

Changemakers Initiative: Inspiring Approaches to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Learning

Summary of Post Discovery Framework

By Kevin Chin, The J.W. McConnell Family Foundation

At the conclusion of the [Changemakers Initiative: *Inspiring Approaches to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Learning*](#), the organizers were keen to learn more about the social innovations that were being proposed by all the candidates.

In order to identify any emerging patterns, the organizers made use of their Discovery Framework, a tool developed to help better understand social innovation (http://cdn.changemakers.com/sites/default/files/fnmi_education_post-comp_discovery_framework_final.pdf). Ashoka Changemaker competitions always use this tool as a starting point for its work, and constantly revise the specific design principles and barriers to best reflect the particular problem area that is being focused on. After a number of reiterations, a collaborative — that included elders, content experts, and funders — provided feedback and developed targeted design principles and barriers that would be addressed. This Framework takes the shape of a grid with two types of categories along each axis: Design Principles (types of solutions) and Barriers (parts of a problem) (Figure 1).

		BARRIERS			
		Funding and resource constraints	Learning readiness	Education relevance and learner engagement	Geography and limited access to quality opportunities
DESIGN PRINCIPLES	Increase the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit educators and professionals in education and learning environments				
	Provide relevant supports for First Nations, Métis and Inuit learners transitioning to new learning environments				
	Develop integrated, holistic education programs that meet the needs of First Nations, Métis and Inuit learners				
	Strengthen First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultural integrity				

Figure 1. Discovery Framework grid used in Changemakers Initiative: Inspiring Approaches to First Nations, Métis and Inuit Learning.

Macro-level Patterns

The competition attracted a total of 266 entries (10 of which were not categorized for various reasons). The 256 entries were categorized using the Discovery Framework grid according to its design principles and the barrier addressed (Figure 2).

		BARRIERS			
DESIGN PRINCIPLES		Funding and resource constraints	Learning readiness	Education relevance and learner engagement	Geography and limited access to quality opportunities
	Increase the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit educators and professionals in education and learning environments	0 (0)	2 (1)	3 (1)	4 (2)
	Provide relevant supports for First Nations, Métis and Inuit learners transitioning to new learning environments	4 (2)	21 (8)	19 (7)	10 (4)
	Develop integrated, holistic education programs that meet the needs of First Nations, Métis and Inuit learners	15 (6)	6 (2)	65 (25)	17 (7)
	Strengthen First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultural integrity	10 (4)	5 (2)	68 (27)	7 (3)

Figure 2. Total number of entries categorized according to design principles and barriers addressed (%).

Based on this information, approximately 50% of entries addressed issues related to developing integrated, holistic education programs (25%) and strengthening First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultural integrity (27%). The most often addressed barrier was “Education relevance and learner engagement” (approximately 60%). In terms of design principles, the most often addressed was integrated, holistic education programs (40%), and the least addressed was increasing the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit educators (4%).

Micro-level Patterns

In addition to sourcing innovations, Changemakers also has the potential to better understand future trends and innovations of tomorrow. With that in mind, 30 shortlisted entries were categorized according to three criteria: innovation, social impact, and sustainability. These entries were again categorized using the Discovery Framework grid (Figure 3).

		BARRIERS			
DESIGN PRINCIPLES		Funding and resource constraints	Learning readiness	Education relevance and learner engagement	Geography and limited access to quality opportunities
	Increase the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit educators and professionals in education and learning environments	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (3)
	Provide relevant supports for First Nations, Métis and Inuit learners transitioning to new learning environments	0 (0)	5 (17)	2 (7)	1 (3)
	Develop integrated, holistic education programs that meet the needs of First Nations, Métis and Inuit learners	0 (6)	1 (3)	8 (27)	2 (7)
	Strengthen First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultural integrity	1 (3)	1 (3)	7 (23)	1 (3)

Figure 3. Thirty shortlisted entries categorized according to design principles and barriers addressed (% in brackets).

Based on this information, a similar pattern is seen as with the macro-level: approximately 50% of entries addressed issues related to developing integrated, holistic education programs (27%) and strengthening First Nations, Métis and Inuit cultural integrity (23%). The most often addressed barrier was “Education relevance and learner engagement” (approximately 60%). In terms of design principles, the most often addressed was integrated, holistic education programs (40%), and the least addressed was increasing the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit educators (3%).

Gaps

Using the Discovery Framework as a way to better understand future trends and innovations is useful, and surfaces gaps in knowledge. While Ashoka received 266 entries, it is reasonable to assume that there were many innovations that were not submitted for consideration. This may have been due to the language used, an inaccessible web site, or the amount of effort needed to prepare an entry. Another gap was highlighted by the lack of entries related to various areas. For example, increasing the number of First Nations, Métis and Inuit educators and professionals in education and learning environments received few entries, indicating that this is an area that may need renewed investments of time and funding. Another interesting finding was that while limited funding and resources are often cited as barriers, less than 20% of entries actually focused on this.