results and they are going to love it." I think whenever you move students who are used to a banking model into transformative models, UDL inclusion generally, but also even social constructivism you have probably all experienced this the first reaction is actually unease. "I'm on something which I don't like but it's a conveyor belt that I'm used to. You ask me to step off the conveyor belt and engage in learning in ways I have had no heads up. I am not sure how I will do, I worry about my grades and these market-based indicators that I am doing well within a system." If you ask students to step off that conveyor belt, they may not be that comfortable at first. This transitional friction is about accompanying students through a large process longitudinally of saying, "Okay, this is new to you, but I'm going to accompany you, I'm going to explain to you why I did this, and I'll lead you to see that this has a rich impact on your learning."

That transitional friction can be really problematic if they are not accompanied, things are not transparent, they don't really understand why they are doing it. So I think this is what we're looking at, that for a lot of students who have not been exposed to UDL, that accompaniment hasn't existed, the transitional friction is such that they actually may be quite fearful of this shift to something which is the unknown, which is new. So that was a real concern from the student perspective on the campus scale.

Also, the student union is worried about the pocket manifestation of UDL. What we see at the moment is ad hoc sporadic, "this class is there, this class it's there, this department it's not there and this other class it's not there", so if you are looking at the student perspective and all the participants that were students talked about this it can be really unsettling that we are asking them to navigate environments that are super inclusively designed and student focused, to back to traditional environments, on another course they will go back to something which is UDL, and then out of it again to something that's not UDL at all.

It makes sense for us that we say, well, this implementation is classroom based, it's within that bubble, it is happening there, but if you look at the longitudinal trajectory of a student through a 3 or 4 year degree, we ask them to constantly fluctuate in or out of these environments that are either congenial or completely uncongenial, and that is problematic. So their issue was, well, if we don't do this systematically, if we can't manage to find this across campus, sustainable ways of doing this, we are dooming our students to navigate an environment that doesn't make sense, that are so dichotomous in nature that they force them to constantly be in transition.

Interestingly, there was also some ethical concerns. This is anecdotal, but when I asked ethics for this project it was rejected twice. And the argument from the ethics committee was don't create a window for dialogue between the stakeholders because it might be disruptive. I found this really interesting, that even an ethics committee would say why create an issue when there isn't an issue? Why create a dialogue where people might have conflicting views when there is no need for the dialogue to happen? And I did have two goes at going back and saying this is the whole point of this process, is to create the window for dialogue and see what we get.

You see we're so fearful as well of the power dynamics and creating views that are clashing that we actually prefer to back away, as institutions, and say, "Well, we don't even need to create that." I think when you look at the spring we've had the fall for you and the spring we've had of, you know, the protests around the world, Universities, going back to a 60s process of "we have something to say and it may not be what you want to hear", it is interesting even for us in terms of UDL, right, to what extent are we ready at a campus level to hear dissent and hear people's visions are clashing, et cetera.

The role of the student union is crucial in UDL and students generally, but as a student body here we're talking about systemic is crucial, but these bodies and students may be hesitant because they don't necessarily have the know how to create an awareness exercise. The logic of the conversation with these students at that level of the whole institution was we have a critical mass of students who may not understand this, who may not be comfortable with it, who may not see the logic in trying to do this. So we need awareness but who is going to create that awareness? They will say, "We don't have the know-how, we don't have the expertise to create the resources for us to have this internally to be able to actually train our students."

And then there was a reluctance there. Well, even within the power dynamics, do I go to a faculty to say, "Create the material for us, please." So this is, again, in the terms of the ecological complexity, quite complex, right? The stakeholder knowing what they need but not quite being quite sure where they will be able to get that.

Then there was an understanding this was on both sides actually much of what's happening around UDL is based on volunteering at this stage. The workload of faculty around UDL is not recognised. But for students, it's unremunerated work and aware, again, something really ironic, you know, students get engaged at the campus level, be part of this process of implementation longitudinally. But we are not going to pay you for it. You have to do this volunteer on top of your student workload.

Finally, there was definitely fears on the student side of tokenism, again, students with disabilities particularly being used, you know, over and over and over again to be part of this process of UDL implementation. And, really, a realisation that these are students who are dealing with considerable barriers already and then they have student workload and then we are asking them to do another role, literally a role that should be recognised and paid for and they may not want because they may be busy with other things. We are not doing too badly. We've got another 5 minutes of this and I will open up for questions.

So in terms of going back to the findings. So the project is an action research flavour, so we sought to create these two stakeholder groups and to create that dialogue. This was successful. I'm going to be quick here but the innovative part of this, again, was that this dialogue at the end and these two focus groups did happen, and although both of the groups were talking about the difficulty of having that dialogue in an authentic way, it did happen in an authentic way at the end, which was also coded/integrated into the data analysis.

But what was revolutionary about this is we had people able to have these conversations because they were not from the same faculty. We made sure of this. And the focus groups made sure there was no one from the same department or same faculty. And it's something maybe that's revolutionised for us because most of the dialogue and most of the scholarship and the field reflection around dialogue between faculty and students has been around the fact that it's going to happen in the classroom, it's going to happen in the department. But really, if we want it to happen authentically, maybe it needs to be happening in a completely different way, where we are creating this inter disciplinary model, this inter disciplinary approach where people across disciplinary boundaries are able to have much more of an authentic discourse around change, power dynamics involved in that change, and also how to make this sustainable. They are not going to reach that level of authenticity if they stay within their own discipline and their own silos where the power dynamics are so great.

In terms of best practices and there is two slides here, one for faculty and one is for students the Faculty, a lot of other things came up in the discussions that aren't necessarily just about the dialogue with students. First of all, there was really an interesting acknowledgement at the moment that all the work we do in UDL is siloed again, it's happening within school, within discipline. And these projects also gave people an ability to talk to people they had never met before who are doing UDL across disciplinary boundaries. So someone from business meeting someone from nursing. That was really encouraging. There was enthusiasm around that.

Also, a recognition that something that came out of the studies, "Ooh, people here already know about UDL. What about the people who don't know about UDL? What are we doing to attract more people into this dialogue through onboarding of faculty, continuous training across campus, et cetera?" Also, a lot of them saying, "Well, I want to engage with this but let's recognise the redesign workload planning in my tenure and promotion package. Let's involve the unions, let's actually have this scheduled into our workload in a way that makes sense if it's going to be sustainable."

Also, the increasing number of sessional contract faculty, they were not present in this project because of the very nature of the way we carry out the recruitment, et cetera, it was really targeted at people who have a full affiliation, but sometimes certain departments, up to 70% are contract faculty that may be teaching after hours, weekends, et cetera. They may not even have the...to engage in this dialogue, so how do we reach them?

Then an urgency of change of mindset around student voice and their lived experience. There was really, again, that candour, realising, "I do my best. I give everything to get authentic dialogue. I realise maybe the parameters here are wrong and I will not get that authentic dialogue because of the power dynamics that are framing the place where I have to ask for that feedback." Then a need for less threatening use of student feedback. Again, there was a lot of queries around, well, we have student evaluations, we ask them so many other questions during the evaluations. Are they going to be truthful about the things we do want to hear about?" Then there's that whole like, well, people are very conscious, for example, if you are contract faculty, that student feedback during the formal evaluation is also, again, a power dynamic. If that person wanted a full-time job, they wouldn't put on "is my grade good enough", et cetera. So a lot of things were coming into play in the way a student evaluation could be used in lots of different ways.

From the students, obviously a realisation that involvement of the student union is urgent, and the fact that student unions report they need support for UDL to create awareness and tools and things they can use internally but who's going to provide that? Issue around the turnaround, that they realise that by the time we have got people trained on UDL and they have a role and they have a voice, it's time for them to graduate and moving on. So there is an inherent issue there around establishing and sustaining that voice.

A pressing need for formal channels of communication with student body at department level to change that tokenistic, "Oh, we have a student rep, that will do", and that information sharing, is it enough? It's about input and about participation. Importance of widening UDL discourse beyond disability. That was very important for the student body, saying, "If you want this to matter and to be developed sustainably, we need to change the resources we have because most of those are focused on disability, not cultural diversity, not linguistic diversity." Not just being non-traditional students, so how do we tap into that student body if we don't have a discourse which includes them and brings them in?

Again, this knowledge of addressing and acknowledging neoliberal mechanisms that means that sometimes students are so forced to be in that banking model that they become comfortable with that model, and a lot of students saying it is not going to be easy. Even if it is best for them, they may not at the moment realise that it is best for them, because by adaptation they think let me just get out of here and comply and do what I have to do and not rock the boat.

So obviously, this is best practice but is remaining issues around student involvement. You know, how can we do this if we're not interested in the ethnographic exploration of student rights? Can we actually do this? I had a recent example in another project I'm doing at the moment in Ireland where someone said, "I was talking to one of my most dedicated educator in my department, a transformative educator. But when I got student feedback and the students said one of the great pieces of redesign would be if we had 15 minutes and discussion windows to discuss assignments, just so we understand the directives, et cetera." And they were saying these committed transformative instructors pushed back on this and said, "No, this is enough. There is a limit there. We're becoming too indulgent. Students at one point have to take accountability for their work. They shouldn't need another 15 minutes to go around asking questions about the assignment directives."

So here you see some of the difficulties is that even people who think they are transformative and think they are involved in that process, may still have sort of ableist sort of, you know, boundaries where there is some pushback and say, "No, I don't want this." Why? Because we are still doing this from a teacher centric perspective. "I think this is as far as I will go." But what if the student tells you that's not enough and your redesign has to go further or this is required and you are not comfortable with that?

Can we really do this locked away in our office looking at the three principles with a commonsense approach, or do we have to go further and engage in a nuanced, authentic dialogue in order to be able to get that feedback? To what extent do we also deconstruct the mechanism for student consultation so they become meaningful? That's more administrative at a department level. Then how can we create powerful avenues for participation of the student body at campus level without relying on the volunteering, how can we avoid the fact there is no training or awareness for their student body around UDL, and that they, themselves, may be very precarious in their approach to UDL because of this frequent turnover. These are really ecological problems we have to address as we move forward.

Again, this study functioned with faculty and students who had some degree of awareness of UDL. If you went to the whole body of faculty and the whole body of students, that would have been even more complicated. So scaling up this project raises other issues of, well, these have never been introduced to UDL so how do we begin that dialogue where there is no awareness on the other side for both stakeholders?

I did want to finish off in the last 2 minutes talking about this ethnographic. I want to draw you to the work of Jutta Treviranus. She works at the Inclusive Design Research Centre, OCAD, which is the College of Arts and Design in Toronto. She is someone I have a lot of respect for because she is sort of pushing UDL further and saying can we do UDL without engaging and being constantly in contact with the lived experience of diverse learners? Is it possible? Essentially, she said, how can you do inclusive design if you are not involved in user experience or in exploring the user experience or collecting the user experience? I think for a lot of us it is the first wave of discourse on UDL is being useful in saying anyone can do this. It is really user friendly, when it is, but can you really sustain this and make it deep and meaningful and transformative unless you are continuously interacting with the UDL experience?

I will tell you something, which is anecdotal but for me I find fascinating. I'm carrying out this big project at the moment on instructors in Ireland who have taken part in the UDL badge, and what did they do with it, and carry forward, et cetera. Every single person who is in this study and has taken the UDL badge has some family contact with a person with disability, and they talk to you about their kid or their brother, et cetera. I find that really, really interesting, because we've never quantified this, but to what extent are the people who are motivating themselves in continuing this work, is it not because they have somehow a window into the lived experience of people who actually are experiencing those barriers, and to what extent can we do this otherwise in a sterile way if we don't have that?

So those are questions I will leave with you at the end of the session. We have a couple of minutes for questions if there is something that jumped up. Sorry, I took a lot of time there. Is there something in the chat?

DARLENE: There has been. It's been great to listen as well as be engaged in the chat. There's been some fabulous sharing of resources and information in the chat. We've had a few questions come through, but the reality is with only 4 minutes to go we're not going to get to them all. So just thinking first off the best question to ask would be what tips could you give on ways to elevate and celebrate the work that's been done by staff and students? What are some tips you can give to us to help us to elevate that?

FREDERIC: Well, I think something I keep hearing is the notion of beyond inclusive design, its normal people are bringing to the discourse the notion of co design. I think if we look at co design, it widens the discussion into that more authentic territory, right? It's also more threatening. So instructors are often quite scared of co design, but if we start using that vocabulary and bringing it in, it's going to open the door, first of all, to celebrating, as you said, the work that some people are already doing, but also from the start to say this is what we're really aiming for. Not just consultation or a quick poll; co designing. They have to be part of this movement. It brings me back to the work of Jutta Treviranus. Can we think even think of UDL or inclusive design without at some point saying, "I am going to need to do this in a co design process and involve the students fully in this process."

DARLENE: Excellent. Another question was around the involvement of the academic board and uni councils. I know you talked about the student involvement in Senate, but in this research and in the work you're doing, what involvement has the boards or councils played in the decisions or discussions around UDL?

FREDERIC: Well, that will vary from institution to institution. My campus, for example, has an accessibility committee that is now progressively integrating people from all departments and that makes representation to Senate, and those representations have to do with the fact that BC is about to enact an Accessibility Act, accessibility legislation that will force Universities to be accountable in terms of certain things, and UDL is included within that.

I still think whenever you see and it is a wider discussion, but whenever you see UDL at mission level statements, strategy level, you know, in the discourse of academic boards, et cetera, and Senate, it is still very superficial. So even when it is included, I find it's very rare that we look at the implications of what it means. So it's very easy at high level to say, "Yes, we're committed to that", but unless we look at the reflection this leads to, both in dribbling this down across the campus through all the faculties across disciplines, but also accounting for people's workloads, what are the financial implication? There is a funding issue there. For one person to engage with redesign you have to think of what's it going to cost for people to engage with redesign. I think at the moment I'm not seeing in any campus where that is actually done in a realistic and pragmatic way.

Even when you look at Ireland, that's, you know and bless his heart, Dara is pushing for this UDL charter that all these presidents of Universities are going to sign. But if they sign it and don't actually think about what are the implications to workload, in terms of recognition of their work, in terms of, you know, creating windows for that work to happen, then it's still going to be a tokenistic signing on principles but without any reflection of what these principles apply through everyday work and the onboarding of people, et cetera.

DARLENE: Thank you for that, Frederic. We do have a UDL community of practice here in Australia, which is great, and Dara is joining us in September to talk about the charter, so it will be interesting to get more feedback on that. Each of us, America and Canada and Australia, are all doing different responses to try and support UDL, so it's great to collaborate.

Thank you so much for your presentation. It was fabulous to once again hear from you. I love listening to you and seeing what your research is doing and following you on social media. It's absolutely brilliant. I encourage everybody to engage in the Padlet, continue the conversation there, also connect with Frederic in all the ways he has suggested.

This session has been recorded and will be placed on the website in the next few days. And please feel free to share. We also have a short survey that we would value your input into adding your thoughts and also suggest future webinars. Please sign up to our newsletter as well. And we've got two webinars coming up, one is Celebrating Student Success Embedding Inclusive Practice into Graduation, which is coming up next week, which I saw that presentation at a conference a few months ago and loved it. Really, a great way to think about how we can be more inclusive in our graduations. And then Unmasking Literacy: A model for developing academic literacy in their diverse enabling classroom. Once again, a fabulous topic. Thank you all for joining us. It's been fabulous to see the engagement that people have done in the chat and the engagement they've done in the Mentimeter. And thank you Frederic for your time. Take care.

FREDERIC: You're welcome, thank you. Don't hesitate to engage in the Padlet and I will keep moderating that through the day.

DARLENE: Thank you.