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The COVID-19 pandemic, in combination with the re-energized social justice movements as of late, highlighted long-standing issues related to effective educational technology integration along with the void in culturally inclusive history within California’s public schools (Fogo, 2015; Galea & Abdalla, 2020; Mahnken, 2020). The purpose of this project was to design a collection of digital lessons for Southern California educators that would connect nearby learning communities to 11th grade United States history.

The inclusion of local history helps support culturally relevant pedagogy and multicultural deficits that the state history content standards lack, in addition to other benefits (Fogo, 2015; Dillard, 2019). The lessons developed for this project incorporated the local history of Southern California, including the counties of Riverside, San Bernardino, Orange, and Los Angeles.

A Google Site housed six Pear Deck lessons. Pear Deck is a Google Slide add-on that transforms presentations into interactive experiences for the learner. The designed lessons allowed for flexibility in synchronous, asynchronous, hybrid, or concurrent teaching and learning environments. Shared lessons were intentionally designed to remain editable to enable teachers to make modifications to fit their classroom needs and students.

This research explored the background of the California History-Social Science Standards and Framework. The research also presented the value and benefits of incorporating local history into the broader historical themes and supporting culturally
responsive pedagogy. Lastly, effective technology integration was explored to guide the creation of this project, with a strong emphasis on active learning strategies.

The project was developed utilizing Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction along with the ADDIE model (Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation). Gagne’s principles, and the ADDIE model, overlap with active learning strategies. Designing lessons with Google Slides and the Pear Deck add-on allowed numerous active strategies to be woven into the collection of lessons associated with this project. Pear Deck interactive elements such as videos, drag and drops, quizzes, draw features, sorting activities, polls, open-ended text responses, interactive maps, and embedded websites were included in the modules.

To field test this project, approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Participants were recruited via a Twitter post on the researcher’s public Twitter account. History educators who saw the post were invited to provide feedback. A link was provided that took willing participants to an informed consent page which then linked to the project, lessons, and feedback survey.

In the analysis of the data, participants overwhelmingly responded positively to the project. They noted that they liked the active learning elements, modern-day connections, multicultural inclusion, and tie-in to local history. It is recommended to improve upon this project, that lessons should continue to be developed and be added to the site.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic, in combination with the re-energized social justice movements as of late, highlighted long-standing issues related to effective educational technology integration along with the void in culturally inclusive history within California’s public schools (Fogo, 2015; Galea & Abdalla, 2020; Mahnken, 2020). Lessons incorporating local history can help Southern California educators teach the California History-Social Science Standards and suggested Framework in a culturally inclusive way, increase student engagement, and foster civics (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017; Danker, 2005). When the pandemic began, teachers scrambled to adjust. They were faced with different and uncertain learning environments and were in desperate need of quality digital lessons that were adaptable for synchronous, asynchronous, or concurrent teaching and learning.

Background of the Problem

The need to include multicultural narratives and perspectives in the California History curriculum has been a known issue and criticized for several decades (Fogo, 2015). When California shifted toward standards-based education in the late 1990s, the History-Social Science Standards were written by educators, none of whom were history teachers (Fogo, 2015). Gary Nash, who ran the National History Center at UCLA, criticized the Standards as being outdated and developed by people lacking history knowledge, specifically that of California and the West (Fogo, 2015). Nash went on to protest the inattention to Native American, Asian American, and Hispanic American
along with the treatment of African Americans and women in the document. Ultimately Nash concluded that the Standards draft completely ignored any attempt at multicultural inclusion (cited in Fogo, 2015).

The California State History-Social Science Standards have remained unchanged since their adoption in 1998. Still, a newer History-Social Science Framework was rolled out in 2016 as a band-aided attempt to guide the standards to align with more inclusive themes and history (California Department of Education, 2016). Although the State adopted the Framework, supplemental materials and textbooks have not changed for some districts (School Accountability Report Card, 2021).

Approximately 78% of California pupils are students of color; 54% alone are Hispanic or Latino (California Department of Education, 2019). In contrast, white teachers accounted for 79% of public school educators in 2016 (US Department of Education, 2016). This contrast between teachers and their students’ cultural backgrounds is necessary to point out as it is one of the reasons why white-middle class cultural norms have been tied to academic achievement and continue to be the educational standard (Paris & Alim, 2014). Studies show a decline in motivation and low academic achievement when students’ cultural backgrounds are not reflected in the learning or classroom environment.

Incorporating history reflective of the cultural diversity of students when teaching the standards is needed. Utilizing local history is one way to connect to students' culture and increase buy-in to the content, but state standards and textbooks are not specific enough to connect regions/cities to more prominent national history themes (Danker,
2005; Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017). Research shows that educational materials and textbooks do not proportionally represent students' cultural and linguistic representations (Gay, 2010; Heath, 1983).

In addition, the COVID-19 global pandemic changed lesson delivery for teachers and learning for students (EdSource staff, 2020). The pandemic left many educators feeling their job was more challenging (Page, 2020). They struggled to find or create practical digital lessons for their content, history included (Jackson & Newall, 2020). Well-structured digital lessons that tie in local history to the California State History-Social Science Standards and the suggested Framework would significantly help history teachers.

**Statement of the Problem**

The California History-Social Science State Standards connect to broad national themes of history and have significant gaps of diverse perspectives. The incorporation of local history can help fill these deficits. The benefits of teaching using local history have direct correlations to increased student interest in history and their willingness to become civically engaged (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017). Using local history to teach the State Standards can lead to more significant knowledge of local geography and culture (Goksu & Somen, 2019). In 2016 the History-Social Science Framework was adopted, which was more culturally inclusive, yet new textbooks and supplements to support the framework additions were not evenly adopted in California school districts (School Accountability Report Card, 2021). Incorporating local history can also support
multicultural perspectives and suggestions noted in the History-Social Science Framework.

The benefits of using local history are not just to support the State Standards and Framework. Utilizing students’ communities and surrounding communities promotes multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching (Danker, 2005). Students of color make up 88% of California students (CalEdFacts, 2019). Students curriculum should reflect them. According to Gay (2013), when teachers use students’ cultural knowledge, prior experiences, references, and performance styles, learning is more relevant and effective. Dillard (2019) states that local history helps students better understand their community and the inequalities they see around them daily.

Approximately five million California students began the 2020 school year in a remote environment (EdSource staff, 2020). The need for pedagogically sound digital lessons was needed more than ever. Technology became an essential vehicle for delivering and interacting with content. Cheung and Slavin (2013) note that a blend of synchronous and asynchronous instruction has more positive results than face-to-face or solo online learning alone. Multiple studies have found that incorporating active learning strategies have significant benefits (Freeman et al., 2014; Prince, 2004; Reuell, 2019). One study noted that test scores were approximately twice as high in classes that utilized active learning strategies compared to traditional courses (Prince, 2004). Pear Deck is an example of a technology application that pairs well with active learning research and lesson design principles.
Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to create a collection of digital lessons for Southern California educators. These lessons connect nearby learning communities to United States history. The subject matter would cover content from the 11th grade United States California History-Social Science Standards and the accompanying Framework.

Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction were utilized in the development of the six digital lessons. The six lessons were created using Pear Deck to support Gagne’s principles that overlap with active learning strategies. Pear Deck is a Google Slide add-on that transforms presentations into interactive experiences for the learner. Active learning significantly improves student learning and pass rates (Prince, 2004; Freeman et al., 2014). Interactive elements such as videos, drag and drops, quizzes, draw features, sorting activities, polls, open-ended, text responses, interactive maps, and embedded websites were all included in the project. All the Pear Deck modules were also highly visual. Mayer (2012) notes that people learn better when pictures are included compared to words alone.

Assumptions

This project was designed with several assumptions taken into consideration:

● The learners and their students had access to working laptops and WiFi to run the digital Pear Deck lessons in either a remote environment or in a physical classroom.

● The learners knew how to give students access to these Pear Deck lessons or comprehend the accompanying support tutorial video.
● The learners knew how to check student submissions and data associated with Pear Deck lessons and, if not, comprehend the support tutorial video.

● The learners’ students knew how to navigate their device and understood primary navigation and interactive functions associated with the various digital lessons.

● The learner provided students with the historical context of the correlating content since these lessons did not build off each other.

Limitations

This project is susceptible to several limitations related to design and the student's learning environment:

● These lessons were designed for flexibility of the learning environment due to the pandemic. It is ideal to blend face-to-face interaction with digital lessons, but it may not be possible depending on schools/districts’ remote, hybrid, or concurrent classrooms.

● In cases where synchronous instruction is not possible, students may not have the self-discipline or motivation to stay focused or on task to complete the lesson.

● If students are not in a distraction-free work environment, this may hinder students’ ability to focus and complete the lesson.

Definitions of Terms

Active Learning

Active learning is generally defined as any instructional method that engages students in the learning process. In short, active learning requires students to do
meaningful learning activities and think about what they are doing (Prince, 2004, p. 223)

**Asynchronous e-Learning**

Asynchronous e-learning makes it possible for learners to log on to an e-learning environment at any time and download documents or send messages to teachers or peers. Students may spend more time refining their contributions, which are generally considered more thoughtful compared to synchronous communication (Hrastinski, 2008, p. 51).

**Blended Learning**

Blended learning is not based on percentages of instructional delivery mode, but on what is being blended... referring to instructional modalities/delivery media, methods, and the ratio of online and face-to-face instruction as elements that all take a role in defining blended learning (Yamagata-Lynch, 2014, p. 193)

**Culturally Responsive Teaching**

Teaching as using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them (Gay, 2010, p.31).

**Educational Technology (EdTech)**

Educational Technology is the study and ethical practice of facilitating learning and improving performance by creating, using and managing appropriate technological processes and resources (Januszewski & Molenda, 2008, p. 1).
**Multicultural Education**

To reform the school and other educational institutions so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality (Banks, 1993, p. 3).

**Synchronous e-Learning**

Synchronous e-learning, commonly supported by media such as video conferencing and chat, has the potential to help e-learners in the development of learning communities. Learners and teachers experience synchronous e-learning as more social and avoid frustration by asking and answering questions in real-time. Synchronous sessions help e-learners feel like participants rather than isolates: Isolation can be overcome by more continued contact, particularly synchronously, and by becoming aware of themselves as community members rather than as isolated individuals communicating with the computer (Hrastinski, 2008, p. 51).
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this project was to create a collection of digital lessons for teachers to use in their United States history classrooms. The e-lessons aligned with the 11th grade, California History-Social Science Standards, and the Framework with intentional connections to Southern California history. Utilizing local history has been shown to improve students' interest in learning history and foster pride in their community, translating to increased civic engagement (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017; Danker, 2005). Utilizing students’ communities and surrounding communities supports multicultural education and culturally responsive teaching, which also has proven benefits (Danker, 2005; Heath, 1983).

The COVID-19 pandemic and social justice movements of 2020 floodlit concerns and needs related to education, specifically those connected to the social sciences. About six years ago, California adopted a newer History-Social Science Framework to guide educators to teach the History-Social Science Standards in a more culturally inclusive way (California History-Social Science Framework, 2016). Despite the rollout half a decade ago, districts like Corona-Norco Unified School District in Southern California still use history textbooks from 2006 (School Accountability Report Card, 2021). Teachers are left to independently find ways to incorporate the framework, include more diverse narratives, and connect to multicultural themes. The pandemic also challenged teachers to provide instruction in an environment foreign to all stakeholders. This
obstacle left educators scrambling to rapidly adapt their lessons and find content materials that were EdTech friendly while also embedded in sound pedagogy.

To better understand how to best meet the challenges and requirements that history educators face, this literature review explores four themes: the history of the California History-Social Science Standards and Framework, culturally responsive pedagogy, the incorporation of local history, and the current role of technology in education.

California History-Social Science Standards and Framework

In 1998, the California State Board of Education approved the History-Social Science Curriculum for California public schools. This new structure in education was part of a nationwide shift towards standards-based education reforms (Fogo, 2010). In 1998, a committee was formed to draft what would become the new CA History-Social Studies Standards. This committee was composed of all non-history Educators (Fogo, 2015). One of the repeated concerns of the standards draft document was that it was not culturally inclusive. Dr. Gary Nash, who ran the National History Center at UCLA, was one of several who voiced this concern. Nash was involved in the creation of the National Standards. Nash stated, "these standards ignore the attempts of the California History Social-Science Framework to provide a more multicultural curriculum that is relevant to the lives of the state's public school students” (cited in Fogo, B. 2015, p. 753). The State made few revisions to the standards document’s wording, keeping much of the original draft the same (Fogo, 2010).
Since the document’s adoption in 1998, the standards are unchanged, which is surprising since legislation directly connected to California History-Social Science public education has passed in recent years. The FAIR Act, also known as Senate Bill 48, took effect in January 2012. The FAIR Act requires that California public schools provide Fair, Accurate, Inclusive, and Respectful representations of the state's diversity in social studies curriculum (California Department of Education, 2011).

In 2014 legislation to update the standards was rejected by the State Governor. Governor Jerry Brown vetoed updating the History-Social Science Standards in 2014, citing the History-Social Science Framework revisions would suffice (Fogo, 2015). In July of 2016, California adopted the newest History-Social Science Framework. The Framework documents’ forward outlines its attempt to guide the standards toward a more culturally inclusive focus.

This framework tells a much broader story that features the contributions of diverse peoples of all sorts to the story of California and the United States. During the framework’s lengthy development process, the CDE and the SBE received a significant volume of public comment. This unprecedented feedback—from teachers, administrators, professional organizations, interest groups, and members of the public—has been reflected in the document (California Department of Education, 2016, p. V).

Specific inclusion-related shifts and recommendations can be found throughout the K-12 Framework. For example, in 11th grade United States history, the Framework guides how to include lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) history throughout
the document. The term LGBT is referenced 15 times in the Framework for 11th grade alone. LGBT inclusion is just one example of several prominent inclusions and shifts evident in the Framework that is not found in the California History-Social Science Standards document (California Department of Education, 2016).

In addition to filling voids of diverse histories previously excluded, the Framework also incorporates four main emphases: content, inquiry, literacy, and citizenship (California Department of Education, 2016).

This framework guides educators as they design, implement, and maintain a coherent course of study to teach content, develop inquiry-based critical thinking skills, improve reading comprehension and expository writing ability, and promote an engaged and knowledgeable citizenry in history and the related social sciences (California Department of Education, 2016, p. 14).

**Culturally Responsive Pedagogy**

Students of color make up the majority of America’s public school pupils. Between 2000 and 2017, white students in public schools dropped from 61% to 48% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020). The immigrant student population on the other hand has grown. As of 2019, 41% of California public school students spoke a language other than English in their homes (CalEdFacts, 2019). In contrast, white teachers accounted for 79% of public school teachers in 2016 (US Department of Education, 2016). Even with students of color surpassing the number of white students in public schools, white-middle class cultural norms of ‘language, literacy, and cultural’ ways of interacting continue to be tied to academic achievement and remain the
educational standard (Paris & Alim, 2014). Morrison criticizes how white
culture/perspectives are the American default for societal norms and refers to it as the
‘white gaze’ (Morrison, 1998). Centering whiteness and not considering all students'
cultural backgrounds can be harmful to student success. Studies have found that
classroom environments that do not support the students' home culture contributed to a
decline in motivation and low academic achievement, yet educational materials and texts
do not proportionally represent the diversity of students' cultural and linguistic
representations (Heath, 1983; Gay, 2010).

In their book, Hammond and Jackson (2015) note that habits of mind and
cognitive capacities are stifled for culturally and linguistically diverse students because of
unequal educational opportunities making students dependent learners. Dependent
learners rely on the teacher to carry most of the cognitive load, unsure how to overcome
challenging tasks, depend on scaffolds, and do not absorb content well. These authors
stress that studies have shown that culturally responsive teaching can enhance student
learning and school connectedness and help develop independent learners. Independent
learners can tackle challenging tasks without teacher support and retrieve information
from their memory.

Culturally responsive pedagogy incorporates students’ diverse cultural
experiences and backgrounds to support their learning (Gay, 2013). Issues of social
justice and gender have also been emphasized in connection to culturally relevant
pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2014). Sleeter (2011) notes that culturally responsive
pedagogy is also the focus of a political undertaking for equality and justice. Dixson’s
(2003) work stressed how the feminist views of African American women teachers were inherently political and embedded in their culturally responsive pedagogy.

Jackson’s (1993) article titled, Seven strategies to support a culturally responsive pedagogy, entailed research-based teaching strategies. These culturally responsive pedagogy strategies include: (1) building mutual trust between teachers and their students; (2) become culturally literate by learning about their student’s cultural backgrounds and values; (3) build a repertoire of instructional strategies that are not just culturally Eurocentric; (4) use effective questioning techniques by asking higher-order open-ended questions; (5) provide useful feedback equally to all students; (6) analyze instructional materials to ensure cultural inclusion, sensitivity, and factual materials; and (7) establish positive home-school relations early in the school year. Jackson notes that these strategies should be used as a jump-off point for teachers to create a culturally responsive classroom environment.

Villegas and Lucas (2002) wrote of six essential qualities of a culturally responsive teacher to ultimately engage students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and see them as capable learners. The six qualities suggested are: (1) understanding how learners construct knowledge; (2) learning about students’ lives; (3) being socioculturally conscious; (4) holding affirming views about diversity; (5) using appropriate instructional strategies; and (6) advocating for all students. There are noticeable similarities and overlaps between Jackson’s and Newall’s (2020) and Villegas’ and Lucas’s (2002) suggestions. Both sets of work emphasize learning about students' culture and lives, understanding what instructional strategies work best for their
students, reflecting socio-cultural consciousness into the curriculum, and supporting all students.

Hammond and Jackson (2015) made sure to emphasize that culturally responsive teaching is not seen as just a bunch of strategies, but a process that starts with educators recognizing the assets their students of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds bring to the learning environment and incorporating them into the curriculum to support student’s abilities and ultimately strengthen their learning development.

**Local History Connections**

California history educators, like many educators across the country, are juggling more than just teaching content. California history teachers are attempting to weave in a multicultural curriculum, civics, document analysis, geography, and so much more. The bulk of history lessons taught in schools rely solely on national and world history. Yet, research shows that tying in local history into the curriculum "increasing place attachment, interest in history, generalized social trust, and the willingness to become civically engaged” (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017, p. 220). Stefaniak, Bilewicz, and Lewicka (2017) specifically note that although middle and high school-aged students are the least interested group in learning history, when history is taught in connection to students' community, their interest in history and their willingness to become civically engaged increased significantly. The book Multicultural Social Studies, Using Local History in the Classroom, by Anita Danker (2005), advocates for incorporating local history to meet the history classroom’s needs. She notes that “local history is people's
history” (Danker, 2005, p. 2). It ties in civics, strengthens students' understanding of the content, and ties in diversity and multicultural themes.

Danker (2005) remarks that most experts agree that a fundamental goal for social studies is to prepare students to become good citizens. This includes preparing students to grow into educated and informed future voters, reflective citizens aware of social problems, and using this knowledge to make decisions. Danker attests that local history is the best choice to support civics. “It is democratic in that it is truly the history of, by, and for the people” (Danker, 2005, p.19). Danker suggests that the incorporation of local history generates pride and active citizenship. Goksu and Somen (2019) also see the benefits of integrating local history. They note local history allows for inquiry, geography & cultural incorporation, and students gaining essential life skills through connecting the past and present.

According to Danker (2005), associations made between more prominent themes in history with local history loop back to multicultural education. Having students research and dive into their community’s past fosters experiential learning, and is promoted by the National Council for Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education (Danker, 2005). Learning for Justice published an article with similar support for using local history to teach content (Dillard, 2019). In the article, Dillard (2019) wrote, "Local history helps students better understand their community, as well as the inequities in education, poverty, health outcomes and other issues that they see around them every day” (para. 2). Students are more interested and feel more
connected to their school when teachers use real-life examples and strive to incorporate them into their students’ interests (Byrd, 2016).

**Role of Technology**

**Shifting to Remote Teaching**

The COVID-19 pandemic that began in 2020 dramatically changed what teaching looked like for most educators around the globe. One billion, five hundred million students worldwide experienced school closures due to the Coronavirus pandemic (UNESCO, 2020). In California alone, approximately 5 million students began the 2020-2021 school year remotely (EdSource staff, 2020). Teachers scrambled to shift from a face-to-face environment to a distance and digital format. Technology became a necessity for teachers more then ever. The dramatic and chaotic change in teaching and learning led to teachers struggling to adapt. The needs of support for each school and teacher varied. Eighty-three percent of teachers surveyed, out of 505, from a USA TODAY/Ipsos poll, reported in Spring 2020 that remote teaching made their job harder (Page, 2020). An opinion poll conducted by Brown University and the City University of New York found that “COVID-19 and the hurried transition to remote learning presented teachers with an array of challenges that seriously damaged their sense of self-efficacy. The quality of school working conditions, including fair expectations and clear communication, was found to be critical in sustaining the educators’ perceptions of professional success” (Mahnken, 2020, para. 1). Over half of the teachers surveyed said they felt less effective after the shift to crisis teaching (Mahnken, 2020).
Teachers who worked in high poverty schools (free and reduced-price lunch accounted for 75% or more of their student population) stated that about half their students consistently engaged in the distance learning lessons. Teachers working in low-poverty schools had a much different experience, noting that three-quarters of their students were engaged. Older teachers said that they struggled the most to adapt to incorporating technology for online learning. Teachers mid-year in their career reported difficulty juggling their job and caretaking responsibilities, most likely due to them having their own children in school (Mahnken, 2020).

When the 2020-2021 school year began in the Fall, teachers still had concerns similar to when the pandemic first hit in the Spring of 2020. Teachers' concerns about distance learning included the fear that it would cause students to fall behind and not be an effective way for students to learn (Jackson & Newall, 2020). Yet, the same August survey noted that eighty-one percent of teachers (505 teachers surveyed) felt they could teach online in the Fall of 2020, but 55% of the same group polled expressed they could not effectively do their job since starting to teach remotely (Jackson & Newall, 2020). This data shows that teachers felt they could teach remotely but still had concerns about doing it effectively.

Districts scrambled to adapt alongside teachers and students. Many districts pivoted to provide additional technical support to learners, ensuring 1:1 devices and expanding WiFi access (Rauf, 2020). Developments and funding in educational technology have made distance education possible over recent years, but “professors and students will always be in need of instruction to best utilize these ever-changing
platforms” (McBrien et al., 2009, p. 15). An NPR/Ipsos poll surveyed 505 in August of 2020, and only 39% of teachers from the opinion poll believed their school district trained them effectively for remote online learning (Jackson & Newall, 2020). Singh and Thurman (2019) define online learning as synchronous or asynchronous learning environments that utilize web-based devices. Students in an online learning environment can learn and interact with their teachers as long as there is reliable internet access. The flexibility of anywhere, anytime instruction associated with online learning does not automatically make learning more efficient. Cuban (2009) noted that technology allows educators to create student-centered instruction. Yet, the teachers he followed in Silicon Valley used it primarily to enable their teacher-centered instructional tasks, which did not increase student learning.

The pandemic led to a sudden shift and increased the number of remote classrooms across the country, but online instruction was not new; it has been around for decades in various forms. In 1989, for example, the University of Phoenix became the first to offer a higher education program entirely online (Kentnor, 2015). By fall 2018, 6,932,074 higher education students were enrolled in distance learning courses across the nation (National Center for Education Statistics, 2018). Flipped instruction was also growing in popularity before the 2020 pandemic. Flipped instruction was first coined in 2012 by two high school teachers who pioneered this method of teaching. The premise behind flipped instruction was to reverse independent practice, which generally was completed via homework, and replace them with videos to allow more time in class to apply the learning (Angadi et al., 2019).
In 2017 an estimated 16% of US teachers were already flipping their instruction, and 35% of teachers were interested in receiving training (Noonoo, 2017). The research connected to online education can help guide teachers who can better support their struggling students. In the fall of 2020, class failure rates surged (Wong, 2020). There are numerous factors that teachers cannot control in a remote environment, such as WiFi stability, technology issues, distractions, etc. (Learning Network, 2020). Teachers can guide how to deliver content in more effective ways. Educators can use a significant amount of research to guide them in designing or choosing lessons to utilize in a remote, hybrid, or blended technology environment (van Alten et al., 2019; Cheung & Slavin, 2011; Prince, 2004; Freeman et al., 2014).

Insights can be gained from positive gains made with flipped instruction. Students who learned in a flipped classroom structure obtained significantly higher assessed learning outcomes than those in non-flipped classrooms, especially when successful methods like face-to-face instruction and quizzes were incorporated (van Alten et al., 2019). Cheung and Slavin (2013) also found the benefits of incorporating a blended approach to integrating technology. Blended learning combines face-to-face teacher instruction with online applications. Their research concluded that teachers who included a blended approach (mix of synchronous and asynchronous) instruction compared to solely face-to-face or online learning alone saw higher student gains. These studies referred to face-to-face physical environments mixed with online teaching, but similar strategies could be modified for a completely remote environment via synchronous and asynchronous online instruction given the specific needs/requirements of the classroom.
Student Engagement and Educational Technology

According to an online article published by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), there are over 1,000 apps categorized for education in digital app stores alone (Kolb, 2016). If you factor in web-based educational tools on top of those digital apps, there are what appears to be an infinite amount of tools for educators to choose from, especially as they are moving to blended and completely virtual environments. COVID-19 resulted in an 89% increase in educational technology tools utilized by teachers and students compared to the 2018-2019 school year (Molnar, 2020). Although there is an endless supply of technology tools available for educators, the goal is not to use the most tools in one lesson or the newest and flashiest app for no intended purpose. The priority when incorporating technology should always focus on what will best support students and help them meet the learning objectives.

Jelemenska, Cicak, and Dúcky’s (2011) research is another example of how new technology does not automatically make learning better. They stress that digital presentations that incorporate images, photos, and legible fonts are clearer for students than a teacher writing on the front board. Still, the enhanced visual impact is not enough to engage students. The element that is missing in the described scenario is interactivity between the teacher and the student. Luckily for teachers, there are numerous digital tools and strategies that allow for this recommended active learning style.

The concept of active learning, that is, increasing students' involvement in the learning process is an indispensable technique for increasing the effectiveness of teaching. In many cases, active learning can be employed without increased costs
and with only a modest change in current teaching practices. It is low risk with high return (Bonwell & Eison, 1991, p. xvii).

Active learning encourages students to actively participate in their learning throughout the lesson by challenging them to think, reflect, investigate, and produce (Cornell University, 2021). Active learning is more successful at educating students than lectures alone, even when students find the lecturer engaging and class enjoyable (Reuell, 2019).

Designing thoughtful activities for students is a crucial component to promoting student engagement. Well-structured activities connect vital elements to the learning outcomes and foster a deep understanding of fundamental ideas. These activities promote intentional engagement opportunities for students to synthesize the learning. One study, which involved 6,000 students, found that test scores were approximately twice as high in classes that utilized active learning strategies than traditional courses (Prince, 2004). Another study noted that students in regular lecture-style courses were more likely to fail students than students enrolled in classes that utilize active learning strategies, by 60% (Freeman et al., 2014). Popular education technology tools that lend themselves to incorporating active learning and interactive learning are applications/structures such as Pear Deck, Edpuzzle, and HyperDocs. Below is an overview of each and how they support active learning.

**Pear Deck** - Pear Deck is a Google Slide add-on. When enabled, teachers can add engaging elements to Google Slides, transforming them into engaging and interactive experiences. Activity options that can be added to the slides include polls or multiple-choice activities, embedding other apps or websites, text response submissions,
draggables, and draw slides. Students engage in the Pear Deck activity by logging in on their device via a link or join code. The instructor can control the pace of the lesson synchronously or can toggle to a student-paced asynchronous mode. Teachers can see in real-time what students are doing and share all or some responses with the class. Teachers are “hearing” from every student in the classroom and can provide individual feedback on their slide activities (Mohammad, 2020).

**Edpuzzle** - Edpuzzle is a web-based tool that allows educators to upload an educational video; this could be a video they create or found on Youtube and embed checking for understanding activities throughout the video. Students actively engage in tasks as they watch the video. These activities include multiple-choice options or free responses. The teacher can also insert a voice-over. Students cannot fast forward the video, and the teacher can see the data on the back end. Edpuzzle video lessons can be completed in a synchronous or asynchronous environment (Edpuzzle, 2020).

**HyperDocs** - HyperDocs are interactive lessons created by educators typically associated with Google Docs or Google Slides. HyperDocs transform instruction by interactively delivering the content via linked information, activities, web apps, and more. Creators Lisa Highfill, Kelly Hilton, and Sarah Landis, who coined the term HyperDocs originally envisioned this digital format of lesson design to incorporate components that would allow students to engage, explore, explain, apply, share, and reflect. Lessons are structured for synchronous, asynchronous, or collaborative environments (HyperDocs, 2021).
Educators must look at research connected to best practices related to technology integration, but they should also consider student motivation. Martin, McGill, and Sudweeks (2013) reflect on basic understandings related to what motivates students:

Motivation is a key dimension of self-directed learning and, in this study, students were forthcoming about what they found to be motivating, but also demotivating. Some students felt very strongly about the demotivating effect of having to undertake boring or monotonous tasks or having to participate in activities that do not seem to lead towards their performance outcomes or provide an enjoyable learning experience. Motivators should therefore be considered and included in the development of learning designs. Ideally, when designing an activity, lecturers should consider which aspects of the tasks are most likely to motivate them. For example, students may be motivated by tasks with a real-life focus that they can relate to or by the use of networking tools or media that they find to be appealing (p. 62-63).

Seifert and O’Keefe (2001) stressed that students need to feel confident and have a sense of control over their learning. They also recommend considering meaningful and relevant learning activities for the effects of motivation to be maximized. Additionally, Martin (2006) suggested that motivation and engagement both have a significant role in students’ learning, providing the energy and drive to work effectively, learn, and achieve their potential (Martin et al., 2013).

Seifert and O’Keefe’s (2001) recommendation applies to lessons whether they are in a digital format or not. They suggest that teachers create or choose lessons that feel
accessible to students to complete the learning objectives with confidence, control, and find relevance to their lives.

Summary

The global pandemic dramatically changed what teaching and learning look like. Needs that existed pre-COVID-19, such as culturally responsive and multicultural curriculum and lessons that infuse technology, have been pushed to the forefront. This literature first reviewed how and why the California State Standards for History-Social Science were formed in 1998 and lacked cultural inclusivity. There were concerns that the standards ignored multicultural curriculum (Fogo, 2015). Although the standards have remained the same since 1998, in 2016, the State adopted a newer History-Social Science Framework as a step toward cultural inclusivity tied to the state history curriculum (California Department of Education, 2016).

Simply put, the Standards are required to be taught, and the Framework guides how to teach them. Specific recommendations and contributions of diverse peoples are noted in the 2016 History-Social Science Framework, previously not mentioned in the Standards alone. The Framework has four main emphases for teachers to incorporate into their instruction: content, inquiry, literacy, and civics (California Department of Education, 2000; California Department of Education, 2016).

The history of the California History-Social Science Standards and Framework provides essential context to the lack of adequate multiculturalism inclusion and diverse perspective in the history curriculum. Although the Framework was adopted in 2016, implementation is not consistent across California classrooms, setting up the second
focus of the literature review, culturally responsive pedagogy. Culturally responsive pedagogy promotes incorporating student’s diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences to support their learning (Gay, 2013). Some take it further to note that cultural pedagogy also contains social justice and gender. California is the most diverse state in the nation (Clarke, 2020). California students in public education reflect that diversity. Students of color make up 88% of California pupils, and nationally 41% of students speak another language other than English in the home (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020; CalEdFacts, 2019). In contrast, white educators make up most public school teachers (US Department of Education, 2016). White-middle class norms are often tied to academic success and educational materials and texts not proportionally representing the diversity of students’ cultural backgrounds, resulting in harmful impacts on students of color (Paris & Alim, 2014; Gay, 2010; Heath, 1983).

Third, the review examined the benefits of incorporating local history into the curriculum. When local history is embedded, there is an increase in students' connection to their community, a more substantial interest in learning history, and more of a willingness to become engaged civically (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017). Local history also connects to diversity and multicultural themes (Danker, 2005). Tying in local history helps students better understand their community and the inequalities they see around them daily (Dillard, 2019).

Lastly, the literature review delved into the rapidly changing role of technology in education. Due to the global pandemic, educators worldwide scrambled to adapt to virtual or hybrid instruction. Many teachers and students struggled with the change in the Spring
of 2020 (Page, 2020; Jackson & Newall, 2020). An NPR/Ipsos poll surveyed 505 teachers and found that by the summer, only 39% of teachers felt effectively trained by their districts (Jackson & Newall, 2020). Terms like asynchronous and synchronous instruction began to be used as the everyday language for teachers to incorporate new technologies.

Technology integration in education should never focus on using as many tools as possible or the newest hype gadgets. The focus should be on what can best support student learning. Educators looking for best practices and methods to incorporate digital lesson design insights from past research can help. Research concluded that a blend of synchronous and asynchronous had more positive results than face-to-face or online alone (Cheung & Slavin, 2011). Interactivity between student and teacher should also not be overlooked (Jelemenska, Cicak & Dúcky, 2011). The benefits of active learning were the most notable. Studies concluded that active learning strategies significantly improve student learning and pass rates (Prince, 2004; Freeman et al., 2014). Instructors who incorporate active learning methods provide frequent and structured activities through the lesson for students to synthesize the critical learning objectives. Numerous educational technology applications support active learning. The three references in this literature were Pear Deck, EdPuzzle, and HyperDocs. Overall when designing or choosing lessons, whether they are digital or not, educators should ensure that the content is accessible to students so they can complete the learning objectives with confidence, control, and find relevance to their lives (Seifert & O’Keefe, 2001).
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this project was to provide a collection of digital lessons for Southern California educators. These lessons connect nearby learning communities to 11th grade United States history and support the State Standards and Framework essential questions. A Google Site housed six lessons, which noted the corresponding standards and community connection. All the designed digital lessons allowed for flexibility in synchronous, asynchronous, hybrid, or concurrent teaching and learning environments. Shared lessons were intentionally designed to remain editable to enable teachers to make modifications to fit their classroom needs and students. All of the lessons utilized the Pear Deck add-on in Google Slides and are interactive lessons that incorporate various active learning activities for students.

The project was designed based on the ADDIE model of instructional design. Since the ADDIE’s development in 1975, it has become the standard for developing educational and training programs (Muruganantham, 2015). The ADDIE model consists of five phases, analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation (see Figure 3.1). The Analysis phase determines and defines the need, target audience, and what is to be learned (Muruganantham, 2015). The design phase establishes the learning objectives and instructional strategies incorporated into the lesson (Muruganantham, 2015). The development phase creates the learning materials and activities (Muruganantham, 2015). In the implementation phase, the instructional designer delivers the lessons to students (Muruganantham, 2015). Finally, in the evaluation phase, the instructional designers’
The purpose is to obtain feedback on the lesson’s effectiveness and efficiency (Muruganantham, 2015).

**Figure 3.1 The ADDIE Model**

---

**CONTENT DEVELOPMENT**

The first two phases of the ADDIE model, analysis, and design are covered in Content Development. They were utilized to develop the project.

**Analysis Phase**

The analysis phase established the foundation of the project. In this phase, the needs of the learner are identified along with the objectives and the target audience. The
instructional goals and tasks associated with the analysis phase are the outputs. These outputs will become the inputs for the design phase. In the design phase, the digital mode of delivery is determined and other multimedia aspects (Muruganantham, 2015).

**Needs Analysis** - The need for the project was a combination of factors. The COVID-19 pandemic, in combination with the re-energized social justice movements as of late, highlighted long-standing issues related to effective educational technology integration along with the void of culturally inclusive California History-Social Science Standards (Fogo, 2015; Galea & Abdalla, 2020; Mahnken, 2020). In July of 2016, California adopted the newest History-Social Science Framework. The Framework guides the standards toward a more culturally inclusive focus, lacking in the Standards alone (California Department of Education, 2016). Although the State adopted the Framework five years ago, some districts have not adopted new textbooks (School Accountability Report Card, 2021). This disconnect puts the burden on teachers to seek out resources or develop curriculum on their own.

There is also a need to incorporate local history, which connects to nearby communities. The California History-Social Science State Standards connect to common national trends in history and have significant gaps of diverse perspectives (Fogo, 2015). Utilizing local history can support this need. Using local history is proven to increase students' connection to their community and support culturally responsive pedagogy. When students learn local history, research notes that it leads to a more substantial interest in learning history and an increased willingness to become engaged civically (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017).
Learner’s Analysis - The project’s target audience was Southern California educators who teach 11th grade United States history; age, seniority, gender, etc., are not a factor. The project’s purpose was to provide these teachers with digital lessons, which tie in local history, are culturally inclusive, and incorporate active learning strategies to support the California State History-Social Science Content Standards.

Technology Analysis - The target audience ideally had district Pear Deck and Google accounts. Pear Deck pro accounts were ideal but not necessary to utilize the lessons. Google accounts were needed to make copies of the eModules, which were added to their Google Drive. The learners and their students had access to working laptops and WiFi to utilize the Pear Deck lessons in a remote or physical classroom environment.

Extant Data Analysis - The lessons developed for the project utilized the Google Slides add-on, Pear Deck. The target audience may or may not have formal training on how to provide Pear Deck lessons to students. School districts have different technology applications that they subscribe to. Pear Deck is a popular application amongst many districts and individual educators.

Design Phase

The design phase encompasses determining the learning objectives, narrowing down the content, deciding on the multimedia components, and selecting the delivery system (Muruganantham, 2015).

While designing the project, using the ADDIE model, the scope, interface, and delivery of the lessons, along with the interactions, were planned. The project’s scope was to create a website via Google Sites to house the collection of six lessons for teachers...
to take and use with their students. Three major learning objectives were identified for this project as a whole. The overarching learning objectives were; (1) Students would be actively engaged throughout the lessons via the incorporation of various multimedia applications. (2) Students would develop an understanding of how people from diverse cultural backgrounds in the United States were/are affected by various social, political, and economic factors. (3) Students will make connections between the State history standards and their local community.

The objectives previously noted were for the project as a whole. The next step was to narrow down the topics for each of the six lessons. Community research and exploration were conducted. Local history in Southern California that strongly supported the Standards and Framework suggestions were sought out. Once the research was finalized and ideas were brainstormed, six-lesson concepts were developed, and standards-aligned essential questions were developed for each module. For all six Pear Deck modules, the designer was intentional to chunk the information into digestible segments to help students maintain interest and focus.

The lessons were designed to allow for flexibility in synchronous, asynchronous, or concurrent learning environments. Lessons could be provided to students via instructor-pace, which enables the teacher to lead the lesson. As the teacher changes slides/tasks in the instructor-paced mode, the changes are reflected on students’ computer screens. Students would not be able to move ahead or go back. The lessons could also be provided to students in an asynchronous format. In this self-paced format, the student controls the navigation of the lesson. Even if a lesson were to be delivered to students in
an asynchronous or synchronous format, it could be toggled to the other by the instructor. For example, a teacher could begin the lesson in an instructor-led synchronous format but then toggle to student-paced, allowing students to continue working at their own pace.

The navigation of the modules was all in a linear format.

Essential questions started each lesson, allowing students to preview the objectives. The expectation was that students would use evidence and rationale from the lesson to answer the essential questions; this would be evidence that they met the learning objectives. Videos were interwoven into all the lessons to frontload, teach, or reinforce the content. All the lessons were highly visual since images were heavily incorporated throughout. Interactive elements used to engage the audience included videos, drag and drops, quizzes, draw features, sorting activities, polls, open-ended, text responses, interactive maps, and embedded websites.

The connecting standards, essential questions, and community connections associated with each lesson are listed below:

**eModule #1: Vibrant Black Communities** - eModule #1 showcased a vibrant Black community that existed in Redlands, California, around the 1900s. It asked students to compare it to other vibrant Black communities that also developed in the United States around the same period. In addition to learning how/why these communities came to be. Key concepts, terms, and people included were: Jim Crow, segregation, great migration, Black communities, Black-owned newspapers, Black churches, Jacob Lawerence, push factors, and pull factors.

Of the twenty-six Pear Deck slides in the lesson, twenty-two of those slides
included some sort of interactive element for students to engage with or synthesize the information. Interactive activities and tasks infused in the lesson included clicking and exploring interactive maps, playing videos, highlighting evidence from a passage, completing graphic organizers, a self-graded quiz, and answering open-ended questions.

CA HSS Standard:

- 11.1.4, Examine the effects of the Civil War and Reconstruction and of the industrial revolution, including demographic shifts and the emergence in the late nineteenth century of the United States as a world power (California Department of Education, 2000)

Essential questions:

- How did the country change because of the Civil War and Reconstruction in the nineteenth century?
- What were the push and pull factors associated with the Great Migration?
- Fields to factories: What were the similarities and differences of life in the North compared to the South?
- What were similar characteristics of thriving Black communities in the early 20th century?

Southern California community connections:

- Redlands and Riverside County, CA

**eModule #2: Harada Family, House on Lemon Street** - eModule #2 studied the story, struggle, and courage of the Harada family. The Haradas were a Japanese American family that settled in Riverside, California. Due to the fact that Jukichi and Ken were both
born in Japan before immigrating to the United States in the early 1900s, they were subjected to discriminatory laws that negatively impacted many Asians living in America during that time. Their story explores how Japanese and Asian immigrants were affected by unfair policies and how they resisted these injustices. Key concepts and terms included were: immigrate, nativism, 1790 Immigration Act, 14th Amendment, 1907 Gentleman’s Agreement, 1913 Alien Land Law, State of California vs. Jukichi Harada, Nisei, Issei, citizenship, Executive Order 9066, and Japanese Internment.

Of the fourteen Pear Deck slides in the lesson, eleven of those slides included some sort of interactive element for students to engage with or synthesize the information. Interactive activities and tasks incorporated in the lesson included a photo slideshow, playing a video, responding to primary source documents, completing graphic organizers, linked Quizlet flashcards, and answering open-ended questions.

CA HSS Standard:

- 11.2, Students analyze the relationship between the rise of industrialization, large-scale rural-to-urban migration, and massive immigration. (California Department of Education, 2000)

Essential questions:

- Who came to the United States at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century? Why did they come? What was their experience like when they arrived? (California Department of Education, 2016)

- What California and federal laws created land ownership barriers for Japanese Americans? How did the Harada family challenge those barriers?
• How can the Harada story help us better understand our community’s history and immigration at the turn of the century?

Southern California community connections:

• Riverside, CA

**eModule #3: Pansy Craze** - eModule #3 focused on the Pansy Craze of the 1920s and early 1930s to highlight the cultural changes due to the Prohibition of alcohol. The Pansy Craze was the growing visibility of gay, lesbian, and transgender performers and patrons in Speakeasies in major cities across the United States. In this lesson, students learn the background on the Pansy Craze and analyze primary sources to answer the essential questions. Key concepts, terms, and people included were: 18th Amendment, Prohibition, Pansy Craze, Drag, Speakeasy, and Gladys Bentley.

Of the twenty-two Pear Deck slides in the lesson, thirteen of those slides included some sort of interactive element for students to engage with or synthesize the information. Interactive activities and tasks embedded in the lesson included playing a video, poll responses, responding to primary source documents, completing graphic organizers, and answering open-ended questions.

**CA HSS Standard:**

• 11.5, Students analyze the major political, social, economic, technological, and cultural developments of the 1920s. (California Department of Education, 2000)

**Essential questions:**

• How did culture change in the 1920s? (California Department of Education, 2016)
Were LGBT Americans welcome in Hollywood during the 1920s and 1930s?

Southern California community connections:

- Los Angeles, CA

**eModule #4: The Growth of the American Suburbs and the Open Road** - eModule #4 traced the rise and migration to the American suburbs in addition to the development of the open road. The lesson heavily focused on the decades of the 1920s and 1950s. Numerous local Southern California community connections were included in this eModule to get students considering the positives and negatives associated with the growth of the suburbs during those periods. Key concepts and terms included were: urbanization, rural, urban, suburbs, Model T, Hollywoodland, segregation, Redlining, GI Bill, Levittown, Federal Highway Act, Route 66, Greenbook, Sundown towns.

Of the forty-four Pear Deck slides in the lesson, twenty-eight of those slides included some sort of interactive element for students to engage with or synthesize the information. Interactive activities and tasks embedded in the lesson included multiple-choice options, playing videos, draggables, drawing on the slides, responding to primary source documents, highlighting evidence from a passage, a photo slideshow, and answering open-ended questions.

CA HSS Standards:

- 11.5.7, Discuss the rise of mass production techniques, the growth of cities, the impact of new technologies (e.g., the automobile, electricity), and the resulting prosperity and effect on the American landscape
• 11.8, Students analyze the economic boom and social transformation of post–World War II America. (California Department of Education, 2000)

Essential questions:

• Why were the 1920s filled with political, social, and economic extremes?
• How did the Cold War affect ordinary Americans? (California Department of Education, 2016)
• How has suburban migration shifted over the decades, and why?
• What were the positives and negatives associated with suburbs in the 20s & 50s?
• Why would some historians regard the GI Bill as a success, and why would others view it as a failure?
• Why was the Green Book a necessity for Black travelers?

Southern California community connections:

• Hollywood, CA
• Long Beach, CA
• Disneyland, CA
• Glendale, CA & more

**eModule #5: Stealing Home** - eModule #5 dove into the displacement and resistance of Latinos in East Los Angeles through the history of Chavez Ravine, which is now home to Dodgers Stadium, Redlining and freeway construction through neighborhoods, and current displacement issues such as gentrification in Boyle Heights. Key concepts and
terms included were: 5th Amendment, eminent domain, Chavez Ravine, Dodger Stadium, white flight, redlining, gentrification, and Boyle Heights.

Of the thirty-two Pear Deck slides in the lesson, twenty of those slides included some sort of interactive element for students to engage with or synthesize the information. Interactive activities and tasks embedded in the lesson included multiple-choice options, playing videos, draggables, linked websites, typing into graphic organizers, and answering open-ended questions.

CA HSS Standards:

• 11.8, Students analyze the economic boom and social transformation of post–World War II America

• Draw Slide: Students will use the draw feature to color code the appropriate information based on the color key.

• 11.1, Students analyze the major social problems and domestic policy issues in contemporary American society. (California Department of Education, 2000)

Essential question:

• How did the Cold War affect ordinary Americans? (California Department of Education, 2016)

• How did eminent domain impact residents in Chavez Ravine? Was it lawful?

• What connection did Redlining have with freeway construction through communities in Los Angeles?

• What is gentrification, and how does it impact communities?

• What community obstacles have Mexican Americans & Latinos faced in Los
Angeles over the decades? How have they fought back?

Southern California community connections:

- East Los Angeles, CA

**eModule #6: Mendez vs. Westminster, Civil Rights History** - eModule #6 taught the significant history of the court case Mendez vs. Westminster, which paved the way for ending segregation in California. Seven years after the Mendez case, Brown vs. Board of Education ruled that segregation in all American public schools was unconstitutional.

Key concepts and terms included were: Juan Crow, segregation, Mendez vs. Westminster, Plessy vs. Ferguson, Brown vs. Board of Education, and de facto segregation.

Of the twenty-nine Pear Deck slides in the lesson, twenty-two of those slides included some sort of interactive element for students to engage with or synthesize the information. Interactive activities and tasks embedded in the lesson included multiple-choice options, playing videos, draggables, highlighting evidence from a passage, an embedded drag and drop, image hotspot with text pop-ups, linked websites, and answering open-ended questions.

CA HSS Standard:

- 11.10.2, Examine and analyze the key events, policies, and court cases in the evolution of civil rights. (California Department of Education, 2000)

Essential questions:

- What does “equal rights” mean?
- How did various movements for equality build upon one another? (California
Department of Education, 2016)

- What role did Mendez v. Westminster play in civil rights history?
- How close to, or far from, fully embracing the Mendez decision are we today?

Southern California community connections:

- Westminster, CA
- Orange County, CA

Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction were utilized in the development of the six lessons. Over half a century ago, Robert Gagne developed a nine-step guide to instruction to maximize mental conditions for learning (Northern Illinois University Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, 2020). These nine events of instruction are meant to provide instructional designers with a guide to efficient and effective lessons for students (Northern Illinois University Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning, 2020). Gagne’s principles refer to actions that the student and teacher during the instruction (Miner et al., 2015). When Gagne’s nine events of instruction are incorporated into the lesson design process studies, have shown that student grades improve significantly (Miner et al., 2015).

The nine events are; (1) Begin with a hook activity to gain attention. (2) Inform the learners of the objectives via the essential questions. (3) Stimulate recall of prior knowledge. (4) Present the content through a variety of engaging formats such as text, images, video, and activity learning chunked strategies. (5) Provide learning guidance via scaffolding, visual images, and real-world applications. (6) Practice and self-assessment. (7) Provide opportunities to give feedback. (8) Assess performance. (9) Enhance
retention and transfer through the promotion of deeper thinking and modern connections (See Figure 3.2).

Figure 3.2 Gagne’s Nine Events of Instruction
Program Development

The Program Development covers the Development Phase of the ADDIE Model.

Development Phase

The next phase of the ADDIE model is the development phase. In the development phase, the instructional designer constructs the resources delivered to the learner (Muruganantham, 2015).

Six Pear Deck lessons were created in this phase along with additional activities needed for embedding into the Pear Deck lessons, such as an image hotspot created using thinglink.com, a drag and drop sorting activity created using wordwall.net, and an interactive quiz created using quizizz.com. Some of the images in the lessons were altered to create a transparent background. This was done using the website remove.bg. YouTube videos were incorporated into all six lessons. All the modules were created using Google Slides with the Pear Deck Slides add-on.

In addition to developing the lessons, a Google Site website was created to house the six Pear Deck lessons. It had a basic and easy-to-navigate layout. There was a homepage with thumbnail images of the six lessons. The images on the website and in the modules themselves followed Multimedia Fair Use Guidelines and were obtained through various websites such as Unsplash, Giphy, Flaticon, and Google Images. Pear Deck slides were designed by either the designer, or a design template was utilized from the sites Slidesgo or Slidesmania. Below the thumbnail images were buttons to take the user to the page that housed the lesson. Each lesson was housed on its own subpage with the associated Standards, Framework essential questions, additional connecting essential
questions, and noted community connection. On the lesson page, the user could click a button to receive a copy of the lesson that would save their Google Drive. There was also an option to preview the Pear Deck lesson in student view. In addition to the homepage and lesson subpages, there was a page for tech support. A video tutorial was provided on the tech support page along with other support links to address questions that teachers unfamiliar with Pear Deck possibly would have. The tutorial video was created using the Screencastify Google Chrome extension.

**Field Testing Procedure**

The last two phases of the ADDIE model incorporate the implementation phase and evaluation. They are covered in Field Testing Procedure.

**Implementation Phase**

The implementation phase refers to activating the project in its intended setting (Muruganantham, 2015).

Before this project was ready to be field-tested on a large scale with educators, it had to go through several troubleshooting rounds. This process took some time since there were six lessons to troubleshoot in addition to the website. A small group of social science teachers who work closely with the instructional designer tested the lessons in student view using different devices and browsers. The beta testers clicked on all the links on the website to ensure everything worked as intended. The lessons were also tested on the district-provided Chromebooks using the school WiFi to ensure the district’s firewall did not block sites at the school site. Minor fixable issues were discovered through the beta testing, such as spelling errors, incorrect share settings on certain links,
and missing Pear Deck features. All problems were easily corrected once they were brought to the attention of the instructional designer.

**Evaluation Phase**

The evaluation phase measures the effectiveness and efficiency of the lesson (Muruganantham, 2015). This phase incorporates both formative and summative assessments. The formative evaluation is conducted when the instructional designer implements the study with learners. The summative evaluation concludes at the end of the program (Kurt, 2017).

Donald Kirkpatrick’s four evaluation levels were used for the last phase of the ADDIE model, the evaluation phase (See Figure 3.3). There are four levels in Kirkpatrick’s model, which include level one, Reaction, level two, Learning, level three, Behavior, and level four, Results (Kirpatrick, 2013). These four levels were used to help the instructional designer get helpful feedback. Level one, Reaction, is generally used to determine to what degree the participants react favorably to the developed lessons. Level two, Learning, assess the degree that participants mastered the intended learning objectives. Level three, Behavior, determines to what degree the participants can use what they learned in their job setting. Lastly, level four, Results, evaluative measures, seek to understand if the target outcomes led to significant performance changes at the organizational level (Kirpatrick, 2013).
For field testing of this project, level one of Kirkpatrick’s model was used to determine educators’ reaction toward the collection of digital lessons housed on the website. Evaluations from the field test by educators help understand how the project and its multiple parts are relevant, engaging, and practical.

The field test survey included sixteen questions to obtain feedback about the website and the six lessons created for the Master's Project. This project was designed for educators in Southern California who teach 11th grade United States history. To field test this project, the following steps were taken:

- IRB Authorization to invite participants (see Appendix A)
- Post and pitch to educators on Twitter (see Appendix B)
- Informed consent form (see Appendix C)
- Field testing for a week
- Collecting feedback from participants (see Appendix D)
CHAPTER FOUR
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The year 2020 brought to the forefront long-standing issues related to effective educational technology integration along with the void in culturally inclusive history within California’s public schools (Fogo, 2015; Galea & Abdalla, 2020; Mahnken, 2020). When the COVID-19 pandemic hit, teachers were scrambling to adjust to the different and ever-changing learning environments. Teachers were and still are desperately in need of quality digital lessons that are adaptable for synchronous, asynchronous, or concurrent teaching and learning environments, while also incorporating active learning strategies can also help history teachers better support their students.

The need to include multicultural narratives and perspectives in the California History curriculum has been a known issue and criticized for several decades (Fogo, 2015). The California History-Social Science Standards have remained the same since 1998. In 2016, California adopted a newer History-Social Science Framework as a step toward cultural inclusivity tied to the state history curriculum. Although the State adopted the Framework, supplemental materials and textbooks have not changed for some districts (School Accountability Report Card, 2021).

Approximately 78% of California pupils are students of color, from whom 54% alone are Hispanic or Latino (California Department of Education, 2019). In contrast, white teachers accounted for 79% of public school educators in 2016 (US Department of Education, 2016). Studies show a decline in motivation and low academic achievement
when students’ cultural backgrounds are not reflected in the learning or classroom environment. Yet, educational materials and texts do not proportionally represent students' cultural and linguistic representations (Heath, 1983).

Lessons incorporating local history can help Southern California educators teach the California History-Social Science Standards and suggested Framework in a culturally inclusive way, increase student engagement, and foster civics (Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017; Danker, 2005). Incorporating history reflective of the cultural diversity of students is needed. Utilizing local history is one way to connect to students' culture and increase buy-in to the content, but state standards and textbooks are not specific enough to connect regions/cities to more prominent national history themes (Danker, 2005; Stefaniak, Bilewicz, & Lewicka, 2017). Incorporating local history can support multicultural perspectives and suggestions, which are noted in the History-Social Science Framework.

Technology became a necessity for teachers during the pandemic. The dramatic and chaotic change in teaching and learning led to teachers struggling to adapt. When the 2020-2021 school year began in the Fall, teachers still had concerns similar to when the pandemic first hit in Spring 2020. Teachers' concerns about distance learning included the fear that it would cause students to fall behind and not be an effective way for students to learn (Jackson & Newall, 2020). Yet, the same August of 2020 survey noted that eighty-one percent of teachers (505 teachers surveyed) felt they could teach online in the Fall of 2020, but 55% of the same group polled expressed they could not effectively do their job since starting to teach remotely (Jackson & Newall, 2020). This data shows
that teachers felt they could teach remotely but still had concerns about doing it effectively.

There are numerous factors that teachers cannot control while in a remote environment, factors such as WiFi stability, technology issues, distractions, etc. (Learning Network, 2020). Teachers can guide how to deliver content in more effective ways. Cheung and Slavin (2013) note that there are more significant benefits to utilizing a blended approach to integrating technology. Blended learning combines face-to-face teacher instruction with online applications. Their research concluded that teachers who included a blended approach (mix of synchronous and asynchronous) instruction compared to solely face-to-face or online learning alone saw higher student gains.

Multiple studies have also found that incorporating active learning strategies has significant benefits (Freeman et al., 2014; Prince, 2004; Reuell, 2019). One study noted that test scores were approximately twice as high in classes that utilized active learning strategies compared to traditional courses (Prince, 2004). Technology applications and lesson design strategies that pair well with the research are web-based programs, especially Pear Deck.

The purpose of this project was to create a collection of eModules for Southern California educators. These lessons connect nearby learning communities to United States history. The subject matter would cover content from the 11th grade United States California History-Social Science Standards and the accompanying Framework.

The project was designed based on the ADDIE model of instructional design. Since the ADDIE’s development in 1975, it has become the standard for developing
educational and training programs (Muruganantham, 2015). The ADDIE model consists of five phases, analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation. The analysis phase was the foundation of the project. In this phase, the need was identified along with the objectives and the target audience. In the design phase, the digital mode of delivery was determined, along with multimedia aspects of the project (Muruganantham, 2015).

Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction were also utilized in the development of the six lessons. To support Gagne’s principles, which also overlap with activity learning strategies, the six lessons were created using Pear Deck. Pear Deck is a Google Slide add-on that transforms presentations into interactive experiences for the learner. Active learning significantly improves student learning and pass rates (Prince, 2004; Freeman et al., 2014). Interactive elements such as videos, drag and drops, quizzes, draw features, sorting activities, polls, open-ended, text responses, interactive maps, and websites were embedded in the modules. All the Pear Deck slides are highly visual. Mayer (2012) notes that people learn better when pictures are included compared to words alone.

During the implementation phase, the project went through several troubleshooting rounds prior to the project being field-tested. Minor fixable issues were discovered through the beta testing, such as spelling errors, incorrect share settings on certain links, and missing Pear Deck features. All issues were quickly corrected once they were brought to the attention of the instructional designer.

To field test this project with educators, approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at California State Polytechnic University. Participants
were invited to provide feedback through a Twitter announcement (See Appendix B) that
the researcher posted on her public Twitter account, which invited history educators
interested in obtaining lessons on SoCal history to click the link and provide feedback.
Before participants could access the project and survey, they first had to click accept on
the digital informed consent (See Appendix C), housed on a Google Site. Once the digital
consent was completed, participants were linked to the project and the anonymous online
questionnaire to give feedback.

The survey was created using Google Form (See Appendix D) and included
questions to help to determine if the lessons and website were easy to navigate, if the
participants were engaged by the lessons, if the lesson objectives were met, if the
participants ran into any technical issues, if participants plan to utilize the lessons with
their students in future, etc. Participants were all adult educators. No personal
information such as gender, age, or income was collected. It was anticipated that it would
take 15-20 minutes to explore the website and Pear Deck lessons. The online survey
included a total of sixteen questions, and responses were collected during a week. Once
the period ended, the project was still available to view, but the feedback survey was no
longer accessible.

The sixteen questions in the survey were divided into two sections. Section one
was related to website feedback questions. Section two pertained to lesson feedback.
Seven of the questions were presented in a Likert scale 1 to 5 format, with 1 being the
most negative feedback and 5 being the highest positive feedback. One question was
multiple-choice, and another was a mark all that applied. Seven open-ended short answer responses allowed participants to provide feedback and reflections in their own words.

According to Twitter analytics (See Appendix B), the Twitter post that the researcher posted on their Twitter account, which asked educators to explore the project and provide feedback, was clicked on 440 times. Of those who clicked on the link in the Twitter post to be taken to the informed consent, then the project, fifty-seven participants completed the online questionnaire. The survey consisted of a total of sixteen questions. From question six onward, the total participant count reduced from fifty-seven to forty-eight. There was an error with the first nine participants who submitted their feedback in the survey. The survey had two sections, one for website feedback and one for lesson feedback. The form had an error that made it, so the first nine participants only saw the first section of the form. These questions were only connected to website feedback. The error was corrected for the rest of the participants. An analysis of the responses is viewable in the next section.

Conclusions

Respondents used a Likert scale for Questions #1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. These questions were on a one through five scale. A one indicated the lowest Likert scale choice and represented the most negative view/perspective related to the feedback question. A five indicated the highest option on the Likert scale choices and represented the most favorable view/perspective pertaining to the feedback question.

The first five questions addressed the usability of the website.
Question #1: The website was easy to navigate

Response options for this question were presented to participants in a Likert scale option. One indicated “not easy,” while five indicated “very easy.”

Forty-nine (86%) out of fifty-seven respondents noted that the website was very easy to navigate. No participants marked a 1, but one marked a 2, and another marked a 3. Six participants (10.5%) marked a 4. The data suggests that overwhelmingly respondents found the website very easy to navigate (see Figure 4.1).

![Figure 4.1. Easy to navigate.](image)
Question #2: The information on the website was organized clearly

Fifty-two (98%) out of fifty-seven respondents found the information on the websites to be clearly organized. Only one person (1.8%) rated the website organization a 2, which is closer to the not clear side of the Likert scale (see Figure 4.2).

![Bar chart showing website organization ratings](chart.png)

*Figure 4.2. Website organization.*
Question #3: Would you or did you utilize the Pear Deck tech support resources?

Twenty-six (45.6%) out of fifty-seven respondents noted they would or did utilize the Pear Deck support tutorials and resources. Twenty (35.1%) of fifty-seven respondents stated they were already comfortable using Pear Deck and would not need the support resources. Eleven (19.3%) of fifty-seven respondents listed that they would maybe use the Pear Deck support resources, but they are unsure at the moment when responding (see Figure 4.3).

![Pie chart showing survey responses to Question #3](image)

**Figure 4.3.** Pear Deck support.
Question #4: Did you have any issues with the website? Anything you found confusing with the website? Please explain

There were seven open-ended questions in the questionnaire. The first, “Did you have any issues with the website? Anything you found confusing with the website? Please explain,” resulted in fifty-one comments. A sampling of those comments follows (see Table 4.1)

Table 4.1.

Clarity of the website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns/Issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A word cloud was then generated representing all of the words found in the participant’s responses to the question (see Figure 4.4). A complete list of responses may be found in Appendix E.
Figure 4.4. Word cloud representation of website clarity.
Question #5: Any additional feedback is appreciated regarding the website

The second open-ended response, “Any additional feedback is appreciated regarding the website,” resulted in twenty-six responses (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2.
Additional feedback for the website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comment</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns/Feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A word cloud was generated representing all the words found in the participant’s responses to the open-response statement (see Figure 4.4). A complete list of responses may be found in Appendix F.
Figure 4.5. Word cloud representation of website feedback.
Question #6: Which lessons did you look through? Mark all that apply.

Forty-eight participants noted which of the six lessons they explored. Participants could explore one or all six. The Suburbs lesson piqued the most interest. Thirty-seven (77.1%) of forty-eight participants looked at that lesson. The Harada House received the fewest views, with twenty-seven (56.3%) participants out of forty-eight looked at that one. The rest of the percentage breakdowns are viewable below (see Figure 4.6).

![Bar chart showing lesson popularity](image)

Figure 4.6. Lessons observed.
Question #7: I found the interactive elements in the lessons _______.

Forty-seven (98%) out of forty-eight participants found the interactive features compelling, noting a four or five on the Likert scale. Only one person (2%) rated the website organization a two, which is closer to the not compelling side of the Likert scale (see Figure 4.7).

---

**Figure 4.7. Enough Interaction.**
**Question #8: Navigating the lesson was _____.

Forty-seven (98%) from forty-eight participants found the navigation of the lessons easy, noting a four or five on the Likert scale. Only one person (2%) rated a two, which is closer to the difficult side of the Likert scale (see Figure 4.8).

*Figure 4.8. Navigation of lessons.*
Question #9: The lessons were ___ at the teaching standards and lesson objectives

Forty-seven (98%) from forty-eight participants found the lessons sufficient to teach the standards and lesson objectives, noting a four or five on the Likert scale. Only one person (2%) rated a two, which is closer to the not sufficient side of the Likert scale (see Figure 4.9).

Figure 4.9. Met the objectives/standards.
Question #10: The lessons were ____ for the skill level of 11\textsuperscript{th} grade students

Forty-three (89.5\%) of forty-eight participants found the lessons were appropriate for the skill level of 11\textsuperscript{th} grade students, noting a four or five on the Likert scale. Three (10.4\%) out of forty-eight participants were in the middle marking a three on the Likert scale between not appropriate and appropriate (see Figure 4.10).

\textit{Figure 4.10. Appropriate skill level.}
Question #11: I will be able to immediately apply these lessons to my classroom

Forty-three (89.5%) of forty-eight participants agreed they would be able to immediately apply these lessons in their classroom, noting a four or five on the Likert scale. Three (10.4%) out of forty-eight participants were in the middle marking a three on the Likert scale between strongly agree and strongly disagree (see Figure 4.11).

Figure 4.11. Ready to implement.
Question #12: Did you have any issues with any lessons? If so, which lesson(s) and which parts of the lesson?

The third open-ended response, “Did you have any issues with any lessons? If so, which lesson(s) and which parts of the lesson?” resulted in thirty-three responses (see Table 4.3).

Table 4.3.

Lesson issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No issues</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment or N/A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns/Issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A word cloud was generated representing all the words found in the participant’s responses to the open-response question (see Figure 4.12). A complete list of responses may be found in Appendix G.
Figure 4.12. Word cloud representation of lesson issues.
Question #13: Anything you found confusing with the lessons? Please explain

The fourth open-ended response, “Anything you found confusing with the lessons? Please explain,” resulted in forty-eight responses (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4.
Any confusion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing confusing</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comment or N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns/Issues</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A word cloud was generated representing all the words found in the participant’s responses to the open-response question (see Figure 4.13). A complete list of responses may be found in Appendix H.
Figure 4.13. Word cloud representation of any confusion
Question #14: What did you like about the lessons?

Of the forty-eight responses that noted what participants liked about lessons, the most common responses were visual appeal, the interactive or engaging elements, the connection to local history, and the Pear Deck format. See Table 4.5 for the breakdown. The table notes the most frequent responses. Since this was an open-ended question, some of the participants noted multiple points they liked about the lessons, which were added to the tallies in the table.

Table 4.5.

What was liked about the lessons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interactive/engagement</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection to local history/relevant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual appeal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pear Deck</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A word cloud was generated representing all the words found in the participant’s responses to the open-response question (see Figure 4.14). A complete list of responses may be found in Appendix I.
Figure 4.14. Word cloud representation of what was liked.
Question #15: Was there any information you think should be elaborated on more?

Please explain

Of the forty-eight participants, only five (10%) responded to this question. Since all five responses were so different from one another and no overlap was apparent, all their comments are listed in the table below (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6.

More information needed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt all material accomplished in meeting the standards and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May encourage students to gather more evidence to support their answer at the end for Mendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see more questions at higher levels rather than relying on questions with one answer. Even with on-level learners, it is good to challenge them with questions that cause them to reflect on their thinking, such as explaining how they know their answers are correct or what might someone say who disagrees with their opinion on a topic, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like a few of the lessons definitely connected to the Zoot Suit Riots of WWII, and would have loved to see that mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it was fine, especially right now during distance learning. The lesson was able to go into some depth due to the digital and interactive nature of the lesson and toggling between teacher guided and self guided it allows one to cover a lot of information while also letting students work at their own pace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 16: Any additional feedback is appreciated

Of the forty-eight participants, fifteen (31%) people responded to provide additional feedback. Ten (66%) out of the fifteen comments gave praise for the project (see Table 4.7). Since this was an open-ended question, some of the participants noted multiple points they liked about the lessons, which were added to the tallies in the table.

Table 4.7.
Additional feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise of project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope for it to continue to develop/future lesson suggestion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request for professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A word cloud was generated representing all the words found in the participant’s responses to the open-response question (see Figure 4.15). A complete list of responses may be found in Appendix K.
Figure 4.15. Word cloud representation of lesson feedback.

Recommendations

The aggregated data collected from the anonymous educators shed light on areas of improvement as well as strengths for those looking to develop a similar project or digital lessons. Based on the Likert scale data from the questionnaire (questions 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11), 96% of the feedback was positive, 3% was neutral, and 1% was negative (see Figure 4.16). Only one participant marked lower than a three on the Likert scale, and this same participant only chose to view one lesson out of the collection.
Overwhelmingly participants noted that the website and lessons were clear and engaging. When participants were asked what they liked best about the lessons, many commented positively on the interactive features and how engaging the lessons were. Visual appeal and the tie into local history were also mentioned as positive points of the project.

Constructive feedback was also provided, which should be considered to improve upon and enhance the project/lessons. For example, a participant noted that some of the activities felt repetitive in the Vibrant Black Communities lesson, and students may get bored. One participant also suggested a future local history lesson on Indian Boarding schools would be a good addition to the project. Other participants noted that they would like to see this project continue to develop. It is recommended to improve upon this
project, lessons should continue to be developed and added by the instructional designer in addition to crowd-sourcing other educators who would like to contribute lessons.

Two comments from the feedback survey stated the Pear Deck and website were hard to navigate. Based on their description, it was evident the participants were viewing the project on their smartphone and not on a computer. Although the lessons and website work on a mobile device, computer access is ideal and should have been indicated by the Instructional Designer before attempting to complete the survey. In future field tests, it is also recommended that participants be told that access to the project on a smartphone is not preferred. Also, when survey data is collected in a non-controlled environment, such as Twitter, it is recommended that researchers include a question asking what type of device they viewed the project on.

All six lessons were created in Google Slides and utilized the Pear Deck add-on to enable the active learning elements within the lesson. Based on the questionnaire, only 35% of respondents noted they were already comfortable using Pear Deck. Although a tutorial was provided, this is good information to keep in mind. One participant in the survey indicated that they use a different but similar program, Nearpod, and would convert it.

Overall, many respondents noted they were appreciative of the lessons provided. They liked the active learning elements, modern-day connections, inclusion, and tie-in to local history. Continued research is needed to determine what the best practices are for non-traditional learning environments such as teaching and learning in settings that are part virtual and part in-person instruction, completely remote, hybrid, etc., essentially
environments that developed due to rapid changes as a result of the pandemic.
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The purpose of this study is to determine history educators' reaction toward a collection of digital lessons for Southern California educators. Evaluations from the field test by educators help understand the degree to which the project and its multiple parts are relevant, engaging, and practical. These lessons contain nearly ten lessons that are designed to engage teachers in 11th grade United States history and support the State Standards and Framework essential questions. A Google Site housed these lessons, which contain the corresponding standards and community connection. All the designed digital lessons allowed for flexibility in synchronous, asynchronous, hybrid, or concurrent teaching and learning environments. Shared lessons were intentionally designed to remain editable to allow teachers to make modifications to fit their classroom needs and standards. All of the lessons utilized the Pear Deck add-on in Google Slides and are interactive lessons that incorporate various active-learning activities for students.

You will be asked to complete an anonymous survey after you have navigated the website and lessons. Our experience has been that it should take you 15-20 minutes to explore the site and lessons. We do not anticipate you experiencing any discomfort or other negative feelings when participating in this study.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. Should you decide to discontinue participation, you may do so without penalty. You may also skip any screen you do not wish to complete. We are not asking you to place your name anywhere on the survey, so your participation is anonymous. None of your responses in the survey can be directly traced back to you.

Should you have any further questions, please feel free to contact the study's principal investigator, Mrs. Amanda Sandoval, a graduate student in the Educational Multimedia Program in the College of Education and Integrated Studies. Her Twitter handle is @historysandoval and her email address is ansandoval@cpp.edu. You may also contact her committee chair, Dr. Shahnaz Lotfipour, by phone at (909) 869-2255 or by email at slotfipour@cpp.edu.

By clicking “Accept” below, you consent to participate in the study. To decline participation, click the “Decline” button.
APPENDIX D
ADMINISTERING GOOGLE FORM QUESTIONNAIRE

4/23/2021

SoCal Community Connections History
Lessons | Feedback Form

* Required

Note
All responses are anonymous. No names or emails are collected.

Copies of lessons
A link will be provided once you have submit your feedback. The link is a different Google Site with editable copies of the lessons.

Website Feedback

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLS1yVrK_M65744ae5ukYm86l58Uzwe9HswQgLgj4GNYA/eedit
1. The website was easy to navigate *

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5
not easy 0 0 0 0 0 very easy

2. The information on the website was organized clearly *

Mark only one oval.

1 2 3 4 5
not clear 0 0 0 0 0 very clear

3. Would you or did you utilize the Pear Deck tech support resources? *

Mark only one oval.

Yes, I did or would utilize them
No, I already am comfortable using Pear Deck
Maybe I would use them. I am not sure yet.

4. Did you have any issues with any part of the website? Or anything you found confusing? Please explain

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1d71w35Vr_M1zJd4ae5uYmBj90Uzwr4eVqiBq7iY/A/edit
5. Any additional feedback is appreciated regarding the website *


Lesson Collection Feedback

6. Which lesson did you look through? Mark all that apply *

Check all that apply.

☐ Vibrant Black Communities
☐ Harada House
☐ Pansy Craze
☐ Suburbs
☐ Stealing Home
☐ Westminster ve Mendez

7. I found the interactive elements in the lesson *

Mark only one oval.


not compelling

compelling

8. Navigating the lessons was *

Mark only one oval.


difficult
easy
9. The lessons were ____ at teaching the standards and lessons objectives *
   Mark only one oval.
   
   1  2  3  4  5
   not sufficient  O  O  O  O  O  sufficient

10. The lesson were ____ for the skill level of 11th grade students. *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
    not appropriate  O  O  O  O  G  appropriate

11. I will be able to immediately apply these lesson to my classroom *
    Mark only one oval.
    
    1  2  3  4  5
    strongly disagree  O  O  O  O  O  strongly agree

12. Did you have any issues with any lessons? If so which lesson(s) and which parts of the lesson? Anything else you found confusing? Please explain *

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1d71w5VK_M037fJhAc56Y4n9M8/1k8U2wEdHxGqD5qBsl8Y/edit
13. What did you like about the lessons? *


14. Was there any information you think should be elaborated on more? Please explain


15. Any additional feedback is appreciated


This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms
APPENDIX E

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ANY ISSUES

(QUESTION #4)

Did you have any issues with any lessons? If so, which lesson(s) and which parts of the lesson?

1. No
2. No
3. N/A
4. The Suburbs was a hit with my juniors!
5. None
6. no
7. I found some of the materials too low for my advanced students, but mostly appropriate for my students who might struggle with reading English and navigating the textbook. It would be nice to have two versions, one for advanced readers and classes and one for a traditional US History class.
8. No issues
9. no
10. No
11. NA
12. N?A
13. No
14. No
15. none at this time. I will adapt them to NC standards

16. The lessons are amazing as usual. Your work is always great as is.

17. Some parents in some communities might find them too progressive.

18. No issues, i just don’t use peardeck so i need to convert them to nearpod

19. nope.

20. NA

21. No issues.

22. Thinglink, sometimes it works on student chromebooks and sometimes it is blocked.

23. Nope!

24. None

25. Your “local” is a little different from my location. So, I would make a few small changes. However, these are excellent and I will use some of them.


27. No issues

28. No issues all links worked as did pear deck features

29. Lessons are tightly aligned to standards. Lots of connections

30. None

31. NA

32. no

33. No

34. No
35. Most of the lessons included a culminating question that wrapped up the topic, but not all. I think it's helpful for students to have topics wrap up with one of these types of questions. I also found a couple of activities a little repetitive (3,2,1) or below the level of 11th grade students.

36. No issues

37. no

38. none

39. no

40. Honestly, I did not have any issues. These lessons are wonderful and engaging.

41. None

42. None

43. None

44. None

45. N/A

46. I did no

47. no
APPENDIX F

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ANY ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

(QUESTION #5)

Any additional feedback is appreciated regarding the website

1. You're awesome!!!!

2. The lessons are amazing! They can be easily amended. I think students will find them to be really interesting

3. Wonderful integration of local/state history into the bigger context of American history

4. Really nice lessons with strong vocabulary and reviews throughout.

5. n/a

6. Provide more background information on the lesson

7. Some teacher websites can be overwhelming because there is so much going on, but yours is extremely easy to navigate because there's nothing to explore/look for -it's all right there.

8. The home page with large icons/images to click to go to each lesson is attractive and easy to use.

9. great design and easy to navigate layout

10. All of your resources are exceptionally valuable -- thank you!

11. Appreciate the use of images/gifs for visual appeal

12. Fantastic job with all of these.
13. I enjoyed the variety of interactive opportunities. The variety prevented the lesson from becoming mundane. I also enjoyed the embedded vignettes.

14. Your resources are amazing.

15. This is a wonderful resource.


17. Love the graphics. I think it really helps the kids immerse themselves in the history!

18. Your lessons are AMAZING. Thank you so much for all your inspiration to “up the ante!”

19. "You're so generous to make these things and share them."

20. More please. I’ve been building my own local history based lesson plans for my community (Oxnard). Maybe we should have a working group of people who can share and generate ideas?

21. The preview of student slides is great!

22. I can't wait for more lessons!!!!!!

23. no

24. Super easy to navigate

25. I would refer to Japanese internment as Japanese incarceration.

26. I absolutely love it and look forward to using it to create my own lessons.

27. Your lessons are so thoughtful and well done.

28. I really like how you include the standards that lesson covers, the sources and research that was used in creating the lesson and if it was “remixed”
APPENDIX G

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ANY ISSUES WITH ANY LESSONS

(QUESTION #12)

Did you have any issues with any lessons? If so, which lesson(s) and which parts of the lesson?

1. No
2. a
3. No
4. N/A
5. The Suburbs was a hit with my juniors!
6. None
7. no
8. I found some of the materials too low for my advanced students, but mostly appropriate for my students who might struggle with reading English and navigating the textbook. It would be nice to have two versions, one for advanced readers and classes and one for a traditional US History class.
9. No issues
10. no
11. No
12. NA
13. N/A
14. No
15. No
16. none at this time. I will adapt them to NC standards
17. The lessons are amazing as usual. Your work is always great as is.
18. Some parents in some communities might find them too progressive.
19.
20. No issues, i just don’t use peardeck so i need to convert them to nearpod
21. nope.
22. NA
23. No issues.
24. Thinglink, sometimes it works on student chromebooks and sometimes it is blocked.
25. Nope!
26. None
27. Your “local” is a little different from my location. So, I would make a few small changes. However, these are excellent and I will use some of them.
28. No issues.
29. No issues
30. No issues all links worked as did pear deck features
31. Lessons are tightly aligned to standards. Lots of connections
32. None
33. NA
34. no
35. No

36. No

37. Most of the lessons included a culminating question that wrapped up the topic, but not all. I think it's helpful for students to have topics wrap up with one of these types of questions. I also found a couple of activities a little repetitive (3,2,1) or below the level of 11th grade students.

38. No issues

39. no

40. none

41. no

42. Honestly, I did not have any issues. These lessons are wonderful and engaging.

43. None

44. None

45. None

46. None

47. N/A

48. I did not

49. no
APPENDIX H

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ANY CONFUSIONS

(QUESTION #13)

Anything you found confusing with the lessons? Please explain

Anything you found confusing with the lessons? Please explain

1. Any additional feedback is appreciated regarding the website

2. Very easy to follow and use

3. Not an issue. They are great.

4. No.

5. Clicking on “answer question” to get to article rather than a link embedded on page. None except accessing linked articles by selecting “answer question”. Some the text was small... maybe make the header smaller to make text students need to read larger

6. Nothing was confusing

7. NA

8. NA

9. no

10. No, but there are some modifications I would need to complete as I teach RSP History

11. no

12. Nothing confusing. Very easy to navigate through the lessons and click in and out of activities.
13. From a student perspective, some slides had overwhelming amount of information
14. no
15. no
16. no
17. I didn’t find anything confusing.
18. Nothing
19. No
20. None
21. Some things I might change is in some of the interactive parts I might (for my students) have to actually put "drag the start..." after asking the question "which school is closer" - my kids would see that there isn't a text box to type in and they would just move on.
22. N/A
23. No
24. No
APPENDIX I

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO LIKING THE LESSONS

(QUESTION #14)

What did you like about the lessons?

1. What did you like about the lessons?
2. They were beautiful and engaging.
3. All of the interactive elements
4. The draggables were especially helpful in understanding the content.
5. Got my students engaged and talking!
6. Organization of slides, stated the main essential questions and were easy to understand.
7. I like that they frequently require students to interact. That ensures they remain engaged in some really content-heavy long lessons.
8. I love that they are ready to go in PearDeck. PearDeck is great for monitoring student engagement and even when a student is absent they can complete the lesson and I can monitor.
9. Everything!! They are relevant and engaging - not to mention beautifully created and visually appealing to students. Each of them gives students opportunity to investigate further and connect to today. They all have multiple modalities and the Peardeck immersive reader is so useful for ELLs and struggling readers. I love the use of sentence frames for the essential questions students need to write about. All of these lessons go beyond the normal US history textbook and cover interesting
and important topics. Students will love learning with these lessons.

10. interactive and creative

11. How it connects past practices to the present.

12. Everything! I teach students special needs students whose skill levels are at a middle school level but comprehend at grade-level. These lessons make it easy for me to differentiate information and capture student interest/engagement without forfeiting content.

13. Provides real world connections to my students and asks them to make contemporary connections

14. Interactivity was phenomenal

15. I enjoyed the varied opportunities to interact and demonstrate knowledge and depth.

16. Very vibrant and engaging

17. They are aesthetically pleasing, which the students need for engagement.

18. Variety of new information

19. They’re interactive, interesting, and relate to our lives and our area

20. I like the mix of sources such as graphs, videos, reading excerpts and photos.

21. It's engaging

22. I loved the primary sources.

23. Interactivity, different formats, platforms, options. Visually appealing.

24. Lessons are student centered and interactive. There is more student buy-in when the content focuses on their background.
25. The interactive elements

26. Locally focused. Some issues like the Chavez Ravine lesson are generalizable for most of Southern California. Other lessons are more localized like the Harada house lesson. I would like a hyper-local lesson that mirrors this but focused on Oxnard.

27. Visual appeal.

28. Various options to participate in showing what they know

29. Easy to navigate with various activities

30. Lessons about everyday lives of people, connections of many themes, interactive checks for understanding

31. Informative, Engaging, Rigorous and moves the narrative along well.

32. Engaging, Rigorous and they move the narrative along well.

33. The presentation of concepts were easy for students to understand & navigate.

   Visually stimulating as well.

34. Accessibility & content is clear & easy to comprehend

35. I love the engagement level and how the topics of the lesson are something your students could connect with. The added local history is always more exciting for students.

36. LOVED the design; lots of creativity! Interesting topics, and really would bring students into the history.

37. Variety of delivering/receiving/interacting information. Really loved the flow of the Stealing Home lessons with content and questions interspersed to get
immediate feedback. Very visually appealing and accurate, high-quality content and resourcing.

38. very interactive

39. Very interactive

40. So visually appealing and the fact that it is soca history makes it very student friendly

41. They were packed with information, but the information is presented in a fun way. They appeal to all types of learners. There are numerous opportunities for students to provide their own responses using different strategies.

42. Everything

43. I love how relevant these lessons are for students in southern California

44. How they were highly interactive and integrated local history.

45. The lessons were very engaging and interesting (as opposed to being boring with no colors or pictures, etc). I liked the use of various different features of Pear Deck to make it more interactive for students.

46. I am so inspired by this work! I am thrilled to see content that is beyond the usual historical narratives. These are so inclusive and relevant to our students' lived experiences. Thank you so much for this incredible work.

47. Very creative

48. Visual
APPENDIX J

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO POSSIBLE ELABORATION

(QUESTION #15)

Was there any information you think should be elaborated on more? Please explain

1. Great job as usual!
2. Excellent resources! Thank you for your tireless work for students.
3. These are amazing!! Thank you for sharing!
4. Thank you for the resources
5. This is the direction that I hope more social science curriculum will be headed in
   our state. I hope this project will continue or will be expanded as resources and
time allows.
6. We appreciate you! I LOVE the work you do.
7. The lessons were very detailed. It made learning the material engaging instead of
   just reading content.
8. Thanks
9. Thanks!
10. It is obvious a lot of hard work went into these lessons.
11. It might be nice to have a Nearpod option, as well. Nearpod allows some
    functions not available in PearDeck, such as being able to see student engagement
    and answers all at once for the entire slideshow.
12. These are wonderful.
13. Your doing well
14. I would like to see a PD where you facilitate teachers working on creating locally based lessons.

15. Fantastic work! I learned a lot! If you were to add another lesson, I would say you could focus on the Indian Boarding Schools, since there are some SoCal campuses still in operation.

16. Thank you for your hard work on these lessons, sharing them with the community, and your openness to feedback and collaboration.

17. This project is an excellent idea. Thank you for really digging in and creating important lessons for students and teachers alike. Hopefully your work is the start of a movement among SoCal teachers and more locally connected lessons are developed. ...Maybe in the summer you can recruit a team of twitter teachers/or challenge them to create a lesson like this, that way together we can craft local lessons for ALL units.

18. I really liked them and aspire to be a teacher that can create content like this one day.
APPENDIX K

COMPLETE COMMENTS IN REGARD TO ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK
(QUESTION #16)

Any additional feedback is appreciated.

1. thank you for your hard work on these lessons, sharing them with the community, and your openness to feedback and collaboration

2. Thank you for the resources

3. Thanks

4. The lessons were very detailed. It made learning the material engaging instead of just reading content.

5. Your doing well

6. It is obvious a lot of hard work went into these lessons.

7. We appreciate you! I LOVE the work you do.

8. I would like to see a PD where you facilitate teachers working on creating locally based lessons.

9. These are wonderful.

10. Fantastic work! I learned a lot! If you were to add another lesson, I would say you could focus on the Indian Boarding Schools, since there are some SoCal campuses still in operation.

11. Excellent resources! Thank you for your tireless work for students.

12. Thanks!

13. These are amazing!! Thank you for sharing!
14. I really liked them and aspire to be a teacher that can create content like this one day.

15. This is the direction that I hope more social science curriculum will be headed in our state. I hope this project will continue or will be expanded as resources and time allows.