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Introductions

- **The partners**: OSD, SEDE and TLS
- **The history**:  
  - Safe Space Workshops on UD & Access  
  - Learning to Teach Day for TAs  
  - Build up to a presentation on Universal Design for a Joint Board Senate meeting (Nov 2012)  
  - Creation of the Working Group on the inclusion of diverse learners  
- **The three partners’ interest in UD.**
Collaboration

Happy conjuncture
Where our missions meet and our expertise is mutually beneficial
Collaborative Goals

Social Justice Education, Critical Multi-Cultural Education, Universal Design for Learning and Learner-Centered Teaching
Context

- McGill has launched in Sept 2011 a radical **Universal Design implementation** drive.

- 18 months of **strategic lobbying** with various campus partners (completed)

- 18 months of **collaborative initiatives** with faculty (in progress)
Objective

• To discuss the progress made on phase 2 of UDL implementation at McGill.

1. Process observed
2. Analysis of qualitative data collected
3. Possible solutions
What is our working understanding of UD?

- The partners have adopted a wide, fluid interpretation of UDL

- A sustainable, environment-focused framework to manage Disabilities issues

- Central notion: Practices can disable or enable learners

- Translates the Social Model of Disability in service provision terms.

- Focuses on the conception of delivery and evaluation methods, rather than on retrofitting.

- Is a progressive exploration and transformation
Part I - Process observed

- Instructors are **not opposed** to UD **on principle**
- **Resources and institutional pressures** are used as delaying tactics in implementation
- Issue of **training and professional development**: voluntary vs. compulsory
- **Lack of awareness** surrounding Disability: social model but also simple demographics of the user base
- **Lack of exposure** to the work of OSD, but also of TLS and SEDE. How best reshape outreach work with instructors?
- **Clash of culture**: lack of personal experience with inclusive model
Part II - Data collected

Methodology:

• Qualitative feedback and reactions to promotional material

• 1. During large forum discussions (such as the Joint Board Senate meeting)
• 2. Following UD workshops
• 3. Individual interactions and discussions (particularly during proactive emails from OSD regarding retrofitting)
• 4. Consultancy: OSD support to faculty in ‘course re-design’ process

• Triangulation is an active part of the methodology as the UD material has substantially evolved during the promotional drive, in light of continuing faculty feedback and reactions
## Results of analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressors</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of time and fear of depleted resources</td>
<td>1. Pre-existing ‘core skills’ analysis in the faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of support from faculty leadership</td>
<td>2. Dialogue with key students advocates and impact of privileged relationships with students affected by disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Myths and floodgate argument internalized</td>
<td>3. Access to user friendly and time effective tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ‘Core skills’ analysis absent from curriculum design</td>
<td>4. Validation and positive reinforcement of existing pedagogical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Misconceptions about UDL as a ‘new concept’</td>
<td>5. Availability of tools that are subject specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Threat to feeling of professional competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III – Possible solutions

• Selection of UD advocates and liaison personnel within each faculty
• Showcasing of existing UD practices by key faculty personnel
• Increase in campus wide ‘modelling’ of UDL
• Use of video resources as ‘grab and run’ tools
• Integration of UD awareness and mastery as a tenure criteria on teaching portfolio
• Integration of UD as a criteria in teaching evaluation
• Consultancy and support during curriculum ‘re-design’
• Degree of ‘ownership’ over framework through repatriation of the implementation drive to responsibility of faculty
Resources for participants to explore

- McGill video on UDL, created by students, for the Joint Board Senate presentation: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LjUKGBipJZA
The future…

- **Remaining imperatives:**
  - Integrating social justice and diversity into the curriculum and evaluation review. UD is not just about format; it is about widening access in light of existing diversity.
  - Successfully featuring UDL in the sustainability and resource efficiency debate
  - Linking UD implementation even more closely towards faculty specific concerns: e.g. labs? Languages? Real world components?
  - Getting researchers on campus interested in exploring UDL outcomes.
Discussion

• These examples of collaboration are extremely important to analyse, as they evidence that access is no longer just the concern of DS units.

• Conjuncture is ripe for the discourse of DS units to go beyond the minority discourse and to blend into a majority discourse on inclusion.

• This offers unprecedented momentum to the process of transferring post-secondary pedagogy in a sustainable way.

• UDL is not just about Disability. It’s about widening access in the most global of ways. We have to allow other parties to acquire ownership of the model.
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