

0:00 - 2:10

Wisdom Tettey: I just want to introduce myself again. I'm Wisdom Tettey, and I'm the convener of the dialogues. I'm a Black male. I have short hair. I've got glasses on. And this is the voice you will hear when I intervene at any point over the course of the afternoon. Just before we get started, I just wanted to remind people about certain key things to bear in mind. One is that this is meant to be a respectful, collegial environment where we're engaging on an issue that is of critical importance for all of us. And so all voices are important. We wouldn't tolerate any disruptions, anything that promotes hate, or anything that denigrates any member of our community who is involved in these conversations. If we get to that point, which I hope we don't get to, we will remove you from participation in the event. I'm very hopeful that everybody's here to have a meaningful, collegial conversation so we're not gonna get to that. But it's important that we all understand the commitment that we are making to create a really congenial space for the conversations that we wanna have. So, the next session is focusing on inclusive co-curricular, extracurricular, and inside curricular kind of learning experiences design. But we're also looking at the broader work environment and looking at how we support, or don't support research endeavors by colleagues who are living with disabilities. And so it covers the full gamut of student experiences, faculty experiences, staff experiences, as we all work together to advance the mission that brings us into the higher ed sector. And so with that, I'm gonna turn it over to our moderator for this session, Chloe Atkins, my colleague, who is going to be in charge of ensuring that we have a robust, exciting conversation. So with that, Chloe, I turn it over to you.

2:11 - 5:08

Chloë Atkins: Thanks so much, Wisdom. It's been a very interesting morning and I anticipate the afternoon. Hello and bon apres midi. My name is Chloe Atkins and I'm an academic with a disability who conducts research on health equity and on ableism at the University of Toronto Scarborough. I'm a white middle-aged woman with dark, short hair and blue eyes. I'm wearing a white button-down, wing-collared shirt. Welcome everyone and thank you for joining us. Welcome everybody to the session on inclusion in curriculum and learning design work facilitation and research supports. This session examines strategies and actions that promote movement away from pedagogical and research environment in which people with disabilities seek individual accommodations to one that builds, sustains classrooms and research environments which are anti-ableist and inclusive from the outset. Drawing on the concepts of the duty to anticipate accommodation and intentional inclusion, areas to be covered will include pedagogical approaches, designs of co- and extracurricular curricula, format of assignments and research funding structures, protocols, processes, and assumptions. Panelists will address pathways to genuine engagement with people with disabilities and with the goal of building institutions which recognize and embrace learners and scholars who function, I'll also say staff, who function in and investigate disabling learning and research contexts. I'd like to introduce you to the panel of our esteemed speakers. Erin Anderson is a PhD student at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. Darla Benton Kearney. I hope I pronounced that right, Darla. Learning strategist and an accessibility counselor in the Accessible Learning Services department at Mohawk College. Frederic Fovet is an Assistant Professor in the faculty

of Education and Social Work at Thompson Rivers University. He's currently in Australia, so I'm very grateful he's here. And Anne McGuire, who's Associate Professor, Director of the Program for Critical Studies in Equity and Solidarity at U of T. I'm gonna ask each panelist to provide an opening statement. Erin, why don't we begin with you?

5:10 - 11:58

Erin Anderson: Thank you so much, Chloe. Hello, everyone and welcome. My name is Erin Anderson. I am a white female settler who uses she/her pronouns. I have shoulder-length blonde hair, and I'm currently wearing a dark green cardigan. I'm a PhD student at the University of Toronto OISE in the Department of Leadership, Higher, & Adult Education. I'm honored to be speaking to you today from London, Ontario on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, and Lunaapeewak peoples, lands which are also part of the Dish with One Spoon Covenant Wampum. I'm speaking to you today as a high school dropout who is now doing a PhD. I'm here to share with you my own experience, a mere glimpse at how systems fail our students. As someone who has struggled with their mental health for as long as I can remember, it was only recently that I was diagnosed with ADHD. My academic journey has been defined by my ability to hide key aspects of my identity. From the early days of elementary school, I received the message that I should speak up less, ask fewer questions, and blend in with my classmates. Not surprisingly, I wasn't very good at this and it proved detrimental not only to my academic success, but also to my relationship with learning. Despite being told that I was smart, my struggles with executive functioning, things like emotional regulation, attention, and memory and task initiation were not recognized at the time as the real barriers. Instead, the external behaviors were attributed to personal failure, which I really internalized. I ended up dropping out at the age of 15 with no real resistance from those who might have played a pivotal role in connecting me with the supports needed to keep me there. While I would eventually complete my high school diploma years later, followed by a college certificate, undergraduate and master's degrees and now doing my PhD, it has not been an easy road and the shame and stigma have followed me relentlessly. During undergrad, while caring for my two young children, I crammed my schedule with honors classes and extracurriculars in an effort to make up for what I saw as irredeemable failure for my past. Obviously, this wasn't sustainable, and it took a major breakdown for me to finally get the support I needed to finish the degree. Higher education has provided me the opportunity to gain awareness of my strengths, things like lateral thinking, communicating my ideas, intense persistence in the face of adversity, and the need to challenge arbitrary and oppressive norms. While I found new outlets in which to apply these skills, at the same time, I was aware of the subtle messaging that the things which helped me to succeed academically are simultaneously devalued within certain contexts. As I studied Education in my master's program, focusing on student affairs in higher education, I became fascinated with the notion of identity development and the ways in which it plays a role in academic success and how it is impacted by the ways in which identity dimensions intersect. Through my research on identity and marginalization within higher education, my professional experience in academic advising, facilitating the accommodation process, through my own lived experience of being neurodivergent and now advocating for my neurodiverse children, I have seen the gaps that still exist

threatening to swallow anyone who isn't able to shrink themselves to fit into the narrow education model we operate within. Even those who manage it do so at the cost of their own wellbeing. Faculty members receive little to no formal training on accessibility, yet they play a large role in the accommodation process. In my experience, many faculty want to support students but lack the tools to be able to do so. We expect them to accommodate students without fully understanding the nature of students' disabilities, or how they impact students academically. While this disconnect stems from policies designed to protect students against discrimination, the notion that disability status should be kept confidential points to the persistence of stigma surrounding disability. According to disability scholar Nicole Brown, the higher one moves up the ladder of the academy, the less likely they are to disclose a disability. And the reason for this decrease is twofold. The risk of discrimination in relation to the benefits of support is a deterrent to self-disclosure among graduate students, faculty, and staff and no way of ascertaining how many are pushed out of... We have no way of ascertaining how many are pushed out of the academy by its rigid systems and structures. As a PhD student, it's hard to ignore the statistical evidence that suggests my future prospects like my past encounters with educational systems not built for me will depend on my ability to hide the authentic parts of myself. The very strengths I see as integral to my successes are often at odds with the requirements of rigid structures that privilege certain skills over others. Shame and stigma cause me to conceal my struggles, adding to the already heavy load of invisible labor carried by students with disabilities like myself. For more than two decades, I have carried this weight alone. My question for all of you today is, how can systems help carry the load, particularly ones that were already overwhelmed prior to the pandemic and have only been exacerbated by conditions and depleted resources? I don't believe that there's a simple answer. I believe it will take a concerted effort on the part of everyone within the system to create inclusive spaces that are flexible to the needs of an increasingly diverse student body. Every person who works with or makes decisions that impact students with disabilities must be trained in trauma-informed and universal-design principles so that all students are given equitable opportunities to succeed. Administrators must understand the gravity of the consequences of inaction, as well as developing an appreciation for the wide-reaching benefits of accessible higher education for everyone, students, staff, and faculty alike, regardless of their disability or disclosure status. Faculty members need to be brought into the conversation in more meaningful ways and to be provided formal training and inclusive course design and flexible assessment methods that measure more than just a handful of prescribed skills, to be given the tools to support the success and retention of diverse learners, all learners, I would argue more effectively. This holds great potential to trickle down to the student level, perhaps someday leading to a more flexible and inclusive system of higher education where accommodations are no longer necessary for offsetting the barriers created by the system's own rigid structures. Thank you.

12:01 - 12:06

Chloë Atkins: Thank you so much, Erin. Thank you. And I'm gonna turn it over now to Darla.

12:09 - 18:18

Darla Benton Kearney: Thank you so much. Thank you for having me here today. I'm so grateful for the time and effort given by the event organizers, my fellow panelists, and all of the attendees. I'm a white woman with long, dark red hair. I'm wearing a black and white houndstooth shirt and a black sweater. I'm coming to you from my home in Stoney Creek, Ontario, which is situated on the traditional territory of the Anishinaabek and Haudenosaunee and is governed by the Dish with One Spoon Treaty as well as the Upper Canada Treaty, and is adjacent to the Haldimand Treaty. I thought I would start by just giving a little bit about my context at Mohawk College. I was a learning strategist, an accessibility counselor at Mohawk College for 12 years. But the last six, I have been a teaching and learning consultant specifically for Universal Design for Learning in our Center for Teaching and Learning Innovation. And so that's the perspective I'll be connecting with you today. Mohawk College is committed to UDL implementation to address access, equity, and inclusion barriers. At Mohawk College, we are explicit about the goal of UDL, which is to remove the systems and barriers that make disability-related accommodations necessary. Those barriers and systems devalue members of the college community as they uphold and keep our exclusionary systems intact. UDL implementation forces us to proactively look at those barriers and work to dismantle them. We also recognize the need to employ inclusive frameworks in all of our teaching and learning spaces to shift our institutional culture to one of fundamentally valuing diverse persons and reducing the access fatigue these equity-deserving groups face. You'll hear me mention educators and learners, of course. Just to provide some context around that, I believe we're all educators. Whether you are staff, whether you are faculty, whether you are management, whether you are leadership. And I believe we're all learners. And again, regardless of the positionality that you hold within your institution, my hope is that we'll all see ourselves in both roles as we chat and discuss today. For me, today's topic really comes down to three chunky themes, the need to fundamentally value diversity, the intentionality of inclusive education, and the need to share power to reduce implicit bias. And I'm gonna break down each one of those. So, chunky theme number one for me. We need to fundamentally value diversity, not just accept it or work to include it. We need to value it so deeply that we are compelled as organizations to ensure equity, access, and inclusion. I think most higher education institutions feel this is where their values are, but we know from those with lived experience that this is actually not the case. A culture shift is required. Further, we need to value all aspects of learners more than we value keeping our systems. We value systems over inclusion and accessibility when we insist on specific resources, teaching methods, assessments, delivery modalities, even when we know that they contribute to exclusion or ed barriers. I think we must, at our core value not just our learners with disabilities, but our educators, our staff, and our leaders. Yeah, just an enormous and very deep culture shift is required in higher education. Chunky theme number two for me is really about the intentionality of inclusive education. Inclusive education isn't a thing that just happens. Even if the culture is right, it's not a thing that just happens. If we as educators, managers, leaders, organizations that support education are serious about removing systemic barriers and supporting access and ultimately equity, we all need to be intentional about our implementation of an inclusive framework. We need a plan, we need professional development, we need resources, we need modeling, we need a framework that fits our context or that our context could adapt to. And this is not

just work for educators or traditional faculty members. Everyone in the institution needs to take responsibility for inclusive teaching and learning in every teaching and learning opportunity. We all need to see ourselves as educators and as learners. Everyone needs to be committed to implementing elements that support inclusion, accessibility, and equity across an institution. And chunky theme three for me is really the need to share power and privilege. Sharing power to reduce implicit or unconscious bias is really an extrapolation of Andratesha Fritzgerald's approach to using UDL to support anti-racist education. When we share power and responsibility of both teaching and learning with learners, we are not only demonstrating our value for learners and how they contribute to education, but we are also intentionally removing our bias from the system. I think many inequities and barriers come from imposing our bias, which is often grown out privilege for many of us within our teaching-learning spaces. And for me, every decision I make includes my implicit bias. And I think that's true for all of us. While working to identify biases and remove them as necessary, I think an elegant solution, at least in part while we continue to do the personal work that's definitely required, is to make fewer decisions for our learners. Learners, particularly learners seeking accessible and equitable learning spaces, know themselves and their needs. In my context, we're using UDL to do this as it outlines and reminds us where we can and need to provide options, as well as where we can share power. Then we need to trust learners and educators to make the decisions that work for their needs. The work needed to ensure anti-ableist, inclusive, accessible, and equitable education is everyone's responsibility. We need to value it, we need to be intentional about it, we need to share in it. I'll leave it there for now. I do look forward to the discussion to follow. Thanks so much.

18:20 - 18:31

Chloë Atkins: Well, thank you so much, Darla. I think there're gonna be a number of questions. They're already coming up. But I'm gonna turn it now to Fred, Frederic, please, and if you would, please step up. Thank you.

18:32 - 27:00

Frederic Fovet: Hi, everyone. So, I'm Frederic. I'm a 5'9" male, uses he and him as pronouns. I have a brown shaved head with a glare over my head from a hotel room in Australia. I have brown eyes. I am, as was said in the introduction, an Assistant Professor in the School of Education at Thompson Rivers University. What I bring today is multiple perspectives. I've had the unique experience of being both faculty and support, particularly supporting contract faculty, particularly when I've been overseeing master's degrees graduate programs. But also previously was Head of Accessibility at McGill for four years. So, I've transitioned between these two roles and I keep trying to examine these two roles, and I think there's a lot we need to discuss today and how difficult sometimes the communication and relationship is between these two roles. For the anecdote, I've often been told when I was in accessibility, "Oh, you're not faculty. "You don't understand." And now I'm faculty, I'm often told, "Oh, you're not accessibility. "You don't understand." Although I've had both roles and I think we need to break down that misunderstanding about perceptions and et cetera. Also want to acknowledge that I normally work from the unceded and traditional territory of the Tk'emlups te Secwepemc

people. And today would like to acknowledge the rich, abundant history of Aboriginal people in history on the land on which I'm situated today and their claims to lands as well. So, the argument I'm gonna have today is gonna really follow Darla's sort of position in arguing for the introduction and integration of Universal Design for Learning. But I'm probably gonna take a step back from that and say that the way we're gonna get buy-in and the way we're gonna get people to really see the urgency of this is really to acknowledge to what degree the system is actually broken. We are really faced with a system that is literally cracking at the seams and no longer functioning. So, I'm gonna take a few minutes to really break down why I think it's now obsolete and no longer working. First of all, I think we need to acknowledge it's a historical system. It came into place to defend human rights and civil liberties in the '60's and '70's when there were really a minority of students with disabilities. And I think we need to acknowledge that at that time we had a non-inclusive K-12. So, unfortunately a lot of students were stigmatized and marginalized and very few made it into post-secondary. If you look at the intake of accessibility services in higher ed from the year 2009, you see that first wave of students having had access to inclusive provisions in K-12 actually hitting the post-secondary sector in Canada and actually hitting it all over the world. And from there, you see the number of students making requests for accessibility services doubling literally year to year. From 2009, every year, the figures sort of double. It's a system that was based on having very few requests for services, having very few staff, having limited budgets, and at the moment it's literally cracking at the seams. So, it's leading to bottleneck in access to services, underfunding, frustrations from service users. Literally. And the volume is unsustainable. It has been unsustainable for a number of years, but as we go forward, the numbers don't actually decrease. People sometimes say, "What is the ceiling?" University of Brighton in the UK is one of the largest universities in the world. I think they have 40,000 students and they have up to 10% of students actually fully registered with full access. So, they have diagnostic information and they've gone through the whole process of admissions. Out of 40,000 students, that's 4,000 students registered. And we don't even know if that's yet the ceiling of what we're likely to see. And that's not counting the incredible number of students who are just floating and not making those requests and not coming forward to accessibility services and not necessarily having access to diagnostic information. So, unsustainability of numbers. That's my first argument. Secondly, it's a system that perpetuates deficit model approaches to students. It stigmatizes and it locks us down into a deficit model. And by deficit model, I mean that we have, sometimes it's called biomedical, but the deficit model inherently just sees people with disabilities as being less than, as missing something, as needing fixing, as requiring an intervention so that they can fit back in or able to access the mainstream design process. And that's very damaging for all involved. And it's unfortunately a system that we perpetuate, unless we stop that process and actually rethink the theoretical foundations of what we do, we're not gonna be able to move forward. So, I would argue really for a proactive, reflective move back to social model sort of perspectives, which then would translate really well into universal design, where we see ourselves as faculty, as the designers, as the one responsible for the friction that we create in the environment. And the problem not being the exceptional learner, or the diverse learner, the problem being the way we design being narrow and historical and creating barriers that can easily be eliminated. My third

argument is that this is a system that actually creates a deresponsibilization. I don't know if that word even exists, but basically makes faculty feel not accountable for the issue of accessibility. It's what I like to call a culture of referral in my papers. And we see this in the K-12 and in the post-secondary sector. We have taught people in the last 10 years that when an issue arrives with access, it's not my problem, it's someone else's problem. Someone else will have the solution. And unfortunately this is still how we see the post-secondary sector. If a faculty's faced with an issue, instead of teaching them and training them in how to actually think inclusively, we tend to fall back to a default system, which is someone else is gonna take over. Someone else is gonna have that magic bullet, that magic solution. And it doesn't exist. So, we've got to really change that relationship between this dependency on people outside of the classroom that are magically gonna fix this. No, it has to be taken back to the classroom as a whole-class solution that can actually be designed and sustainable. My last argument is that it does not transform pedagogy. We spend an awful lot of money on accommodations with no view of changing pedagogy, of changing the way we teach and learn. And this is really phenomenal. If you look at the budgets that we have for accessibility, this is non-sustainable expenditure. I'm not saying we should cut that, obviously this is a period of transition, but a lot of those funds need to go into changing the mindset of pedagogy so that we can actually carry those changes forward with us and it can actually help us resolve issues with accessibility in the future. So, we need to make a change in operational mindset there where we don't just spend to fix, we spend to change, and we actually put money aside so that we have training and we have formations and we have intensive, rich sort of opportunities for faculty to really change the way they're looking at teaching and learning from an inclusive perspective. My last point, and it has already come up in the introduction from Chloe, is that this is also a system that is solely student-centered, and that tends to disregard accessibility from personnel and from staff and faculty perspective. So, we also have to have a system that integrates the lived experience and the barriers that are faced by employees themselves in the post-secondary sector. And at the moment that does not exist. I can tell you as a head of accessibility, I would have faculty knock on my door and say, "Can you solve an issue for me?" And I'd have to say, "I'm gonna do my best, "but you've gotta realize the funding model "means I'm funded from student services." There's actually an ethical issue for me to actually divert services to faculty. HR should be doing that and HR tend to deresponsibilize themselves from that and actually say, "It's not our problem either." So, people are playing sort of tennis with each other between HR and accessibility servicing. "It's your problem." "No, it's not, it's your problem." I'll leave at that, but I think I look forward to the conversations, and I think we'll have lots to discuss today. Back to you, Chloe.

27:01 - 27:50

Chloë Atkins: Thank you so much, Frederic. The first three speakers have got my head booming a bit. Just to give you a little bit from the audience, there are a number of members who've wanted to thank Erin for being so vulnerable and sharing her experience as a student with disability. They found it very important. I am gonna come to you. And the other thing I just wanted to say, I just recently read, talking about what Frederic said about statistics and numbers is that a recent study out of the CDC of 18-

to-35-year-olds, therefore prime-of-life adults, that one in two identified as having a chronic health condition. Which shows that this is not a minority. Anyway, thank you so much and I will now be quiet, and please if you would make your remarks.

27:51 - 35:11

Anne McGuire: Thank you. Thank you, Chloe. This is Anne speaking. Thanks so much for the invitation to speak today. It's a real honor to be here. I'm beaming in from my home in Toronto, from Treaty 13 territory on the lands of the Haudenosaunee, the Anishinaabek, the Wendat, and the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. I appear on your screen as a white, young, you know, young-ish cis woman with long brown hair. It's pulled up into a ponytail. And green glasses. In my background, there is a bookshelf which is home to many colorful books and a plant. Some of the books are written by people we've already heard from today. I come to this as a teacher and as a researcher of critical disability studies, a still very green academic program director and a member of disability community. My colleagues have really generatively spoken today about the limits of individual accommodation models, deficit models, and this importance to a turn to more social approaches to access like Universal Design for Learning. And I wanna echo and uphold this call. When it comes to creating accessible learning environments, universal design is the ideal. It's the goal. And as we seek to build better, more accessible, usable, welcoming educational spaces, I think we also have to account for the limits of the universal. Universal design works except when it doesn't. It works until, for example, an unanticipated user shows up, a body or mind we just didn't think about or plan for. And this unanticipated user, you, we, we will always show up and inevitably so, marking out the limits however expansive of any normative, universalist imagination. Universal Design for Learning works, but how it works assumes that the person providing the access, or often assumes that the person providing access is teacher and the person receiving the access is the student. This model fails to account for how the work of access is really embedded in a networks of complex relations. Access isn't a place we ever arrive at, but an ongoing practice we participate in. As my colleague here at U of T and Disability Studies scholar Tanya Titchkosky teaches us, access is always negotiated between us, teachers and students, students and students, administration and faculty. All of these relations, all of these negotiations mean that making access happen can sometimes be really hard. The particularities of a given access situation might not fit a predetermined universal model. Sometimes we need a solution that's more flexible, local, creative, something that works in the context here and now, but maybe isn't kind of generalizable to the next situation. Nowhere is this need for creativity and flexibility more clear than it is when people's access needs conflict. Students and faculty, of course, have a wide range of access needs, and of course these kind of access needs are not always in alignment. For example, I know that some of my students learn best when I teach with visual images to help illustrate a theoretical point, and other students I know can be disabled by this practice. So, here we have a conflict. Teaching with images increases access for some students and creates inaccess for others, what crip theorists Aimi Hamraie and Kelly Fritsch call an access friction. And so this is the question I really wanna think with today. What do we do with and in these moments of access friction or even access failure? Of course we're striving toward universal ideals. We also need to develop other kinds of tools. We need to hone and

practice our imaginative and creative skills, skills that equip us to better negotiate the times when making access happen isn't just this straightforward thing. And we need to do this, we need ways of doing this collectively rather than, once again, placing responsibility on individuals. Post-secondary education, I think, I know has a lot to learn from disabled, deaf, mad, sick, and neurodivergent people, as well as others impacted by ableism and intersecting systems of oppression. The disability justice and practice of collective access is what disabled activist Patty Berne talks about as a ground-up practice of sharing responsibility for our access needs. Collective access is, from Stacey Milbern, premised on the particularity of the relationships that we have here before us. It is, in her words, about asking after one another and making sure folks have what they need. Collective access is one example of transformative disability community knowledge and practice. And it really, I think, opens up all kinds of pedagogical possibilities in the classroom. Concretely, in the context of my undergraduate disability studies courses, collective access has looked like collaborative note-taking, flexible or negotiated assignment deadlines. It's inviting people to say their name before they speak in class, or to go back to my earlier example of this kind of inherent conflict when I'm teaching with visual images, collective access is sighted students and teachers collaborating to first describe key images used in class before relying on them subsequently for the lesson. Collective access looks like building opportunities for students to share access needs. And if they wish, having the space to name and disclose disability, as Erin spoke about. And it's listening and being responsive to these disclosures, following up. And it's also being transparent as faculty about our own needs, our own constraints, challenges, and limitations. And in COVID times, as so many of our disabled and immunocompromised students and colleagues are speaking about feeling unsafe, collective access means all of us masking up if we can. After all, collective access isn't simply about including more disabled than other non-normative bodies and minds into our shared spaces, such as they are. It's not about keeping our classrooms and our labs and our pedagogies and our workplaces the same, but for the singular difference of a few more disabled people. The collective part of collective access means that we notice when some of us are getting left out, and then the burden falls on all of us to figure out a better way forward. It means tethering the promise of universal design with this kind of ongoing commitment to moving together, negotiation, to creativity, to the messiness of failure, to care, to compromise. And this really requires this openness to change and to be changed, our systems and ourselves, in order to account for our need to be together and learn together. And so I'm gonna leave it there, but I'm really looking forward to talking about this more in the Q&A. Back to you, Chloe.

35:12 - 36:10

Chloë Atkins: Thank you so much, Anne. That was wonderful. So, I'm gonna try quickly, we have some prepared questions, but there are some that are coming up in the chat that I'm gonna just paraphrase 'cause I think some of you've all touched on this, and I'm gonna ask it. A number of people have asked about sort of medical discussions. Health and wellness, people have talked about that, that staff are sent to health and wellness and students are sent to access. But there are also evident and non-evident disabilities and about being believed or not being believed. And that's often tied to whether you have a medical certificate and those complications. And that runs into then

putting the person who's claiming the disability against the person who's meant to be accommodating it. I would love you to talk about that difficulty. And I know that's a difficult question, but anybody like to take that on? Please, Anne, go ahead.

36:11 - 38:20

Anne McGuire: So, I can share an example of a collective access practice that kind of comes out of, at least in my teaching experiences, from that like moment of breakdown or of friction. I mentioned earlier that we use collaborative note-taking in my courses, and this practice really came out of a place of frustration and inaccess. Where so many students were coming to me in September, some of whom required note-taking services. Sometimes we wouldn't get a volunteer in the class who would volunteer to take those notes every week. And so I would keep on having to make that announcement every week. And meanwhile, students were missing out on getting their notes. Other times students who qualified for note-taking accommodations were late to get an appointment and there was a backlog in accessibility services. And so we were getting into October and students were still not having kind of the formal accommodation for getting these notes. And so as a way of circumventing some of these issues, for each of my courses at the beginning of the term, I started setting up 12 empty Google Docs and posting those links on Quercus, on our learning platform. And each week I asked for a volunteer note taker. It doesn't have to be the same person, it's not required of the students in the class. And students can earn points for engagement and participation in the course for doing that work. It's another form of participation that is recognized in the class. And so last week in one of my courses, I forgot to ask for a volunteer. I totally forgot. I just got right into the lecture. Another time, I forgot to post the link to the Google Doc. But students don't forget, I'm finding, and they're reminding me to ask for a volunteer. Some people a few weeks ago went in and like actually set up the Google Doc on their own. And I love this and I love that this has gotten bigger than me as an instructor. And I love how this is kind of providing students with a sense of shared responsibility, shared acknowledgement without having to rely on kind of that individual model of disability. It's something easy we can do to share that space.

38:22 - 38:28

Chloë Atkins: I notice, Erin, you're nodding your head. Do you wanna add to that in any way? I know I'm picking on you, but...

38:29 - 39:27

Erin Anderson: No, I just think of the possibilities of that and what that might have looked like for me in my own studies. But another thing that I'm also thinking about is just the inequities that are involved in even getting accommodations. Like oftentimes it's the people who have the most resources who can afford the assessment needed to even get that piece of paper to get the supports that they need. So I think that, as many others have said, there's just lots of reasons to shift away from this model that focuses on the accommodations and start thinking more about the ways in which we can just make small and large changes, like many have proposed today to be able to support all students.

39:29 - 40:10

Chloë Atkins: Now, a number of the audience members are asking about universal design in terms of learning and want suggestions about how to do that. Which actually reminds me about how much as teachers all of us feel this burden of trying to do this, and we're self-resourcing. And when Anne was talking, it made me think, "Oh, well why don't we just build that into all classes, "that there's a Google Doc sort of on Quercus "and that's part of the, "that just becomes universally designed in all courses "and it's an expectation?" So, there are a number of questions, obviously from people who are interested in how they create this universal design in their courses. Please, Darla, go ahead.

40:14 - 43:29

Darla Benton Kearney: I feel like Frederic's gonna have incredible things to say. So I'll go first before, like, before that happens. Yeah, it's a real challenge. I am ridiculously fortunate that our Universal Design for Learning implementation at our institution is, at this point in time, top down. So, that is not to say that we did not have lots of grassroots pockets of UDL happening before my position existed about six and a half years ago. But there was an institutional recognition of, "UDL needs to be a thing. "We need to be doing this." It doesn't make sense for us not to be doing the inclusive work required in all of our teaching and learning spaces. So, I'm really fortunate that I have a very large, supportive leadership and management team for the work that gets done at our institution. I would also like to point out it is not just me doing the work. So, the strategic direction for UDL implementation does come from our Center for Teaching and Learning Innovation. It is a lot of me doing research, me determining next steps based on the research with folks with lived experiences. And then I work with a wonderful group of folks, of curriculum development specialists, CPQCs, instructional designers who all embrace UDL and the UDL work that we do. Listening to Anne, we've been doing crowdsourcing of lecture notes for a number of years now and we've just built it into our learning management system. A little bit for context, Mohawk College is a blended learning institution. We had them for over a decade. So, every single course we have has online delivery and assessment elements. So for us, building UDL into our learning management system made a lot of really good sense. We spent a lot of time, we used to spend a lot of time doing professional development specifically on Universal Design for Learning. "Oh, here are the fundamentals "and here are the basics," and those things. And what we found is folks felt it is in addition to their work, as opposed to, this is actually the way we should all be doing the work we're doing anyway. This is the right way to do that work. And so within our Center for Teaching and Learning Innovation, we spend time looking at how do we build UDL into our learning management system. We build learning, UDL sorry, into sessions on how to develop learning outcomes, how to write a course outline. UDL is built into sessions on how to use the LMS and how to use it really well. And so really trying to embed it in all the work that we do. It's not in addition to the work, it is how we do that work. We've had good success. That said, there's always gaps. There's always more work to be done. And so that's where our efforts are focused now. Yeah, yeah, it's tricky, especially depending on what your support structure looks like. I'll leave it there, but thank you.

43:30 - 43:33

Chloë Atkins: Frederic, do you wanna take this on as well?

43:34 - 49:11

Frederic Fovet: Absolutely. Thank you, Darla, for that introduction and laying the ground there. I would say that we have, that would be my introduction to this, that we have to be really lucid that behind everything we discussed, there are huge systemic areas because we work in complex, I keep saying complex, multi-layered and politicized environments in higher ed campuses. So, there's no simple problems. They have actually big problems that are reflected sometimes in simple situations. It allows me to hop back on the question of documentation. Behind documentation is a funding system that we need to start changing because we've gotta realize that services are only accessible and funded if we have that piece of paper. So unless we break that mold, we're not gonna move away from documentation requirements. So, that's one example. Here in universal design integration, there's been a lot of work going on now for close to 20 years. There's some excellent practices, and certainly Mohawk College at institutional level stands high up there in terms of really sort of ecological view of everything that's involved. But in most campuses, it's in the hands of one instructor, a community of practice, a small group of people trying to do something, and it cannot grow from there. And I keep writing now more and more and reflect on what do we need to do to our institutions to actually manage change on the sort of level that we're looking at. Some of the campuses we're talking about are 40, 50,000 students, huge amount of faculty. I think, unfortunately, the literature on UDL. We've been so keen, we focus on the benefits. And all the literature, all the scholarship look at why this is important, look at what it will do to the teaching, look at how it will resolve the accessibility issue. But we have no literature on how to get there. And this is not easy. We are institutions that are resistant to change, that are huge and bureaucratic, that are fragmented and in silos. So, how do we guide our campuses through that? First of all, there's this issue of strategy. Is it top down, is it bottom up? I tend to argue that campuses are gonna have to look at their own situation. They are gonna have to take an ecological view of who they are. Some campuses are small and young and they can handle change in a different way than old campuses that are huge and historical. There's not one way that fits all. I think we're gonna have to actually be really strategic about how do we do this here and how do we do this here and how do we do this in this other campus. The second is to look at resistance to change. And this, we have, sort of psychology in the industrial, in industry gives us lots of model in how to manage change and how to manage proactively resistance to change. We have huge resistance to change from faculty and staff in the university. So, it's not just about putting a good idea, you have to actually navigate and support people through all these fears that they have. And we're not doing any of that. We tend to have that sort of tendency in education to have reforms and we click our fingers and say, "From tomorrow, we're doing this." Well, no, it's not gonna work like that. We have to actually confront in what they do. I think we also need, and I was talking before about the misunderstanding sometimes that we have from the accessibility side and from faculty. We've gotta realize as well, we are in an environment where faculty have never been as oversolicited, overworked, underpaid. In my first three years as contract faculty, I taught 49 graduate courses, and I had to

create most of these. 49. You make the count. There's some semesters I was teaching seven courses, seven graduate courses. I'm a UDL advocate. I was enjoying UDL. I didn't have the time to do UDL. So, acknowledging these variables that also impact the way faculty are being supported and have the space to do this. Design and redesign is really sustainable, but it takes a lot of energy. It takes the space to become that so people can do this in a supported and relaxed manner. We don't have that at the moment. The last point is even issues of funding. Again, at the moment, we tend to say to people, "You will do this in your holidays. "You will do this in your weekends." We don't carve out in our workload a space for people to actually be introduced to UDL, be supported in developing UDL, continue their journey with UDL, monitor their journey with UDL and the impact that it has on learning. We just hope that, "Oh, someone's gonna wanna write a paper on this, "so they're just gonna do it on their time off." And it's not fair. It's interesting to look at the relationship with unions. If you look at what we're doing at the moment, we tend to give UDL to accessibility services, who are probably the most ambivalent stakeholder because, again, they're funded through a medical model. So, how can they promote UDL approaches? I was in those shoes for four years. I can tell you it's very uncomfortable. Do as I do not as I preach, but you are actually doing things that are very conflicting with the UDL model. So, who should we give this to? Teaching and learning, a community of stakeholders, instructional designers? We are gonna have to look at the politics of this. First of all, is that stakeholder able to carry that momentum across the institutions to be able to develop this? And also are they funded? Look at the relationship that we have with unions. We tend to not invite them to the table. Faculty associations have very important questions about saying, "How are you doing this? "How are you carving out space for people "to be able to take that workload "and do it properly and do it "in a sustainable way for the rest of their career?" And we're not doing that at the moment. So, management of change at the moment, I have very little hope unless we start rethinking the whole approach to organizational change and with respect to accessible, inclusive design. Thank you. Back to you, Chloe.

49:12 - 50:23

Chloë Atkins: Thanks. That was very comprehensive. I'm gonna come to you, Anne, in a sec. But I was thinking back in my own research, there's something called anticipatory duty. There's a law in England. It's not very well enforced. But in a sense it's expresses that, that you need to anticipate. You have a duty to anticipate, that there will be people in your community who will require accommodation and you need to kind of go from the start. And some of the things I'm getting in the comments is that there's overwork, this sense of overwork. And I think if this whole system, if it comes from above or if it comes from within the university, that classrooms, like all classrooms, both it's known from whether they're accessible not only from the student's point of view, but from someone who might be standing at the lectern, either a student or a faculty member. So, if you break your leg as a faculty member when you're on ski holiday, if you ever get your holiday, whatever, that you're not worried when you come home. You know that, in fact, you can go stand at the lectern and it's not gonna be a big deal. But the other part is, is that if it's system-wide, then each faculty member's not having to reinvent and carrying this full burden. And that seems to me that in the end will get some rid of what's some of

it, access fatigue, in that sense of over demand. But I'll go to you, Anne, and I'll leave it at that.

50:24 - 53:35

Anne McGuire: Yeah, I wanna kind of talk about this exhaustion, and I'll talk about it from my perspective, but also thinking about a kind of big picture. This sense of overwork can itself be debilitating to faculty. And creating new disabilities, mental health disabilities, physical health issues from kind of having to negotiate all these competing ways of doing things. And so I think we really have to kind of honor people's exhaustion here. And just a quick example, just like kind of how it works on the ground. When we're showing media in class, captioning is great. They support all kinds of learners from students who are deaf and hard of hearing, to English-language learners, to people like myself who don't process well orally. But building captioning material into our courses, it's the UD ideal, but how does it happen? And this is a really important, like how does it happen on the ground? Personally, I've had to do a lot of hustling to make captions happen. I've hired work-study students who have been captioning podcasts that I know in advance I'm gonna be using in class. Sometimes I've done it myself the night before, particularly if I have a student who I know relies on this to participate in lecture the next day. And I think this goes to like Frederic's point about like vacation. Like, "Oh, winter break is coming up. "I can get ahead on some of the things "that I've been pushing aside." But sometimes captioning is impossible in those moments. Sometimes access fails. And I think instructors really need better supports to help us to create these kind of deep, accessible, multimodal classes that we all wanna be doing or many of us wanna be doing. That I'm not sure what's best here, what the best, most workable solution. But I think we need to kind of dream bigger. We need to think outside of the current model and current systems that we have at our disposal. And I just wanted to very quickly share an example. At New College, I've been working with one of our wonderful college librarians, Aneta Kwak, on a captioning pilot project where we've hired program-specific work-study students who have been going through recorded lectures and correcting the auto-generated captions from those recorded lectures to create correct captioned video within 24 hours after the instructor records that video. And it's a pilot, it's in process. There's still a lot of needs, issues, sorry, that still need to be addressed. But we've already had feedback that the program has been able to meet the access needs of some of our students who are registered through accessibility services without kind of that need of going at it through an individualized accommodation model. Other ideas. An access Genius Bar model, like where faculty can access in real time captioning supports, supports around audio description. There's all kinds of ways that we can think about diffusing, I think, the supports and making them easy to access for faculty that don't involve kind of downloading responsibility either on an individual faculty member or on students with disabilities.

53:36 - 55:15

Chloë Atkins: That's great. I actually, and on that note, what I've realized. I taught a course that was actually virtual with deaf scholars overseas, and we were teaching here at UTSC, and what I discovered, we had a great physical room that had cameras, but we also needed IT support to be able to integrate the IT, and to mingle Zoom as well as

the PowerPoints and making them... And it was complex. We needed many departments' support and it just showed me how system-wide revisions need to happen. And it can't be on the backs of professors to do this. It has to be a commitment throughout the system that even procuring new applications, procuring furniture, that all of this is being thought in terms of like universal design. I'm getting questions with regard. I'm gonna move on to the competitive sort of environment of the academy, and particularly around research and graduate students as well as faculty members. How do you in fact deal with that and research supports for graduate students and faculty members, postdoctoral students, maybe visiting scholars or even independent scholars? This, in a sense, models for students as they're moving up anyway about to see how it's done. So, how do you deal with this hyper-competitive environment in which people are set against each other to create a collaborative environment in which people are doing access? I'd love it if someone would talk about that. I can take this on a bit. I could natter on about this myself, but if somebody wants to go for it. Frederic, please, go ahead.

55:16 - 58:17

Frederic Fovet: Starting off with one comment because it's something I've been interested in sort of researching and looking at, is that we've gotta be careful, even when we look at things like inclusive design, that we have a tendency to put a lot of caveats. And we say, "This works well in the undergrad classroom "but not in the graduate environment. "This works well in the classroom "but doesn't work in a supervisory relationship." And though we have to actually think about accessible universal design in all of these relationships. So, I think there's a lot of work to be done, both in terms of, again, of practice and scholarship and saying to people who work with graduate students, for example, "Universal design, inclusive design has a place here too. "You need to actually look at the barriers "that you are creating for your students." And unfortunately, and this touches on Anne's point, I think we can't just say that I agree with you that UDL has limits. And I'd say, I like to see it as something porous, something that has a lot of osmosis with other great theoretical, philosophical approach. And I tend to say critical pedagogy is definitely there and it needs to overlap. We've seen, for example, during COVID that I've seen some fully-accessible online courses that left students completely cold because there was no personalization whatsoever. So, we need to get that overlap when we have constructivism and we have critical pedagogy and we have UDL. And it's that happy place in the middle. So, I think the graduate relationship is the same thing, is we need to create, obviously, think about the barriers, create accessible environment, inclusive environment, but also think about the power dynamics in that relationship and think how we create, how we renegotiate this and re-empower people within that. So, it's a really tense, I think, environment, graduate studies and the supervision environment because it is all of those things. And then people are individuals in those spaces. So, they tend to say, "Well, that's just the way I am. "I can't change the way I am "and the way I handle the graduate students "on the one-on-one." Well, yes you can. You can dribble down all of what we've talked into that one-on-one relationship. Now add to that, again, systemic issues. There is the issue of funding. Often within this relationship you have competition because you have funding issues. Because the students need the funding or you have the funding and they need

to be involved, et cetera, but you don't always have the time. So again, I would say that we have behind all of the tension that exists with transforming those relationships in those spaces, the graduate spaces and individual supervision spaces, there's also the wider issue that systemically we have to question ourselves at what we do with graduate students. I've heard when I was in accessible here, supervisors having 35 students that they supervise at the thesis level. You think, "Okay." "Okay, you think that's feasible somehow, "and that you're trying to be accessible "and personalize the learning "and do a bit of critical pedagogy in there. "I don't think it's gonna work." So, there are a lot of things that we need to work on before faculty are even feeling comfortable about tackling some of that.

58:18 - 59:42

Chloë Atkins: Well, what comes to mind for me when I think about it is the highly competitive environment that universities are about getting tenure. And I remember very early on in my career, this was before there were a lot of technologies for blind people, but I was told by one of my supervisors that he had been at a tenure committee hearing for somebody who was blind, who only had, I think, two thirds of the articles that most people had. And this individual kept on saying... The individual didn't get tenure, but the other faculty members would not listen to the argument, "But he's blind. "It takes longer." Like, can you not accommodate that? And if we don't accommodate these things with one another, then how can we do it with our students if we don't show this? So, there may be on someone's resume, they've only been to one university or one town. Well, maybe their medical care required that they stay in that town or in another instance. We show a hostility at the top towards some of these things. And yet we're asking that we change things. We are modeling something else to our students. I wonder, how do we stay positive? How do we create this environment amongst ourselves? I have questions here about how you stay positive in an ableist environment like this. How do you create this better sort of mode of being? Please, go ahead, Anne.

59:43 - 1:01:27

Anne McGuire: I'm speaking too much, so this is my last point. I think we need to question this kind of culture of more. And I was in a meeting the other day where we were talking about like, "Oh, it's nice to be able to Zoom into meetings "every once in a while "because life happens and it's more convenient "and we save time." But then the other side of it is is that meetings can be scheduled back to back to back to back, but don't even anticipate that we need to move from meeting to meeting. And so it's just, it seems to me like there is, and especially exacerbated with the pandemic, that this expectation of doing more and more and more. We were reading in one of my seminar courses this week Moya Bailey's "Ethics of Pace," where she is is kind of thinking with, like how do we engage what we call in disability studies, crip time or disability time? How do we think about the pace with which we are moving through the university, and also how are we expecting our students to move alongside us in that pace? And I think there is an opportunity for solidarity between faculty, staff, and students in intentionally taking steps to address that kind of always ramping up of more and more and more. And one of the things that I've been thinking about in kind of setting my syllabus for a senior seminar for next term is I'm only gonna assign one reading every week for the

duration of the term. And that's really hard for me as an academic, but I'm gonna do it. And we're gonna read it and we're gonna read it deeply and as one possible way of thinking about how we can intentionally slow down.

1:01:28 - 1:01:29

Chloë Atkins: Darla, please.

1:01:31 - 1:03:33

Darla Benton Kearney: I'm chiming in but not with a good answer. Like my answer is I don't know. So, I would say like my natural disposition is a positive one, but even for me it's hard sometimes. It is, and I guess this is both a point and an answer, I suppose, or a discussion topic to add, but it is wild to me to watch higher education right now. We have just made a dramatic shift to flexibility, to support, to delivery modality options for learners, for faculty, increased access, meeting folks where they're at, really hearing an individual's lived experience and then supporting it. Because we're all kind of in this collective thing together. On and on and on. And so many institutions are planning to move or are currently moving right back to a system that is broken for so, so many. Like for me, this is an incredible opportunity. We have an opportunity to make fundamental changes to the system as a whole, and we just aren't. It is wild to me to watch decisions being made that I 100% know I will be asked to remediate by developing a scalable UDL element for the institution in just a couple of years. Decisions that we know will negatively impact learners, decisions that we know will negatively impact educators who have access and equity needs, but we're still making them. Like as a sector, we're still making... It's wild to me. So yeah, no good answer. No good answer for that. I gotta stay positive. And I realize that that did not support staying positive, but it is wild to me. I feel like we're squandering just an incredible opportunity, and I'm just so desperate to like hold onto it and grab it. I'll stop there. Thank you.

1:03:34 - 1:03:36

Chloë Atkins: Frederic, did you wanna say something or were you just gesturing?

1:03:37 - 1:05:56

Frederic Fovet: I'll just add something on to Darla's. I totally support what Darla has just said, actually. And just speaking around that. I actually see, ironically, light in the darkness. And I'm gonna explain that. But I come back to this notion that the system is broken, but I think more and more people are acknowledging that it's broken, and I think that frustration is what we build on. And it may be contradictory because it's quite negative, but I think it actually is gonna be the pivot, the flipping point where people start saying, "I can't do this anymore." Whenever I've run a workshop with staff or with faculty, et cetera, I tend to say, "Can you imagine yourself "doing the job you're doing now in five years?" And people always say, "No." And if you work with that, when I work with that and I talk about inclusive design now, I spend half the session saying, "What's not working?" And people have a lot to say about what's not working. And you can use that as a foundation. Say, "Right, well that's where your energy for change is. "That's the drive that's gonna take you "to embrace new things and do things differently." People, I think as a human nature, we want to be happy in our jobs. We want to actually

do good to others. And acknowledging that things are not working anymore, that you need change and you need new approach, that's a growth mindset. And I think we're suddenly seeing people in growth mindset out of frustration. They're saying, "Well, this definitely doesn't work anymore "and I have to do something." And I will piggyride Darla's comment. I think we are also in a monumentally opportune time at the moment. When I used to do UDL training for faculty, people would say, "I'm not a designer. "I don't design. "What are you talking about? "I just deliver." For the first time in history, almost every educator in the world has realized the impact of design. They have tried something on that first night that was catastrophic, and have realized, "I am a designer. "I can design well or I can design badly." So, we have great things to work with there as well. And I would say that the disruption there has been so major that if we are proactive and reflective and really intentional, we can actually build quite a lot on the experiences that people have had. Now, there are also tired legs. I acknowledge that. COVID exhaustion exists. But in terms of mindset, they have finally, the switch has been flipped and people are really open to this notion that, "Yes, I do design "and I would like to design better "and in a more accessible,hospitable way "that creates those environments for my learners."

1:05:58 - 1:06:43

Chloë Atkins: So a number of questions have appeared in the chat, which are asking, "But what are those institutional changes "that you wanna see? "What needs to be supported "so that departments support each other "so that the experience between departments "for students and faculty member are not different?" And the other part, actually there's a wonderful question here. "Is there a model allows faculty to teach authentically "in their own styles and strengths "as well that also converts "to being accessible and deliverable "in an accessible format to learners?" So, those are two questions that someone can take on. Yes, Frederic.

1:06:44 - 1:09:29

Frederic Fovet: I'll give a very short answer to the first of the two and to get people going. I think definitely the role of senior administration is crucial in this. As I've said, these are large, fragmented, siloed institution that are enormous to manage and have historical baggage often. So, there needs to be some will at the top to embed this into mission. And that embedding is not just symbolic. It then turns into funding priorities. I think we underestimate to what extent when something is actually embedded in a strategic plan and actually formulated openly. That is then something that people can use as a lever to actually get funding, to get things done, to move things along. So, unless we have that commitment at the top, it's gonna be very hard to move these huge, bureaucratic organizations. So,there needs to be a will. We can't hope that it all is bottom-up and that just because some faculty are trying, somehow this is gonna happen. No, there needs to be a committed support at the top, and that will translate hopefully into funding that is aligned with that. The other thing that I think is important, as I said, these are fragmented institutions. We haven't talked at all today about the fact that access, the barriers that the learners with disabilities are facing are faced by a lot of other learners on campuses. If you talk to people who support international students, they report exactly the same barriers to learning. It's a very sort of ethnocentric teaching

that creates very similar barriers. And when you look at resolving those barriers through inclusive design, often you come to the same solutions. I worked in fully international graduate courses where I used UDL and the same tools that I learned in accessibility, and it worked very, very well. It was very successful. They're very important for Indigenous students and access to Indigenous students in a higher education. Lifelong learners face the same barriers. We have to stop looking at these populations as separate populations and look at them in terms of access and barriers to learning and the need for redesign. And certainly we're not talking about minority student. When you total up all these groups, you are very close to 50% of your campus that is actually facing significant barriers to their learning and would benefit from that. So, breaking down the silos is gonna give us a lot more momentum because a lot more voice, and also enable us to scaffold the work that we do because between the students who are racialized and the students who are lifelong learners and the students who are supported by international student support officers and students with disability supported by accessibility, all of these resources put together would have a serious impact on inclusive design and the change in policies and practices. I'll leave at that 'cause I know everyone wants to contribute.

1:09:30 - 1:09:32

Chloë Atkins: That was lovely. Erin?

1:09:34 - 1:10:23

Erin Anderson: Yeah, and I think just to add on to Frederic's point, I think that there's so much opportunity for collaboration across institutions within this country. Like Frederic said, the more sort of resources that we can put towards this, the more experience and the more funding and knowledge, the more powerful we will be and the more momentum we will have. So, I think that not just connecting across campus but also connecting across institutions within Canada and within similar educational systems.

1:10:24 - 1:10:26

Chloë Atkins: All right. Darla?

1:10:28 - 1:12:10

Darla Benton Kearney: Thanks so much. Yeah, I did want to just kind of affirm Frederic's point from earlier. The need for leadership support in inclusive frameworks and UDL implementation and including it in policies has been unbelievably helpful. To clarify, I think sometimes leadership has a different understanding of when something is included in a policy. I think sometimes folks feel as though then it's done 'cause it's in a policy, where I kind of look at that's the first step, not the last step. It's great that you've written it in. But I can tell you having Universal Design for Learning built into our strategic mandate agreement with the province, having it built into our student service policies. We have a UDL standard for our institution. UDL is a key pillar in our EDI action plan. Having it built in allows not only myself whose role is UDL and supporting educators in their implementation of UDL, but it's also really helpful for faculty who may not have the support that I do within my department to be able to point to a policy and

say, "This is a key policy for our institution. "This is a key element of that policy. "I need time to do this," or, "I need funding to do this," or, "We need resources to do this," or, "We need research to do this." And so it's been really helpful in really supporting educators to get what they need in order to do this really well. That's all I wanted to say about that. Thanks.

1:12:11 - 1:13:30

Chloë Atkins: Yeah, I mean I've been thinking about these things as well. This is sort of something I research. I think we tend to think, again, that it's siloed off to a specific population, but we will all benefit. And I think it's hard to see originally, but in fact there's so much... We get deprived of people being a part of a community if we don't do this. The other part is, there are things, just like the ramps and the curb cuts have crossed our cities have really helped everybody with their prams and their strollers and their buggies or whatever it is, including people who use wheelchairs. But even things like making your internal documents accessible so they can be read by a screen reader. The number of times... I've made that a policy on our research team. The number of times when I've been rushing to a meeting and I'm busy doing something, but I can now turn it on and have it read to me as I'm tutting my desk for the Zoom meeting and I'm listening to what going on. That's an accessibility feature, but I'm using it in a way that somebody who might be blind using it, but it's very helpful to me in that instant. Or I might even listen to it if I'm in the car, through my headphones, someone else is driving, or with the family or whatever. So, there are things that actually if we build them in, they cost less 'cause they're ubiquitous and they benefit all of us. It all starts to become, "This is de facto how we function." Anyway. Yes, Anne.

1:13:31 - 1:15:17

Anne McGuire: Yeah, and also just a quick point to add in, too, about how we really need a power analysis here as well. I was just having this conversation. I have a children's book and I've been having these conversations around disability justice in, sorry, in elementary schools. I was just having this conversation with kids the other day around curb cuts and how they've made things accessible for everyone, or ramps into shops. Someone who's pushing a stroller can get in, someone who uses a a mobility device can get in. And that's a really important moment where we can recognize the ways in which we all benefit from these instances of universal design. At the same time, one of the conversations we were having was, we don't all benefit in the same ways. So, a parent, I have a baby. I can park my stroller outside of the shop and still go in if I need to. Whereas someone who uses a mobility device just isn't able to get into the shop. And so I think that there is an importance of finding these points of solidarity between different communities that benefit from accessibility, while at the same time kind of not losing focus. In this particular day, today we're talking about disability. We're talking about disability access in particular. I'm thinking along with disability justice movements who make the call that we need to move with those who are most impacted by the systems of oppression we're talking about, and not those who are the least impacted. And so kind of beginning there at the bottom, I think for me anyway, is an important place to begin to think about how we build new structures and systems to support us all.

1:15:18 - 1:16:50

Chloë Atkins: That brings me to a point. I mean, we're a very white panel here. And I've been thinking about what Frederic said about Indigeneity and international students. And there's intersections of power and disadvantage that come into it. I've been very aware, Indigenous students tend not to finish, disabled students tend not to finish. Being a disabled Indigenous student, that is huge. There are also different systems of healthcare and care and funding that exists for Indigenous people with regard to their disabilities that are different from the rest of us. And if universities are more open to universal design, then those individuals will be less impacted. They'll still need to be met where they're at. But also I've been thinking about sort of different cultural practices, and even for international students, what do you deal with the risk associated with admitting disability? An international student who admits a disability, who claims it, may in fact not be able to immigrate later if they choose to immigrate. They can't. So, how do you deal with... We say, "Oh, let's claim it. "Let's make it accessible." But in fact you are in a sense claiming an identity or a need that may in fact disadvantage you, not give you advantage even though we're talking about accommodation. I'd love you to address some of those things. Frederic.

1:16:51 - 1:19:24

Frederic Fovet: To break the silence to get people going. I think we have an awful lot of work to do. So I think at all level, I think it's important to acknowledge the fact that even within universal design, as you say, it's a very wide discourse. It's also a very Global North discourse. And when you start breaking this down, invite scholars into this discourse and make sure that we have diversity within it. It's gonna be a long-haul job, but we have to keep hammering at it and making sure that we do reflect on this need every time it happens. In terms of intersectionality as well. I think that, again, if we go back to the model as it is now, unfortunately accessibility services often really are not geared to deal with intersectionality. And we see reports across the country of issues with Indigenous students being fearful of coming to accessibility services, as you say international students facing a whole amount of questioning about going to accessibility services. So, I think it is not easy, and I think we need to do a lot of reflection. I invite you to look at the #DisabilityTooWhite movement. And we have to question ourselves as a community too, as a community of disabled people and people with disabilities and scholars on disability that sometimes we have a lot of resistance there. The only time I've ever been trolled on Twitter is when I've used the hashtag #DisabilityTooWhite. And I've been trolled by people with disabilities. It's a harsh truth, but we need to really reflect on that community itself and open it up to this shared understanding of marginalization and bring these other stakeholders into that discourse as opposed to saying, "No, it's only about us." Marginalization is shared. As you said, it's more and more students are reporting intersectionality in the way they live their higher education experience. So, it is the reality. But again, I will take you back to the systemic issue, is that we hire people in a specific silo and then they support students in a specific way. We don't have crossed, interdisciplinary training. We often come from very different theoretical background. And once we are in position, it's very hard to create this collaboration. I've tried very hard in accessibility services, but it's sometimes very hard

to reach out to these different services. They'll say, "Well, I'm not funding the way you are "and I'm not working the way you are." So, we have a lot of thinking to do about how we create that multidisciplinary. And maybe it is about exchanging staff across services, really breaking down those barriers and doing some quite radical things. I'll open up for my other colleagues.

1:19:28 - 1:19:31

Chloë Atkins: Anne, it looks like you need to say something or wanna say something.

1:19:32 - 1:21:28

Anne McGuire: Yeah, I was just gonna say, I agree with Frederic that UDL is a very white discourse. At the same time, negotiating access barriers isn't. Is a discourse and a practice that often is one that is done disproportionately more often by communities most impacted by various systems of oppression. And racism, classism, colonialism, and ableism of course as well. And then particularly when these systems come together and bear down on particular populations. And so thinking about, in some sense, this event today is comprised of scholars and researchers, many of whom identify in different ways as disabled. We have talked about this panel is disproportionately reflecting whiteness, is white. At the same time, the folks that are part of today's event have, at least in some ways some of the time managed to navigate the academy. And I'd like to see another event or maybe several other events that really take the lead from those who are most acutely impacted by these systems of oppression that we're talking about here. And talking about multiply-marginalized disabled students, BIPOC disabled students, international disabled students, students who are feeling like they're being pushed out actively from academic spaces, students who have been pushed out from the academy who are no longer here. Students who haven't even been able, and faculty too, who haven't even been able to get here in the first place. I'm thinking, just as an example around like people labeled with intellectual disabilities. We need to be having these conversations not just from kind of this top-up approach, but conversations that begin by hearing and listening to the perspectives of those who are kind of most impacted by what we're talking about today.

1:21:31 - 1:23:13

Chloë Atkins: So, I'm gonna, we're almost, we're getting close to the end, but I've been rather bad about not reading out the sort of preset questions that we have. But we've been talking about intersectionality, so one of the final ones that I had on my list was, "Many have expressed concerns "that large gaps continue to exist "in institutional approaches and practices "to recognize the intersectionalities "between UDL, EDI, "and accessibility and learning in work contexts. "What can be done to bridge the gaps "and to meaningfully and simultaneously "incorporate principles of equity, diversity, "inclusion, and decolonization, "another very key factor, "in addressing ableism "and promoting accessibility "in the learning and working environment?" And I'm just gonna talk for a second while you guys put your thoughts together. 'Cause I've left these silences. But I think that one of the things is that we've talked a lot about students, but I also think we have to look at ourselves a bit. I think we have to look about the intersectionalities of faculty. I think that students don't have models of disabled faculty

and an intersectional disabled, gay, queer, trans BIPOC faculty members or staff members who are in front of them and performing within the universities. I also think that disability is tied to colonization and the science and medicine that is also colonized. That there are all sorts of things get linked together in all of this framework in the universities. So, it's a complex topic, I realize, but in my own work when I have spoken to people about EDI, they almost talk about everything else, and then disability disappears off the end. And we need to get them all laced together. So, I'd love to know your thoughts about that. Yes, Darla.

1:23:16 - 1:26:02

Darla Benton Kearney: Thank you so much. Again, I don't know that I have a great answer. I feel that this has really been a challenge, like at our institution. It's not always apparent to everyone in my college community that accessibility is actually an essential part of EDI. I think it's been helpful to have some clarifying communications that are explicit about what EDI actually includes for the institution. We have an EDI action plan. Accessibility is included in there. Really clear about that. Again, UDL is a pillar of that. We've made a point to clarify the role of accessibility in our strategic planning through that action plan. Again, helpful, but a fundamental shift in understanding the role that accessibility plays in creating meaningful equity and inclusion targets often is missing. I think to bridge this gap, institutions can promote and support collaboration, which I think Erin had so eloquently mentioned earlier. Higher education is somewhat famous for our silos. Frederic's talked about it. Anne's mentioned it. Erin's mentioned it. Meaningful collaboration often highlights these gaps, but also possible solutions. And I think collaboration needs to really be prioritized. And to do that we need to resource it and we need to support it in a meaningful way. Not just the policy piece, not just the writing it down piece, but actually resourcing it. I think clarifying EDI statements, goals, policies to ensure explicit language regarding the inclusion of accessibility is really helpful. I also think providing a way to report ableism would be really helpful. We have policies and processes in place to report a wide variety of discriminatory events, but folks with a lived experience seem confused about what ableism actually is and also then what to do about it when they see it or experience it, or, or, or. I think EDI professional development has to include examples and case studies and relevant disability and accessibility information. In my experience thus far, a lot of EDI kind of touches on a wide variety of other things, and then kind of sort of maybe possibly might at some point mention disability quietly, and usually using terms that we don't appreciate or want. And as I said, it's a real challenge at the moment. It seems to involve a number of the same folks kind of constantly reminding others that accessibility is actually a part of EDI discussions and actions. I don't think we're close enough to solving this one, and I'd love to know where others are at.

1:26:04 - 1:26:06

Chloë Atkins: Anne?

1:26:07 - 1:26:52

Anne McGuire: I would love to see a culture built around disability on this campus. I think we can also see it in workplaces if we're thinking across those two sites. Tangled

Art Gallery in Toronto has opened up and exploded. It's a disability-specific arts gallery in Toronto. It's opened up and exploded the disability cultural arts scene in Toronto. We heard Cassandra talk earlier about the need for a disability cultural space on campus. That's quite apart, I think, and separate from accessibility services. A place to incubate ideas, for students and faculty and allies to meet up, to connect, to organize, to grow. I think that that cultural piece really is so important, and it will have impacts in the classroom and outside.

1:26:53 - 1:27:56

Chloë Atkins: I was gonna add to this also. I'm gonna say something a little revolutionary. I'm white, but I actually have a partner of color and have children of color. Years ago, 20 years ago, I would've said, "Of course I'm not racist." Now I just say, "Of course I'm racist." Like, "I'm doing my best. "Of course I'm racist." And in the same way I also now say, "I'm ableist." And one of the things that I think part of this is people don't know what's ableist. I make ableist mistakes. Like I have used a wheelchair, I used a wheelchair for a decade and a half, and yet I still make mistakes about that when I encounter somebody who's using a wheelchair. So, everybody's different. You're gonna make mistakes. And I think that there has to be an openness and not a judgment, a willingness to sort of go, "Okay, I'm gonna make ableist mistakes, "I'm gonna make racist mistakes. "What are they?" And so then you're not offended when someone says, "Oh, by the way, that was ableist." "Oh, it was? "Can you tell me? "Can you explain it to me? "Sorry, I didn't get that." So, that it becomes less of a terribly difficult, "Oh, I don't wanna offend anybody" problem. I don't know. That's just a thought. Darla... Oh, Erin, please.

1:27:58 - 1:29:18

Erin Anderson: Yeah, thank you. I just wanted to also add, thinking about sort of Indigenous paradigms that can support us or those in student-facing roles. Someone mentioned earlier how the history of Disability Studies is very much tied to colonialism. Student affairs is certainly a field where that is the case as well. And many of our theories of student development are based on research on white male students from a high socioeconomic background. And Michelle Pidgeon talks about just broadening our definition of student success and how Western knowledge systems are very much prioritizing like individual goals over the collective. And so thinking about just ways in which we can sort of deconstruct theories that privilege Western ways of knowing and being, which, Dr. Stephanie Waterman writes about. And thinking about sort of.

1:29:19 - 1:29:20

Chloë Atkins: You've got 30 seconds.

1:29:21 - 1:29:39

Erin Anderson: Ways that they're often, we're privileging Western worldviews at the expense of others and not giving sort of credence to students' prior experiences before coming to higher education.

1:29:40 - 1:29:56

Chloë Atkins: I think that's a great place to end. This is incredibly... I felt I've learned a lot in this conversation. I want to thank you all. Thank you, Anne, thank you, Erin, thank you, Darla, thank you, Frederic for your thoughts in this. And Wisdom, I'm now gonna pass it off to you.

1:29:57 - 1:32:11

Wisdom Tettey: Thank you. Thank you, Chloe. Thanks to our panel. Again, another very stimulating conversation. I think that this panel dealt with a lot of the tensions that operate. And I see folks were talking about accessibility in EDI. What I've heard from some folks that these offices sometimes operate not collaboratively, but as siloed units. And so I'm hoping that later on in the afternoon we'll address this question about how we operate across these structural divides when in fact we should be melding into one another in ways that address the points around intersectionality that you talk about. And the politics about owning territory as opposed to serving the community that we're there for. And the other area of tension that you raised, which also came up in the first session, had to do with this question around the social model versus the biomedical model and our discomfort with ambiguity. Because we want these binaries and these neatly divided spaces. But if you're talking about intersectionality and so on, these things do collide in ways that are tension-filled. But out of that tension allows for ways to resolve those seemingly tension-filled points. It is interesting that you folks are not just telling us these things are difficult to do, but you're also raising questions that I think all of us can take into our different spaces and try to resolve. Because some of it sits with us in terms of how we've even structured these spaces and these territories that we try to inhabit and protect. So, thank you for putting all of those pieces on the table. I think it'll make the work of that last session even more exciting as we try to get to particular actions that would enable us to move forward. So, I think we are at a point now where we need to, again, take a health break for the next half hour. I entreat folks to come back at about 2:25 so we can set up and be ready to go. But thank you again. Thank you so much and take care. Bye-bye now.