



AECED

aesthetic and embodied
learning for democracy

REPORT OF THE CASE(S) DESIGN

Deliverable 4.2

FEBRUARY 2024



Project Title	Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming
Project Acronym	AECED
Grant agreement	101094052
Project start date	1 April 2023
Project end date	31 March 2026
Call	HORIZON-CL2-2022-DEMOCRACY-01
Participants	University of Zagreb (UNIZG) University of Lapland (ULA) Philipps University Marburg (UMR) Riga Technical University (RTU) Universidade Aberta (UAb) University of Hertfordshire (UH) – Associated partner
Coordinator	University of Lapland
PI	Professor Susan Meriläinen

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Deliverable	4.2 Report, by each national partner, of Case Design (incl. Ethics Permissions) and how it contributes to the total project
Work Package	4
Lead Beneficiary	Philipps-University Marburg
Work package leader	Lea Spahn
Version	8
Due Date	29.02.2024
Submission Date	29.02.2024
Dissemination Level	PU - Public
Authors	Monika Pažur (Croatia), Pauliina Jääskeläinen (Finland), Julia Petzold, Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Lea Spahn, Susanne Maria Weber (Germany), Konstantins Kozlovskis, Karine Oganisjana, Natalja Lace, Rolands Ozols (Latvia), Cláudia Neves, Ana Patrícia Almeida, Juliana Oliveira, Marta Abelha, Pedro Abrantes (Portugal), Philip Woods, Karen Mpamhanga, Suzanne Culshaw, Hannah Reeves (UK).
Partner Contributors	All consortium Partners
Document Manager	Lea Spahn
Internal review	Joonas Vola, Pilvikki Lantela

Version	Date	Main modifications	Modified by
1.0	22.1.2024	Introduction written.	Lea Spahn
2.0	25.1.2024	Integration of national case design templates (separate template for each case) and the existing ethics permissions.	Lea Spahn
3.0	5.-9.2024	Revision of case templates (combining each partner's cases under one template to avoid repetition); formulating further ethics related instructions to partners.	Lea Spahn
4.0	12.-16.2.2024	Revision of case templates by national partners, adding information on the national ethics process and processing of data.	National representatives: Monika Pažur (Croatia), Pauliina Jääskeläinen (Finland), Lea Spahn, Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Susanne Maria Weber (Germany), Karine Oganisjana, (Latvia), Cláudia Neves, Ana Patrícia Almeida, Juliana Oliveira, Marta Abelha, Pedro Abrantes (Portugal), Philip Woods, Karen Mpamhanga, Suzanne Culshaw (UK)
5.0	15.-16.2.2024 19.-20.2.2024	Internal Review and proofreading of all cases and the introduction; editorial and grammatical changes made	Pilvikki Lantela Joonas Vola
6.0	21.2.2024	Revision of <i>Ethical considerations</i> in the introduction	Lea Spahn
7.0	20.-21.2.2024	The document underwent a review, and final edits were made based on internal reviewers' feedback and suggestions; revision of <i>Introduction, Case Design, Ethical considerations, Appendix, an format control and edit of the References. Thematic elements</i> of the AECED project and PAR methodology were taken from the Croatia's template and inserted into the introduction.	Kardelen Dilara Cazgir, Susanne Maria Weber
8.0	27.2.2024	Final proofreading. Finalizing the layout of the document.	Pilvikki Lantela Joonas Vola Cláudia Neves

ABREVIATIONS

ABE	Arts-Based and Embodied (methods)
AECED	Project Acronym for Transforming Education for Democracy through aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming
AELD	Arts-based and Embodied Learning
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
PAR	Participatory Action Research
VEN	Visual, Embodied and / or Narrative Approaches

DISCLAIMER

Funded by the European Union and UK Research and Innovation. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

REPORT CASE(S) DESIGN

Report, by each partner, of their case(s) design (including ethics permission) and how it contributes to the total project

Content

1 Introduction	5
2 Case Design	7
3 Ethical Considerations	13
4 References	14
5 Appendix	15
5.1 Croatia: Case 1 - 4	15
5.2 Finland: Cases 5 - 6	21
5.3 Germany: Cases 7 – 10	25
5.4 Latvia: Cases 11 – 13	32
5.5 Portugal: Cases 14 - 17	37
5.6 UK: Cases 18 - 19	44

1. Introduction

The purpose of this deliverable is for all partners to share their case designs, ethics permissions, and explain their contributions to the overall project goal.

The project aims to create an innovative, evidence-based aesthetic and embodied pedagogical Framework that impacts the practice of education for democracy and the associated Guides to pedagogical practice that support responsive, participatory pedagogies.¹ For that, the six AECED partner countries use a Participatory Action Research (PAR) design through which they co-create, trial, and analyse a prototype pedagogical Framework and four associated Guides for elementary school, secondary school, higher education, and adult/professional education. In this deliverable, we present the case design for all 19 cases, covering a wide array of institutional trialing settings to ensure a differentiated and diverse set of data for reflecting on, analysing, evaluating, and re-designing the pedagogical Framework and the practice Guides.

In alignment with the research aim and overarching research questions of the project, we have formulated specific research questions for all national partners, as outlined in the methodological Framework. These questions serve as guiding principles for the cross-case analysis, ensuring that each partner's research aligns with the overall objectives and contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the project's focal areas.

In the following, we will give a short overview of the case design phase that also encompasses the approval of each country's ethics commission. Both aspects will then be portrayed in the appendix.

¹ See Grant Agreement-101094052-AECED

2. Case Design

AECED applies a Participatory Action Research (PAR) methodology with distinct phases and different levels of participation and opportunities to co-design, co-create, and co-evaluate (see Kemmis et al. 2014; Bryman, 2012).

PAR is a methodology that pervades the work of the research teams and the project. Conducting PAR involves the researchers not as distanced observers but as participants who are fundamentally involved as embodied beings and draw on their embodied and felt experiences as knowledge-makers. We understand knowledge-making as an epistemic practice in discourses, collective imaginaries, and embodied practices. As such, PAR is a methodology that mirrors our understanding of democracy-as-becoming as relational and lived experience: It is a methodology based on emergent, co-creative processes sensitive to power/knowledges, difference, and embedded practices in relation to learning for democracy in education (Seppälä et al., 2021).

All national partners design, conduct, analyse, and report on their own research according to a PAR methodology to develop, trial, analyse, and evaluate the Prototype Framework and the Guides in practice.

Process of Case Design

The work package leaders have established a regular exchange of methodological questions in WP4 meetings in which all researchers can participate.

All national teams received a template to create their case design following a PAR methodology and ensuring comparability for the cross-case analysis. The preliminary case designs were presented on December 5th 2023 in a consortium meeting, to be reflected upon and re-formulated into a final version until January 21st 2024.



Table 1: The Timeline for the Case Design

Cases in the AECED Project

There are 19 cases in total, spanning primary, secondary, higher, and adult/professional and organisational education settings.

Partner	No. of Cases	VEN focus	Phase	ABE pedagogical activities
Croatia	4	N N+E N N+E	Primary Primary Higher Education Higher Education	Storytelling; theatre
Finland	2	E E	Higher Education Adult/professional	Movement & sensory-based methods
Germany	4	V E V E	Higher Education Higher Education Adult/professional Adult/professional	Pattern Language Cards; Aesthetic Pattern Cards, Social Presencing Theatre
Latvia	3	V+E+N V+E+N V+E+N	Secondary Adult/professional Inter-generational	Drama sketch
Portugal	4	V+N V+N V+N V+N	Primary Primary Adult/professional Adult/professional	Visual imagery; storytelling
UK	2	V+E+N V+E	Secondary Adult/professional	Collage; gesture-response; narrative expression
Total	19			

Table 2: Overview of Cases in All Partner Countries

Common Features of the Cases

The following are the core and common features of all the cases. These features enable the comparison of interventions between cases and the cross-case evaluation of the Prototype Guides to pedagogical practice.

C1. Common intervention: Each case applies a common intervention: trialing the Prototype Framework and the Guides and creating opportunities for AELD involving aesthetic experience, arts-based and embodied pedagogical approaches (as described in D4 below). These enable self-expression through different aesthetic or artistic approaches, aesthetic reflection, cooperation, and collective processes.

C2. Participatory: Each case will be participatory, involving collaborative and transformative interactive activities as described in section A1.

C3. Methodological Framework: Partners will design each case, guided by the methodological Framework designed and agreed upon in Phase 2. Each case will, therefore, involve a common core data collection method (arts-based and embodied research methods), a specified, systematic, staged analysis process, and the use of a core set of evaluation criteria.

All partners are committed to the following research questions, formulated in the Methodological Framework:

RQ1. Regarding process: a) How do participants experience being introduced to and working with the Prototype Framework and Guides? b) In what ways is AELD co-created and facilitated through ABE methods?

RQ2. Regarding the transformational change in participants: In what ways do the Prototype Framework and Guides, by facilitating the co-creative design of AEL for democracy using ABE pedagogies, lead to individual and collective growth in regard to

- feelings for democracy,
- aesthetic awareness and qualities (such as empathic, ethical, and spiritual sensibilities),
- collaborative, reflexive and critical capabilities,
- openness to newly 'seeing' the other,
- willingness to move towards more reflexive and critical modes of awareness and knowing that reconnect with the body as a source of learning,
- capacity to challenge social injustices and engage creatively with conflict and antagonisms
- any other aspects that will be developed in and through the PAR process

RQ3. What influence, if any, did the researchers have on how the Framework and Guides were used and the designs of AEL for democracy that emerged in the trials?

RQ4. What evidence-based conclusions for revision and refinement of the Prototype Framework and Guides emerge from the experience of using the Prototypes and addressing RQ1, RQ2, and RQ3?

The case specific research question will be found in the case templates.

C4. Report template: There will be a common template for each case study report.

In order to follow the Pedagogical Framework and Guides in learning opportunities, some *thematic elements* can come together as principles, goals and values of AECED project and PAR methodology:

- **Personal and social identities:** Attention to aesthetic and embodied learning brings to the fore the unavoidable role of the body in thinking, feeling, experiencing, and acting – getting in touch with an identity. Focusing on aesthetic and embodied learning through arts-based methods can help us recognize how each body participates in societal life, including educational practice in creative settings. Becoming aware of different ways of participating in educational practice – through reflecting emerging emotions, thoughts, and bodily sensations in touch with arts-based methods – opens up possibilities to understand, for example, how emotional reactions recognized through the senses carry values, beliefs and learned ways of relating to others.
- **Responsibility:** Educational relations, such as those between educator and student, are viewed in AELD as interactive and jointly created. This means that learning is a two-way route from teacher to learner. It is an unfolding practice in which, at its best, teachers, students, peers, and families become jointly responsible for a process in which all grow together. Further on, aesthetic and embodied learning empowers communities to take an active role in the learning process.
- **Feelings of helplessness and empowerment:** Creative and sensory methods help participants to tap into their emotional real-life experiences to shed a new light on complex issues that they were dealing with. Ultimately, using aesthetic and embodied learning in light of “democracy as becoming” lead toward developing motivation and drive for social change. By engaging participants in a personal and meaningful way, they can be empowered to take collective action, and become active participants in democratization.
- **Embracing Diversity:** The values of democracy are concerned with human dignity and rights, respect and acceptance of cultural diversity, participation, justice, fairness, and equality and are based on oppression-free, trustful and inclusive interaction between people.
- **Dialogue and communication:** Transforming education for democracy requires a liberating dialogical process of (co)becoming in which all the involved participants continually recreate and transform their understandings of their selves and the world in an oppression-free, collaborative, and aesthetically and bodily aware environment that is friendly towards critical thinking.

The following are differentiating features of the cases. These enable the multi-case design to investigate the common intervention (trialing the Prototypes) in differing contexts and across different arts-based and embodied pedagogical approaches.

Differentiating Features of the Cases

D1. Phases of education: Each case will cover the trialing of the Framework and the Guides in a specific phase of education. Partners will design a case for each of their chosen phases of education, as outlined in Table 3. Therefore, the multi-case design will cover all of the phases of education to trial the common intervention across significantly diverse educational contexts.

In any phase of education, there may be very different stakeholders and participants involved, such as educators, involved artists, or parents.

Educational Phase	Primary (incl. Early Years)	Secondary	Higher Education	Adult / professional learning
Countries	Croatia	Latvia	Croatia	Finland
	Portugal	UK	Finland	Germany
			Germany	Latvia
				Portugal
				UK

Table 3: Phases of Education for Each Partner

D2. Partner countries: Most cases will be realised in the country of the partner undertaking the case. There is one case in Austria, led by the German project partner. Each partner is expected to handle at least two cases.

D3. Methods: In addition to the methods outlined in the Methodological Framework, each case will involve the use of data collection and analysis methods specifically tailored to complement the core approaches, such as arts-based and aesthetic methods. These additional methods aim to capture data pertinent to the unique contexts of each case. As researchers, we stay open to the participants’ experiences, ideas, and wilful adaptation of the Framework and the Guides, and perceive them as valuable for the analysis and adaption of the launch-ready design.

D4. Introducing Arts-based and Embodied Learning (AELD): Each partner will have a focus in their case(s) on particular approaches to aesthetic and embodied learning.

Some ABE pedagogical approaches emphasise the visual (such as collage-creation); some emphasise narrative (such as story-telling); some emphasise the embodied (gesture-response), and some – combination of these approaches (such as drama which integrates narrative and embodied elements). The multi-case trials will encompass a range of ABE pedagogical approaches that emphasise all of these; each partner will design into their case(s) visual, narrative, and/or embodied (VEN) approaches.

Designing, using, and evaluating new aesthetic and embodied pedagogies and learning opportunities for education for democracy is at the core of the project. Therefore, staying responsive to the participants' needs and ideas is important throughout the trialing. The research itself is perceived as a responsive and open process, with the expectation and assumption that each partner will integrate these principles into their data collection processes.

D5. Scope of the cases: The Framework and the Guides are epistemic devices that introduce a certain understanding of educational practices and institutions – aesthetic and embodied learning for democracy, responsive pedagogies, and democracy-as-becoming. Therefore, they will be introduced to very different stakeholders and participants. With that, the scope of their trialing will vary: from trialing methods to professional training of educators, to organisational change processes with policy actors, institutional representatives, or social movements. It is important to note that the scope of the cases is realized on different levels and that the data material generated from these interactions will be part of the cross-case analysis.

The case design depicts six iterative phases of PAR realized in the AECED project.

1. Introduction: viewing an introductory presentation (the project video created for the purpose)
2. Familiarisation with the Framework and the Guides: reading the Framework and the Guide (relevant to the case phase)
3. Collaborative reflection: carrying out a collaborative reflection activity using the Guide to decide priorities and the focus for an AELD innovation
4. Planning: formulating an Action Plan for implementing their AELD innovation
5. Action: carrying out the Action Plan
6. Reflection: meeting for a reflection of experiences, learnings, and possible adjustments of the Framework and the Guides

Each of these phases represents distinct ways of interacting with the participants and applying the pedagogical Framework and the Guides for practice. Each partner's case design is documented in the appendix 5.

3. Ethical Considerations

In the Ethics Summary Report, the involvement of vulnerable groups, such as minors or students, and processing personal data in a sensitive education context, were identified as the project's ethical challenges. Thus, an ethics advisor, Dr. Simo Kyllönen, was appointed to the project. In liaison with the AECED Ethics Group, the ethics advisor, with representatives from each partner country, have elaborated on the aforementioned ethical issues related to the field work, data collection and data protection.

Each partner has drafted a plan to conduct the research according to the GDPR, considering data protection, especially the possibility of processing sensitive data. Each partner filled out a preliminary evaluation sheet provided by the ethics advisor to assess whether a data protection impact assessment (DPIA) was necessary. None of the project partners needed the DPIA. However, the vulnerable position of research participants was identified in cases relating to students and minors.

The cases differ in terms of direct and indirect participants. The PAR methodology is based on the exchange with participants, the mutual involvement of a joint interest, and the co-creative research in all phases of the project. In many cases, teachers or staff of an educational institution will participate in the research. In these cases, the relationship of the researcher and the participant is close to equal – some of the AECED researchers can be viewed as researcher-teachers who themselves are learning about possible applications of ABE methods for education for democracy as they teach (e.g., case of Finland, see pages 22-27). In other instances, the power imbalance between researcher and participant is more substantial, as in courses where students are offered the possibility to participate in the research (e.g., Latvia, see page 37-42; Germany, see pages 28-36). In these instances, special attention is directed towards the rights and freedom of the students; all students must be aware of their right to choose if they want to participate or not, and of the possibility of withdrawing from the study without negative consequences.

Three partners, Latvia, Croatia, and Portugal, are involving minors in their research. In Croatia and Portugal data is not collected directly from minors; rather data is collected from the teachers who operate in their classes with minors. In Latvia, some students under 18 (Latvia's threshold for minors) are offered to partake in the study, and in case of participation, they need to have an assent form signed by their parents.

Each partner is committed to providing participants with the necessary information on how their personal data will be processed and protected in the research process. The Coordinator provided partners with a Data protection notice for scientific research -template, which addresses the GDPR articles 12-14. Each partner has applied this information to their national context and culture; each has formed individual and locally responsive informed consent sheets and other informative materials for the participants.

In terms of data management, of essence is the recognition of audio and video recordings as personal data, since all partners will use either of these means in their data creation. Attention will be paid to the transfer of raw data (with personal information) into anonymized research data. Generally, the data will be pseudonymized during the first round of analysis so that the names cannot be connected to the interviews or other raw data. Some partners use coding in this phase. All data will be anonymised the latest before the cross-case analysis (taking place in spring 2025) when the parts of the datasets produced in different countries and educational contexts will be shared among partners. No raw data, such as recordings, are shared with the other partners for

the protection of personal information. Published images will be made available only in a form where participants' identities will not be revealed. The identity of any participant would only be shown in published data where the participant gave, written permission through a process explained in the ethics permission sought.

To facilitate a systematic cross-case analysis, the Latvian team has proposed and provided "A Conceptual Model for Organizing Metadata to Conduct a Cross-Case and Cross-Country Comparative Analysis within Participatory Action Research" for structuring Matrix. The initial model was an Excel Matrix with 19 active rows, each corresponding to one of the 19 project cases. The columns are structured to represent the six Participatory Action Research (PAR) phases. This Matrix is a practical tool for gathering meaningful data throughout the case studies.

The leader of Work Package 4 (WP4), the German Team, has actively worked on the systematization and developed the dimensions and content of the Matrix by addressing partner countries' requests for practicality and clarity to facilitate cross-case analysis. This process involved co-creation and collaboration with all partner countries during WP4 meetings, resulting in the development of the Matrix.

The new Matrix has been configured with 7 columns by 7 rows. It encompasses general questions at descriptive, reflective, conceptual, and theoretical levels, corresponding to each of the six PAR phases and main questions and functions for each phase. It applies four different theories of comparison. The German Team has proposed specific main and sub-questions for each cell intersecting each level and PAR stage.

This design enables each partner to consider these questions and functions while planning their research, ultimately facilitating cross-case analysis.

The Matrix is a comprehensive tool to guide investigations across various phases and levels within the PAR framework.

The Matrix will not contain raw or pseudonymized data in national languages but metadata in English, derived from the separate analysis of each of the 19 cases.

The design of the Matrix guarantees cross-case transparency, easy data input and access, and meaningful vertical comparison of metadata related to each criterion, including intra and inter-group collaboration. The hyperlinking of each Matrix cell supports access to the most critical data from each case at any level of information comparison.

4. References

- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods* (4th Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jääskeläinen, P. (2023). *The Reversibility of Body Movements in Reach-searching Organisational Relations* (PhD diss. University of Lapland). <https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-337-396-9>
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Wiesbaden: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4560-67-2>
- Seppälä, T., Sarantou, M., & Miettinen, S. (2021). *Arts-Based Methods for Decolonising Participatory Research*. London: Routledge.

5. Appendix

5.1 Croatia: Case 1 - 4

1.	Educational Setting
<p>Case 1 Phase: Primary education Target group: 10-12 teachers who are working in different primary schools with children aged 5 to 11 years old.</p> <p>Case 2 Phase: Primary Education Target group: 10-12 employees (teachers, professional associates) in an elementary school</p> <p>Case 3 Phase: Higher education Target group: Teaching staff (approximately 10 people) from the Faculty for Teacher Education, University of Zagreb.</p> <p>Case 4 Phase: Higher education Target group: students (around 20 of them) of Faculty for Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, from different study years (from first to fifth year) or study programs (either studying for being a preschool teacher, either for being a teacher in primary education)</p>	
2.	Research Questions
<p>RQ1 Regarding the process, how could the connection between democracy as becoming and using ABE methodologies in different educational institutions be described?</p> <p>RQ2 What reactions, emotions, and experiences arise from the participants' contact with the Framework and the Guides?</p> <p>RQ3 How would researchers involved in implementing the Framework and the Guides describe their involvement, contribution, and growth during the PAR process?</p> <p>RQ4 Which topics and questions have opened during the PAR process that leads towards improvement of the Framework and the Guides to be more applicable and usable for different institutional and personal realities?</p>	
3.	Objectives in relation to your educational setting and national case studies
<p>To understand the connection between ABE methods and the process of democracy-as-becoming in different institutional and personal realities.</p> <p>Tasks:</p> <p><i>Sum up the words and concepts used by participants while explaining their experiences with the Guides.</i></p> <p><i>Generate topics that participants find relevant regarding democracy-as-becoming in their (institutional and personal) realities.</i></p> <p><i>To understand better and explain different visions of participation and collaboration while working in different groups and communities.</i></p> <p><i>To better understand participants' thoughts and understandings on using ABE methods to promote power sharing, transforming dialogue, holistic learning, and relation well-being in their contexts.</i></p>	

To portray different individual stories of participants they have constructed while being part of a specific learning opportunity offering AELD for democracy.

Tasks:

To understand how an individual went through the process of sharing their experiences with other participants

To better understand how personal characteristics influence the interaction with Guides.

To interpret the process of developing reflective practice within an individual while connecting his/her/their thoughts with emotions, feelings and body.

To develop questions that are important for teachers to “think about”, keeping in mind the different life stories of participants, while starting a learning opportunity based on AELD for democracy.

To start the questions about good sides and needs for improvement of the Framework and the Guides to be more applicable for different institutional and personal contexts.

Tasks:

To connect participants’ everyday practice with the AECED research process, and highlight potential “meeting places.”

To sum up ideas of how the AECED Framework and the Guides could answer more precisely to “real” problems that participants are facing in their contexts.

To generate important topics that should become part of the Framework and the Guides in order for them to promote and encourage democracy-as-becoming.

To understand better if the Guides are useful for both teachers with more and with less experience with using aesthetic and embodied methods.

4. Involvement of Participants

In order to get in touch with participants, the research required permission from the Ethical Committee of Faculty for Teacher Education, University of Zagreb. The list of documents was prepared for the Committee:

- A form with data about the research (information about researchers, goals of the research, research problems, relevance of the study and practical contribution, description of the research participants, the way we will come to the participants and how they will be chosen, the thorough explanation of how research will be done, detailed explanation of instruments and other methods of collecting data, how specific groups of participants will be protected, the detailed process how we will get the consent of participants for the research, potential risks for the research participants and the well-being for participants to be a part of this research, the ways how anonymity and data confidentiality will be guaranteed, the ways how the research participants will be informed about results, and how and where collected data will be used),
- An informed consent
- List of instruments that will be used in collecting data process (protocol for interviews, protocol for focus groups, an instrument for measuring the institution’s culture with a focus on elements of democracy).

An informed consent was developed as a document on two pages containing information about the project, research, its goals, potential risks for participants, and the well-being of participants, their institutions, and society. The PAR process is explained, and all methods that will be used are explained. Participants had an opportunity to decide whether they wished not to be part of some specific data collection method that is going to be used (for example – photo recording or interviews). A section highlights that participants have any right not to be part of some learning activity or research method, and their anonymity will be guaranteed in showing results. It is also explained that they can decide not to be part of some activity or stop being involved in the research at any time. Informed consent is signed by the national project leader and each research participant, and each gets its copy.

Regarding all cases, the same procedure is used for participants to get to know the project and sign an informed consent. The participants were introduced to the project goals, results, central concepts, PAR, and their specific role in the research. Then, a pause of 15 minutes was given to participants so they had time to read and sign an informed consent form before any data collection was done. After signing an informed consent, every participant gets their code. Based on that, the codebook (list of codes and names of participants) is done. After that, in all data collection documents (questionnaires, interviews, research diaries), codes are used to connect something with a research participant; names are not used. The codebook for each case is available only to the research team in printed form. After all four cases of PAR are finished, all data will be gathered and categorized according to specific categories (for example, age of participants, type of institution), and then the codebooks will be destroyed.

In Case 1 and Case 2, indirect participants will be minors. However, since children will not be research participants, and no information will be gathered from them directly, or their opinions used as research data, there is no need to have permission

from them. The research participant teachers will use some methods from the Guides in their classes while working on some topics in the regular school program related to the research goals. After using these methods, researchers will discuss with teachers whether the methods were clear and useful and how children reacted, to improve Guides. However, researchers will not use anything that children say, photograph children, or take audio or video recordings of them as data. While teachers expressed their interest in being part of this research process, they were asked if they needed anything from the project regarding principals or parents to use some methods in their work. The participant teachers are entirely autonomous for work in the class in any way they like, in line with Croatian national legislation.

Case 1

In this case, a group of teachers working in different schools will be gathered. After a learning opportunity, they will try to implement the Guides in their class, and their opinions on it will be collected.

- Direct participants: 11 teachers coming from different educational settings and realities.
- Indirect participants: children in primary education from classes where teachers will implement Guides.

The participants had an opportunity to apply to be a part of this project via Google online form, which was shared online on Faculty pages, where the project's main elements were described.

Case 2

One school where interested teachers will have different learning opportunities, and along with those, they will work on implementing the Guides in their classes.

- Direct participants: 10 – 12 teachers coming from the same school.
- Indirect participants: children in primary education from classes where teachers will implement Guides.

After the principal was informed about the project via detailed document, a group of interested teachers was gathered.

Case 3

A group of teaching staff will be formed. After a learning opportunity, they will try to implement the Guides in their class, and their opinions will be collected.

- Direct participants: teaching staff.
- Indirect participants: students with whom teaching staff will implement Guides.

The participants had an opportunity to apply to be a part of this project via Google online form, shared via the Faculty newsletter, where the project's main elements were described.

Case 4

Participants will students from the Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Zagreb, from different study years (from first to fifth year) or study programs (studying to be a preschool teacher or a primary education teacher).

Participants applied for the elective course Volunteering in Education, where the syllabus is connected to the topics of democracy-as-becoming that are developed via arts-based and embodied methods. A whole group of students creates the final grade in this course. Therefore, the teacher is not in power regarding passing the subject if students decide not to be part of a research. Students have the option to participate in the course without taking part in the study.

5. Empirical Data Generated

In Croatia, there will be four cases of PAR implemented: two in primary education and two in higher education setting.

The cases will be the same regarding (1) main pedagogical principles that are defined in the Prototype Pedagogical Framework of the project, (2) reflection cycles that are defined via PAR methodology, and (3) main topics that are going to be opened in learning opportunities for research participants.

The principles of democracy-as-becoming that will be considered while planning a PAR intervention are power sharing, transformative dialogue, holistic learning, and relation well-being. These principles imply that learning opportunities should promote inclusive participation, mutual respect, having a say, an open exchange of views, growth in aesthetic and embodied awareness, development of critical thinking, and feelings of belonging and connectedness to others.

Along with PAR, there are 4 phases of implementing research in all four cases: planning, acting, reflection, and replanning. The exchange of those phases indicates cycles within one case.

The cases will differ regarding (1) group of research participants, (2) methods that are going to be used, and (3) learning opportunities.

Regarding research participants, case 2 will be done on the whole school level. A combination of narrative and embodied methods will be used. Within each method, different learning opportunities will be offered to research participants. In this case 2, there will be an educational program consisting of five shorter educational sessions that occur periodically during the PAR process. Along with those sessions, there are group and individual reflections.

Reflection groups and interviews will be (voice) recorded and stored safely. The national project leader will transcribe all voice recordings and give them special codes connected to the cases they came from (pseudonymisation). After the transcription is done and coded, the voice recording will be permanently deleted; thus, the data will be anonymous and shareable with partners.

6. Data Analysis

Evaluation will be done on two levels: transformation and process. Process data will be gathered and after analysed with content analysis (grouping results in themes, categories, and codes). All data will be imported into the NVIVO program, where coding of the same part will be done by at least two researchers in order to get the inter-reliability factor.

Data will be collected by several methods on both levels:

Level 1: Transformation

The transformation of research participants, focused on their thoughts and on principles of “democracy-as-becoming” will be evaluated through initial and final measuring that will be done by following methods:

- Group reflection by using drama methods – joint group improvisation on main thematic elements essential for “democracy-as-becoming” and AECED project – doing and filming improvisations by the group in the initial meeting and again in the final measuring (after the whole PAR process);
- Individual reflection by using narrative method *Concepts in advance* – every participant defines a main thematic element in the initial measuring and again in the final measuring (after the whole PAR process);
- An instrument for measuring elements of a culture with a focus on the level of democratization of an educational institution/class where someone is working;
- Group interviews.

Instruments will be developed for each method that will be used for initial and final evaluation.

Level 2: Process

For the need to reflect and re-plan action in PAR, the process would be followed by using different methods and techniques:

- Drama methods: individual reflection (e.g., stepping out of roles and talking about what happened in an imaginary world) and reflection in the group (joint improvisation, searching for solutions, etc.).
- Narrative methods: storytelling (e.g., Letter to a character or Letter to the author; guided fantasy), techniques to understand what participants have learned (e.g., INSERT - I know, it's new to me, I'm conflicted about it, it confuses me; double diary - I also learned commentary; table *I know, I want to know, I learnt*), techniques that gather opinions and values of participants (hot chair, associative cards and connection with content, frozen image)
- Research methods: individual interviews, participant observations (done by researchers that will be gathered in their research diaries), and reflective groups.

Instruments will be developed for each method that will be used to evaluate the process.

7. Phases of Empirical Research

Timetable at the end of this template

Research will take place from January to July 2024.

Along with PAR, there are 4 phases of implementing research in all four cases:

- 1) Planning

- 2) Acting
- 3) Reflection
- 4) Replanning

In this case, planning and acting is happening on two levels:

- Level 1 – Researcher plans and acts
- Level 2 – Participants plans and acts

8. Contribution to the Project as a whole

The researcher team will implement the Guides in the case with students and will take notes and comment on it by themselves.

Participant teachers will implement the Guides in their everyday work (with children/students), and during the reflection groups, they will give their comments on using it.

Interviews will be done with some of the research participants with a special focus on how the Guides could be improved, about their good sides and problems that they have while using them.

Timetable

	Case 1 _PE_teachers	Case 2 _PE_one school	Case 3 _HE_teaching staff	Case 4 _HE_students
Month 0a – September and October 2023	Research team is preparing a research design in line with the project methodological Framework.			
Month 0b – November and December 2023	Preparing documents and sending them to the Ethical Committee of the Faculty for Teacher Education, University of Zagreb An opinion on compliance of research with ethical principles was given by the Ethical Committee to the research team on 16th January 2024.			
Month 1 – second half of January 2024	Initial meeting – getting to know the project Signing informed consent An initial measuring			
Month 2 – February 2024	First longer educational training (ACTING LEVEL 1) Group reflection	First shorter educational session (ACTING LEVEL 1) Group reflection PLANNING - Develop personal growth plans for every student.	First longer educational training (ACTING LEVEL 1) Group reflection PLANNING - Plan how to use the Guides in their work with students (PLANNING LEVEL 2).	Initial meeting – getting to know the project Signing informed consent An initial measuring
Month 3 – March 2024	PLANNING - Plan how to use the Guides in their work with children (PLANNING LEVEL 2). Implementing the Guides (ACTING LEVEL 2) + meetings with researcher REFLECTION via group reflection: reflection of research participants on two levels: personal development & using the Guides	Second shorter educational session (ACTING LEVEL 1) Reflection of researchers about using the Guides with this group.	Implementing the Guides (ACTING LEVEL 2) + meetings with researcher Group reflection: reflection of research participants on two levels: personal development & using the Guides	First, second and third shorter educational session (ACTING LEVEL 1) Reflection of researchers about using the Guides with this group
Month 4 – April 2024	Implementing the Guides + meetings with researcher (ACTING LEVEL 2) Group reflection	Third shorter educational session (ACTING LEVEL 1) Plan of participants how to use the Guides in the future steps (PLANNING LEVEL 2).	Implementing the Guides + meetings with researcher (ACTING LEVEL 2) Group reflection	Fourth and fifth shorter educational session (ACTING LEVEL 1)

		Using the Guides with children in class (ACTING LEVEL 2) Group reflection		
Month 5 – May 2024	Second longer educational training (ACTING LEVEL 1) Group reflection	Forth shorter educational learning opportunity (ACTING LEVEL 1) Using the Guides with children in class (ACTING LEVEL 2) Group reflection	Second longer educational training (ACTING LEVEL 1) Group reflection	Group reflection
Month 6 – June 2024	Meetings with researcher Group reflection	Fifth shorter educational session (ACTING LEVEL 1) Group reflection	Meetings with researcher Group reflection	Final encounter with researchers Group reflection
Please note: all learning opportunities / educational sessions are for teachers				
Month 7 – July 2024	Final measuring			

5.2 Finland: Cases 5 - 6

1.	Educational Setting
<p>Case 5</p> <p>Phase: Higher education.</p> <p>Target group: University students from the University of Lapland: Faculties of Social Sciences, Arts, and Law / Aalto University</p> <p>Case 6</p> <p>Phase: Adult and professional learning.</p> <p>Target group: University teachers (University of Lapland: Faculties of Social Sciences, Arts, and Law / Aalto University/ Uniarts Helsinki)</p>	
2.	Research Questions
<p>RQ1. How are we able to recognize and transform the ways we move/act in relational entanglements in higher education contexts toward practices that support democracy?</p> <p>RQ2. <i>How</i> can the acceptive gaze as an embodied intervention for democracy transform disembodied institutional practices in higher education that cause organizational numbness and cynicism?</p>	
3.	Research Objectives in relation Educational Setting and National Case Studies
<p>Case 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrate the Guides to teaching practice for researcher-teachers (working on the project) and evaluate their use in accordance with the university students' reactions, behavior, learning results and feedback. Researcher-teachers are the University of Lapland AECED-project team's researchers, directly working for the project, and integrating the pedagogical Framework and Guides to their own teaching and trialing them based on their own practice-based experiences in teaching. Therefore, researcher-teachers differ from stakeholder teachers, who are employed in the university as teaching staff, but are not employed by the project. Researcher-teacher approach is used to guarantee first hand experiences of using the Framework and Guides, and therefore providing the AECED project researchers with a peer status in relation to stakeholder teachers in accordance with PAR. <p>Case 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use the adult & professional education Guide as the basis of training the stakeholder university teachers. Introduce the higher education learning Guide to the stakeholder teachers for their professional learning. Educate the university teachers to use, implement and adapt the Guides to their own use in the context of higher education, and offer consulting on how to apply them 	
4.	Involvement of Participants
<p>Research ethics review for PAR involvement</p> <p>The Lapland University Consortium Ethics Committee has been appointed to assess ethical review requests and issue statements on the ethical aspects and other inherent risks of research plans according to the principles and guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (TENK 3/2019) where researchers so request.</p> <p>An Ethical review request was submitted to the Lapland University Consortium Ethics Committee 20.9.2023 in relation to the PAR conducted at the University of Lapland. The ethical review request included the following submitted documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short project Summary in Finnish language (<i>AECED: Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming, 2023–2026</i>) 	

- Complete the research plan in Finnish for the research conducted at the University of Lapland under the AECED project. The research plan includes research group members and other personnel, introduction, aims and objectives, execution plan, research methods and research environment, integrated workshops, courses and teaching for data gathering, research ethics and bibliography.
- The research plan of the entire consortium in English: *Proposal template Part B: technical description Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming (AECED)*
- Letter of the PI for the Lapland University Consortium Ethics Committee in English.
- Informed written consent form for students participating in the AECED research in Finnish.
- Informed written consent form for teachers participating in the AECED research in Finnish.
- Data management plan in English.
- Data protection notice for students in Finnish.
- Data protection notice for teachers in Finnish.
- Ethical review request to the Lapland University Consortium Ethics Committee form in Finnish.

The Ethics Committee in its meeting on 4.10.2023 reviewed the research plan and supplementary materials provided by the PI. The committee notes that the request and the attached materials have been prepared carefully and the potential risks, ethical issues and solutions related to the planned research have been well described. The documentation has been prepared appropriately and no essential deficiencies have been found in them. However, an internal contradiction related to the storage of data containing identifiers has been detected in the material, which has been required to be corrected. The committee has decided that the chair and secretary of the committee will review the corrected documents submitted to the registry and the matter does not require a new committee meeting. The chair and secretary have received the corrected materials, reviewed them, and concluded that the project can be given a positive statement in accordance with the decision made by the committee at its meeting. The corrected documents were sent for review on 11.10.2023 and the official electronically signed document for approval was received on 24.10.2023.

Through the informed consent and data protection notice all participants received information in how their personal data will be processed in the research project. The informed consent was signed by both parties, the student/ teacher and the responsible project researcher, in two copies, one archived by the project, and one left for the participant student/ teacher. Recorded interviews and videos have been counted as personal information as well as written materials with personal identification such as name or student number.

Interview recordings don't include names and they will be anonymized when they are transcribed into a textual format, and the audio recordings are deleted. Students' lecture journals will be anonymized during the first step of analysis, after which the material cannot be connected to any names. The ethnographic and autoethnographic notes that the team researchers gather, will be collected without any names and other personal details like gender or ethnicity will be mentioned only if they seem relevant to the context and analysis.

The students, who are asked to participate in the research, are over 18 years old adults, and are informed with clear emphasis that there will not be any negative consequences if they do not participate in the research. In the courses taught by our team's researchers, the students have alternative possibilities to fulfil the course requirements besides the ones that will be part of the research material collection, and choosing one option over the other does not have a difference in the estimated amount of work to be conducted. The students are informed at the beginning of the course about the possibility of withdrawing from the research at any point. The participating teachers are given the same information as the students, and their participation is completely voluntary, and there are no means or aims for pressuring for participation.

PAR according to the research plan cases 5 and 6.

Case 5

- Test and cultivate the methods by integrating the Guides to our own teaching (autoethnographic material collected by the teacher researchers' team), on two different courses by three researcher-teachers, including the student feedback and learning diaries after receiving written consent.
- To develop with university teachers the higher education Guide and the Framework based on their experiences in trialing them in higher education. The teachers will give their views on how using the Guides worked in our interviews.

Their reflections concern the educational settings, their embodied experiences during the trial and students' reactions and feedback.

Case 6

- The potential stakeholder teachers are engaged with the project's objectives through the workshops which provide the teachers with experimenting with embodied and aesthetic methods. In the workshops the Framework and Guides are presented to the stakeholder teacher. Each workshop is arranged in accordance with a specific thematic setting in relation to AECED's democratic values: equality, freedom and responsiveness. As the workshops are for stakeholder teachers, in a setting of professional learning, we use the Adult, Professional and Organizational Learning Guide in planning the workshops and learning experience.
- To offer mentoring on how to apply the Guides and methods in teaching and recognize potential situations for learning interventions.
- Arrange stakeholder interviews after the stakeholder teachers have made use of the Framework and the Guides in some context, way or forms.

5. Empirical Data Generated

Case 5

- Autoethnographic reflective diaries (by researcher-teachers) based on higher education course teaching. The autoethnographic aim to translate the embodied presence, sensation, interactions and collective movements into literal form for sense-making, comparative data analysis and reporting.
- Reflective discussions in our research team.
- Student feedback and learning diaries.
- Interviews, and discussions with higher education teachers who try the Guides and the Framework in their teachings.

Case 6

- PAR stakeholder teacher interviews.
- Pictures of the arts-based 'products' that are used as reflective mediums in workshops and courses.
- Possible other reflective material from the stakeholder teachers.
- Ongoing discussions and collective sense-making with the teacher-stakeholders which feed the process and development of the implementation of the Guides and the Framework. Notes from these one-to-one discussions.
- During every encounter we stay in touch on how the bodies move and react and encourage teachers to focus on their bodily signals through aesthetic awareness. Addressing the body while discussing the experiences.

6. Data Analysis

- Data is generated and analysed by describing the embodied and aesthetic experiences in literal form, including also collectively produced and analysed experiences made in joined debriefing sessions. Written documents are produced either from audio recordings, notes from the sessions, analysis of the pictures or directly through memory work.
- We focus on emerging phenomena while reading, discussing and collectively analysing the research material following the general and our country-specific research questions.
- Analysis is based on embodied methods in the sense that we stay alert to our bodies' signals, emotions and senses while analyzing the material to find out the important phenomena in relation to the research questions.
- We consider writing together as a research method, which evolves through thinking, reading and discussing with and about the research material. This means research writing with several rounds of it and negotiating the content in

relation to the project's aims as well as being open to the surprises and development of thinking during the writing process.

- In our discussions and interviews we focus on embodied reactions and encourage to make sense of the teacher-stakeholder's reflections through aiming attention to aesthetic awareness. In analysis, we focus also on these aspects.
- With the stakeholder teachers, we will proceed with analysing and making sense of the material.

7. Phases of Empirical Research

Timetable at the end of this Template

Empirical research phases are explained and detailed in the timetable at the end of this template.

8. Contribution to the Project as a whole

We expect to contribute to the development of the Guides based on our personal and PAR experiences and feedback, by considering:

- Possible differences in learning results by students and their sensibility for aesthetic and embodied approaches, based on teacher's observations and student feedback and learning diaries.
- Our own teaching experiences on how we can communicate, teach and learn in accordance with the resources, that the Guides offer for us, to recognise their functionality, ways to operationalise and their possible limitations and potential new openings in pedagogy
- Our stakeholder teachers' experiences on teaching and applying the Framework and the Guides. Their feedback is used for evaluation and later modification.
- Also, education workshop participants' feedback on our education on how to engage and make use of embodied methods and aesthetic approaches is considered as useful information for revisions, and on strategies to introduce the Framework and the Guide for the professional educators.

Timetable

Time	Research Activity
Sept. – Oct. 2023	Ethical review request made with required documents to the Lapland University Consortium Ethics Committee 20.9.2023. The review was conducted on 4.10.2023 with a preliminary positive statement and a request to correct and update two documents with contradicting information. The required correction was made to the updated documents. A positive statement was granted on 24.10.2023.
Oct. – Nov. 2023 Oct. – Nov. 2024	CASE 5: A course for students in higher education starting 25.10.2023 where aesthetic, embodied methods are applied and trialled as part of the lecture series, with selected themes and sessions. The same course for higher education students will be repeated in the autumn semester of 2024.
Mar. 2024	CASE 5: A course for students in higher education taking place in March 2024 where aesthetic, embodied methods are applied and trialled as part of the lectures and exercises.
Nov. – Dec. 2023 Feb. – Apr. 2024	CASE 6: Workshops for adult and professional learning on embodied and aesthetic methods.
Jan. – Sept. 2024	CASE 5 / CASE 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual mentoring of stakeholder teachers on applying the pedagogical Framework and the Guides in their teaching. - Interviews with the stakeholder teachers individually after concluding their individual teaching periods.

5.3 Germany: Cases 7 – 10

1.	Educational Setting
	<p>Case 7</p> <p>Phase: Higher Education</p> <p>Target Group: Students of Educational Science</p> <p>Background: Master (Winter 23/24) & Bachelor Class (summer 24) of organisational education and consultancy.</p> <p>Contextually, case 7 refers to the field of Higher Education. From a content perspective, it relates to the field of Adult, Professional & Organizational Learning: The co-present seminars within Master class consulting in the first round and Bachelor class consulting with 'Marburg Module' in the second round take place at Philipps University of Marburg, Germany.</p> <p>Reference to the Methodological Framework: Professionalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regarding self-transforming educational processes • towards becoming design agents for democracy-as-becoming • dimension: individual and collective learning <p>Case 8</p> <p>Phase: Further Education in Higher Education & Professional Learning</p> <p>Target group: Professionals & multipliers in social inclusion and transformation.</p> <p>Background: The case relates to both Higher Education and the field of Adult, Professional & Organizational Learning: Hybrid Research Setting & Co-present Workshop within the hybrid Seminar "Images & Practices of Organization" within the MA Professional Program 'Inclusion & Transformation in Organisations' at the Bertha von Suttner University in St. Pölten (Austria).</p> <p>Reference to the Methodological Framework: Professionalisation of professionals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding context-changing and self-transforming educational processes • towards design agents for democracy-as-becoming • dimension: organisational learning <p>Case 9</p> <p>Phase: Adult Education & Organisational learning; informal /nonformal educational setting, self-organized education within social movements of commoning</p> <p>Target Group: Multipliers in different organisational settings of societal and collective transformation toward democratisation, who are already using the pattern language cards of commoning within educational settings.</p> <p>Reference to the Methodological Framework: expert exchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • transforming educational processes towards commoning • commoning as strategy & practice for democracy-as-becoming • dimension: epistemic transformation • trans-epistemic design perspective for transformation on three levels: products/processes, system building, and consciousness <p>Case 10</p> <p>Educational field: Field of arts education: informal educational settings within higher & adult education</p>

Target group: multipliers & facilitators in the field of arts education

Reference to the Methodological Framework: Professionalisation

- regarding transforming arts educational processes and institutions
- dimension: individual and collective learning and organisational learning

2. Research Questions

The research questions for all national partners, as explicated in the methodological Framework, are guiding the cross-case analysis. For the German cases, we have four research questions for the specific participant groups we are involved with.

RQ1 How do the Framework and the Guides support students' professionalisation as future design agents for democracy-as-becoming in their own contexts based on AELD? (organisational contexts: social work, adult education, and organisational learning, sustainability, Case 7)

RQ2 How can AELD support the professionalisation of practitioners and organisational learning in the educational field towards (commoning as the potential for) organisational democracy? (Case 8)

RQ3 How can the methodologies and methods of commoning practitioners contribute to the Framework and the Guides towards a threefold understanding of democracy-as-becoming encompassing social togetherness, political self-governance, and care-economy? (Case 9)

RQ4 How can arts education facilitators' practices, experiences and attitudes contribute to the Framework and the Guides through aesthetic transformation towards democracy-as-becoming? (Case 10)

3. Research Objectives in relation to Educational Setting and National Case Studies

Case 7

- Broadening the testing and adapting of the Framework and the Guide in specific settings within HE: organisational education and consultancy in BA and MA
- Exploring professionalisation as transformative (context-changing) and transformational (self-transforming) educational process toward becoming design agents
- Receiving feedback from the students who are the cooperating participants regarded as knowledge agents with their experience and perspectivity from below, we will expect, that here we will have a main focus on transformational methods, and as well a focus of transformation of the self, regarding the BA and MA students.

Case 8

- Broadening the design with stakeholder participation of the pedagogical Framework and the associated Guides to pedagogical practice for education for democracy in the context of inclusion and transformation within organisations.
- Exploring the potential of the pattern language of commoning for organisational analysis and organisational transformation.
- Exploring the potential of participatory future labs for organisational democracy-as-becoming.
- Receiving feedback to analyse of the potential of boundary transgressing future labs for democracy-as-becoming.

Case 9

- Broadening the main research objective to analyse and collect the existing practice of Pattern Language Cards (PLC) in order to learn the spectrum of application, the spectrum of method combination, the contexts of work and the conditions and success strategies of collective learning and organizational change, so the potential it brings into the field of organizational democratisation, societal change and epistemic transformation.
- Exploring the expertise and experience of PLC of Commoning experts regarding methodological designs as well as conditions of success that will enter into the Guides.
- Receiving feedback with a primary focus on the transformational method of PLC, which strongly connects to the individual, collective, organisational, and epistemic levels for the purpose of AELD.

Case 10

- Broadening the focus on aesthetic experience in the field of arts education towards democracy-as-becoming; transforming arts-educational cultures towards democratisation.
- Exploring virtual spaces as sites of embodied educational practices and their specific aesthetic potential.
- Receiving feedback from participants on the pedagogical Framework and the Guide for practice on the basis of their professional and organisational habitus and experiences.

4. Involvement of Participants

Ethical approval:

An application to the Ethics Committee at the Department of Educational Science, Philipps Marburg University (PUM), was submitted for the ethical assessment and approval of research projects involving human participants on June 25, 2023.

In the application process, we provided a document that thoroughly details all four cases. This document explains the aims, potential participants, data gathering and includes information on informed consent.

According to the preliminary examination in accordance with Section 3, Paragraph 3 of the Code of Ethics at PUM, we received positive results and final approval on August 12, 2023.

Research ethics process:

In all cases, participants receive a written document, "informed consent," at the beginning of the research, encompassing the use of their personal information and covering all data produced, developed, and received during the data gathering process. In the case of interviews, an additional informed consent is provided, which participants read and sign.

Participants articulate their informed consent verbally on audio and additionally sign a written informed consent.

Informed consent is planned to be collected not by the professor but by AECED researchers involved in the project to mitigate potential power imbalances.

As the research is planned to be conducted as ethnographic research, researchers will keep observation notes. Research participants will be informed about this, and they have the right to withdraw.

All participants are informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any stage without facing negative consequences. We recognize the importance of this, particularly for students earning study credits. This information is detailed in the informed consent.

There is a possibility of using video recordings in the research process. If utilized, our plan includes blurring faces and refraining from disclosing the names of the individuals.

Data Management:

In the data collection phase, shared data will not include any personal identifications or information that could lead to the recognition of individual participants.

There is no raw data with personal information, apart from that everybody has been part of the course - but there is no identification of individuals - neither intended nor possible based on the data provided.

In all four cases, we conduct peer interviews without researchers in the interview room. Participants autonomously select rooms with identity-concealing options. They independently record and submit their interviews, providing only the recording devices to us. During the response to interview questionnaires, they pseudonymise their answers.

In Case 9 we plan to conduct an online survey at the beginning of the study. Participants will respond anonymously to this survey.

Pseudonymising and anonymising the data:

Right from the beginning of the research process, data will remain non-personalized. Any contributions or reflections will be collected without any reference to personal background, acknowledging participants solely for their role in the research phase. However, there is a possibility of using video recordings in the research process. If utilized, our plan includes blurring faces and refraining from disclosing the names of the individuals.

Interview data are based on peer-interviewing, which means, that no researcher has access to identify the individuals, who have been peer-interviewing each other.

Data Storage:

Data will be stored in the Philipps-University of Marburg (UMR) one-drive, which provides secure, multi-factor-identification storage. Only the German research team have access to these files.

In case videography is used, the process of pseudonymisation concerning audio-visual (video) recordings of participants will latest start once these are stored on the OneDrive. This will involve the removal of participants' names from the automatically-generated transcripts. Participants' on-screen names will not appear on recordings.

Case 7

* Introduction of the Framework and the Guides to the students within one to three seminar sessions.

* Familiarisation: reading the adapted prototype Guides and the Framework.

* Collaborative reflection:

1. Defining their professional challenges of democracy and participation in their work settings (image-based).
2. Identifying solutions or visions and how such challenges might be overcome (image-based).

* Planning: Developing change processes themselves, how their organisations might better deal with such problems of organisational democracy.

* Action:

1. Trialling out a Guide-based intervention in the course.
2. Based on the feedback of their ABE-based method intervention, they are invited to trial it out in their professional field.

* Reflection: Bring in the feedback of their trialling experience and the feedback on the Guides to be developed further.

Case 8

* Introduction: introducing the Framework and the Guides to the students within an online seminar setting.

* Familiarisation: reading the adapted prototype Guides and the Framework.

* Collaborative reflection:

1. Reflecting on images and practices of organising about commoning.
2. How can the Guides interlinked with pattern language cards be used as a transformational tool?
3. Identifying organisational challenges of democracy and participation.

* Planning: students will analyse the potential for organisational change by using the Guides interlinked with the PLC as an instrument for a) team development, b) organisational analysis, and c) organisational transformation toward Commoning.

* Action: The student-professionals will be interviewing a) themselves as team development, b) the host of the trialed organization, c) some organisational members and integrate these results into d) the future lab, and e) the institutional feedback for transformation, based on the Framework and the Guides.

* Reflection: Students will reflect on their potential and contribution to team development, organisational analysis, and organisational design and integrate these approaches into the Guide.

Case 9

Together with our cooperating Partners of the Commons Institute Germany, we involve PLC Practitioners throughout the main steps of PAR:

* Introduction: initiating an online survey and introducing the research project (via mail).

* Familiarisation: co-creating an online exchange meeting on the objectives and ideas of the Framework and the Guides.

* Collaborative reflection between researchers and practitioners on possible mutual opportunities.

* Planning: co-present workshop with stakeholders.

* Action: supporting a commoning professionals network, conducting a co-present workshop to identify existing practices and methods of the pattern language cards and exchange about their relevance/applicability for the pedagogical Guides.

* Reflection: Analysing potentials of the explored methods and practices: how could these learnings be integrated into the Framework and the Guide leading to preparing a practitioners' handbook on commoning education.

Case 10

Cycle 1

* Planning: preparatory workshop in presence with trial participants in January 2024, trialing of embodied methods on futures and embodied reflection.

* Reflection: collecting experiences from participants, analysing feedback from the workshop.

Cycle 2

* Introduction of the project, the Framework, and the Guides to the participants ("KulturForscher!" network and interested guests) in a virtual workshop space hosted by PWC foundation and in collaboration with working group arts education on aesthetic transformation and learning for democracy.

- * Familiarisation with the adapted prototype Guides and the Framework in an explorative embodied practice in the virtual space.
- * Action: conducting workshop = virtual embodied introduction and exploration of the Framework and the Guides, interprofessional reflection groups, collecting feedback, discussing possible applications in their field.
- * Collaborative reflection during the online workshop in online peer-exchange.
- * Planning of inquiries into the participant's professional practice and organisational structures regarding responsive pedagogies and organisational learning for democracy-as-becoming.
- * Reflection: analyzing feedback from the workshop, collecting experiences from participants within their professional settings for (1) the phase of re-designing the Framework and the Guides and (2) the framing of aesthetic and embodied practices in groups and their potential for transformative change.

5. Empirical Data Generated

Case 7

- ABE methods: seminar-journaling (feedback template) and image-based appreciative inquiry approach (images which are used in the method are pre-collected, generally available pictures), collective reflection, image-based peer-interviews.
- Participant observation

Case 8

Data gathering will be self-organized by students-professionals over all the phases: (1) peer-interviewing of teams, 2) host interviewing within the teams, organisational interviews by the teams, 3) PPT of students for the organisational democracy future lab (brown paper templates), 4) Guides intervention suggestions and reflections based on reflection sheets, templates for the Guides to be filled and argued for, 5) reflection-sheets on presenting the intervention suggestions to the organisations and reflection sheet on the own transformational process throughout the course.

- Recorded pattern language cards-based interviews of a) project teams, b) organisational hosts, c) organisational members, d) reflections on future lab.
- Pattern language cards-based Participatory Future Lab – Brown Papers of the Pattern Language System Sculpting Process and reflection sheets of students.
- Student's evaluation of pattern language cards-based interviews integrated into PowerPoint presentations.

Case 9

- via Online Survey
- Collective Reflection, Protocol, and observation during the online workshop.
- Collective field notes of the co-present workshops, brown paper documentation, written feedback on the Guides, peer-interviews.
- Large Group Reflexivity Methods on the Guides (transformative evaluation (Weber 2012) using PLC as research method.
- Documentation of the Copresence Workshop (to be handed over to participants).

Case 10

- Mind-maps, feedback round, video recording of the workshop, online mind-maps, written feedback. Participant observation of the practical application with peer-researcher

6. Data Analysis

Case 7

- Based on our Trans-epistemic Design research approach, we are interested in the three layers of transformation, which are a) transformation at the layer of products and processes, b) system building, and c) consciousness. By this, we tie in the methodological Framework of learning and transformation at the individual and collective, the organisational and level of epistemic transformation.

- Exploring for useful insights primarily at the level of individual and collective transgressive learning in organisations.
- Type of analysis: We will employ thematic content analysis (Kuckartz/Rädiker 2022) to extract meaningful patterns and themes from the gathered information.

Case 8

- We work with pattern-language card-based individual and collective aesthetic reflexivity.
- A discourse analytical research perspective, which refers to practices as discursive or rather viscursive (visual discourse studies) social practices within collective imaginaries and orders of the gaze. This means, that we refer to subjectivation and transformation within and beyond such orders of the gaze in the field of organisational democracy.
- Based on our Transepistemic Design research approach, we are interested in the three layers of transformation, which are a) transformation at the layer of products and processes, b) systembuilding, and c) consciousness. By this, we tie in the methodological Framework of learning and transformation the individual and collective learning, organizational learning and epistemic transformation.
- Data analysis of the material will be iterative along the process, and data will be analysed based on the formulated research questions.

Case 9

- Online Survey: Content Analysis
Online Workshop: Content Analysis
- Co-present Workshop:
 - * Aesthetic reflexivity in collective reflection.
 - * Autoethnographic reflexivity.
 - * Collective Autoethnographic Resonance.

Case 10

- Embodied and aesthetic approaches that address the participants through their lived body.
- Embodied reflection as a method to regard embodied sensations, feelings, and resonances as part of situations and thematic inquiries.
- Imagination as an embodied approach to social transformation.
- Using Social Presencing Theater as an awareness-based and embodied method for social fields transformation.
- Post-digital embodiment for collective resonance and corporeality.

7. Phases of Empirical Research Timetable at the end of this Template

- First Round: Master Class Consulting is involving the Guides in their students' projects (Dec. 2023 and Jan. 2024). (Case 7)
- First cycle: a preparatory explorative workshop with material from the Framework and the Guides with students in Higher Education (Jan. 2024). (Case 10)
- Second Round: Bachelor Class Consulting & Marburg Modul (Apr. -July 2024). (Case 7)
- After the online-survey, the virtual workshop with Commoning professionals is planned, adapting to create an interactive virtual space. (Case 9)
- Second Cycle: realisation of the virtual workshop (April 2024). (Case 10)
- After the virtual workshop with Commoning Professionals, a copresent workshop with Commoning Professionals is planned.

We work with an Iterative approach to Co-Create Case Design, Intervention & Research. See the timetable at the end of the template.

8.	Contribution to the Project as a Whole
	<p>Focus on students' perspectives: students apply their suggestions and test, where possible, their methodical approaches in their fields of practice.</p> <p>Experimenting, trialling, and collecting impulses for democratising educational and social pedagogical organisations.</p> <p>Development of further methods for the Guides for practice.</p> <p>Preparation of practitioner handbook on Commoning education.</p> <p>We understand the design phase as an iterative and co-creational process with students and stakeholders. We see the need for a co-creational approach, following a co-creational and iterative PAR methodology, and will reflect the potential within our analyses.</p> <p>Case 9 is a unique contribution as we are leaving formal educational settings and gathering practice knowledge from the field of social movements (commons community) to integrate concrete experiences of proven methods into the Guides</p> <p>knowledge transfer from nonformal to formal educational settings and contexts of organizational transformation in general.</p> <p>Contributing to a threefold approach to democratisation (social togetherness, peer governance, care economy).</p> <p>Impulses from the field of arts education that applies aesthetic research (Kämpf-Jansen).</p> <p>Interconnection with the field of art education as an exemplary field for aesthetic research and innovative aesthetic practices with professional artists and out-reach programmes.</p> <p>Insights into institutional practices in the field of art and arts education.</p> <p>Impulses for the political dimension of art education for democratic citizenship and agency.</p>

Timetable

Time	Research Activity
August 2023	To obtain ethical approval for the research, communication and application were carried out with the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Educational Science at PUM. Ethical approval for the research was granted on August 12, 2023.
November 2023	Introduction (Case 7, Case 8)
Dec. 2023-Feb. 2024	Data gathering (Case 8)
Jan. - Feb. 2024	Data gathering (Case 7)
Mar./April 2024	Data gathering via online survey (Case 9)
Apr. 2024	Data gathering (Case 10)
May 2024	Online workshop and data gathering (Case 9)
Sept. 2024	Co-present workshop and data gathering (Case 9)

5.4 Latvia: Cases 11 – 13

1.	Educational Setting
<p>The research will be conducted in three Latvia secondary schools, engaging 16-18-year-old students, their teachers, and school principals. The aesthetic and embodied learning activities for democracy will be held during traditional lessons and/or extracurricular activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case 11 will be realised in Daugavpils State Gymnasium, phase: secondary education • Case 12 will be realised in Jūrmala State Gymnasium, phase: Adult/ professional learning • Case 13 will be realised in Riga Secondary School No 22, phase: inter-generational <p>Different variations of drama sketch as an arts-based and embodied learning method will be offered for use when introducing the three models “The model of embedding ABE into a task,” “The model of embedding ABE into the pedagogical process for creative self-discovery and discovery of others,” and “The embedding of ABE into the 5E instructional model” elaborated and presented in the Prototype Pedagogical Guide for the Secondary Education Phase.”</p>	
2.	Research Questions
<p>In addition to the research questions planned for cross-national case analysis, the Latvian team will study and answer four more questions.</p> <p>RQ1. How do teachers/trainers use the prototype Framework and the Guides to create new learning opportunities for AEL for democracy using ABE teaching and learning methods?</p> <p>RQ2. What is the effect of AELD using ABE methods on participants’ individual and collective growth from the perspective of getting a democracy-as-becoming experience?</p> <p>RQ3. To what extent are users ready/willing to base their pedagogical practice on the democracy-as-becoming principles offering learners AELD using ABE methods?</p> <p>RQ4. What are the main PAR-based principles, findings, conclusions and recommendations that should make the base for the launch-ready versions of the pedagogical Framework and the Guides?</p>	
3.	Research Objectives
<p>Achieving inclusive education is one of the strategic goals of democratising the Latvian educational system, which implies responsive pedagogies and diversity management as higher priorities and crucial means to achieve quality education for all.</p> <p>The development of social-emotional competence has been declared a compulsory component of the curriculum in Latvia to build relational well-being, enable holistic learning, empower transforming dialogue, and experience power-sharing, which makes the principles of democracy-as-becoming.</p> <p>Since 2018, Latvia has been implementing a competence-based curriculum encompassing six transversal competencies; one of them is civic participation. There is a new study subject, Drama, which is designed to promote arts-based and embodied learning for opening creatively to new experiences and expressing themselves also, including their emotions and feelings, vs. mainly cognitive learning.</p>	
4.	Involvement of Participants
<p>We elaborated the following six documents and submitted them to the Riga Technical University Ethics Committee to get their evaluation and conclusion on whether the correspondence of the Latvian part of the participatory action research (PAR) is designed to be realised according to the EU research ethics regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application to the RTU Ethics Committee to receive permission for the research, i.e., to assess the research ethics and data protection, also providing the information about the research design and cases to be implemented, 	

- Form of Preliminary Evaluation – Data Protection Impact Assessment and AECED Ethics Checklist of research ethics prepared by Riga Technical University (RTU) and submitted to the AECED project ethical advisor,
- Information sheet for secondary education institutions to participate in the project implemented by RTU with the support of the Institute of Lifelong Learning and Culture "Vitae" on democracy-as-becoming using AELD and its expected impact on teachers, heads of secondary education institutions, and students.
- Application for participation in the "AECED" project with a statement from the educational institution that it wants to work in the research and can provide what is necessary for its realization.
- European Union research and innovation program Horizon Europe project "AECED" participant's consent form.
- Informed assent form for parents and their children (10-grade students) to participate in the study within the Horizon project AECED, providing all the necessary information about the project, its realisation stages, and specific elements, including issues related to confidentiality and protection of personal data, and voluntary participation.

Contact to Participants:

- The Invitation for secondary education institutions to participate in the project was shared using the Homepage of the Institute of Lifelong Learning and Culture "VITAE," which has access to all the schools of Latvia. The three schools for the PAR three cases were chosen based on their application and motivation in transforming their school culture for democracy and in acquiring and mastering arts-based and embodied learning methods joining the AECED participatory action research.
- Then we talked with the Heads of schools to explain some research details and answer their questions. A two-day intensive training program was held on the AECED project, AELD, ABE, responsive pedagogies, democratic values, and democracy-as-becoming principles in February 2024 for 15 pedagogues (three headmasters and four teachers from each school), linking them to the pedagogical topicalities in the secondary education phase in Latvia. The informed consent forms were signed at the end of the two-day interactive training by the participants so that they had extensive knowledge of what participation to the research entails.
- We have already had an in-person meeting with our stakeholders (external participants) – two experts in education and a psychologist to discuss the Prototype Framework and the Guides. Before the meeting, these materials had been sent to the stakeholders with a watermark on pages using a safe communication channel through RTU OneDrive. We got their feedback on 1) their impression of the Prototype Framework and Guide and 2) what should be changed, added, or removed to improve the text and formulations of ideas and make them more comprehensive. They expressed their readiness and willingness to visit the project schools and observe the pedagogical and research process, sharing some ideas on what special attention should be paid to when working with the target group of students and teachers.
- The next group of participants comprises 10-grade students (at least 12 students in each trial of a case) from the three chosen secondary education institutions. In Latvia, a person is considered an adult when they reach the age of 18 and become legally responsible for their actions. Since some students are younger than 18, their enrollment in the project is possible only with their parents' written assent form. It has been agreed that the headmasters and teachers will pass the assent forms to parents and their children. Additionally, the students are provided with the RTU research team's contacts in case parents or students need more detailed clarification about any research aspect. It has been emphasized that students can leave the research at any stage if they do not wish to participate in it anymore without being worried about any negative impact on their assessments or worsened attitudes towards them.

The research data are to be collected based on the principle of anonymity. Project participants will be assigned code numbers orally after the first AELD activity before writing their reflections in electronic diaries (in Google forms) and asked to fix the codes in their mobiles for further use. Teachers or the project team will not store the code numbers anywhere to avoid any possible means of recognition. The only information collected based on the personal profile of project participants is their gender. As the project expects to have a gender balance, it is essential to have the option of comparing research outcomes from a gender-based perspective.

All the audio recordings of the AELD lessons, post-activity discussions, and semi-structured interviews will be used only to create World files of the transcripts. These audio recordings will be accessible only to one person in the research group until the transcripts have been created for the qualitative content analysis. After that, the audio recordings will be deleted. All the necessary data will be stored securely in the RTU OneDrive with access to it by all the RTU project team members using an encrypted password for additional security.

5. Empirical Data Generated

In the data collection, arts-based and embodied research methods will be combined with traditional research methods.

Arts-based and embodied research methods

1. Drama sketch simultaneously as an ABE learning and research method.

Drama sketch will be used as a problem/challenge-driven collaborative learning and research method to activate students' affective, cognitive and embodied learning in an emotionally safe, dialogical and responsive learning environment and enable participants' embodied reflection.

2. Collage-creation as an ABE learning and research method

Collage creation will be used as a creative process of collaborative and democratic interactions that offer learners a way to explore individually and collectively their feelings, emotions, and thoughts about an idea to be materialized using a range of different items as a creative response to a stimulus question and as means to conduct participants' embodied reflection.

Traditional research methods

3. Observation

Observation will be used as a qualitative research method to observe the teaching and learning process organised according to AELD and participants' ongoing behavior in a natural learning environment.

4. Reflection

Individual and group reflections will be offered to participants to get their feedback on the AELD experiences from the cognitive, affective, and embodiment perspectives.

5. Interviews

Interviews will be used as a complementary means to get a deeper insight into AELD elements that need clarification and development.

6. Data Analysis

The main focus will be on exploring meanings and values created by pedagogues, and students lived experiences when practicing AELD using ABE for democracy-as-becoming. To answer the research questions, we will conduct a qualitative content analysis of the data collected using the drama sketch, collage-creation, observation, reflections, and interviews specific to ABE research methods. The strategy of the qualitative content analysis is based on the fundamental idea of the AECED project, which claims that AELD realised using ABE learning methods in a responsive pedagogical environment enables the experience of democracy-as-becoming. Therefore, the categories developed will be considered from the perspective of democracy-as-becoming four principles: power sharing, transforming dialogue, holistic learning, and relational well-being.

Along with the coding using the constituent elements of democracy-as-becoming principles as pre-constructed codes, we will also conduct open coding, leaving room for revealing elements that were not highlighted before but might enrich our understanding of AELD, ABE methods and their effect on democracy. MAXQDA software will be used for the qualitative data analysis. This approach logically continues our previous research experience gained within the Erasmus project ENABLES.

7. Phases of Empirical Research

Timetable at the end of this Template

The empirical research is designed to be realised in seven phases:

Phase 0. Discussions of the ethical aspects of the PAR are to be conducted in three schools in Latvia with the Research Ethics Committee of Riga Technical University (RTU).

Phase 1. Introduction of the project AECED and the PAR to the school headmasters and teachers who participate in the research.

Phase 2. Familiarisation of the research participants with the Prototype Pedagogical Framework and the Guides.

Phase 3. Collaborative reflection on using the Guides to decide priorities and the focus for an AELD innovation.

Phase 4. Planning – elaboration of an Action Plan for implementing AELD.

Phase 5. Action – carrying out the Action Plan.

Phase 6. Reflection – reflection on experiences, learnings, and possible adjustments of the Framework and the Guides.

8. Contribution to the Project as a Whole

The Latvian team has elaborated “A Conceptual Model for Organising Metadata to Conduct a Cross-Case and Cross-Country Comparative Analysis within Participatory Action Research.” The model is an Excel Matrix with 19 active rows – one row for each of the 19 project cases. The columns are constructed for the six PAR phases – “Introduction,” “Familiarisation,” “Collaborative reflection,” “Planning,” “Action,” and “Reflection,” which make the methodological Framework of the research. Each PAR phase in the Matrix consists of four or more comparison criteria that the project research team decides to be crucial for cross-case analysis. Each comparison criterion occupies one column within its corresponding PAR phase. The Matrix is not designed to contain primary data in national languages but metadata in English, which is derived from the separate analysis of each of the 19 cases. Each cell of the Matrix has its hyperlinked code; its name is constructed correspondingly from the country code, case number, letters of the PAR phase, and comparison criterion. This guarantees cross-case transparency, easy data input and access, and meaningful vertical comparison of metadata related to each criterion, including intra and inter-group collaboration. Only one click on a cell and entering the password opens an interactive Word or Excel file for individual and group work for all the research participants. The hyperlinking of each Matrix cell supports access to the most critical data from each case at any level of information comparison.

The Latvian part of the research can be incorporated for conducting cross-case analysis with almost all the partners when exploring the research questions common for the entire project. However, more commonalities can be found with the UK partner’s research as both work with learners and educators of secondary education and adult/professional learning phases. Besides, the Latvian team plans to use not only Drama Sketch as an arts-based and embodied learning and research method but also collage-creation, which is the crucial ABE learning and research method to be used by the UK team.

Timetable

Time	Research activity
11 Dec. 2023 – 30 Jan. 2024	Communication, consultation, and discussions of the ethical aspects of the PAR to be conducted in the three Latvian schools with the RTU Research Ethics Committee. Preparation of the six files (see Paragraph 4, “Involvement of the participants”) and sending them to the Committee to get their Ethic Decision Letter – the Permission to start the research. Ethical approval for the research was granted on January 29, 2024.
31 Jan. – 15 Feb. 2024	Introduction of the AECED key concepts, matter, democracy-as-becoming principles, the PAR aim and phases to the research target audience - headmasters and teachers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using online presentations and question-answer sessions. • during two-day intensive AECED learning activities organised at the RTU Faculty of Engineering and Economics by the RTU project team for all 15 research participants from the three secondary schools with the participation of stakeholders.

15 Feb. – 15 Mar. 2024	<p>Getting familiarised with the Framework and the Guides by the research target audience - headmasters and teachers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • during the two-day intensive AECED learning activities organised at the RTU Faculty of Engineering and Economics (see above). • provide online support for teachers and principals (e.g., question–answer sessions, etc.) organized after the intensive learning program.
16 Feb. – 30 Apr. 2024	<p>Collaborative reflection of the target audience – headmasters and teachers on to what extent the professional learning with the project research team combined with the individual reading of the Prototype Framework and the Guides supported them to comprehend the matter of AELD and decide the priorities and further focus in their planning of activities with students:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • through the online workshops with each school team separately. • during on-site reflections of headmasters and teachers combined with observation of the project research team and stakeholders.
1 Mar. – 15 May 2024	<p>Planning two-round AELD activities to be conducted with students by headmasters and teachers. The planning is to be finalised in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • online workshops held by the RTU research team to support each school in their planning process. • on-site collaboration of each school's project team with each other.
2 Apr. – 30 May 2024	<p>Realisation of the on-site AELD activities with secondary school students led by teachers with headmasters', stakeholders', and research project team's observation providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • immediate embodied and written reflections after the activities implemented in schools (students, teachers, principals, project team, stakeholders). • discussions of the AELD experience gained. • interviews of headmasters, teachers, students, and stakeholders.
2 Apr. – 30 Sept. 2024	<p>Joint online/on-site group reflections of the AELD experience gained during the PAR by headmasters, teachers, students, stakeholders, and the project team combined with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • discussions on the potential improvements to create the launch-ready versions of the Framework and the Guides. • discussions on the readiness/willingness of the secondary schools to make AELD a part of regular schooling practice for transforming education for democracy. • data analysis, interpretation of the results, and making conclusions.

5.5 Portugal: Cases 14 - 17

1.	Educational Setting
	<p>Case 14</p> <p>Phase: Early years and primary education (from 3 to 6 years)</p> <p>Target group:</p> <p>Direct participants: Teachers, educators and trainers.</p> <p>Case 15</p> <p>Phase: Early years and primary education (from 3 to 6 years)</p> <p>Target group:</p> <p>Direct participants: Teachers, educators and trainers.</p> <p>Case 16</p> <p>Phase: Adult education training centers, vocational education schools.</p> <p>Target group: Teachers, educators and trainers.</p> <p>Case 17</p> <p>Phase: Adult education training centers, vocational education schools.</p> <p>Target group: Teachers, educators and trainers.</p>
2.	Research Questions
	<p>RQ1. Do the direct participants find the prototype Framework and the Guides appealing and motivating to use with their audiences? (before)</p> <p>RQ2. How have the direct participants appropriated and used the prototype Framework and the Guides to create learning opportunities using arts-based and embodied methods toward democracy-as-becoming? (during)</p> <p>RQ3. What role did the prototype Framework and the Guides play in developing activities using ABED methods to foster collective and individual growth and democracy-as-becoming experiences and feelings? (during)</p> <p>RQ4. What difficulties did the participants experience when carrying out the activities based on the prototype Framework and the Guides? (during)</p> <p>RQ5. Are users ready/willing to base their pedagogical practice on ABE methods to foster experiences and feelings of democracy-as-becoming? (after)</p> <p>RQ6. What research-based improvements should be made in the prototype Framework and the Guides to prepare their launch-ready versions to be more inspiring to embed AELD using ABED methods? (after)</p>
3.	Research Objectives
	<p>To understand if the Framework and the Guides are in an inspiring and easy-to-understand format.</p> <p>To understand how participants appropriate and use the prototype Framework and the Guides to develop activities to create learning opportunities using arts-based and embodied methods towards democracy-as-becoming.</p> <p>To understand if and how the prototype Framework and the Guides influenced the development of activities using ABED methods to foster collective and individual growth and democracy-as-becoming experiences and feelings.</p> <p>To identify the difficulties the participants encountered when carrying out the activities based on the prototype Framework and the Guides.</p>

To understand if, after the project, the participants are ready/willing to base their pedagogical practice on ABE methods to foster experiences and feelings of democracy-as-becoming.

To identify the research-based improvements that should be made in the prototype Framework and the Guide to prepare their launch-ready versions.

4. Involvement of Participants

The activities of the Portuguese team of the AECED project seek to guide the ethical standards that must govern scientific research and whose principles are set out, namely, in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (ALLEA, 2018) and Universidade Aberta Code of Ethics, published in order no. 80 /R/2023, of July 5, 2023. Since the research will take place in educational contexts involving children, the principles expressed in the EECERA Ethical Code for Early Childhood Researchers (2015) will also be fully respected.

Here are the ethical procedures of the Portuguese team:

- Ethical report for the AECED Project

This document contains the procedures adopted by the team. It is systematically presented to scrupulously comply with the standards above, taking into account the specificities of this project and the national reality. These procedures are organized into five dimensions, necessarily interconnected: a) academic environment; b) scientific production; c) relationship with the research subjects; d) data management; e) training, guidance, and supervision.

- Institutional Review and Ethical Oversight

We have obtained the Universidade Aberta Ethics Committee and the LE@D Research Centre Ethical Committee the approvals before initiating the research project. These Ethical boards have analysed the relevant ethical guidelines, regulations, and codes of conduct, and ensure ongoing ethical oversight and monitoring throughout the duration of the research.

- Informed Consent

We will obtain informed consent from all participants in the online workshop before their involvement in the research project (a digitally signed consent form by each participant). This involves providing clear and comprehensive information about the purpose of the research, the procedures involved, any potential risks or benefits, and the rights of participants. In this informed consent, participants will be informed about the use of all their personal data during the project.

- Information sheet

An information sheet was shared with potential stakeholders to participate in the online workshop offered by Universidade Aberta on democracy-as-becoming using AELD and its expected impact on learning activities for democracy-as-becoming.

- Authorization from the school or educational institution

Prior authorization from school/institution leaders and, if they request it, from the Ministry of Education (through the academic survey monitoring system) of research activities to be carried out in schools;

- Parental Involvement and Communication:

Since we will not involve children directly, only the educators and teachers, there is no need to ask parents for permission for this research. Nevertheless, we will maintain open and transparent communication with parents or legal guardians of the children indirectly involved throughout the research project. They will be provided with clear information about the research objectives, procedures, and potential implications for their children, and any questions or concerns they may have will be promptly and respectfully addressed.

Contact and information to Participants:

- Dissemination of an information leaflet on the project and the studies to stakeholders to gather potential interested parties for the course;
- Selection of 15 participants from early and primary education and vocational education to participate in the course;
- During the implementation, we will select 2 cases for early and primary education and 2 cases for vocational education.
- Information to parents or legal guardians of the children about the project;

- Clear information to the children involved indirectly, considering their age, maturity, and capacity to understand the research.
- All the selected participants will be informed about the possibility of the decision of teachers/educators and/or students who do not intend to participate in research activities, avoiding any type of pressure, sanctions, or reprisals.
- The selected participants will have (in the Moodle platform) clear information about the use and storage of data collected during the case studies.

Power sharing between direct and indirect participants:

To ensure equitable participation and minimize the power difference between teachers and students in the case studies, we will provide in the online course for teachers and educators one module that addresses the need for:

- Clear Communication: Foster open and transparent communication between teachers and students;
- Shared Decision-Making: Encourage collaborative discussions and consensus-building to ensure all voices are heard and respected.
- Empower students to take on active roles in the research project by providing opportunities for them to contribute their ideas, perspectives, and expertise.
- Position teachers as facilitators or mentors rather than authority figures.
- Facilitate regular reflection and evaluation sessions with teachers and students to assess the dynamics of power and participation within the activities.
- Foster a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion within the project activities that recognizes and celebrates all participants' unique backgrounds, perspectives, and contributions.

5. Empirical Data Generated

The case studies developed by the Portuguese team will generate data of various types and formats, namely:

Artistic documents: Encourage participants (teachers and educators) to create visual, artistic, or narrative representations (such as drawings, paintings, sculptures, collages, or digital media) that reflect their learning experiences. Analyse these artefacts for themes, symbols, and meanings.

Embodied interviews or dialogues: Conduct interviews or dialogues that focus on bodily sensations, emotions, and physical experiences related to learning activities.

Reflective narratives: Encouraging reflective practices through aesthetic enquiry, inviting participants to engage in open discussions or written reflections on works of art, performances, or sensory experiences related to collective and individual learning.

Written diaries or art-based diaries: Encourage participants to keep diaries where they can use artistic expressions, sketches, or mixed media elements to record their daily experiences, emotions, and thoughts related to the activities.

Activities developed in the interactive and participatory course: Throughout the online course, encourage the use of various artistic expressions (visual arts, music, theatre, etc.) to engage participants in collaborative activities. Document the process and results of this course.

The data generated throughout the studies will be processed in accordance with the applicable regulations of the Universidade Aberta. Data collection tools will include digital voice recorders for face-to-face interviews, audio and video recording using Zoom (or similar) for online interviews and to capture online activities, and digital cameras (video) for face-to-face activities (photo and moving images).

Qualitative data: researchers' notes, observation field notes, participants' written reflections (diaries), audiovisual recordings, images, including photos. To make the sharing of videos or photos with the consortium more ethical, there will be no visual records or photos of the children involved, only the activities. The video/audio recordings will be transcribed and then destroyed.

The process of encouraging the availability of research data under Horizon 2020 is being carried out through the Open Research Data Pilot (ORD Pilot), which follows the FAIR principles that data should be searchable (findable), accessible (accessible), interoperable (interoperable) and reusable (reusable).

All the data collected during the research is covered by the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), which transposes the European directive on this matter, Regulation (EU) 2016/679, on the protection of natural persons concerning the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data.

The project team will have exclusive use of the data until such time - within the funded period of the project - as the project website becomes available. The website will be used to publish results, processes and methods, guaranteeing the anonymity of the research subjects.

The research results (journal articles, conference papers, etc.) will be presented and published in different spaces, formats and languages. This information will be made available and accessible on an open-access basis (with special attention to the research subjects), thus fulfilling their responsibilities in terms of scientific dissemination and the transfer of knowledge.

Pseudonymised data to anonymised data:

During the online course, participants (teachers and educators) will collect data. All this data will be pseudonymised. The data will be shared among the course participants with no identification of the children/students involved, only data of the activities (no persons) can be shared. The only possible identification is the teacher/educator who implemented the activities.

After the online course, the pseudonymised data will be transformed into anonymised data involving further de-identifying the information to ensure that individuals cannot be re-identified.

Here are steps to achieve this:

Removing any direct identifiers from the dataset.

Analyse Quasi-Identifiers (such as dates of birth, zip codes, gender, occupation).

Aggregate individual-level data to a higher level of granularity, such as summarising data by groups or categories.

Conduct a re-identification risk assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of the anonymisation techniques applied.

Before the data is shared with partners all the files that may lead to personal identification will be destroyed.

6. Data Analysis

Qualitative Data Analysis: Thematic analysis and content analysis to describe data gathered from observations, interviews, or participant reflections.

Arts-Based Methods: Arts-based research methods such as visual documentation or storytelling to capture and analyse participants' experiences.

Mixed-Methods Approach: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches (forms) to comprehensively understand arts-based and embodied learning activities.

Reflexive narrative analysis: Analyse stories, narratives, or personal accounts shared by participants to uncover themes, metaphors, and underlying structures shaping their learning experiences.

Collaborative and participatory analysis: Involve participants in the analysis process through collaborative or participatory methods (online courses and cases). Co-analysing data with participants enhances the validity of interpretations and ensures diverse perspectives are considered.

7. Phases of Empirical Research

Timetable at the end of this Template

The Portuguese team's case studies will be based on an online course aimed at educators and teachers to provide them with the knowledge and skills needed to carry out independent research and integrate them into the research project as co-investigators.

Based on the fundamentals of participatory action research methodology, the cases developed by the Portuguese team will follow the following design:

A course will be organised on the Moodle platform of Universidade Aberta, with 10 to 15 participants (from pre-school, primary, and vocational/professional education) with a total duration of 52 hours (17h online and 35h autonomous work) structured in themes based on the phases identified in the participatory action research process. The course is expected to take place between March and May 2024. The design of the studies follows these phases:

Phase 1 - Introduction

The first part of the course will consist of an introductory presentation of the AECED project (video).

Participants will also analyse a learning contract that contains everything that is expected of them throughout the course and what their involvement will be in the course activities.

This contract will present the structure of the course and what is expected of the participants, define the roles of each, and discuss the process of emerging differences, tensions, or power relations within the team (participants and AECED team) according to the Universidade Aberta's Pedagogical Model.

Phase 2 - Familiarisation with the project and the topics covered

In the second phase, participants will analyse the prototype pedagogical reference and the Guides defined for the levels of education to which they belong. As an activity, participants will be asked to produce an individual reflection on the two documents, highlighting the aspects they consider to be the most positive and the least positive.

Data collection method: individual reflections.

Data analysis method: categorical analysis of individual reflections.

Phase 3 - Collaborative reflection

A discussion forum will be opened for participants to debate the most critical aspects they identified in the previous activity. The research team will guide the discussion and will try to collect data on the following dimensions: perceptions of the prototype Framework and the Guides, interest in their implementation, most appealing aspects, aspects that don't work, and what should be changed/improved.

Data collection method: guided discussion in an online forum with previously defined questions.

Data analysis method: content analysis of forum discussions.

Phase 4 - Planning

Based on the Guides and the pedagogical Framework of reference analysed above, participants will develop a proposal for the development of activities to be implemented in an educational context, taking into account the following guidelines:

- Discuss ethical issues that the selected methods can raise.
- Establish which aesthetic and embodied methods should be prepared to support data collection.
- Define how the team will incorporate reflection and interaction throughout the process.

The research team collaborates with the group members to establish shared objectives, define what they want to achieve with the research, and jointly decide on the research methods, data collection techniques, and engagement strategies.

Data collection method: focus group / discussion observation grid.

Data analysis method: content analysis of the observation grids.

Phase 5 - Action

The implementation of interventions in educational contexts by each course participant begins. Researchers and participants collect data through interviews, questionnaire surveys, focus groups, or aesthetic and embodied methods agreed during the planning phase. Weekly online focus group sessions will be organised to continually evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions through data collection, feedback loops, and reflections.

Data collection method: observation of weekly discussions/ observation grid.

Data analysis method: content analysis of the observation grids.

Four cases will be followed up in the field – two cases in pre-school and primary school contexts, and two cases in vocational education.

In these four cases, the data collection methods will be observation, photographic or film recordings of the activities, analysis of the products of the activities based on aesthetic and bodily methods, analysis of the materials produced by the children and young adults, and interviews with teachers and educators.

Data analysis method: content analysis of materials, observation grids and interviews.

Phase 6 - Reflection

Each participant will develop a reflective narrative about the activities they have carried out. This narrative can be written or visual and will be shared with the group on the online learning platform.

Subsequently, synchronous creative sessions will be organised with the participants, where they present the results of their work.

Each participant presents the results of the activities implemented, identifying what worked and what didn't and why; identifying dimensions of the pedagogical Framework and the Guides that may be forces resisting action and identifying what needs to be changed.

Data collection and analysis methods: The analysis of the reflective narratives will be based on content analysis with the identification of codes or categories to systematically analyse the written/visual content of the narratives. This may involve identifying themes, emotions, attitudes, opinions or any relevant elements in the narratives.

The data analysis from the collaborative discussion sessions will be done according to categories for content analysis in which both the researchers and the course members interpret the results, identify patterns, and extract key ideas.

Phase 7: Production of a report summarising the data collected

After the previous work phases, the Portuguese team will produce a synthesis report presenting the data collected throughout this Participatory Action Research process.

9. Contribution to the Project as a Whole

Like the other case studies, the data collected will serve as a basis, for the revision of the Framework and the prototype Guides. The case study phase is crucial for understanding what went well and what didn't work very well concerning the Guides and Framework developed at the beginning of the project. Throughout the development of the case studies, ideas and specific objectives or implementation strategies in Portugal will be presented.

Besides these expected contributions the Portuguese cases intend to contribute to the project by:

- Developing an online workshop for educators to help them incorporate aesthetic and embodied learning methods into their teaching practices, providing resources, strategies, and examples to support teachers in fostering democratic values such as critical thinking, empathy, and collaboration through embodied experiences.
- Developing digital platforms and online resources that facilitate aesthetic and embodied learning experiences for teachers and educators, using technology to enhance accessibility, engagement, and collaboration in promoting democratic values through immersive and interactive educational content.
- Empowering educators and teachers as co-creators and agents of change in their learning experiences. Provide opportunities for educators-led projects and peer mentoring that harness the power of aesthetic and embodied learning to promote democracy-as-becoming.

Timetable

Time	Research Activity
Feb. 2024	Ethical approval for the research was granted on February 5, 2024.
Apr. - May 2024	<p>Online courses and development of activities in educational contexts.</p> <p>Phase 1. Introduction: viewing an introductory presentation (the project video created for the purpose) - 8-12 april.</p> <p>Phase 2. Familiarisation with the Framework and the Guides: reading the Framework and the Guide (relevant to the case phase) - 15 -19 april.</p> <p>Phase 3. Collaborative reflection: carrying out a collaborative reflection activity using the Guide to decide priorities and the focus for an AELD innovation - 22- 26 april.</p> <p>Phase 4. Planning: formulating an Action Plan for implementing their AELD innovation - 22 april - 10 may</p> <p>Phase 5. Action: carrying out the Action Plan - 13 - 24 may.</p> <p>Phase 6. Reflection: meeting for a reflection of experiences, learnings, and possible adjustments of the Framework and the Guides - 27 - 31 may.</p>
June - July 2024	Data analysis and report by the Portuguese team.
Early Sept. 2024	Discussion of the results with selected stakeholders.
Sept. 2024	Final report of Portuguese cases.

5.6 UK: Cases 18 - 19

1. Educational Setting

Case 18

Phase: Professional learning

Target group: The focus of this case is on opportunities for doctoral supervisor development, towards more democratic supervisory relationships and more democratic doctoral pedagogy. Although the supervisor plays an integral role in doctoral students' experiences, supervisor development is a relatively under-developed area, especially (though not exclusively) in terms of development to support newer forms of doctorate, such as professional doctorates (Lee, 2018).

Participants would then either be doctoral supervisors (individuals or collectively), seeking to engage in their own professional learning to support, for example, more democratic approaches to research supervision, or researcher/educational developers who support the development of research student supervisors.

Lee, A. (2018) How can we develop supervisors for the modern doctorate?, *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(5), 878-890

Case 19

Phase: Secondary Education

Target group: The focus of this case is on opportunities for educators and learners in the secondary education phase. The aim of this case is to explore the use of the AECED Prototype Pedagogical Framework and the Prototype Pedagogical Guides for secondary practice in supporting secondary educators and learners to design opportunities for aesthetic and embodied learning for democracy (AELD).

Participants in up to 6 settings will be invited to engage in participatory action research (PAR) to use the Framework and the Guides and to create innovative AELD. The research method will apply an *ethnographic sensibility* that supports sensitivity to process and interactions in short periods of action research. The setting(s) will be a school or schools (e.g. a department, class or group of teachers engaging in collaborative pedagogical development) and/or a charitable organisation promoting citizenship education by visiting and working in schools.

As a study that is PAR and a case that is exercising ethnographic sensibility, the research will be flexible and responsive to participants in its execution whilst being guided by a broad design. It is anticipated that:

- participants will include educators (including facilitators of pedagogical innovation advising schools), learners and school leaders, as well as others, as appropriate, who have a role in the pedagogical development, practice and evaluation, such as parents/carers/families.
- the number and nature of instances of AELD innovation will be determined by participants in response to their interpretation of the Framework and the Guides in the context of their setting; they will engage in familiarising themselves with the Framework and the Guides, collaborative or individual innovative design of AELD activity, organising and trialling the activity/activities, and evaluating the activities and the Framework and the Guides leading to changes in the Framework and the Guides.

2. Research Questions

Cases 18 and 19 tackle identical questions within different educational settings, employing distinct research processes and involving different participants.

RQ1 Regarding the process, to what extent do the prototype Framework and the Guides lead to positive participants' experiences (doctoral supervisors in Case 18 and secondary educators and learners in Case 19) and success in facilitating co-creative design of AELD using arts-based and embodied (ABE) pedagogies?

RQ2. Regarding *transformational change in participants* (doctoral supervisors in Case 18 and secondary educators and learners in Case 19), to what extent do the prototype Framework and the Guides, by facilitating co-creative design of AELD using ABE pedagogies to support the development of democratic supervision practices, lead to positive individual and collective growth in regard to:

- feelings for democracy
- aesthetic awareness and qualities (such as empathic, ethical and spiritual sensibilities)
- collaborative, reflexive and critical capabilities
- openness to newly 'seeing' the other
- willingness to move towards more reflexive and critical modes of awareness and knowing that reconnect with the body as a source of learning
- capacity to challenge social injustices and engage creatively with conflict and antagonisms

RQ3. What influence, if any, in the trials (in Case 18 and in Case 19) did the researchers have on how the Framework and the Guides were used and the designs of AELD?

RQ4. What evidence-based conclusions for revision and refinement of the prototype Framework and the Guides emerge from the experience of using the prototypes (in Case 18 and in Case 19) and addressing RQ1, RQ2 and RQ3?

3. Research Objectives

Case 18

The aim of this case is to explore the use of the AECED Pedagogical Framework and Adult, Professional and Organisational Learning Guide for practice in supporting professional learning and development in relation to developing more democratic approaches to supervisory practices.

As in Case 19, we will address these additional research questions that focus on the *use* of the Prototype Pedagogical Framework and the Guides.

RQ1a. How do users of the prototype Framework and the Guides *translate* these as they design an AELD opportunity AELD using ABE pedagogical methods?

RQ1b. As users of the prototype Framework and the Guides translate these and design and implement an AELD opportunity using ABE pedagogical methods, to what extent do they conduct themselves according to the principles and features of democracy-as-becoming?

RQ1c. What evidence is there of the prototype Framework and the Guides encouraging creativity and innovation in education for democracy?

RQ2a. To what extent do participants view or come to view democracy as democracy-as-becoming?

We are also interested in evaluating the *readiness* and *willingness* of educators to use the revised Framework and the Guides (and AELD methods more broadly) in their pedagogical practice over a period of time.

Case 19

The aim of this case is to explore the use of the AECED Prototype Pedagogical Framework and the Prototype Pedagogical Guide for secondary practice in supporting secondary educators and learners to design opportunities for aesthetic and embodied learning for democracy (AELD).

As in Case 18, we will address these additional research questions that focus on the *use* of the Prototype Pedagogical Framework and the Guides.

RQ1a. How do users of the prototype Framework and the Guides *translate* these as they design an AELD opportunity AELD using ABE pedagogical methods?

RQ1b. As users of the prototype Framework and the Guides translate these and design and implement an AELD opportunity using ABE pedagogical methods, to what extent do they conduct themselves according to the principles and features of democracy-as-becoming?

RQ1c. What evidence is there of the prototype Framework and the Guides encouraging creativity and innovation in education for democracy?

RQ2a. To what extent do participants view or come to view democracy as democracy-as-becoming?

We are also interested in evaluating the *readiness* and *willingness* of educators to use the revised Framework and the Guides (and AELD methods more broadly) in their pedagogical practice over a period of time.

4. Involvement of Participants

Case 18

The case is designed in four cycles, where the first three collective cycles contribute to the fourth, more individual one. Each cycle draws on different direct participants.

Cycles 1-3 are collaborative and involve the following:

- Cycle 1 will work with a group of (approx.: n=8) doctoral supervisors at institution A.
- Cycle 2 will work with a group of (approx.: n=8) supervisors at institution B.
- Cycle 3 will work with a more institutionally diverse group of doctoral supervisors (approx.: n=8), collectively.

Cycle 4 will work with a more institutionally diverse group of doctoral supervisors, individually (approx.: n=32), who will work with the Guide themselves.

Cycles 1-3 would be carried out in the following way, in six stages:

1. Introduction to the project and its aims.
2. Familiarisation with the Pedagogical Framework and the Guides.
3. Collaborative reflection using the Guide to decide priorities and the focus of the AELD innovation that aims to foster reflection on democratic supervisory practices.
4. Planning: formulating an action plan for implementing the AELD activity.
5. Action: collective trialling of AELD innovation, within workshop settings.
6. Reflection: collective evaluation of the design process, and the AELD innovation, within a workshop setting, with follow-on final reflections. Make changes to the Framework, the Guides and their introduction (during familiarisation) in preparation for Cycle 4 and ultimately the launch ready versions, following data analysis.

In cycles 1-3, participants will engage collaboratively and collectively (either online or face-to-face) in *five distinct phases* that operationalise the stages outlined above:

1. An initial session outlining the aims of project (*introduction*) and developing understanding (*familiarisation*) of the Framework and the Guides;
2. A workshop involving the collaborative design of an ABE (arts-based and embodied) activity for AELD to support the development of democratic approaches to supervisory practices (*collaborative reflection and planning*). In relation to the collaborative design phase, the AELD innovation will be determined by the participants according to their interests and particular contexts. The choices are likely to be influenced by the expertise of the UK team (which includes poetry-writing, embodied auto/ethnographic writing, collage/zine making, gesture-response), as well as the examples provided in the Guide (which includes pattern cards, walking encounters, sculpting, collaging). Design of the AELD innovation will also be influenced by pragmatic and logistical constraints (e.g., time; whether the trialling session is in person, or online; and access to resources).
3. A session or sessions (to be determined by the participants) trialling the AELD innovation that was designed in phase 2 (*action*);
4. An evaluation session, including an arts-based and embodied research method (ABER), with group interview, and follow-on qualitative questionnaire, and an open call to participants to take part in a further individual interview, where a smaller number will be invited (*reflection*).
5. The data from the phases of the three cycles will be analysed and findings will be used to develop the Framework and the Guides, and resources to support their use, in preparation for Cycle 4.

Throughout the process, participants will be invited to engage in reflective activities. Sessions 1&2, and sessions 3&4 could be combined, if this is more convenient for the participants. Session 1 could be delivered asynchronously, through a video briefing (as in Cycle 4).

Cycle 4, the final cycle, will have a different, more individual flow of action, which moves closer to how the resources will be ultimately used.

- Individuals will engage with this cycle individually. An introduction information session (in the form of a video) with an opportunity to ask questions (via email, or through an online meeting) will be shared (*introduction and familiarisation*).
- Those who consent to participate will be sent a resource pack including the Framework and the Guides. The pack will include information on how to develop an AELD innovation to support the development of democratic approaches to supervisory practice (*planning*).
- Participants will then trial that self-reflective AELD innovation (*action*).
- Throughout the design and trialling, participants will be invited to engage in reflective activities. Following the design and trial period, participants will be sent a short qualitative questionnaire to share their experiences. A small number will be invited to engage in arts-based and embodied research method (ABER), with a group interview, and/or a further follow-on individual interview (*reflection*).
- Analysis of this cycle will contribute to the development of the launch-ready Framework and the Guides by learning about what happens when participants engage with the resources more closely to how it is proposed that they will be ultimately used following the launch.

Approach to ethics

Prior to the involvement (and recruitment) of participants, an application was made to the University of Hertfordshire Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities Ethics Committee with Delegated Authority. The application comprised the following documents:

- An application, which provided information about the title of the study, the applicants, details of the study (including how participants would be involved, where the study would be located, and any necessary permissions), an assessment of harms, hazards and risks, information about the participants; information about confidentiality and consent (including reference to personal data) and use of and storage of data, information about any rewards, other relevant matters; and a check of other documents provided.
- Two participant information sheets one for participants recruited to Cycles 1-3, and one for participants recruited to Cycle 4.
- An informed consent form (to be administered online).
- A form relating to harm, hazards and risks assessment and mitigation.
- Permission to access participants, where required.
- Indicative questions for all data collection methods, in all stages of the project.

The participant information sheet (based on a template designed by the university) contains detailed information about the study including: the title; the purpose; a statement noting the right to withdraw at any point, and also the approach to gaining informed consent; any restrictions on participation; how long they will be engaged in the project and what they will do; any possible disadvantages and also possible benefits of taking part; information on confidentiality; specific information on audio-visual material; what will happen to the data that is collected as part of the study and whether it will be reused; there is information on who reviewed the study, what happens if factors that put others at risk are identified by the study, and the contact details of those who can answer questions about the study (i.e., the researchers) and also who to contact within the institution if there are complaints or concerns about the study.

Participants will be given this information prior to engaging in the project, and there will be opportunities for them to ask any questions or seek any necessary clarifications about all aspects of the project.

If they are happy, participants (or parents/carers on behalf of their child) are asked to complete a consent form. The consent form asks the participant to carefully read the participant information sheet, and then invites them to signal their consent. The participant is reminded of the right to withdraw at any time, without negative consequences.

In relation to video material, only video material (or images) that do not show people will be shared securely across the consortium. The researchers may wish to include data in publications or other publicly accessible material where participants may be identifiable. This would only be done with the participant's prior explicit consent and where the researchers can justify inclusion of such data. Before inclusion of such data, the participant would be informed of the data

the researchers wished to include and asked, to confirm in writing, if they consented. If they did not wish to give consent, those data would not be included. This information is included in the participant information sheet.

Data Storage

Data will be stored in the University of Hertfordshire (UH) OneDrive , which provides secure, multi-factor-identification storage. Only the UK research team will be given access to these files. Participants will be made aware of the data storage arrangements, and who has access to these data, through Participant Information Sheets. Modified data, that is research data which have been anonymised, may be shared with the wider AECED project consortium. If it is shared, it will be shared securely, through the consortium-wide Teams Channel, Lucit, where only named project-partners have access; via a secure file exchange, such as Exchange File, or via zipped, password protected files. The process of pseudonymisation concerning audio-visual (video) recordings of participants will begin once these are stored on the UH OneDrive. This will involve the removal of participants' names from the automatically-generated Zoom transcripts. Participants' on-screen names will not appear on Zoom recordings. All data and recordings stored as data on the UH OneDrive will be deleted from the OneDrive 60 months after the completion of the project.

Seeking Relationships between researchers and participants

As a participatory project, the study will seek to build relationships between the researchers and participants. The participants in Case 18 are adults who work within university settings, like the researchers, so it is not envisaged that there will be the power differentials that might exist in studies that involve children or students, for example. The researchers may have had previous working relationships with participants which may impact on the dynamic, so need to be aware of that.

Case 19

The research method will apply an ethnographic sensibility that supports sensitivity to process and interactions in short periods of action research. As a study that is PAR and a case that is exercising ethnographic sensibility, the research will be flexible and responsive to participants in its execution whilst being guided by a broad design.

The research process will begin, where feasible for the setting(s), with gentle familiarisation with the setting(s), during which time a University of Hertfordshire (UH) researcher(s) would be getting to know and understand people and practices in the setting(s). The UH researcher(s) will then introduce the prototype Framework and the Guides and facilitate reflection on these. Participants will embark upon a process of pedagogical innovation in which they design individually or collaboratively co-design AELD innovations and trial these. A period of reflection and evaluation will follow, in which participants share their views and experiences through research data collection methods that include ABE methods. The purpose will be to enable participants to share in different ways their reflections on and their experiences of trialling the AELD innovation(s) and the prototype Framework and the Guides.

In line with a PAR approach informed by ethnographic sensitivity, the UH researcher(s) will adopt a flexible and responsive positionality, being guided by the participants' ideas on how to be involved in the co-design and share feedback from the trialling and on the prototype Framework and the Guides.

5. Empirical Data Generated

Case 18

To support the evaluation of the trialling during the action phase, the following empirical data will be collated:

For Cycles 1-3:

- Reflective activities (e.g., journaling, visualising, making, moving) – by supervisors (participants) and the researchers. Data will comprise digital, handwritten, and/or audio notes from journaling; images, or outputs from online tools (such as Padlet, Canva) for visualising; artefacts (and images thereof) from making; and video files of moving.
- Observation of the AELD sessions. Data will comprise video files and observation notes.
- An ABER method (e.g., collage and gesture response) and follow-on (group) interviews (with discussion focused on the artefact). Data will comprise collage artefacts made by the participants (and images thereof), video and audio files of the group interviews.
- *Where feasible, a further follow-on invitation to provide feedback relating to ongoing use beyond the timeframe of the cycle via a qualitative survey. Data will comprise a spreadsheet of responses collected through an online survey tool.*

- *Where feasible, a further follow-on invitation to a small sample of participants to provide feedback via an individual interview. Data will comprise an audio and/or video file of the interview.*

For Cycle 4:

- Encouragement of participants to engage in reflective activities during the process, e.g., journaling, visualising, making, moving. Data will comprise digital, handwritten, and/or audio notes from journaling; images, or outputs from online tools (such as Padlet, Canva) for visualising; artefacts made by the participants (and images thereof) from making; and video files of moving.
- An invitation to share feedback on their experiences through a qualitative questionnaire. Data will comprise a spreadsheet of responses collected through an online survey tool.
- Option to invite a sample of participants to engage in an ABER method (e.g., collage and gesture response) and follow-on group interview (with discussion focused on the artefact). Data will comprise collage artefacts (and images thereof), video and audio files of the group interviews.
- *Where feasible, a further follow-on invitation to a small sample of participants to provide feedback via an individual interview. Data will comprise an audio and/or video file of the interview.*

Case 19

This participatory action research (PAR) is being approached with an ethnographic sensibility. Data collection will include methods such as participant observation by the researcher(s), but will also involve reflexivity by the researcher(s) through, for example, autoethnographic observations. The ethnographic sensibility that informs the case methodology means that:

- Emphasis will be given to analytical story telling where it is possible to generate *thick description* of the field.
- The importance of building relationships with participants to deepen understanding of the research context will be foregrounded.
- The research method will be dynamic and adaptable and responsive to the research context, including human participants and the *more-than-human* environments in which they are situated.
- The application of narrative formats and holistic approaches to analysing and interpreting data will attend to subtle dynamics – for example, when considering the extent to which participants come to view democracy as democracy-as-becoming.

Methods used (subject to discussion and agreement with participants) will be:

- arts-based and embodied research (ABER) methods
- observation of meetings with participants and participant-led discussions, activities and AELD pedagogical innovations, recorded through researcher fieldnotes
- autoethnographic/reflexive journals completed by participants
- audio-recorded meetings (e.g. participants planning and creating AELD innovations)
- interviews (individual or group, as agreed with participants), which will be audio-recorded and some audio-visual recorded
- self-completion questionnaires
- images and artefacts created by participants (e.g. in AELD sessions and evaluation sessions)
- audio-visual recordings and photos of AELD sessions, evaluation sessions using arts-based and embodied methods, and images and artefacts created in those sessions
- collaborative data analysis with participants in sessions in which the researcher shares prompts and selected, anonymised data inviting participants' reflections through arts-based and embodied methods, writing and discussion

The AELD innovations will take shape in dialogue with participants, but will revolve around the key priorities of:

- Participant-generated AELD innovations which arise from interpretation, and enable evaluation, of the Prototype Pedagogical Framework (PPF) and the Prototype Pedagogical Guide (PPG)
- Facilitating AELD activities using ABE methods
- Encouraging a shift in perception and feeling from democracy as a fixed system of governance to democracy-as-becoming

How many AELD innovations take place is dependent on what is possible within the context of the setting(s). Participants will be free to choose and plan the type and specific nature of AELD innovations as suitable for and responsive to their context, and depending on their own interests and expertise.

In addition to the ABE approaches used in the AELD innovations, ABE research methods (ABER methods) and more traditional qualitative methods will be used to generate and analyse data, such as interviews, focus groups, questionnaires. The following are examples of ABER methods that could be used to generate and analyse data:

- Poetry-writing
- Embodied auto/ethnographic writing
- Collage/zine-making
- Gesture-response (observed ethnographically and/or logged by reflexive multimodal journaling)
- Collaborative analysis methods:
 - o found poetry/poetic analysis (reviewing textual data chunks and formulating into poetry)
 - o reflexive multimodal analysis of embodied auto/ethnographic writing (e.g. in response to prompts around democracy-as-becoming); poetic analysis
 - o group exchange and discussion; reflexive multimodal journaling

6. Data Analysis

Case 18

Data analysis will follow the approach outlined in the Methodological Framework, which involves a process of data organisation; preparation; preliminary coding and the development of initial storylines; firming and theorising; and reporting.

It is intended that data analysis would involve some ABER approaches, including, for example, visual responses to the data through mapping activities; reflexive multimodal analysis; the use of collage as sensemaking; and poetic responses to and with data. Data analysis will be ongoing through Cycles 1-3, and this formative analysis will contribute to Cycle 4.

Following the completion of the cycles, there will be a further period of analysis, drawing on and consolidating the findings from the four cycles. This analysis will be incorporated into the final case report. This case report will be discussed with the wider consortium, as part of a cross-case analysis, and will contribute to the recommendations for the development of the launch-ready Framework, the Guides and associated resources in WP5. This process of cross-case analysis will be supported by a meta-analytical matrix developed for the AECED project.

Case 19

Data analysis will follow the approach outlined in the Methodological Framework, which involves a process of data organisation; preparation and familiarisation; preliminary coding and the development of initial storylines; firming up of emerging concepts and theorising; and reporting.

It is intended that data analysis would involve some ABER approaches, including, for example, visual responses to the data through mapping activities; reflexive multimodal analysis; the use of collage as sense-making; and poetic responses to and with data.

This case will also aim to engage in collaborative analysis with participants (detailed at the end of section 5).

The analysed data will then be consolidated by the UH research team and distilled into a format for the final case report. This case report will be discussed with the wider consortium, as part of a cross-case analysis as indicated in the Methodological Framework, and will contribute to the recommendations for the development of the launch-ready Pedagogical Framework, the Guides and associated resources in WP5. This process of cross-case analysis will be supported by a meta-analytical matrix developed for the AECED project.

The case reports will be disseminated in appropriate formats to various audiences. For example, to participants, partners across the consortium, other stakeholders and interested parties, including the project funders.

7. Phases of Empirical Research

Case 18

Cycles 1-3 would run concurrently between February (on receipt of ethics committee approval) and June 2024 and would involve the following:

Cycles 1-3 (This list incorporates the 5 phases explained under Q4 above.)

- Expression of interest request for supervisors (and those who support the development of supervisors) to take part
- Initial session outlining the aims of project and introducing the Framework and the Guides
- Workshop involving the collaborative design of AELD innovation to support the development of democratic approaches to supervisory practices
- Trialling the AELD innovation in another session(s)
- Evaluation session – using an ABER method (e.g. collage and gesture response) with group interview, and follow-on qualitative questionnaire.
- Data analysis and development of the Framework and the Guides

Following Cycle 3, the development phase will also include the drafting of support resources that help those who wish to use the Framework and the Guides individually.

Where feasible, a further follow-on invitation to provide feedback relating to ongoing use beyond the timeframe of the cycle through an individual interview.

Cycle 4 could follow on from Cycle 3 (e.g., 1 July – 31 August). However, an extended timeframe is preferable to allow for consolidation of learning from Cycles 1-3, the development of resources to support individual use of the Framework and the Guide, and avoiding data collection during what is for many the summer vacation period (see Timeline).

Cycle 4 would involve the following:

- Invite people to engage individually, via social media, mailing lists and personal contacts
- Provide an introduction information session online
- Send resource pack to those who consent outlining how to engage – encourage ongoing reflection (and sharing of those reflections) throughout
- Send qualitative questionnaire to share experiences
- Identify a small number of participants to engage in evaluation through an ABER method (e.g. collage and gesture response) with group interview.
- Data analysis and recommendations for the development of the launch-ready Framework and the Guides

Where feasible, a further follow-on invitation to provide feedback relating to ongoing use beyond the timeframe of the cycle via an individual interview.

Following the completion of the cycles, there would be a further period of analysis, and cross-case analysis, as detailed in section 6.

Case 19

The number of cycles in the research will depend on decisions by participants in designing innovative AELD and the number of settings in which the research takes place. For the purposes of this case design, we define a cycle as a process that begins with a particular version of the Pedagogical Prototype Framework (PPF) and the Pedagogical Prototype Guide (PPG). During the cycle, the PPF and the PPG are used, evaluated and refined. A new cycle begins with a new version of the PPF and PPG.

Following ethical clearance, we aim to start working with the setting(s) in March 2024. In the summer term (April – July 2024), the UH researcher would facilitate the process of pedagogical innovation and trialling. A period of reflection and evaluation involving participants could take place in the autumn term (Sept – Nov 2024). Should it be necessary to conduct the research over a more condensed timeline, the AELD innovations could be designed and trialled in the first half of the summer term; the reflection and evaluation phase could be incorporated into the second half of the summer term.

Overview of key timeline components:

Ethics: Ethical approval will need to be sought from UH; settings may have their own procedures we also must follow. Informed consent from individual participants must also be carefully navigated, but due to the PAR design, cannot be sought before making preliminary arrangements with institutional gatekeepers.

Familiarisation phase: to deepen the understanding of the research context and establish a firm basis for responsive AELD pedagogies, the UH lead case researcher will, where feasible for the setting, spend time in the setting before the structured

process of familiarising participants with the prototype Framework and the Guides begins, and before any structured interventions are planned. During this time, researcher fieldnotes will be the only form of data collected.

Meetings with participants: Meetings held with participants will include familiarisation with the PPF and PPG, co-design of AELD innovations, collaborative analysis and evaluation.

AELD innovations: These, including their frequency and length, will be planned with participants.

Data analysis: Researchers will use predominantly qualitative data analysis methods, including narrative and thematic analysis. Collaborative data analysis will also be used: in this, the researcher shares prompts and selected, anonymised data inviting participants' reflections through arts-based and embodied methods, writing and discussion

Evaluation: Key to our AECED research questions, evaluation of the PPF and PPG will take place in close dialogue with participants (educators), but opportunities for the learners to also engage in participatory evaluation should be built in whenever possible or feasible.

Analytical consolidation: This will be conducted by the UH researcher, supported by the AECED UK research team, and will involve consolidating various levels of data and analysis into a format that can be shared with participants.

Report of case research completion: This will be part of project deliverable D4.3.

Data analysis report: This will be the culmination of analysis during and following completion of data generation, and will be part of the project deliverable D4.4.

Cross-case analysis: Analysis conducted across the respective findings of international partners across the consortium.

8. Contribution to the Project as a whole

Case 18

The UK team has discussed the idea of AELD method 'drop-in' sessions that could be hosted online by consortium members with relevant expertise in specific methods. Adult participants could potentially attend these, along with participants from cases elsewhere in the consortium.

The final cycle, Cycle 4, will benefit from findings emerging from Cycles 1 to 3. In particular, it is envisaged that Cycle 4 will be closer to the projected use of the Framework and the Guides, beyond the lifetime of the project when the launch-ready Framework, the Guides and Resources are available for use by others. It is intended that this Cycle will be particularly helpful for designing the guidance resources that sit alongside the Framework and the Guides that outline how they could be used, including Objective 3 of WP5 which is to 'design guidance on adapting the templates to differing contexts (regional, national, cultural and local)'.

Case 19

The UK team has discussed the idea of AELD method 'drop-in' sessions that could be hosted online by consortium members with relevant expertise in specific methods. Adult participants could potentially attend these, along with participants from cases elsewhere in the consortium.

In working with the setting(s), this case will deepen our collective response to the matter of democracy-as-becoming and responsive pedagogy. The case will generate rich data on the extent to which the PPF and PPG can be used effectively by educators and others to co-design pedagogical innovations in aesthetic and embodied learning for democracy

The PAR approach to data collection with an ethnographic sensibility will generate in-depth and nuanced understanding of the extent to which AELD can facilitate a shift in users' understanding from democracy as a fixed system of governance to democracy-as-becoming, from which suggestion may be gleaned about this beyond the immediate setting(s) in which the research will be done. This approach will also allow evaluation of the *readiness* and *willingness* of the Framework and the Guides users to use them in the future and offer useful insights into how they could be used and how to 'design guidance on adapting the templates to differing contexts (regional, national, cultural and local)' Objective 3 of WP5.

Timeline

Time	Research Activity
January 2024	Case 18 and Case 19: development of ethics application and research design of cases
February 2024	Case 18 and Case 19: submission of ethics application (Case 18: 7 February; Case 19: 16 February) Case 18 and Case 19: Ethical approval pending Case 18 and Case 19: Detailed planning of Case design Case 18 and Case 19: Following ethical approval, recruitment of participants to both cases
February – June 2024	Case 18: stages of introduction, familiarisation with Prototype Pedagogical Framework and Prototype Pedagogical Guide, collaborative reflection, planning, action, and reflection (including evaluation), for Cycles 1-3. Case 19: (March 2024 onwards) gentle familiarisation with the setting(s), introduction of Prototype Pedagogical Framework and Prototype Pedagogical Guide, planning and co-design of pedagogical innovation(s), trialling (action).
July – August 2024	Case 18: analytical consolidation of Cycles 1-3; development of resources to support Cycle 4 Case 19: ongoing trialling of pedagogical innovation(s).
September 2024	Case 18: Cycle 4: distribution of Framework, Guides and Resource Pack to participants (who go through the planning, action and reflection stages) Case 19: reflection and evaluation stages.
October - December 2024	Case 18: (October 2024) Completion of data collection Case 18: Evaluation, analysis and development of recommendations for the launch-ready Pedagogical Framework and Pedagogical Guide Case 18: analysis of Cycles 1-4 and report drafting Case 19: (November 2024) Completion of data collection Case 19: Evaluation, analysis and development of recommendations for the launch-ready Pedagogical Framework and Pedagogical Guide
January – February 2025	Case 18: exchange with partners for cross-case analysis Case 19: exchange with partners for cross-case analysis
March 2025	Case 18 and Case 19: completion of data analysis reports

SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU
UČITELJSKI FAKULTET
Etičko povjerenstvo
Savska cesta 77, HR – 10000 Zagreb

Učiteljski fakultet u Zagrebu

Primljeno: 17.01.2024.
Klas. ozn.: 641-03/23-01/03
Ur. broj: 251-378-01-24-1
Ustr. jedinica: 21
Prilozi: , Vrijednost:

Zagreb, 16. siječnja 2024.

MISLJENJE O USKLAĐENOSTI PRIJAVE ISTRAŽIVANJA S ETIČKIM NAČELIMA

Istraživačica *Monika Pažur* uputila je zahtjev Etičkom povjerenstvu Učiteljskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu za davanje mišljenja o usklađenosti prijave istraživanja s etičkim načelima.

Tema istraživanja je "*Mijenjanje obrazovanja za demokraciju kroz estetsko i utjelovljeno učenje, responzivne pedagogije i demokraciju u nastajanju*", a provest će se u suradnji s *Maja Drvodelić, Vlatka Domović, Katarina Aladrović, Maša Rimac Jurinović*.

Na temelju uvida u plan provedbe istraživanja, te u sve mjerne instrumente i obrasce pristanka na sudjelovanje u istraživanju, članovi Etičkog povjerenstva na sjednici zaključenoj *16. siječnja 2024.* jednoglasno su donijeli zaključak da prijava istraživanja udovoljava etičkim načelima propisanim Etičkim kodeksom Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Predsjednik Etičkog povjerenstva


Izv. prof. dr. sc. Draženko Tomić

Asiakirjan ovat allekirjoittaneet

Nimi	Tunnistautuminen	Aika
Falin Petra Anita	Telia Tunnistus	24.10.2023 15:47:37 UTC+03:00
KIRSTI MARIA LEMPIÄINEN	Telia Tunnistus	24.10.2023 16:33:20 UTC+03:00



Tämä dokumentti on sähköisesti allekirjoitettu

Sisällys: - Kansilehti (1 sivu)
- Alkuperäinen dokumentti (2 sivua)

Kansilehden sivu 1/1



Lapin korkeakoulukonsernin ihmistieteiden eettisen toimikunnan lausunto 24.10.2023

Lausunnonhakija:	Professori Susan Meriläinen, Lapin yliopisto, YTK
Lausuntopyynnön diaarinumero:	1121/13.02.01/2023
Lausuntopyynnön päiväys:	20.9.2023
Tutkimuksen aihe:	AECED – Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming
Perusteet lausunnon pyytämiselle:	Tutkimuksen rahoittaja edellyttää ennakoarviointia

Lausunto

Lapin korkeakoulukonsernin ihmistieteiden eettisen toimikunnan tehtävänä on arvioida tutkijoidensa pyynnöstä suunnitellun tutkimuksen eettistä hyväksyttävyyttä ja muita tutkimukseen sisältyviä riskejä TENK:n laatimien periaatteiden ([TENK 3/2019](#)) mukaisesti. Eettinen toimikunta on kokouksessaan 4.10.2023 käsitellyt asian toimittamanne lausuntopyynnön ja siihen sisältyneen aineiston perusteella.

Toimikunta toteaa, että lausuntopyyntö ja siihen liitetyt materiaalit on laadittu huolellisesti ja suunniteltuun tutkimukseen liittyvät potentiaaliset riskit ja tutkimuseettiset kysymykset sekä ratkaisut on kuvattu hyvin. Dokumentointi on laadittu asianmukaisesti eikä niissä ole havaittu oleellisia puutteita. Toimitetussa materiaalissa on havaittu kuitenkin sisäinen ristiriita tunnistettujen aineiston säilytykseen liittyen, miltä osin suunnitelmaa ja dokumentteja on edellytetty korjattavan. Toimikunta on päättänyt, että toimikunnan puheenjohtaja ja sihteeri tarkastavat kirjaamoon toimitetut korjatut dokumentit eikä asia edellytä uutta toimikuntakäsittelyä. Lausuntopyynnön hakija on toimittanut päivitetty materiaalit, jotka puheenjohtaja ja sihteeri ovat tarkastaneet ja todenneet, että hankkeelle voidaan antaa **myönteinen lausunto** toimikunnan kokouksessaan tekemän päätöksen mukaisesti.

Mikäli ennakoarviointilausunnon hakija ei hyväksy toimikunnan päätöstä tai sen sisältämiä muutosehdotuksia, hän voi pyytää asiasta lausuntoa Tutkimuseettiseltä neuvottelukunnalta (TENK). Perusteltu lausuntopyyntö liitteineen tulee jättää TENK:lle kahden kuukauden kuluessa tämän päätöksen tiedoksisaamisesta. Lisätietoja: www.tenk.fi

Uusi lausunto on haettava, jos tutkimussuunnitelmaa muutetaan siten, että muutos voi heikentää tutkimukseen osallistuvien oikeuksia tai lisätä ihmisille, yhteisöille tai muille tutkimuskohteille tutkimuksesta aiheutuvia riskejä, vahinkoja tai haittoja. Uutta lausuntoa on haettava myös sellaisessa tilanteessa, jos tutkimussuunnitelmaan lisätään jokin sellainen asetelma, osatutkimus tai aineisto, jota ei alkuperäisessä suunnitelmassa ole mainittu, ja jolla on vaikutusta tutkimuksen eettiseen arviointiin.

Kirsti Lempiäinen, puheenjohtaja

Petra Falin, sihteeri

Voitte pyytää asiasta tarvittaessa lisätietoja toimikunnan sihteeriltä:

Petra Falin, [etunimi.sukunimi\(at\)ulapland.fi](mailto:etunimi.sukunimi(at)ulapland.fi)



Statement of the Ethics Committee of Lapland University Consortium

24.10.2023

PI/Contact person for the request: Professor Susan Meriläinen, University of Lapland
Date of request: 20.9.2023
Record number: 1121/13.02.01/2023
Title: AECED – Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming
Reason for requesting an ethical review: The funding body requires an ethical review

Statement

The Lapland University Consortium Ethics Committee has been appointed to assess ethical review requests and issue statements on the ethical aspects and other inherent risks of research plans according to the principles and guidelines of the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity ([TENK 3/2019](#)) where researchers so request.

The Ethics Committee has in its meeting on 4.10.2023 reviewed the research plan and supplementary materials by Susan Meriläinen. The committee notes that the request and the attached materials have been prepared carefully and the potential risks, ethical issues and solutions related to the planned research have been well described. The documentation has been prepared appropriately and no essential deficiencies have been found in them. However, an internal contradiction related to the storage of data containing identifiers has been detected in the material, which has been required to be corrected. The committee has decided that the chair and secretary of the committee will review the corrected documents submitted to the registry and the matter does not require a new committee meeting. The chair and secretary have received the corrected materials, reviewed them, and concluded that the project can be given **a positive statement** in accordance with the decision made by the committee at its meeting.

When the statement includes instructions from the committee and the researcher does not follow the instructions of the statement received, it may be a violation of responsible conduct of research (RCR).

If you do not accept the decision of the Ethics committee, you may request a statement on the matter from the Finnish National Board on Research Integrity (TENK). The request for a statement, including the grounds for requesting a statement, must be submitted within two months of receiving this decision. Further information: www.tenk.fi/en

A new ethical review must be requested if the research plan is changed in such a way that the change may impede the rights of the research participants or increase the risks or harm caused by the research to people, communities or other research subjects, A new opinion must also be sought if such a new research design, study, or data that has an impact on the ethical evaluation of the research, will be added to the research plan later.

Kirsti Lempiäinen, chair

Petra Falin, secretary

More information: Ethics committee secretary, Petra Falin, [petra.falin\(at\)ulapland.fi](mailto:petra.falin@ulapland.fi)

This document has been signed electronically in the Dynasty case management service of the University of Lapland. An electronically signed document is considered as valid as a document with original signatures. The final date of the document is the date when the document is signed by all signatories (signing times are recorded on the signature page under "Aika").

Antrag zur ethischen Beurteilung und Genehmigung von Forschungsvorhaben, die menschliche Studienteilnehmer involvieren

Dieses Antragsformular soll für alle Forschungsprojekte ausgefüllt werden, die menschliche Studienteilnehmer involvieren und die am Fachbereich Erziehungswissenschaften oder durch Wissenschaftler des Fachbereichs durchgeführt werden. Die Terminologie 'menschliche Studienteilnehmer' beinhaltet in diesem Zusammenhang lebende Menschen, Personen die vor kurzem verstorben sind (Leichen, menschliche Überreste und Körperteile), Embryos und Foeten, menschliches Gewebe und Körperflüssigkeiten sowie Personendaten und -aufzeichnungen/-einträge (wie z.B., aber nicht ausschließlich, medizinische, genetische, finanzielle, private, kriminelle oder administrative Aufzeichnungen/Eintragungen und Testergebnisse inklusive scholastische Ergebnisse).

Das wissenschaftliche Projekt sollte nicht beginnen bevor nicht eine schriftliche Genehmigung vom EK dafür erteilt wurde. Dieses sollte unbedingt berücksichtigt werden, wenn ein Starttermin für das Projekt festgelegt wird.

Anträge müssen auf diesem Antragsformular gestellt werden und elektronisch dem Vorsitzenden oder der Vorsitzenden der EK zugesandt werden. Eine unterschriebene Kopie in Papierform muss zusätzlich eingereicht werden. Anträge werden in erster Instanz vom Vorsitzenden der EK beurteilt; sie werden ggf. zu weiteren Kollegen der EK weitergeleitet bzw. im Rahmen einer EK Sitzung bewertet. Eine Kopie des Forschungsvorschlags und alle notwendigen unterstützenden Dokumente (z.B. Einverständniserklärung, Material zur Probandenrekrutierung, etc.) sollten dem Formular beigefügt werden. Eine vollständige Kopie des unterschriebenen Antrags wird im Fachbereich Erziehungswissenschaften für sechs Jahre nach Abschluss des Projektes aufbewahrt.

1. Titel des Forschungsprojektes:

"Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming" (AECED)

2. Der Titel des Projektes wird im Protokoll der EK veröffentlicht werden. Sollten Sie dagegen widersprechen, wird eine Referenznummer anstelle des Titels eingetragen werden.

Widersprechen Sie der Veröffentlichung des Titels? Ja / Nein x

3. Dieses Projekt ist ein:

- Projekt eines Wissenschaftlers des Institutes
- Studentenprojekt

4. Verantwortliche(r) Projektleiter(in) (Studenten/Studentinnen sollten auch den Namen ihres Betreuers oder ihrer Betreuerin angeben):

Name:	Bereich:
Prof. Dr. Susanne Maria Weber	FB 21; Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft

5. Falls bereits eine externe Genehmigung für dieses Forschungsprojekt erteilt wurde, dann braucht nur dieses Titelblatt eingereicht werden.

Externe Ethikgenehmigung bereits erhalten

Ja / Nein

Erklärung des(r) Projektleiters(in):

Die in diesem Antrag enthaltenen Informationen, inklusive aller zusätzlich eingereichten Informationen, sind nach bestem Wissen und Gewissen vollständig und korrekt. Ich/wir habe(n) die Ordnung für die Ethik Kommission des Fachbereichs Erziehungswissenschaften gelesen und akzeptiere(n) die Verantwortung für die Durchführung der Handlungen, die in diesem Antrag ausgeführt sind. Ich/wir haben versucht alle potentiellen Risiken, die im Zusammenhang mit der Durchführung des Forschungsprojektes auftreten können, zu identifizieren und akzeptiere(n) meine/unsere Verpflichtungen sowie die Rechte der Studienteilnehmer.

Unterschrift(en): 

Name(n) in Blockbuchstaben:.....Prof. Dr. Susanne Maria Weber.....

Datum: 25.6.2023

Antrag auf Durchführung eines listengestützten Verfahrens:

Ich beantrage, zu prüfen, ob statt eines Einzelvollverfahrens im Sinne von § 3 Abs. 1 Ethik-Ordnung ein listengestütztes abgekürztes Verfahren im Sinne von § 3 Abs. 2 Ethik-Ordnung durchgeführt werden kann. Das für das vorgelegte Projekt gewählte Untersuchungsverfahren ist nach meiner Einschätzung in der Liste der unbedenklichen Verfahren der EK enthalten.

Unterschrift der Antragstellerin/des Antragstellers: i.A. Spe

Ergebnis der Vorprüfung gemäß § 3 Absatz 3 Ethik-Ordnung:

Der/die Vorsitzende der EK oder ein von ihr oder ihm beauftragtes Mitglied der EK hat das Projekt begutachtet und insbesondere einen Abgleich mit der Liste der unbedenklichen Verfahren der EK vorgenommen.

1. Alternative:

Dem Forschungsvorhaben des Antrags liegt nach Auffassung des/der Vorsitzenden oder des beauftragten Mitglieds der EK ein Untersuchungsverfahren aus der Liste zugrunde und ist deshalb als unbedenklich einzustufen.

Dieser Antrag soll deshalb gemäß § 3 Absätze 2 und 3 Ethik-Ordnung positiv beschieden werden, sofern die EK nicht innerhalb von 7 Tagen der Einstufung als unbedenklich widerspricht.

Datum der Entscheidung: _____

Datum der Mitteilung an die EK: _____

Datum des Ablauf der Widerspruchsfrist: _____

Widerspruch eingegangen: Ja Nein

Unterschrift:.....

Name in Blockbuchstaben:.....

2. Alternative

Dem Forschungsvorhaben des Antrags liegt nach Auffassung des/der Vorsitzenden oder des beauftragten Mitglieds der EK ein Untersuchungsverfahren zugrunde, das nicht in der Liste der unbedenklichen Verfahren enthalten ist, zugrunde.

Dieser Antrag wird der EK deshalb zur vollumfänglichen Prüfung im Wege des Einzelvollverfahrens vorgelegt.

Unterschrift:.....

Name in Blockbuchstaben:.....

Datum: 12.08.2025.....

Philipps-Universität
Institut für Sportwissenschaften und
Motologie
Prof. Dr. med. Dipl.-Sportw. M. Benke
Leiter des Bereichs
Medizin, Training und Gesundheit
Sahnstr. 12, 35037 Marburg

Dieser Antrag wurde nach Durchführung des Einzelvollverfahrens von der EK genehmigt

Dieser Antrag wurde nach Durchführung des Einzelvollverfahrens von der EK nicht genehmigt

Unterschrift(en):.....

Name(n) in Blockbuchstaben:.....

Datum: 02.08.2023.....

M. Benke
M. BENKE

Rīgas Tehniskās universitātes

Pētījumu ētikas komitejas

LĒMUMS

Nr. RTU-PEK-001/2024

Rīga, 29.01.2024

Komitejas sastāvs	Zin. grāds	Amats
1. Uldis Bērziņš	Dr. biol	Biomedicīnas inženierzinātņu un nanotehnoloģiju institūts - Vadošais pētnieks
2. Katrīna Boločko	Dr.sc.ing	Lietišķo datorsistēmu institūts - Asociētais profesors
3. Inga Dāboliņa	Dr.sc.ing	Individuālo aizsardzības līdzekļu laboratorija - Zinātniskās laboratorijas vadītājs
4. Arita Dubņika	Dr.sc.ing	Biomateriālu un bioinženierijas institūts - Vadošais pētnieks
5. Aleksejs Kataševs	Dr.phys	Biomedicīnas inženierzinātņu un nanotehnoloģiju institūts - Profesors
6. Airisa Šteinberga	Dr.psych	Digitālo humanitāro zinātņu institūts - Asociētais profesors
7. Elīna Ločmele	-	Zinātniskās darbības koordinācijas un informācijas nodaļa - Nodaļas vadītājs
8. Sanita Vanaga	-	Zinātņu prorektora dienests - Projektu vadītājs

Pieteikuma iesniedzējs/i	Karine Oganisjana, Dr. paed., profesore, vad. pētniece IEVF Ekonomikas un uzņēmējdarbības institūts
Pētījuma / projekta nosaukums	Horizon Europe AECED projekts "Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming" ("Pārmaiņu īstenošana demokrātijas veicināšanai izglītībā, izmantojot estētisko un ķermenisko mācīšanos, dažādības pedagoģiju un demokrātijas piedzīvošanu", projekta Nr. 101094052; W237; W4751).
Pieteikuma datums	26.01.2024
Komitejas sēdes datums	29.01.2024
Pētījuma protokols	<p>Izskatot pētījuma pieteikuma materiālus, komiteja konstatēja, ka pētījuma mērķis ir kopā ar pedagogiem aprobēt un pilnveidot darbā ar izglītojamajiem projekta komandas izveidotos materiālus un pedagoģiskos modeļus, kas ir paredzēti demokrātijas piedzīvošanas pieredzes iegūšanai un ar to saistīto pārmaiņu veicināšanai izglītībā, izmantojot mākslā balstītas un ķermeniskās mācīšanās metodes.</p> <p>Pētījumu veic pētnieki ar ilggadīgu pieredzi un atbilstošu kvalifikāciju. Pētījuma iesaistītas nepilngadīgas personas – 16-18 gadus veci skolnieki. Riski ir minimizēti, jo tiešo darbu ar nepilngadīgām personām veic šo personu skolotāji. Pētījuma protokols paredz, ka pētījumu gaitā skolniekiem neveidojas papildu mācību slodze.</p> <p>Pētījumu dalībnieku konfidencialitāti nodrošina pētījumu veicēji, izvietojot iegūtus datus publiski nepieejamā RTU mākoņa krātuve. Aptaujas tika veiktas anonīmi, izmantojot pseidonimizāciju. Neanonimizēto pētījuma datu nodošana projektu partneriem nav paredzēta.</p> <p>Gan dalībnieki, gan nepilngadīgo dalībnieku vecāki parakstīs informētās piekrišanas veidlapu ar iekļauto informāciju par pētījuma norisi.</p> <p>Komisija uzskata, ka pētījums atbilst pētījumu ētikas prasībām.</p>
Komitejas lēmums	Piekrist pētījuma īstenošanai, apstiprināt pētījuma protokolu

RTU Pētījumu ētikas komitejas priekšsēdētājs


Aleksejs Kataševs

ŠIS DOKUMENTS PARAKSTĪTS AR DROŠU ELEKTRONISKO PARAKSTU UN SATUR LAIKA ZĪMOGU

ETHIC DECISION LETTER

by the Research Ethics Committee
of Riga Technical University (RTU)

Nr. RTU-PEK-001/2024

Riga, 29.01.2024

Committee members	Degree	Position
1. Uldis Bērziņš	Dr. biol	Institute of Biomedical Engineering and Nanotechnology - Leading researcher
2. Katrina Boločko	Dr.sc.ing.	Institute of Applied Computer Systems - Associate Professor
3. Inga Dāboliņa	Dr.sc.ing	Laboratory of personal protective equipment - Head of the Scientific Laboratory
4. Arita Dubņika	Dr.sc.ing	Institute of Biomaterials and Bioengineering - Leading researcher
5. Aleksejs Kataševs	Dr.phys	Institute of Biomedical Engineering and Nanotechnology - Professor
6. Airisa Šteinberga	Dr.psych	Institute of Digital Humanities - Associate Professor
7. Elina Ločmele	-	Department of coordination and information of scientific activity - Head of Department
8. Sanita Vanaga	-	Office of the vice-rector of sciences - Project manager

Applicant/s	Karine Oganisjana, Dr.paed, professor, senior researcher of the Institute of Economics and Entrepreneurship of RTU FEEM
Title of the research / project	Horizon Europe AECED project "Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming", project Nr. 101094052; W237; W4751).
<i>Date of application</i>	26.01.2024
<i>Date of Committee meeting</i>	29.01.2024
Research protocol	<p>Examining the materials of the research application, the committee found that the purpose of the research is to validate and improve the materials and pedagogical models created by the project team for the high school students to experience democracy in education and promote related changes in education, using art-based and embodied learning methods.</p> <p>The research is carried out by researchers with long-term experience and appropriate qualifications.</p> <p>The research involves minors: 16–18-year-old high school students. Risks are minimized because direct work with minors is carried out by their teachers. The research protocol provides that during the research, students will not have an additional learning load.</p> <p>The confidentiality of the research participants is ensured by the researchers by placing the obtained data in the RTU cloud storage, which is not publicly available. Surveys were conducted anonymously using pseudonyms. Transfer of anonymized research data to project partners is not intended.</p> <p>Both participants and parents of minor participants sign an informed voluntary consent form with information about the conduct of the study included.</p> <p>The commission believes that the study meets the requirements of research ethics</p>
Decision by the committee	Approve the research protocol

The Chairman of the RTU Research Ethics Committee

Aleksejs Kataševs

THE DOCUMENT IS SIGNED ELECTRONICALLY AND CONTAIN THE TIME STAMP

Ethics Committee

Opinion on the documents presented by Cláudia Neves on the Project *Transforming Education for Democracy through Aesthetic and Embodied Learning, Responsive Pedagogies and Democracy-as-becoming* (AECED)

The researcher Cláudia Neves submitted the following documents to the Ethics Committee:

- Research Design
- Research Ethics Report
- Statement of Informed Consent to be presented to research participants.

The documents presented by the researcher are in accordance with the ethical standards explicit in the Ethics Charter of the *Laboratório de Educação a Distância e eLearning*, and the researcher has complied with the ethical aspects of the ongoing research. It is considered that the documents related to the obtaining of the acceptance of participation by the informants comply with the ethical standards, presenting the appropriate information for their clarification.

The Statement of Informed Consent presents the title of the research, the **persons responsible for the research, the host institution and the objectives of the data collection, the objectives** the research project, the **expected duration**, the possible **risks and benefits, how the data will be used, how the results will be disseminated**, the **contact of the researcher** and ensures the **confidentiality and anonymity** of the participants.

Based on the proposed documents' analysis, the Ethics Committee gives a favourable ethical opinion of the above research.

05/02/2024

The Ethics Committee

Alda Pereira

João Paz

Maria Prazeres Casanova

AECED Project UK Cases Ethics Permission Update

The UK participatory action research cases will involve human participants. During the process of designing the professional learning and the secondary cases, the UK team has been considering ethical issues relating to the approach and methods of research adopted for each case. This includes consideration of participant, inclusion and exclusion criteria, the types of data that will be collected and methods of data collection, procedures for seeking informed consent and participatory activities such as collaborative analysis. The ethnographic research method planned for the secondary case raises ethical issues particular to ethnography (such as the extended commitment of time-presence in the case setting and in relationship-building with participants) which have been considered.

Research with human participants requires ethics permission from the University of Hertfordshire's Ethics Committee. Ethics Committees with Delegated Authority act as sub-committees. For the cases to be conducted as part of the AECED project, the relevant one for the AECED research is the sub-committee for Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities (SSAH). Further information on the process is available at <https://www.herts.ac.uk/research/research-management/ethics-and-research-integrity>

Drafting of ethics applications – one for each of the two cases – began during the process of their design. The designs being completed, the forms can be finalised. The ethics application ask us to explain where the aims of the research relate to human participants; (briefly) the design, methods and procedures of the research (particularly in relation to human participant); the starting and finishing dates of the research; where the research will take place; potential harms, hazards and risks; the kind of people intended to be participants; the maximum number of participants; procedures for obtaining consent; whether personal data will be sought and/or audio-visual recordings made and how access to these will be regulated; and whether data will be anonymised. All required documentation as specified will be submitted, such as participant information sheets, consent forms, indicative questions and risk assessment forms (where necessary).

The intention is to submit the ethics applications to the SSAH ethics sub-committee by the beginning of February 2024. It is anticipated that ethics permission will be received in February 2024. Recruitment and research will not begin until permission is received.

**AECED UK Research Team
January 2024**