

**Lee-Ann Sequeira:** Welcome to The Common Room, a series of podcasts by the LSE Higher Education Blog. Today's podcast is a follow up to More Than a Pivot Thinking Critically About Our Pedagogy, a workshop in June that was hosted by the Digital Education Network and the Institute for Curriculum Enhancement at Lancaster University, and the LSE Higher Education Blog at the LSE Eden Centre for Education Enhancement.

Sean Michael Morris was the invited guest speaker but unfortunately, he couldn't make it, and Jesse Stommel, his longtime collaborator kindly stepped in. The workshop threw up a number of thought-provoking questions both during the session and on Twitter, and we would like to thank the participants for their valuable contributions. This podcast is intended to be an extension of that workshop in June, where we reflect on that discussion and take the conversation forward: how can we practice and enact pedagogy critically during this online pivot? We are absolutely delighted to have Sean join us this time and participate in person.

At our podcast today, we have four panelists. Sean Michael Morris, Sara Camacho Felix, Dustin Hosseini, and myself Lee-Ann Sequeira. Sean is a Senior Instructor of Learning, Design, and Technology in the School of Education and Human Development at the University of Colorado, Denver. He is also the Director of the Digital Pedagogy Lab and has authored and contributed to many books and publications on critical digital pedagogy.

Sara is an Assistant Professorial Lecturer for the Atlantic Fellows in the Social and Economic Equity Programme at the International Inequalities Institute at the LSE, and also a member of the LSE Decolonising Collective. Dustin is a Digital Education Facilitator, the School of Management at Lancaster University. I, Lee-Ann, am an Academic Developer at the LSE Eden Centre for Education Enhancement and the Editor of the LSE Higher Education blog.

Last but not least, a big shout out to Chris Doughty, our fantastic podcast producer who makes these conversations possible. So, let's get started, but before we do, it would be nice to say hello and hear from our other panelists. Hi, Sean, how are things in Portland?

**Sean Michael Morris:** Things are great. We're having a very cool summer here. I'm very busy planning digital pedagogy lab for this year, which has gone fully online, but otherwise, things are really good.

**LS:** That's great. Thanks. Dustin, how things in Glasgow?

**Dustin Hosseini:** It's similar to where Sean is. It's been a cooler summer this year, I think, and a bit more rainy lately.

**LS:** Great. Sara, where are you joining us from?

**Sara Camacho Felix:** I'm joining from East London. It's actually been a wonderful summer so far, but I tend to like it hot. The hotter the weather, the better. I'm busy preparing for the next academic year for the programme I'm on, we're going to be completely online. It's a complete rethink about how we teach.

**LS:** Great, thank you so much. This is possibly been one of the most British introductions to a podcast where we start off discussing the weather, but that's great! One of the things, if you don't mind, I'd like to start the conversation off with is a discussion that happened that occurred during the session in June. It was about getting students to turn on their camera during Zoom calls, something very specific. This really got quite a few people interested in talking about their experiences. Some of things coming up were, does it enable a better quality of interaction and communication in the class, if you can see everyone's cameras, or is it an invasion of privacy? Does it turn the students into an unwitting data point in the surveillance capitalism economy? I was wondering if you would like to share your thoughts about this, either from your experience or from what you've seen and heard.

**SMM:** Sure, I'll start off. I think this is something we've talked about a lot actually in the groups that I speak with, and it's become a real issue because so many people – as soon as we pivoted to online in the spring - many people immediately went to Zoom. Because they wanted this synchronous thing. They wanted to be able to port their classroom into an online space as much as possible. There were actually a lot of faculty that I've talked to who said that they required students to turn their cameras on, and if they didn't - even if they were like present with their camera off - they wouldn't be considered in attendance for the class. They had to see their faces. I'm definitely against the whole idea of surveillance capitalism but I'm actually going to talk about something slightly different than that. That is more the personal side of this.

I've been working remotely for years. I've been working remotely for over a decade. I first started using Zoom when I was at Middlebury college years and years ago. I have the privilege of understanding how the platform works and understanding what people are seeing behind me. I actually worked really hard to make sure the lighting is good and that you're not seeing anything that I don't want you to see. Behind me, I can close my door so people don't wander in and out. At the most, you may see a dog come and go. Students often don't have that privilege. Here in the states anyway, we often have situation where students who may have computer access on campus, when they go home, they have to share a single computer with their entire family.

That computer may be located someplace or maybe a laptop and they may not have privacy. You may end up having a student sitting in class and you see their family behind them or you see some other place in their house behind them. I feel like that's not really appropriate. You would never ask, "We're going to have class in your living room. Is that cool?" I don't think that we would ever do that. We wouldn't go that direction. Asking people to turn the cameras on is problematic unless we can provide them with the guidance around how that can be done and in what the best conditions are for that so that we give students the opportunity to set up a space and then we give them the opportunity to say, "Hey, I don't have a space that I can set up, I share a room with my little brother". Whatever it may be. If we can open that conversation with them, as opposed to just forcing them to do it, as opposed to just making it part of their grade.

I think that we can actually have really productive conversations about what this digital technology means and what it means to have people looking in on your home. Teachers are often doing this too but I've also worked with faculty who don't want to

turn their cameras on. It's the same issue. I go straight to the personal side of this and the kinds of conflicts that it immediately brings up for students and their homes.

**SCF:** I think you've hit that nail right on the head in a way, especially when you're talking about like what's going on in this background. I work in an international inequalities institute so it's not going to be surprising that my first instinct is to go straight into the inequalities that having a camera means, from things as simple as the quality of your broadband. I mean, how many times have we been in meetings where you need to turn off your camera because it keeps cutting in and out? That's made worse when you have maybe your student is in your class but maybe that student has three siblings who are also sharing that internet connection or a parent that has to share that internet connection for more work. By assuming that everybody has the ability just from a technological perspective, access to high-speed internet, to be able to see each other is an assumption we can't afford to make.

I would definitely say that. It's true. I've been in meetings where colleagues don't want to turn it on and yes, from a comfort perspective, I read facial expressions. I know if someone's paying attention based on what they're doing, the smiles, the giggles, when I attempt to be funny, I don't always succeed. That's what makes learning, right, is those interactions. I can understand that instinct to want to force the camera on but what you're doing is creating a situation where we claim that you're not participating unless I can see you're participating and that's not a safe claim to make. There's housing poverty. There is lots of people at home. There's all sorts of reasons why that camera can't be on. To force that camera on is to ensure that we're adding more stress onto students that are already stressed by the situation. That's my take on it.

**DH:** I was just going to add that sometimes the numbers won't allow everyone to turn their cameras on anyway. If you have a workshop or a seminar, I will say, 50 people, you just won't see them all. It doesn't really make sense. There's no real argument to see all of them. If people really want to track the students, they could send out a survey or something, an exit ticket type thing, where they get them to answer a question.

I know in the UK context, they don't take attendance unless it's a seminar. Lectures are not surveyed. Sorry, attendance isn't taken in lectures because there's too many people. There might be a signup sheet especially for international students because there are visa-related issues that they have to address and make sure they're addressing but traditionally, in the UK, attendance was never linked to academic success or progression, so you, in theory, could skip a lot of your classes, lectures and just still pass.

Coming from the US system, I would say, I think we should give them some credit for attending because being present takes a lot of effort for some. If they're engaging - I come from a language background where you have to be present. It's harder to learn a language in isolation. You can do it, but it takes a lot more effort. As far as cameras, it seems like lately with colleagues, we turn them on maybe the first time we're meeting and we've never met before, or if we really want to see the other colleague, but there's been plenty of meetings where, as colleagues say, they're lecturing into the void. They don't know how to do that. That's the other way of looking at it. The flip side. Teachers certainly are thrust in situations where they're

talking to a screen and there are people their eyes on the other side of the screen, but they don't know how to talk to those eyes because they don't know what facial expressions are being made, and so on and so forth.

**LS:** Thanks. That's really, really interesting. It's a weird coincidence because I've had to turn my camera off a number of times, during, the, what, 10 minutes we've been online, primarily, because I'm experiencing some sort of lag, and other issues as well. It's really quite interesting about this. Thanks for sharing your thoughts. Who has another question that they'd like to bring up and discuss and throw around?

**DH:** I guess maybe the next question if we want to move on is how can we convince colleagues to engage with digital pedagogies or digital education? From my own experience, the best way it's happened is where colleagues have come to me with a problem, should they say, especially in terms of COVID-19, they say we have this issue, we want to do it, how do we do it? An example might be delivering online exams or doing exams online and at a distance while still maintaining some kind of academic rigor, for example.

Through an hour-long conversation, we would talk about the different options. I know from my own practice, the best way seemed to be where lecturers came with that problem with an open mind and listen to all the solutions, without immediately saying, "No, that won't work." The open-mindedness is something that I don't have an answer to. We can't open people's minds. What do you think?

**SMM:** I've done a fair bit of work trying to help faculty who suddenly are faced with teaching online in much more controlled situations than what we faced this last spring but the challenges are very similar because they're often being - for example, I've worked with faculty in a cohort, who have been told by their administration, "You are going to teach online. You are going to develop an online course." My job is then to come in and triage that a little bit and try to make this look like it's going to be an interesting thing and sort of fun.

In that question about how do we convince colleagues to engage with digital pedagogies? I think there's a couple of different ways to look at that. In terms of the pedagogy side of it, I actually try to help faculty understand that their essential pedagogy is not going to change when they go online, that they can learn to bring what's most necessary to the way that they teach into an online space. There are tools to help them. There's all kinds of things you can do. There's techniques, but that ultimately, what the first thing they need to do is look at their pedagogy. What is it that you think is the most important thing that you do? If the most important thing that you do is lecture to your class, great. Bring that online. That's actually really easy. If the most important thing that you do is making human connections with your students, then let's figure that out, let's find a way to make that happen in an online class. The sort of requirement around that though is to break down the assumptions about what online learning looks like. One of the first things we have to do is dissect that a little bit and say, "It doesn't have to look like the LMS or the LE." It doesn't have to look like this very controlled model, where you have to just fit your teaching into these boxes.

Actually, you can bring your teaching into these spaces in a brand new way, You just have to develop a literacy around how those tools work or to do that. In terms of the

convincing part, I actually don't try to convince anybody to do digital pedagogy. I am an advocate for digital pedagogy. I run digital pedagogy lab. Clearly, it's a thing, but I actually don't try to convince anybody to do it under normal circumstances, obviously these last few last several months, it has been a requirement to go on to using digital technology in some way. I think most people have sort of default to Zoom like we were just talking about, they just fall into the easiest technology that makes it seem like you can replicate the classroom in an online space. Again, there's a big piece of this, that's a kind of digital literacy, understanding how tools work and what you can actually do with them, but also the difference between what you can do in an on-ground space, in the online space.

All of this is a matter of discussion, and collaboration, it's never just a matter of me saying to somebody, "Here's how you're going to do it and we're going to do it this way." It's always a matter of what do you need, what do you want to have happen here? What are you afraid of losing? And then let's work with that.

**SCF:** I think what you just said, Sean actually leads me to a different question because you're talking about having faculty, teachers, academics think about what they do in the classroom, like what they teach for what they're trying to do and then once they understand why they're teaching that way, or what is it, they try to do then move into the digital. That leads me into this question of to what extent and in what ways is learning technology actually driving the way we learn? It's actually the reverse that's happening, do you guys have thoughts on that?

**LS:** That's an interesting question, Sara, and it is in - I won't say stark contrast to what Sean was saying - but that it is something I think about a bit. Having been a learning technologist and being quite closely involved in technology, but also being fairly skeptical about how it's often used. I think it's difficult in a time like this where we have social and cultural norms that rely so heavily and are mediated by technology to such a great extent that I think unwittingly, at least whether I'm aware of it or not, I am a kind of technophile. It's very difficult for me to step back and answer this question objectively. Having said that, things like the medium is the message, techno determinism, these things have been written about theorized extensively. There's been evidence provided, and it does make me want to be or at least try to be more skeptical. To give an example of learner analytics.

That is something that has only come about fairly recently, and when I say recently, I'm talking about possibly the last 10, 15 years, or even longer, but it's coming to mainstream usage. I think, perhaps of the last 10 years or so and that's something that's only been enabled because of the technology. Perhaps one could say the desire to do so has always been there but it is now it's now happening very much and there have been papers written, there's been evidence collected to show that it does tend to disadvantage underrepresented minorities, the kind of things that I've encountered, especially things like indicators of retention, indicators of interaction, of participation, and it's not just underrepresented minorities, it's also anyone who deviates from the 'good student' profile. Those are all really interesting issues for me and also, to what extent are these kinds of learner analytics are being used to further institutional agendas in their rankings or funding or attracting more students. It's quite interesting in terms of how this is used and there's this kind of bait and switch idea that has come from, I think, Shoshana Zuboff about how we get students as well as ourselves used to these ideas. Then it becomes very difficult to look at it more

critically. I think, definitely, practicing and being more aware, perhaps being more aware of and practicing how we can be more critical of these things is important.

**SCF:** I've got nothing to disagree with you on that. If I'm going to be honest, I think you've hit a lot of points right on the head. I have a lot of anxieties about learner analytics because it's been mentioned already in this podcast and I think it's going to get mentioned again, this notion of surveillance and that learning doesn't happen unless we're there to witness it. I don't know about you guys, but my best learning, nobody who was there to see. Those aha moments where I went, "Oh, oh, that's what this is about." No one was in the room to witness them. They were at times when I was studying or when I was reviewing for an exam or even if sometimes it was in the classroom, but I wasn't about to vocalize that moment of, "Oh, I get it."

To me, this drive to capture everything and to count it and to analyze it, and to determine like, "Okay, the good student numerically looks like this and does this and unless we see these numbers, learning hasn't happened." Is the complete antithesis of what learning is, especially the thing that happens like six months down the road when you're doing something completely different and you suddenly go, "Oh wait, that's what Dr. so-and-so was talking about. I get it now." You can't quantify that. I suppose you could in some longitudinal way, but the idea that we must capture it in order to demonstrate that learning has happened to justify our existence as universities or as educators goes very much against the whole philosophy of what education is or at least, mine.

**SMM:** I think the point that you're ... Oh, go ahead, Dustin.

**DH:** Sorry. I was just going to say, but then how do we ... That sounds like it speaks from a point of a privileged education. What about for the ones who are less privileged? How do we ensure that they're on the right track and so that they don't fail or bail out rather because learning analytics, the arguments for those are, it can help with that? Sara?

**SCF:** Sorry. I was raising my hand because I know Sean wanted to speak, but I want to answer that question. First of all, we ask them. How about we just ask them? We give them space to reflect and we say, "Hey, how much did you learn this year? What really spoke to you?" And let them tell you.

**DH:** I can see that working on a Master's course of say 50 students, but when you have an undergraduate course of say 300, 400 students, how do we do that?

**SMM:** I have [laughs] Everyone listening we're on camera. I can see Dustin laughing, that's why I just laughed. For example, to answer that direct question Dustin, I have actually taught in fully online situations, never meeting my students, never having any kind of synchronous interaction whatsoever, up to 400 or 500 students in a term. Now, they weren't all in the same class, but 400 students during a single term. I've felt like I've been able to make personal connections with all of them and ask them the way that Sara is saying. I have never used analytics in any way, shape, or form when I'm teaching. I have spoken with people who feel like analytics are a really good way for them to see, sort of red flags or, "Hey, this student needs attention. Let's go look at that. Let's go look at that."

I think that can be okay as long as we're willing to negotiate the fact that we are capturing that data and that data is going somewhere and somewhere that we don't necessarily have control over it any longer. There's a compromise there and if we're willing to make that compromise, then okay and if we know that students are willing to make that compromise as well, then okay. That's a digital literacy. That's a thing that people need to understand about the technology that they're using, I don't know that they always do. Lots of faculty use Turnitin, lots of faculty use Proctorio, lots of faculty use these tools to capture data, then sell them back or they capture data and they hold onto it and they do all kinds of - we don't know what they're doing, they're making Frankenstein over there, Frankenstein monster to be technically correct.

There has to be that conversation. There has to be that sort of, if there is going to be any other negotiation, any compromise made, there has to be some real conversation around it. I wanted to speak just really quickly to something that Sara said before. Actually, something that Lee Ann was talking about too, in terms of this idea of becoming used to technology and understanding that we're getting to a point where we think, "Well, this is the way that it's done. Analytics has done this way, Turnitin has just always used it because I'm terrified of plagiarism".

We have to recognize that these are often uses that were not necessary before the technology came along. When the first iPhone came out, I was one of those people who stood in line outside the Apple Store and got my iPhone. I stood there for eight hours before I got my phone. I didn't even know what it was going to do. I didn't understand what apps were, no one knew what apps were at that time. I just bought the iPhone 11 because I keep upgrading because now it's necessary. But it wasn't necessary. It isn't necessary still, but it's become part of my lifestyle, it's become part of the way that I communicate and work. It didn't ever need to do that, Apple told me it should. I believed them because it was cute and it had just the right weight in my hand and the apps are colorful. All of those things convinced me.

When we hear arguments against plagiarism, when we hear arguments for why we need to use proctoring services, these are not arguments that are coming out of education. These are arguments coming out of the education technology. We need to recognize that we are being sold, we're not just being sold a tool, we're being sold an anxiety. We don't need to believe it. We can teach around it. I think that's another piece of that digital literacy, that I think it's so important is that we recognize that where the messages are coming from and what choices we actually have in this situation.

**LS:** That's absolutely fantastic. I love that. We're being sold an anxiety. I don't know, for me as an academic developer, that is so much what I see and perhaps what I'm contributing to. I'm going to be more mindful of that. Dustin, I do want to say, thank you so much for playing the devil's advocate or unless you actually hold those views. I think that's cool, too. I think it's very easy to kind of, not very easy, but sometimes it's easy, at least for me to fall into this thing of being critical and not often thinking about the practicalities or even that one can hold a critical point of view and still disadvantage others. I think it's really great that you've highlighted these issues and at a practical level, it does make sense in a lot of cases. Thanks. That was a very interesting conversation. Any other follow-up questions or any other questions that are lurking around in people's heads?

**SMM:** Yes. I would actually love to bring up an idea. As we're talking, there seems to be, underlying all of this, it seems to be an urgency to talk about our philosophy and talk about what does it mean now the teaching is encountering technology in this way. I'm wondering, especially right now during the whole Coronavirus, COVID thing, when all of us are dealing with this in a way that we've never had to deal with it before. There's people who never taught online, that don't want to teach online or suddenly teaching online. What are the risks right now if we don't take this time to rethink our philosophy behind education and teaching if we don't take this time to reevaluate what's going on with technology and education?

**SCF:** I'm going to jump in here first. If you'll remember from the introduction from Lee Ann, I'm part of the decolonising collective. My doctorate was on critical pedagogies. I am of the school of Paulo Freire and bell hooks, and you know I am anti banking method of education, very much seeing the counter-hegemonic possibilities of education as a means of critiquing the system, reimagining the system and potentially creating more equitable systems. Thinking from a decolonizing perspective, understanding how the colonial project on a global sense created a system of education that values a particular type of knowledge and a particular type of knower that is very quite European, and how we need to be breaking those barriers. I think the biggest risk if we don't go back, if we don't take this time to step back and go, "Oh, why are we here? Why do we teach what we teach? Should we be teaching other things?" That we're going to further entrench these inequalities, that we're going to further entrench these ways of teaching that suit only certain groups, that elevate only those that already coming from privileged positions, that this banking model of education will continue where it's teaching at, and that the student goes away.

It's more than that, it's also education that produces an elite. Education for the elite looks very different than education for the lower socioeconomic statuses, for those from the Global South, as the Global South are forced to learn what the North did and the enlightenment. Why is the enlightenment what that is? Unless we stop and go, "Wait a second, is this really what we should be doing?" Because we're at a point we're changing, where we have to change anyway. That if we don't use this time where we're forced to change anyway to really go, "Oh, wait a second, why do we even exist as institutions? Why do we teach? Why are we in higher education? Why do we have students?" That we're just going to entrench these inequalities deeper and deeper, and it's going to be more those who have great spaces at home, those who have great internet, those who have spouses who will take care of the kids. We're just going to see that elite class get further as those who have all these other structural issues that keep them from engaging be blocked even further from engaging. I think we really need to rethink that. I feel like I've rambled, but that's my pulpit. Okay. What do you guys think?

**DH:** For some programmes in the UK, it is about the money because they bring in over £23,000 - £20,000 per year if they're international students - but it doesn't mean that those students aren't well-cared for. I know that on one of the programmes that they do charge such high fees on because they are international students. It's the same way in the US. In the US, a lot of programmes for international students are expensive, they're not cheap.

What I was going to say is they do get, I guess, their money's worth. When I was helping lectures in question, because they were very sensitive to their audience, they were trying to make sure that the students had as good experience as possible. On the flip side, when I interviewed some students post-COVID-19 about their experiences, they said that they enjoyed the shift to digital, they think lectures are doing as best as they can. Maybe those were privileged students. Maybe they had good internet connections at home, good technology, so they didn't have an experience of having digital poverty, for example, or living in a house where there was a lot of other people. Which, there are a lot of students who do have that. My university, like most big universities, I think, in the UK and the US, it's public university, but it does draw upon the local area, so there are quite a lot of commuter students.

We don't know their living situations, we don't know, as I think Sean said earlier, how many people they're sharing the internet with, as Sara said earlier, their technology. Probably most of our students do have a laptop because just going upon based on where I work, I think a lot of students do have their own. If they don't, there are laptops they can borrow on campus.

From what I know, I don't know if we've conducted a survey on what students have and what they don't have. It'd be good to do that. I think years ago at another university I worked at, they did do that. That was a very different university, they gave the students - Sean might like this. They gave students all their books as part of their fees. Of course, it was part of the banking model, no extra fees, what is it, this little jingle? No added fees, I think that's what it was. [chuckles] They all had this thing.

Some universities give them tablets with preloaded e-books, but it's a tablet. Some universities are trying to deal with this to level with playing field. I know as an American student it would've been wonderful having free books because books were the most expensive unexpected cost. In the UK, I don't know if the books are as expensive, I think they might be but yes.

**LS:** That's a fantastic question. Sorry, Sara, did you want to come in?

**SCF:** I just wanted to challenge Dustin slightly on the assumptions behind what he was saying, like this notion of, "You pay for a good education, they're getting value for money". That's a philosophical question to me. Is that what higher education is? Is it a private good that you buy access to? Then you determine the value for money based on how you're taught, or if we're talking about the philosophy behind our teaching, are we teaching for something else? I would just challenge that under that there's an assumption as to why we exist and therefore why we charge fees. If we don't sit down and question that we run the risk of it getting worse.

**DH:** Interestingly, I am applying for PhDs and as I was looking, I noticed that they all cost different amounts of money. Which didn't make sense because they're all from, the UK, they were all from good subject departments. It didn't matter what the institution was, although the prices did some seem somewhat linked to the institution. Yes, I would say that no, the money you pay should be somewhat equal to the quality, but it's not always. Having had done a master's in the UK years ago, I think it was linked more to the name of the institution rather than the quality of the

actual programme, which is an ethical question because you're sold on the institution's name and programmes are riding on the ... I also studied at Middlebury, Sean, I don't know if you knew that. Did my Russian studies there. It was good, but at certain points, I felt I didn't always fit because it was very Northwestern, very kind of for a certain class of Americans that I'd never met before coming from Dallas, Texas. Anyway, I'll stop there.

**LS:** That's really quite interesting, Dustin, because the whole value of education is driven by what the market will support. It's very much in keeping with the kind of neoliberal agenda in the UK. Definitely. I think that was a really interesting question and really interesting responses. It's made me rethink or think more deeply about some things. Again, I think as you mentioned, Sara, about the privilege we have. It's interesting at the beginning in March or so when we were thinking about the center was gearing up to meet this demand for online education. I remember somebody saying this, never let a good crisis go to waste. It's a great opportunity for us to rethink this whole question of what education should be with digital education should be, should it be this poor country cousin, to this face to face education?

One of the things I did think is for a lot of people, it's not their first crisis. For people in the West, yes, perhaps, but the not in places like Syria that have experienced war and mass displacement, not in places like Palestine, where people are fighting for much more than an education and things that are much greater than that. Not in places like India where 10 million die of tuberculosis or something, or maybe it's not 10 million, but it's a huge number. For these places, this is not their first crisis. I think it does present an opportunity.

Again, I think it presents an opportunity for people who are not likely to be affected by the crisis in ways that are more serious than having their education interrupted, or, things of that sort. We're having to put in more hours to switch from face-to-face to online. I think we can use this as an opportunity to learn perhaps from others who've already dealt with this rather than assuming that all the answers lie with people who haven't been used to crises of this scale. To learn from the Syrians, from the Palestinians, from the Indians, from other people who have a lot more experience dealing with this How does higher education, factor into their plans into their lives, into their policies? I think perhaps looking a bit outwards is also helpful.

**SCF:** Yes, this has been a really interesting discussion. I have noticed that regardless of the question we're addressing certain things seem to pop up, especially along the lines of, in the end, it's about thinking about why we teach. Yes, it's the philosophy question, but even more narrowly. Okay. What is it I'm teaching in this course? Why am I teaching it and then moving into then what does that mean online? That in the end, the digital is about. the teaching and the education and the learning that's already going on and that we have hoped to, and then that in turn shapes, even whether or not we use learning analytics, which we had different views on, right, and some of us felt strongly against and some for admission of, "Okay, well, if we use it more thinking about, what are we doing, why do we teach this certain way, then maybe these tools start to work for us." I want to thank everybody for joining us today. It was great to talk to you about this, and it's really ... It's given me a chance to reflect on what's going on right now, but also what this means moving into the next academic year immediately, but also moving into the next couple of years. Like, is this going to change how I teach more broadly? Thank you,

Sean. Thank you, Dustin, and very much thank you, Lee-Ann, and I'm sure we'll still be in touch.

**DH:** Thank you.

**LS:** Great.

**SMM:** Thank you so much.

**LS:** Thanks for everyone being able to show up and making it into some really, really interesting conversation.