Locating Your Inclusive Practice: A Reflective Heuristic and Workshop

Anna Carissa Rozzo, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

Abstract

Conceptions and theoretical understanding of what constitutes Inclusive Pedagogy abound (Hernández-Torrano et al., 2020; Hockings, 2010; Lawrie et al., 2017; Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal, 2021). Furthermore, wide-ranging recommendations proliferate, complicating implementation. Building on the groundwork of Lewis and Norwich (2004) and that of Moriña (2020), the facilitator provides a heuristic for attendees to clarify their own conception, implementation, rationale, and context-specific iteration of Inclusive Pedagogy. Individuals in this participatory professional development workshop reflected on their own understandings of Inclusive Pedagogy while gaining clarity regarding their own theoretical, axiological, and disciplinary locations within Inclusive Pedagogy. This enabled participants to begin to evaluate their own context in order to articulate a specific approach to Inclusive Pedagogy and to share this positionality and professional practice with peers. The results of this participatory workshop demonstrate the potential of workshop-as-method for both data collection and the co-construction of knowledge among higher education professionals.

Keywords: Inclusive Pedagogy, Professional Practice, Reflection, Theory to Practice, Workshop as Methodology

Introduction

The following article aims to document a professional development workshop designed to elucidate professional practice in Inclusive Pedagogy at The International Academic Forum's (IAFOR) Paris Conference on Education, held in June 2023. The objectives of the workshop were to aid the participants in concretising their conception of Inclusive Pedagogy and to critically reflect on their theoretical, axiological, and disciplinary positionality. The workshop employed a heuristic developed by the author (myself) to enable participants to evaluate their own contexts and articulate specific approaches or iterations of Inclusive Pedagogy. Finally, a shared learning artefact was created in the session that enabled attendees to share their professional practice with peers and the facilitator (also myself). While the goal of workshops such as this one is primarily professional development and idea sharing, the structure also presents the possibility for data capture that scholar-practitioners may consider.

Exploring Complexity

This workshop opened with an icebreaker, followed by moments of informational presentation punctuated with opportunities for individual reflection and audience participation. After an explanation of my heuristic, participants were invited to reflect and discuss, which led to whole group discussion and creation of the learning artefact. The participants (4) were all in professorial teaching roles; one professor from India (PhD) with 21 years of experience; one participant who obtained their[1] PhD in the previous year and was working as a professor in the UK; one EdD candidate from the US; and one faculty member and program director from the US working in the EU. What follows is both the workshop content and the participants' responses.

I began the workshop with a simple icebreaker asking the participants to articulate their conceptions of "inclusive pedagogy":

> *Participant 1:* I'm in K-12 in America, and we use the term 'inclusive' in education. That means we're tailoring our services, our supports, to differing ability, the differing abilities in the population.

> *Participant 2:* …pedagogy or learning methods [that] take into consideration the differences in ability but also the differences of background and also the bias that goes with that and the perceptions…

> *Participant 3:* …my connotation is kind of similar. It's not just about ability, but it's also about cultural background, sometimes even religious background… So any lesson has to be in consideration with their backgrounds and being also careful with kind of the sensitivities that come with all of that.

> *Participant 4:* It puts particular emphasis on the student, giving them equal rights.

Regarding inclusive pedagogy, there is a breadth of interpretation, a plurality of theoretical framings that practitioners draw from, and a wide range of suggestions for practice. According to Hernández-Torrano et. al. (2020), the field of inclusive education:

---

[1] "Their" is used for anonymisation.

… has been fragmented and has developed in multiple and varying directions, making it extremely challenging to harmonise the diversity of existing theoretical, conceptual, and methodological approaches into an integrated framework that enables the field to move forward. (p. 894-895)

Stentiford & Koutsouris (2021) critique the "inconsistency and fragmentation in the conceptual understandings and theoretical approaches," arguing:

The discourse of inclusive pedagogies has become confused and confusing… the term lacks core meaning and, therefore, has little applied relevance for HE educators working on ground-level who might require coherent guidance as to how to improve their practice. (p. 2257)

For the sake of this presentation, I chose to define "inclusive pedagogy" as an umbrella term that denotes various teaching approaches that equitably attempt to serve and engage all students. Lawrie et al. (2017) claim, "Inclusion remains elusive, and opinions about how best to achieve it proliferate" (p. 9). In their literature review, Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal (2021) conclude that "there is no consensus on what constitutes inclusive pedagogy in higher education (HE) or if inclusive pedagogy even exists in that space" (p. 29-30). These assessments are strongly critical of the field, questioning the feasibility of implementation or progression. This is due in part to the complexity of inclusive pedagogy in its meaning, theory, and practice.

Following this brief introduction, I presented visual examples of meaning and theory based on a selection of literature reviews (Hernández-Torrano et al., 2020; Hockings, 2010; Lawrie et al., 2017; Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal, 2021; Moriña, 2020; Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020).

Figure 1: Meanings Visual

Upon this slide, participants were afforded 20 seconds of quiet reflection and prompted with, "What do you notice? Is there a common thread?" One participant shared her observation: "The word 'all' is repeated multiple times in different kinds of ways." In the UK, the term

"inclusive pedagogy" connotes a movement to mainstream instruction in public, often primary, education for all students, regardless of (dis)ability. This is executed by empowering teachers with training and development (Florian, 2008) as well as by supporting a "whole school" (Losberg & Zwozdiak-Myers, 2021, p. 16) approach to support learning in this environment. In this context, inclusion moves away from "special needs" to shift towards practices designed to serve all students (Florian, 2008). Inclusive Pedagogy in the US, by contrast, is primarily located within a DEI (Diversity, Equity, Inclusion) framework, with a strong focus on equity (ACUE, 2020; Danowitz & Tuitt, 2011; Hockings, 2010; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020). (Equity will be addressed further below.) Inclusive Pedagogy is oriented towards creating learning opportunities that particularly support "underserved" (ACUE & SOVA, 2021; Finley & McNair, 2013) or "underrepresented" (Danowitz & Tuitt, 2011; Rapp & Corral-Granados, 2021) student populations. In their literature review of Inclusive Pedagogy, Hernández-Torrano et al. (2020) found "a stronger relationship with inclusive systems and structures rather than disability and special education" (p. 908). A shared emphasis between these two national contexts is that Inclusive Pedagogy is an approach aimed at supporting learning for all students (Florian, 2008; Florian & Black-Hawkins, 2011; Hockings, 2010; Sanger, 2020; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020). Lawrie et al. (2017), in a review of recent Inclusive Pedagogy research, affirm inclusion endeavours to serve the whole learner and all learners. Likewise, Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal (2021) assert that Inclusive Pedagogy "welcomes all learners and treats them as valuable citizens" (p. 31).

Another participant shared the concern that the "who" (a lack of specificity beyond teachers and students) was missing. Conceptions of inclusive pedagogy often centre the classroom as the locus of engagement. However, institutional and community views of inclusive pedagogy implementations advocate for a more holistic approach. Lawrie et al. (2017) call for enhanced awareness of "larger social, cultural, and institutional structures" and how they affect the classroom context (p. 15). Examples of this include campus policies (Whitehead, 2015), community engagement (Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020), and systematic faculty professional development (Iturbe-LaGrave et al., 2021; Moriña, 2020).

After this exchange, I presented a word cloud based on theory represented in the aforementioned literature reviews.

Theory Word Cloud

Figure 2: Theory Visual

Again, participants were afforded 20 seconds of quiet reflection and prompted with, "What do you notice? Which theoretical perspectives do you share? Would you add anything?"

Participant 2 reacted with, "It's interesting. There's one statement there I really don't agree with: 'inclusion is making difference invisible.' I don't agree with that... because it's contradictory to children, but also to adults, when we say being different is ok, so why?"

The phrase in question reflects Stentiford & Koutsouris' (2021) observation (p. 2254) of the conceptual tensions of inclusion between downplaying, masking, or reducing the need to address difference (e.g. Colourblindness, Universal Design for Learning) and actively addressing diverse needs (e.g. equity, differentiation). In the historical context of "special needs" (inclusive)[2] education, great effort was put forth in primary and secondary schools to destigmatize and mainstream previously differentiated students who had disabilities. It is from this perspective that Florian and Spratt (2013) "call for a response to individual differences between learners that avoids marking some students as different" (p. 121). In contrast, Lewis and Norwich (2004) recommend acknowledging the needs of all students, particular groups of students, and individual students. It is this latter framework that I incorporate into my conceptual heuristic below. Stentiford & Koutsouris' (2021) categorise the multi-tiered needs perspective as "moderate" and Florian and Spratt's (2013) as a "strong position of about (full) inclusion" (p. 2247). Like my workshop participant, I hold that it is possible to acknowledge specific group needs carefully to enhance learning while also avoiding marginalisation. This tension perhaps reflects the move away from equality as sameness and equality of access, towards equity of process and outcome. Much of the literature on Inclusive Pedagogy in the US emphasises the role of equity to repair disparity (ACUE & SOVA, 2021; Hockings, 2010; Hogan & Sathy, 2022; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020). To do so necessitates acknowledging differences as integral to the process of supporting the success of all students.

---

[2] "Inclusive" is preferred, as the term "special" denotes euphemism and the very stigmatization the movement seeks to address."

Another participant was surprised that Learning Sciences were not represented, citing the "cognitive connection" between culturally responsive teaching and the brain (Hammond, 2015). Likewise, I would have added Social Reproduction (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), Gender Theory, and Queer Theory to the visual snapshot had they been more emphasised across literature reviews. Allusions to these include (Hernández-Torrano et al., 2020; Hockings, 2010; Lawrie et al., 2017; Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal, 2021; Moriña, 2020; Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020)(2021), who cite "racial, gender, and class prejudices" (p. 39), and Tupan-Wenno et al. (2020) who assert:

> Dimensions such as socioeconomic background, gender, religion, (mental) health and so forth can create divisions in education systems and in society and must therefore be considered carefully, while bearing in mind the reality of how these identities manifest in different educational institutions. (p. 14)

Next, I prompted practitioners to consider recommendations for practice. Examples in the following word cloud were gleaned from previously mentioned literature reviews (Hernández-Torrano et al., 2020; Hockings, 2010; Lawrie et al., 2017; Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal, 2021; Moriña, 2020; Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020) as well as HE teacher resources, *Inclusive and Equitable Teaching ACUE Curriculum Crosswalk* (2020), Sanger (2020), and Hogan & Sathy (2022).

Practice Word Cloud

Figure 3: Practise Visual

After considering this slide, participants shared the following observations:

> *Participant 2:* I'm starting to pull out more of the impact of environments that may not be at least intentionally inclusive, like, for example, conflict management or managing microaggressions… So it's the policies that are in place and that aren't working or that need different skill sets to manage to allow open conversation to happen.

Ecological language is often present in the recommendations for Inclusive Pedagogy that evokes "spaces" and the "environment," often pertaining to classroom management. Hockings (2010) frames her evaluation of inclusive teaching and learning in terms of

"environment" and to a lesser extent "climate" throughout her literature review. Sanger (2020) makes her recommendations within the context of "diverse learning environments" (p. 60) and Hogan & Sathy (2022) discuss the classroom in terms of the inclusive and "noninclusive environment" (p. 87).

Ambrose et al. (2010) describe inclusivity as a "climate" (p. 170) culminating from a variety of factors such as "faculty-student interaction" (p. 170), classroom composition, and content choices. Arao & Clemens (2013) interrogate the comprehensiveness of the term "safe space" and propose "brave space" instead, from their case-study work using training that "intentionally pushes the boundaries of the participants' comfort zones" (p. 137). Similar to Ambrose et al. (2010), the emphasis is on cultivating a "learning environment" (p. 138) through norm-setting, with an acknowledgement that social justice and privilege are not easily navigable. Smith & Felch (2016) invoke metaphorical settings for teaching: journeys and pilgrimages; gardens and wilderness; and buildings and walls. The spatial notion of a garden or a room with walls invites the instructor to conceptualise the process of cultivating or constructing not only the learning process but also the community. Inclusive Pedagogy creatively and critically considers the context, the content, and the learner(s). Participant 2's comment points to the need to proactively build the learning environment rather than (only) reacting once an offence has occurred. Participant 1 made further comments on this topic:

> *Participant 1:* I don't see empowering or including space for dialogical conversation.

> *Facilitator:* Like intergroup dialogue?

> *Participant 1:* And, taking it one step further, having opposing viewpoints and creating the knowledge and a deeper understanding because of those viewpoints… It's not just about argument, disagreement but then discourse and dialogue and dialectical thinking and that space.

This goes beyond norm-setting in a contentious discussion, towards fostering cognitive flexibility and a posture of learning from the other.

A Heuristic for Inclusive Pedagogy

Finally, my observation is that the above recommendations for implementing Inclusive Pedagogy fall into two categories: general teaching guidance and inclusivity-specific practices. Moriña (2020a) raises the question of whether these practices and recommendations necessarily fall under "inclusive pedagogy" or more elementally draw from "sound professional knowledge" (p. 142). Among the recommendations for Inclusive Pedagogy could be considered general teaching guidance are applying a student-centred philosophy; active-learning; and Andragogic principles to the classroom. Many of the recommendations in the *Inclusive and Equitable Teaching ACUE Curriculum Crosswalk* ((2020) pertain to teaching approaches generally, such as formulating clear objectives; student-centred instruction (self-directed learning, active learning, collaborative learning, discussions, group work); expressing clear expectations (directions, rubrics, syllabi, exemplars, civil norms, feedback); aligning objectives and assessment; and implementing transparent and formative assessment. This is a helpful guide of teaching techniques often presented at the initial teacher education stage ("learning students names", p.10) with additional cultural sensitivity tips. This document is often cited on university websites in the US as a key framework; however, with the exception of providing diverse representation in

the curriculum, microaggression management, and implicit bias awareness raising, the bulk of the advice pertains to teaching generally. Likewise, in Hockings' (2010) review of inclusive pedagogy, many of the recommendations were in line with a student-centred, adult learning approach.

Inclusivity-specific practices are recommendations and approaches within Inclusive Pedagogy literature that target serving the needs of all, some, and individual students (Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021) with particular intentionality towards diversity, equity, and inclusion in classrooms and institutions. These range from cultural sensitivity to faculty professional development. The loci of engagement for these recommendations reside in individual instructors, classroom management and design, professional development, and institutional strategies. Individual instructors might consider their positionality in society generally, as well as in relation to their institutional context and the students they serve (Dewsbury et al., 2022) as a clearer view of one's socio-economic standing could lead to a deeper understanding of structural and systemic factors affecting students. Related to reflexive awareness is implicit or unconscious bias raising (ACUE, 2020; Dewsbury et al., 2022) which may elucidate cultural differences in the classroom community and produce fairer outcomes. To that end, Sanger (2020) recommends instructor introspection regarding cultural views and expressions of conflict. Similarly, teachers should be able to identify and address stereotypes and microaggressions (ACUE, 2020; Barnett, 2020; Hogan & Sathy, 2022; Sanger, 2020) as they arise in the classroom. Finally, and related to "mindset," teachers need to shift their perspective away from deficit-thinking (Hockings, 2010; Hogan & Sathy, 2022; Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal, 2021; Sanger, 2020; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020) towards a cultural asset view (Yosso, 2005).

This twofold approach is likely due to 1) a systematic lack of teacher training among US faculty (ACUE & SOVA, 2021; Iturbe-LaGrave et al., 2021; Pallas et al., 2017) leading to a felt need to offer remedial professional guidance, and 2) the mounting evidence that active and student-centred learning advances the success of students of colour (Dewsbury et al., 2022; Eddy & Hogan, 2014; Finley & McNair, 2013; Theobald et al., 2020).

With such diversity in interpretation and range of suggestions for practice, how might practitioners approach this in a contextualised (one description of Inclusive Pedagogy itself) and reflexive manner? How might they assess their own progress, that of others, and that of institutions? What frameworks could they use in research? My heuristic presents a self-reflective, iterative approach to engaging with these questions.

My heuristic: What, Why, How, Where

Relatively Constant		Context Specific	
What	**Why**	**How**	**Where**
Definitions, understandings, conceptual frameworks	*Normative or sociological rationale*	Recommendations for practice, implementation; Pedagogical tools and teaching philosophies	Locus of engagement; disciplinary home and/or Theoretical base
• Student Perspective: All, Some, One (Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021 citing Lewis & Norwich, 2004)	rights-based; addressing sociological inequality; equity as moral principle	e.g., student-centred teaching, representation in the curriculum	e.g., classroom, institutions, community, systems
• Teacher Perspective: Beliefs, Knowledge, Action, Design (Moriña, 2020)			e.g.CRT, Gender Studies, Disability Studies

Figure 4: My heuristic of Inclusive Pedagogy theory and practice

What- *two-pronged consideration of student needs and teacher professional output. From the student perspective,* Lewis & Norwich (2004) (as cited in Stentiford and Koutsouris (2021) and Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal (2021)) present a helpful framing: The needs of all students, the needs of some students, and the needs of a particular student. I give an example of this model with first-generation college students below. *From the teacher perspective,* Moriña (2020), drawing on Rouse (2008) and others, asserts that inclusive pedagogy can be described and captured by teacher beliefs, knowledge, and actions. She adds "design" to acknowledge planning and careful intentionality. Key ideas include: teachers believe that all students are capable of success; they know about their students, their needs, and appropriate teaching and assessment methods; and they plan and take actions accordingly to support student learning.

Why- *normative or axiological reasoning for one's practice.* This is usually based on some kind of moral imperative such as universal right to education, democratic equality, or equity as a reparative measure to address sociological inequality. For example, in the United States, the school funding system results in de-facto segregated schools. Students of colour are more likely to have unqualified or inexperienced teachers and are less likely to have university preparatory coursework or guidance compared to their white peers (Chiu & Khoo, 2005; Clotfelter et al., 2005; Harper & Griffin, 2010; Mickelson et al., 2013). Measures, such as inclusive pedagogy, are thus required to counter racial injustice.

These aspects of the framework (what and why) are relatively constant, though participants were encouraged to personalise and critically reflect (see Appendix A- Participant Handout).

How- *one's chosen methodology.* As discussed, there is a catalogue of options ranging from classroom strategies to organisational change management. Participants were encouraged to explore this further at a later point in the workshop.

Where- *two-pronged consideration of one's theoretical base and one's locus of engagement.* Theoretically, for the de-facto segregated school scenario for example, one might consider interrupting social reproduction ((Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) or addressing institutional racism (Ladson-Billings, 2006). Additionally, participants were invited to consider their location of practice and spheres of influence (e.g. classroom, department, institution, community, systems).

In this heuristic, the *what* and *why* are more or less constant while the *how* and *where* are context and need dependent. For example, some first-generation university students drop out of school because of different cultural capital and a perceived lack belonging in the campus community (Lehmann, 2007). What: While all students need a sense of belonging and community, this particular group has a heightened need for support (Phinney & Haas, 2003; Stephens et al., 2012) and individual students may need more explicit explanations of course tasks in the classroom (Collier & Morgan, 2008). Stakeholders and faculty require knowledge of these needs and the belief that first-generation students are capable of success despite these challenges. Administrators may need to shift their operational model from "college-ready" expectations to an institutional mindset of "student-ready" (Whitley et al., 2018). Why: The larger aim is to address the inequality of low access and high attrition rates of first-generation students based on class or intersectional factors (Beattie, 2018). Where: The application of these efforts will likely be affected by the academic department, type of institution, and the location of the institution. Serving first-generation college students may theoretically fall under Bourdesian studies of class, cultural capital, habitus, etc. The loci of engagement might take place in the classroom, in office hours, in the dormitories, and in offices of student support on campus. How: This may come in the form of explicit, tailored support for first-generation students such as extra orientation, mentoring, peer support, and extended office hours as well as specialised and expanded financial aid options (Whitley et al., 2018). Just as the how and the where are context-dependent, the inputs (what is required, e.g., teacher training) and outcomes (the desired results, e.g., increased retention) will likely differ based on the how and the where.

In response to this heuristic, Participant 1 shared the similarity in philosophy and approach between Lewis and Norwich's (2004) needs framing and the California Department of Education's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (2023).

> *Participant 1:* ...where all students receive, like, we're all going to say good morning, greet; some students need an extra check-in; and then there's that top 5-10% that need, like, 'Let's check in after school so I can understand how I can support you.'

Participants were then given 2 minutes of quiet reflection with the critical prompts on the handout and 8 minutes to discuss with their peers in pairs. Following a lively discussion period, we resumed the whole group conversation to share and process. This was aided by an online sticky-note board with columns for each *what, why, where, how* category, which both the facilitator and participants had access to. The facilitator also transcribed ideas as participants shared. Participants discussed the need to make expectations clear to students at the start of the course, and shifting language from "office hours" to "student hours" citing student hesitancy with the former. This suggestion was balanced with the need to maintain professional boundaries with students who may or may not respect appointments. They also discussed the need to understand students' backgrounds both in discipline and culture and how learning can be "catered" to their needs. Finally, "Deweyism" as a teaching approach informed one participant's *"what"* with the role of "true reflection connecting to experience"

and the intentional time it takes to cultivate. For the *why* participants mentioned mutuality, compassion, equity, anti-elitism, and modelling self-efficacy as the teacher. (See learning artefact).

Following this initial reflection and discussion period with the heuristic, the facilitator prompted the group to focus on the contextualised element of *where (locus of engagement).* The participants recognised the influence the title "doctor" or "professor" can hold and carefully considered power implications, acknowledging inherent hierarchy while welding it to open doors.

> *Participant 1:* It's the role, the title as 'professor,' that I see as also 'influencer' and I'm very aware of that. and it's a position that we are able to influence others and I need to make sure I'm acting out of a place of integrity.

Participant 2 uses their position as degree director to forge "community partnerships" and ensure better representation in their program. *Participant 4* uses their position to ensure students participate in extracurricular activities. *Participant 3* considered how their title can also support "community engagement" in the classrooms and in their research.

Next, I prompted the group to focus on the contextualised element of *how* and to consider general teaching guidance, inclusivity-specific recommendations and approaches based on their loci of engagement. The group engaged in further ideation and populated the online idea board with several strategies. These included pedagogical training, self-reflection, peer evaluation, experiential learning, increased collegial dialogue, and fostering criticality.

Final reflections on the engagement include the appreciation of hearing others' perspectives outside of one's geographical region, and the intentional self-reflection aspect of the activity.

> *Participant 2:* I think what's nice is to do this consciously. A lot of times we do this on-site or we just kind of just do it. But I think this time now, the need, this is what I do, this is the reason why I do it. It would be nice to see this conscious conversation in the bigger context of where we work.

> *Participant 3:* I agree because, as you said, most of us when we work, we just do it normally without even thinking about it. And sometimes it's because it's a norm that comes from above, that it's a policy, institutional level. And you have to do it until you do it in the best way that you can, but without really thinking about why. I think self-reflection is always really important.

As for actionable next steps, *Participant 3* planned on bringing the conversation back to their department to pose the question, "When we do our planning, are we thinking about this?" *Participant 2* stated, "I'm actually going to take the conversation back to the students. Just so that they're more conscious of the approaches and why and also so that they have a constant space to just talk about that."

I attained all participants' permissions to record the session before I began the workshop. I used an AI transcribing software to transcribe the recording and manually edited the transcript for accuracy against the audio. This workshop was designed to not only be professionally supportive to the attendees, but also to glean insights into practitioners' thoughts and challenges, which may inform and build sensitivities in further research. This

workshop may be replicated by instructional coaches and academic developers in other contexts to support faculty self-reflection. Finally, this workshop lends itself to more formal data collection in the future.

Workshop as Method

While Denzin & Lincoln's (2017) tome does not designate a particular chapter to workshop-as-method, workshops exist in and serve a variety of contexts and purposes. These include sources of insight, idea generation, process artefacts, and ethnographic data collection. Lincoln et al. (2018) cite a "workshop participant in the early 1980s" who helped capture the essence of "illegitimate questions" with the phrase "Catholic questions directed to a Methodist audience" (p. 234). Krog (2018) gained a clearer understanding of participants outside of the researchers' experience and culture in South Africa by attending workshops. Spry (2018) developed a deepened reflexivity and sense of relational positionality as a researcher as a result of a workshop. Workshops were the method of ideation among colleagues which led to the formation and emergence of Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Donnor & Ladson-Billings, 2018). Wyatt et al. (2018) facilitated "collaborative writing" to elicit "collective biographies" (p.1280). Torre et al. (2018) engaged in a participatory action research-based "mapmaking process" aimed at examining social, environmental, and political obstacles to "refugee return" (p. 879). Workshops can provide a means of producing new ideas, processes, and artefacts. They can inform researcher identity and sensitivity to both participants and subject matter. The workshop format can also serve as the data collection method itself, providing participants novel or less restrained opportunities for self-expression. Workshops present the potential to be co-constructive, as a tool and extension of the researcher, to generate ideas and knowledge in situ, collaboratively with the participants.

Workshops support both ideation and innovation among practitioners. This is particularly valuable amidst contested and multifarious conceptions of Inclusive Pedagogy that may have direct implications for professional practice. Much of the literature provided is aimed at academic staff as remedial or instructive, rather than produced by practitioners on the ground. Workshops can flip this script, allowing for a more organic barometer of real practices and challenges that empower participants to express situated meanings. Workshops re-centre the practitioner from audience to co-author to articulate what the *what* looks like to them in their contexts. As Charmaz et al. (2018) put it, "[W]e conduct research *with* our participants instead of *on* them" (p. 758). Another potential feature of the workshop is knowledge co-creation and dissemination. This workshop was designed to support self-reflection, and a pleasantly unintended extension of the workshop was the participants' plans to continue this reflective conversation with their colleagues and students.

Certain limitations should be considered. In the context of an interview, the researcher, however reflexive, retains a majority power share in conducting the conversation. They choose the questions posed, the follow-up prerogatives, when to end the engagement, etc. In a workshop format, participants have more autonomy and perhaps more authenticity to explore ideas most interesting or important to them (Ørngreen & Levinsen, 2017). These may diverge from the researcher's initial research questions and the paths to apparent tangents may appear unclear as the researcher can not be fully privy to multiple synchronous discussions. This may be mitigated by recording and transcribing each individual group's conversation (though this may impede the free flow of ideas- feeling self-conscious, slower turn-taking) and/or inviting additional researchers to be in the room. The researcher must decide if the additional measures contribute to the richness of data and outweigh risks of reducing the naturalness of

participant interaction and expression. The research must consider and deliberate on this dimension of data collection. The degree of researcher control may be less of a limitation than a potential reflexive choice. As Charmaz et al. (2018) state, "Enacting a reflexive stance can mean risking vulnerability, relinquishing control, embarking on an uncertain path, and embracing ambiguities" (p. 758).

Conclusion

Inclusive Pedagogy has been described as "confusing" (Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021, p. 2257) and "elusive" (Lawrie et al., 2017, p. 9; Livingston-Galloway & Robinson-Neal, 2021, p. 30; Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021, p. 2245; Tupan-Wenno et al., 2020, p. 7). My heuristic paired with this type of reflective professional development might aid practitioners in making sense of the "fragmentation" (Stentiford & Koutsouris, 2021, p. 2257) and concretising their approaches. This workshop sought to problematize conceptions of Inclusive Pedagogy and invited participants into deeper reflexivity in its practice. The modality of the workshop presented a potential avenue for future research with this subject and population. Furthermore, workshop-as-method presents an interesting approach to gathering and co-creating data for scholar-practitioners.

Acknowledgements

Appendix A: Workshop Handout

Locating your inclusive practice, a reflective heuristic
a workshop with Anna Carissa Rozzo
2504285R@student.gla.ac.uk | anna.locuslearning@gmail.com

What is your working definition of "inclusive pedagogy"? How would you explain it to someone outside of education?

Relatively Constant		*Context-Specific*	
What	**Why**	**How**	**Where**
Definitions, understandings, conceptual frameworks	*Normative or sociological rationale*	*Recommendations for practice, implementation; Pedagogical tools and teaching philosophies*	*Locus of engagement; Disciplinary home, Theoretical base*
What are the needs of all students? Certain groups of students in your context? What are the needs of your students?	What is your *why*? How do you articulate your rationale, motivation, and/or position towards inclusive pedagogy?	How is this implemented in your context? What tools or approaches do/will you employ?	1.Where are you practising? Is this a community or systems effort, a campus-wide initiative, a department, a classroom?
What beliefs, knowledge, actions or designs do you consider key to the practice of inclusive pedagogy? In which areas would you like to grow?	Which normative or axiological framework is most compelling to you?		2. What theoretical or disciplinary lens do you bring to this practice?

Appendix B: Learning Artefact

:Padlet

Anna Carissa Rozzo • 10d

Reflective Heuristic

Idea board for conference workshop

What	Why	How	Where
Deweyism	cognizant of hierarchy	community dialogue (interdepartmental)	classroom, researcher (community engagement), dr. title = door opener
student-centered (ability, culture)	self motivation, self efficacy	self-awareness around disagreements	extracurricular + curricular activities
students' backgrounds and disciplines	education → thrive, social mobility, access	self-reflection, goal-setting,	director or degree program + classroom, creating partnerships in community
setting boundaries	equity & potential to acheive individual aspiration (beyond classrooms)	counseling, coaching	influence as a professor (stewardship / mindfulness of sway)
"student hours"	self-awareness through interactions with others	increasing self-and peer evaluation	MTSS (California)
provide expectations	learning about others	sharing our how's with others	Freire/ Critical Pedagogy
to be acknowledged		reconcile policy and practice	anti-bias education
		training of trainers of pedagogy	
		Experiential learning	

References

ACUE. (2020). *Inclusive and Equitable Teaching: ACUE Curriculum Crosswalk* (p. 20). Association of College & University Educators. https://www.dickinson.edu/download/downloads/id/12169/acue_inclusive_and_equitable_teaching_crosswalk.pdf

ACUE & SOVA. (2021). *Success & Equity Through Quality Instruction: Bringing Faculty into the Student Success Movement* (p. 67). Association of College and University Educators. https://acue.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/SSTFToolkit_ACUE_Final.pdf

Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., Norman, M. K., & Mayer, R. E. (2010). *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching* (1st edition). Jossey-Bass.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From Safe Spaces to Brave Spaces: A New Way to Frame Dialogue Around Diversity and Social Justice. In Lisa M. Landreman (Ed.), *The Art of Effective Facilitation:Reflections From Social Justice Educators* (pp. 135–150). ACPA-Stylus.

Barnett, R. (2020). Leading with Meaning: Why Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Matters in US Higher Education. *Perspectives in Education*, *38*(2), 20–35. https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v38.i2.02

Beattie, I. R. (2018). Sociological Perspectives on First-Generation College Students. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Education in the 21st Century* (pp. 171–191). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76694-2_8

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, 2nd Edition* (R. Nice, Trans.; 2nd edition). Sage Publications.

The California Department of Education. (2023, February 21). *Definition of MTSS - Multi-Tiered System of Supports (CA Dept of Education)*. The California Department of Education. https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/ri/mtsscomprti2.asp

Charmaz, K., Thornberg, R., & Keane, E. (2018). Evolving Grounded Theory and Social Justice Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition, pp. 720–776). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Chiu, M. M., & Khoo, L. (2005). Effects of Resources, Inequality, and Privilege Bias on Achievement: Country, School, and Student Level Analyses. *American Educational Research Journal*, *42*(4), 575–603. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312042004575

Clotfelter, C. T., Ladd, H. F., & Vigdor, J. (2005). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers. *Economics of Education Review*, *24*(4), 377–392. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2004.06.008

Collier, P., & Morgan, D. (2008). Is That Paper Really Due Today? Differences in First-Generation and Traditional College Students' Understanding of Faculty Expectations. *Higher Education*, *55*, 425–446. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-007-9065-5

Danowitz, M. A., & Tuitt, F. (2011). Enacting Inclusivity Through Engaged Pedagogy: A Higher Education Perspective. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *44*(1), 40–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2011.539474

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2017). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Dewsbury, B. M., Swanson, H. J., Moseman-Valtierra, S., & Caulkins, J. (2022). Inclusive and active pedagogies reduce academic outcome gaps and improve long-term performance. *PLOS ONE*, *17*(6), e0268620. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0268620

Donnor, J. K., & Ladson-Billings, G. (2018). Critical Race Theory and the Postracial Imaginary. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition, pp. 350–382). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Eddy, S. L., & Hogan, K. A. (2014). Getting Under the Hood: How and for Whom Does Increasing Course Structure Work? *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *13*(3), 453–468. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.14-03-0050

Finley, A., & McNair, T. (2013). Assessing Underserved Students' Engagement in High-Impact Practices. With an Assessing Equity in High-Impact Practices Toolkit. In *Association of American Colleges and Universities* (p. 44). Association of American Colleges and Universities. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED582014

Florian, L. (2008). INCLUSION: Special or inclusive education: future trends. *British Journal of Special Education*, *35*(4), 202–208. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8578.2008.00402.x

Florian, L., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2011). Exploring inclusive pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal*, *37*(5), 813–828. https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2010.501096

Florian, L., & Spratt, J. (2013). Enacting inclusion: A framework for interrogating inclusive practice. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, *28*(2), 119–135. https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111

Hammond, Z. (2015). Culturally responsive teaching and the brain: Promoting authentic engagement and rigor among culturally and linguistically diverse students. Corwin.

Harper, S. R., & Griffin, K. A. (2010). Opportunity Beyond Affirmative Action: How Low-Income and Working-Class Black Male Achievers Access Highly Selective, High-Cost Colleges and Universities. *Harvard Journal of African American Policy*, *17*, 18.

Hernández-Torrano, D., Somerton, M., & Helmer, J. (2020). Mapping research on inclusive education since Salamanca Statement: A bibliometric review of the literature over 25 years. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *0*(0), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2020.1747555

Hockings, C. (2010). *Inclusive learning and teaching in higher education: A synthesis of research* (p. 67). EvidenceNet. https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/uploads/production/document/path/2/2735/Inclusive_teaching_and_learning_in_HEsynthesis_.pdf

Hogan, K. A., & Sathy, V. (2022). *Inclusive Teaching: Strategies for Promoting Equity in the College Classroom* (First edition). West Virginia University Press.

Iturbe-LaGrave, V., Sponsler, L. E., Paguyo, C. H., & Alvarez, L. D. C. (2021). The Pedagogical Imperative of Changing the Culture of Teaching. *Journal of the Professoriate*, *12*(1), 150–180.

Krog, A. (2018). In the Name of Human Rights: I Say (How) You (Should) Speak (Before I Listen). In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition, pp. 845–854). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools. *Educational Researcher*, *35*(7), 3–12. JSTOR.

Lawrie, G., Marquis, E., Fuller, E., Newman, T., Qiu, M., Nomikoudis, M., Roelofs, F., & van Dam, L. (2017). Moving towards inclusive learning and teaching: A synthesis of recent literature. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, *5*(1). https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.5.1.3

Lehmann, W. (2007). "I just didn't feel like I fit in": The role of habitus in university dropout decisions. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *37*(2), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.47678/cjhe.v37i2.542

Lewis, A., & Norwich, B. (2004). *Special teaching for special children? Pedagogies for inclusion* (1st edition). Open University Press.

Livingston-Galloway, M., & Robinson-Neal, A. (2021). Re-Conceptualizing Inclusive Pedagogy in Practice in Higher Education. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning for Christians in Higher Education*, 29–63. https://doi.org/10.31380/sotlched.11.1.29

Losberg, J., & Zwozdiak-Myers, P. (2021). Inclusive pedagogy through the lens of primary teachers and teaching assistants in England. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *0*(0), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1946722

Mickelson, R. A., Bottia, M. C., & Lambert, R. (2013). Effects of School Racial Composition on K–12 Mathematics Outcomes: A Metaregression Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *83*(1), 121–158. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312475322

Moriña, A. (2020). Approaches to Inclusive Pedagogy: A Systematic Literature Review. *Pedagogika*, *140*(4), Article 4. https://doi.org/10.15823/p.2020.140.8

Ørngreen, R., & Levinsen, K. (2017). Workshops as a Research Methodology. *The Electronic Journal of eLearning*, *15*(1), 80–71.

Pallas, A. M., Neumann, A., & Campbell, C. M. (2017). *Policies and Practices to Support Undergraduate Teaching Improvement*. American Academy of Arts & Sciences. https://acue.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/CFUE_Undergraduate-Teaching.pdf

Phinney, J. S., & Haas, K. (2003). The Process of Coping Among Ethnic Minority First-Generation College Freshmen: A Narrative Approach. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *143*(6), 707–726. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540309600426

Rapp, A. C., & Corral-Granados, A. (2021). Understanding inclusive education – a theoretical contribution from system theory and the constructionist perspective. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *0*(0), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1946725

Rouse, M. (2008). Developing Inclusive Practice: A role for teachers and teacher education? *Education in the North*, *16*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.26203/j15x-ym95

Sanger, C. S. (2020). Inclusive Pedagogy and Universal Design Approaches for Diverse Learning Environments. In C. S. Sanger & N. W. Gleason (Eds.), *Diversity and Inclusion in Global Higher Education: Lessons from Across Asia* (pp. 31–71). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-15-1628-3_2

Smith, D. L., & Felch, S. M. (2016). *Teaching and Christian Imagination*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Spry, T. (2018). Autoethnography and the Other: Performative Embodiment and a Bid for Utopia. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition, pp. 1090–1128). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stentiford, L., & Koutsouris, G. (2021). What are inclusive pedagogies in higher education? A systematic scoping review. *Studies in Higher Education*, *46*(11), 2245–2261. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1716322

Stephens, N. M., Townsend, S. S. M., Markus, H. R., & Phillips, L. T. (2012). A cultural mismatch: Independent cultural norms produce greater increases in cortisol and more negative emotions among first-generation college students. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(6), 1389–1393. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.07.008

Theobald, E. J., Hill, M. J., Tran, E., Agrawal, S., Arroyo, E. N., Behling, S., Chambwe, N., Cintrón, D. L., Cooper, J. D., Dunster, G., Grummer, J. A., Hennessey, K., Hsiao, J., Iranon, N., Jones, L., Jordt, H., Keller, M., Lacey, M. E., Littlefield, C. E., … Freeman, S. (2020). Active learning narrows achievement gaps for underrepresented students in undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and math. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *117*(12), 6476–6483. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1916903117

Torre, M. E., Stoudt, B. G., Manoff, E., & Fine, M. (2018). Critical Participatory Action Research on State Violence: Bearing Wit(h)ness Across Fault Lines of Power, Privilege, and Dispossession. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition, pp. 855–896). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Tupan-Wenno, M., van Marlen, J., & Aumaj, S. (2020). *Rethinking Pathways towards Inclusion in Education* (1; p. 110). Knowledge Innovation Centre. https://multinclude.eu/wp-content/uploads/sites/23/2020/05/Multinclude-Analysis-publication-2.pdf

Whitehead, D. M. (2015). Global learning: Key to making excellence inclusive. *Liberal Education*, *101*(3), 6–14.

Whitley, S. E., Benson, G., & Wesaw, A. (2018). *First-Generation Student Success: A Landscape Analysis Of Programs And Services At Four-Year Institutions* (p. 84). enter for First-generation Student Success, NASPA–Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, and Entangled Solutions. https://firstgen.naspa.org/files/dmfile/NASPA-First-generation-Student-Success-FULL-REPORT.pdf

Wyatt, J., Gale, K., Gannon, S., & Davies, B. (2018). Creating a Space in Between: Collaborative Inquiries. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (Fifth edition, pp. 1276–1306). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *8*(1), 69–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006

Contact email: 2504285R@student.gla.ac.uk