Institutional compassion: a co-design approach to developing digital wellbeing

Debbie Holley & David Biggins (Bournemouth University)  
Marketa Supa (Charles University)  

August 2020
Images of digital wellbeing
“Digital technologies present many opportunities for new ways of working. Understanding the positive benefits and any potential negative aspects of engaging with digital activities is key to ensuring learner and staff wellbeing”

(Jisc 2020)
Audience feedback #1

- How much of an issue is student and staff wellbeing in your institution?
- Please add your thoughts to the chat
Setting the scene

• Establishment of the BU TEL Toolkit in 2016
• Research into the ontology of digital toolkits
Barriers to success delivery

- Organisational culture: 70.45%
- Financial constraints: 47.73%
- Lack of capacity or capability in IT: 40.91%
- Legacy IT systems and practices: 38.64%
- Lack of change leadership competency or capacity: 36.36%
- Lack of sponsorship from the institution's executive team: 25.00%
- General risk aversion: 15.91%
- Other: 4.55%
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Audience feedback #2

• What are your barriers to successful digital delivery?
• How does these barriers impact staff and student wellbeing?
• Please share your stories
DigComp: The European Digital Competence Framework
Jisc digital capabilities model
Digital Learning Maturity Model

Institution

Capability

Wellbeing/lifelong learning
## Digital Learning Maturity Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Institutional strategy</th>
<th>Organisational culture</th>
<th>Technical infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>Tool/toolkit orientation</td>
<td>Staff digital competency</td>
<td>Student involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellbeing/lifelong learning</td>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td>Wellbeing and institutional compassion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience feedback #3

• Do you agree on the importance of wellbeing in the digital learning model
Levels of maturity

- Maturity can be defined as “the extent to which an organisation has explicitly and consistently deployed processes that are documented, managed, measured, controlled and continually improved” Cooke-Davies (2004 p214)
- Only 24% of institutions formally benchmark themselves (USICA 2019)
DLMM sample output
DLMM sample output
## Student wellbeing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Wellbeing and institutional compassion</td>
<td>There is no consideration of staff/student wellbeing</td>
<td>Some staff give consideration to staff/student needs</td>
<td>Tools are chosen based on their wellbeing impact</td>
<td>Those involved are asked for their response to digital learning</td>
<td>Staff/student feedback informs digital learning</td>
<td>Staff/student feedback drives digital learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audience feedback #4

• Do you think these maturity level definitions are appropriate?

• In which ways are your institutions addressing wellbeing for staff and students

• What behaviours might be seen at the different levels?
References

- Intro to digital wellbeing: learn how to develop and maintain healthy tech habits Free course from Google Digital Garage: https://learndigital.withgoogle.com/digitalgarage/course/digital-wellbeing
## DLMM – Theme 1

| Theme        | Dimension                              | Level 0                                                                 | Level 1                                                                 | Level 2                                                                 | Level 3                                                                 | Level 4                                                                 | Level 5                                                                 |
|--------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1a           | Institutional strategy (JISC benchmark) | Digital learning is not part of the organisational strategy            | The strategy acknowledges digital learning                              | The strategy mentions digital learning                                   | Digital learning is a component of the institutional strategy          | Digital learning underpins institutional strategy. Organisations have a defined digital strategy. |
| 1b           | Organisational culture of digital learning and innovation | There is no culture of digital learning. Innovation is not expected of staff and students | The learning culture is individual not institutional. Innovation is not shared. | Learning cultures and innovation are emergent at department levels | Learning has equal importance to other cultures eg research. Innovation is encouraged. Innovation is encouraged of staff and students | Learning is the dominant culture. Culture development is actively supported. Innovation is recorded, celebrated and promulgated |
| 1c           | Technical infrastructure               | There is no defined technical infrastructure                            | Technical considerations dominate eg availability and security, hardware | The infrastructure supports and also inhibits digital learning           | The infrastructure supports digital learning                            | The infrastructure encouraged digital learning                          | Digital learning drives the technical infrastructure |
## DLMM – Theme 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Level 0</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Tool/toolkit orientation</td>
<td>Staff may or may not use their own digital tools</td>
<td>The institution has a range of tools that can be used by staff and students</td>
<td>The institution supports staff and students in the use of the tools</td>
<td>The institution has a centralised toolkit that is available to staff and students</td>
<td>There is an expectation that tools are used where appropriate</td>
<td>The toolkit is managed, promoted and use is monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Staff digital capability (including reward and recognition)</td>
<td>Staff digital skills are unknown. Digital learning is not acknowledged</td>
<td>Staff can assess their digital skills. Individuals may be recognised for their digital achievements</td>
<td>Staff are supported in developing digital skills. Departments recognise digital achievements</td>
<td>Digital skills development is an expectation. There is an institutional approach to reward and recognition</td>
<td>Skills assessed at recruitment and monitored via appraisal. Reward and recognition promotes of digital learning</td>
<td>Digital skill development is encouraged and monitored by the institution. Reward and recognition drives digital learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>Students are not involved</td>
<td>Students are informed about digital learning</td>
<td>Students are consulted on digital learning</td>
<td>Student feedback systematically collated</td>
<td>Working towards a partnership model</td>
<td>Students are equal partners in designing digital learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Level 0</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>Level 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Future orientation</td>
<td>How digital learning affects future employability is not understood</td>
<td>The understanding of future employability needs is embryonic</td>
<td>Departments are aware of the link between future employment and digital skills</td>
<td>There is systematic scanning of future needs</td>
<td>Future needs influence digital learning</td>
<td>Future needs drive digital learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Lifelong learning</td>
<td>The institution has no policy for lifelong learning</td>
<td>Evidence of lifelong learning and outcomes is anecdotal</td>
<td>Departments monitor lifelong learning and outcomes</td>
<td>There is an institutional approach to monitoring of lifelong learning and outcomes</td>
<td>Feedback on outcomes is used to inform digital learning</td>
<td>Lifelong learning and outcomes drive digital learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Wellbeing and Institutional compassion</td>
<td>There is no consideration of staff/student wellbeing</td>
<td>Some staff give consideration to staff/student needs</td>
<td>Tools are chosen based on their wellbeing impact</td>
<td>Those involved are asked for their response to digital learning</td>
<td>Staff/student feedback informs digital learning</td>
<td>Staff/student feedback drives digital learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>