
CONCLUSION

Inclusive Pedagogy 2.0: Implications for Race, Equity, and Higher Education in a Global Context

Frank Tuitt

In 2000, as a part of my dissertation, I set out on an intellectual journey to better understand what it might look and feel like to teach in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of Black graduate students (Tuitt, 2000). Believing in what Lani Guinier and Gerald Torres (2002) identified as the miner's canary, I understood that studying the pedagogical experiences of Black graduate students could provide some insight into what was problematic and yet possible, as it relates to creating inclusive and equitable learning environments in traditionally White institutions (TWIs).¹ The notion of Black graduate students in TWIs serving as a diagnostic tool for what is problematic and possible with education has its roots in *The Miner's Canary* (Guinier & Torres, 2002):

To the extent that individuals have common experiences of marginalization, those experiences often function as a diagnostic device to identify and interrogate system wide structures of power and inequality. When these experiences converge around a visible group, they can raise our awareness about that collective phenomenon. This consciousness, when it helps us identify structural inequalities, becomes a potential catalyst for changing those structures. (p. 19)

The belief was that by identifying the best pedagogical practices for *educating* Black graduate students in particular, and students of color in general, I would be able to identify best teaching methods that could improve the educational experiences of *all* students (Tuitt, 2003a).

Accordingly, the culmination of my attempt to identify a catalyst for changing those teaching and learning structures (Guinier & Torres, 2002) resulted in the conceptualization of “inclusive pedagogy,” which I later featured in an edited book project, *Race and Higher Education: Rethinking Pedagogy in Diverse College Classrooms* (Howell & Tuitt, 2003), as the final chapter, entitled “Afterword: Realizing a More Inclusive Pedagogy” (Tuitt, 2003b). My initial conceptualization of inclusive pedagogy sought to have instructors recognize that “by viewing students as whole human beings with complex lives and experiences, inclusive pedagogy offers some insight into how college educators can create classrooms in which diversity is valued as a central component of the learning process” (Tuitt, 2003b, p. 243). Twelve years later, having taught many classes where I attempted to put inclusive pedagogy theory into practice and after writing several publications about those efforts (Danowitz & Tuitt, 2011a; Tuitt, Agans, & Griffin, in press) and introducing countless others around the nation and across the globe to the concept of inclusive pedagogy, I have the privilege of working with two of my most talented former students on this book project.² Collectively, our desire was to produce a volume that could exemplify how the utilization of critical and inclusive pedagogies (CIPs) has and continues to create transformative, affirming, and equitable learning environments for all students, but especially historically marginalized students in a global context. Consequently, this book project and the chapters in it provide compelling insight into the theory, praxis, and outcomes of inclusive pedagogy and offer an enhanced understanding of how critical and inclusive pedagogical models produce engaging learning environments where all students regardless of their racial and ethnic background have the chance to be the best that they can be.

In this final chapter,³ I provide a synthesis of lessons learned over the years and combine them with key takeaways gleaned from the various contributions in this book. I begin this concluding chapter by reflecting on the current context of race and equity in higher education from a global context, reminding us why putting CIPs into practice is still a pressing matter today—and perhaps even more important than 12 years ago. Next, I extrapolate the common core components of critical and inclusive pedagogical models addressed in this volume and identify several implications they have for creating inclusive, affirming, and equitable learning environments.

Race Still Matters

In 2003, I posited that contrary to what the current climate of anti-affirmative action might suggest (*Gratz v. Bollinger et al.*, 2003; *Grutter v. Bollinger et al.*, 2003), race still matters in education. Specifically, I wrote:

To begin with, students who are conscious of their racial background enter the learning environment believing that the color of one's skin—their own as well as their professors'—will be a factor in terms of how they can expect to be treated in the learning environment. . . . They express feelings of distrust toward White faculty members who they assume are not willing to address race related issues or know how to relate to African American students. (Tuitt, 2003a, pp. 288–289)

Not surprisingly, fast forward to 2015, and race and racism (individual and institutional) is still one of the most pressing issues around the globe. Consider that in March of 2004, the United States watched as the junior senator from Illinois gave the keynote speech at the Democratic National Convention, and pundits began to talk about the possibility of the United States of America's first Black president. Since then, the United States has twice elected Barack Obama as the nation's first Black president, and in spite of the myth of a postracial America, race relations in the United States have not mirrored the accomplishment of that moment (Coble, Cobb, Deal, & Tuitt, 2013). In the last few years we have witnessed in the United States a rise in organized race-based hate groups, the Supreme Court's dismantling of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, continual legal assaults on affirmative action such as *Fisher v. University of Texas* (2013) and *Schuette v. BAMN* (2014), increased anti-immigration legislation such as Arizona's Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act (2010) and the Beason-Hammon Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act (2011), heated debates as to the continued use of racialized mascots like the Redskins and the Blackhawks, increased anti-Muslim sentiment, 65 Asian American groups suing Harvard University for unfair rejection of Asian American students (DeRuy, 2015), and greater racial wealth and health disparities since the U.S. economic recession of 2009. Moreover, names including Trayvon Martin, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, Penny Proud, Eric Gardner, and Walter Scott have become known worldwide, begging the question, do Black lives really matter? Only to be followed by the mass shooting at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal (A.M.E.) church in Charleston, South Carolina—a location of deep significance in the historical and contemporary march for racial justice.

The year 2015 also marked the 50th anniversary of the historic march on Selma, Alabama, as a part of a voting rights movement to bring about racial justice in the southern United States. And 50 years later, the United States found itself in the midst of another racial justice movement. The activism and protests have emerged out of a larger mobilization of the Black Lives Matter movement in cities throughout the United States and many other parts around the globe. The #BlackLivesMatter movement, which was started by three Black women, Alicia Garza, Patrisse Cullors, and Opal

Tometi, after the acquittal of George Zimmerman in the murder of Trayvon Martin, aims to center and affirm the ways that Black people engage resilience and meaningfully contribute to society, even as policies and practices in the United States “systematically and intentionally [target them] for demise” (Garza, 2014, p. 1). The rallying cry to make all Black lives matter has not been restricted to the streets of major urban cities.

Over the past couple of years many college campuses across the United States have witnessed significant increased activism regarding the range of experiences and conditions facing racially minoritized communities in higher education. Specifically, racially minoritized faculty, staff, and students (and their allies) at some of the United States’ finest TWIs, including but not limited to University of Texas–Austin, Emory, University of Virginia, Penn State, and the University of Michigan have been speaking out in resistance to their daily encounters with microaggressions, macroinvalidations, and other not so subtle acts of racial discrimination. Not surprisingly, the increased activism on our college campuses has also been facilitated by a surge in campus racial incidents occurring throughout the nation.⁴ And just as race still matters in the United States, it still matters, despite contextual and historical differences, across the globe, producing hostile living and learning environments and reinforcing racial disparities, especially in education (see Andrews, 2015; Barbara, 2015; Rubin & Breeden, 2015; Sanderson, 2015).

In different parts of the world, such as Tokyo, Paris, the Netherlands, Delhi, Canada, the Dominican Republic, and London, to name a few, interracial coalitions have been mobilizing to bring about awareness of racial disparities, racial neglect, and ever-growing encounters with racist individuals, racist institutions, racist policies, and racist systems and structures. Whether it is the killing of three Black boys by police in Brazil (Barbara, 2015), the increase in funding to fight against racism in France (Rubin & Breeden, 2015), children taking it to the streets in Amsterdam to bring an end to racial and ethnic segregation in their schools (Sanderson, 2015), or calls for schools to change a climate that allows racist language and behavior in London (Andrews, 2015), the various global conflicts around race and racism exemplify the glaring need to address racism and racial equity around the world.

In addition to race mattering in communities across the globe, the search for access to inclusive and equitable higher education learning environments remains similarly elusive. Consider that tracking in higher education across the world is still a structural stratification mechanism that uses standardized testing and secondary school affiliation to sort racially minoritized⁵ communities into segregated educational environments while providing a gated postsecondary education for the privileged and elite (Maoláin, 2013). Correspondingly, the inability to access high-quality public education leaves

racially minoritized communities with very little option but to turn to unreliable alternatives. With the continued emergence of for-profit institutions (Douglass, 2012) and the growing number of so-called private nonprofit institutions with international campuses, corporate connections, and profit aspirations, students generally, and especially racially minoritized students around the globe, are being seduced on false promises of a high-quality education to potentially walk away with no degree and a whole lot of debt (Sheehy, 2013). Finally, although socioeconomic status remains a consistent barrier to postsecondary education access, many higher education institutions around the globe are still not prepared for, and do not know what to do with, the racial diversification of their student base. Overall, the continued significance of race and racism globally suggests that the *browning* of higher education is just not a U.S. phenomenon in that whether students identify as racial and ethnic minority groups, locally defined minority groups, indigenous, and/or “lower caste,” they are becoming the majority of students seeking access to postsecondary institutions not designed with them in mind. As a result, these students are running the risk of being subjected to traditional pedagogical practices, unwelcoming campus climates, deficit-based macro and microaggressions, and educators who are not really invested or capable of teaching *other* communities’ children. Arguably, the characteristics of educational norms—we know—work together to create inequitable educational environments that collectively punish racially minoritized students who choose not to assimilate. It is in this global, racial context that the need to advance CIPs is more vital than perhaps ever before. The unfortunate reality is that race still matters:

To act as though race does not matter places professors in the role of being insensitive to students who do not believe in a colorblind society. Electing to pay too much attention to race potentially places faculty members in the role of objectifying their students. This paradox further complicates the art of teaching. Professors need to find a range of pedagogical practices that works best for them. (Tuitt, 2008, p. 191)

Fortunately, the chapters in this volume offer some direction. In the next section, I return to my original concept of inclusive pedagogy and explore how my thinking about it has evolved over time.

Inclusive Pedagogy 2.0

For the last decade I have had the opportunity to provide training to numerous educators around the globe. During these sessions I ask participants to

consider the following questions: (a) *How might we rethink our pedagogy in increasingly diverse learning environments?* (b) *How can we create learning environments that respect and care for the souls of our students?* The first question speaks to the reality of recent demographic projections, which in many parts of the world show that the students attending higher education institutions today, and in the foreseeable future, will continue to be increasingly racially diverse. The second question encourages instructors to begin to reconceptualize their teaching in light of the reality that our students come to us as whole human beings (consisting of mind, body, and soul) with complex lives and experiences. Moreover, their ability to create inclusive and equitable learning environments, where *all* students have an environment in which to learn at the highest levels, will require that they realize a more inclusive pedagogy by creating classrooms where diversity is valued as a central component of the learning process (Tuit, 2003a). In these sessions, I am often surprised by the fact that many of my participants have not thought critically about their approach to constructing the learning environment. Many of them enter their classrooms relying on their talent and the examples of teaching (both good and bad) they experienced as students. Unfortunately, very few doctoral programs require their graduates to take a course on teaching. Consequently, many have not thought critically about their approach to designing the teaching and learning environment, nor have they considered conceptual or theoretical models that could enhance their practice.

Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies Are Guided by Theoretical Models of Teaching

In accordance with CIPs, all of the chapters in this volume identify theoretical and/or conceptual models that inform construction of the teaching and learning environment. For example, Carter Andrews and Castillo (Chapter 7) and Martinez, del Carmen Salazar, and Ortega (Chapter 8) use the concept of *humanizing pedagogy* to inform their approach to creating critical and inclusive learning environments where they seek to build trust and caring relationships with their students. Drawing upon the work of Freire (1993) the authors in Chapter 7 recognize its power:

These humanizing pedagogies and practices foster inclusion in the classroom and can lead to transformative learning experiences that heighten students' critical consciousness and understanding of the negative systemic effects of bias and discrimination in the lives of historically marginalized people across the globe. (p. 113, this volume)

Similar to their conceptualization of a humanizing pedagogy, many of the other theoretical models of teaching referenced in this volume find their roots

in critical pedagogy and the seminal work of Paulo Freire. Correspondingly, Stewart (Chapter 1); Goldstein (Chapter 5); Smith (Chapter 10); and Ghabra, Juarez, Kattari, Olzman, and Calafell (Chapter 11) utilize variations and combinations of critical pedagogy to inform the pedagogical decisions they make. Whether it is Stewart's or Goldstein's combination of critical pedagogy and inclusive pedagogy, Smith's use of engaging pedagogy, or Ghabra and colleagues' discussion of critical performative pedagogy, the teachings of Paulo Freire remind us that when students fully understand their circumstance, and their place in the world, they can be empowered to change that circumstance and place (Stewart, Chapter 1). However, students cannot be encouraged to fully understand their circumstances and their place in the world if they are not allowed to explore their lived experiences in the classroom.

Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies Leverage the Lived Experiences of Students

At the heart of critical and inclusive pedagogical models is a focus on the exploration of lived experiences. For example in Chapter 11, Ghabra and colleagues write:

Recognizing that our bodies are vessels of knowledge, we were encouraged to explore knowledge beyond empirical text; our experiences weaved in and out of theory as we co-constructed the classroom to emphasize the importance of lived experiences by allowing us, the students, to tell our stories. (pp. 196–197, this volume)

In “Afterword: Realizing a More Inclusive Pedagogy” (Tuitt, 2003b), I posited that life experience should be an important part of the curriculum because when instructors encourage students to personalize subject matter with examples from their own lived experiences, they are better able to make connections between the ideas they are learning in the classroom and the world as they understand it. Similarly, Williams (Chapter 4) sees personal experience and narrative as an important tool for learning. Through her utilization of *radical honesty* she strives to provide a space in her classroom for vocalizing personal truths and leverages her own and her students' truths “to connect the dots between individual and group experiences of (dis)empowerment to institutional and systemic analysis of racism and sexism” (p. 73). Williams's use of radical honesty to invite personal truths and lived experience into the classroom reminds us that we should not ask our students to engage in any pedagogical activity that we as instructors are not prepared to do. Modeling for our students how we make a connection between our own lived experiences and the way we understand complex theories and concepts

provides examples on how to bring our whole selves into the learning environment. However, Bolitzer, Castillo-Montoya, and Williams (Chapter 2) caution us that though faculty engaging students' prior knowledge to advance learning of academic subject matter is a good first step in creating equitable classroom environments, introduction of diverse students' multiple experiences and ways of knowing may also conflict with one another. Specifically, they advise that recognizing student diversity as a collective resource and facilitating students' representation of their identities are vital.

Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies Strive to Create Identity Affirming and Socially Just Learning Environments

In some of my earlier writings on inclusive pedagogy I advocated for the creation of identity-safe classrooms (Tuit, 2003b, 2008). Since that time my thinking about the possibility of creating safe learning environments has shifted in part based on the awareness that for all the years I have spent as a Black male, in predominantly White classrooms, as a student or instructor, I have yet to experience one that was safe. The unfortunate reality is that even with the best intentions, extraordinary skills and talents, and a mastery of critical and inclusive pedagogical practices, no instructor, no matter how great, can control everything that happens in the classroom. Therefore, our classrooms will always be imperfect learning environments filled with imperfect human beings and subject to potential violations of human dignity. Accordingly, I now advocate for the creation of identity-affirming and just learning environments as a goal for which all CIPs should strive. Affirming in the sense, as several of the authors (Bolitzer et al.) in this volume reinforce this notion, that students and their instructors arrive to the classroom with multiple and intersectional aspects of their identity that shape how they experience and behave (as well as the overall sense of belonging) in the learning environment. For example, Bolitzer and colleagues (Chapter 2) suggest that in order to design critical and inclusive learning environments faculty should consider

how to create opportunities for students to share their own representations of who they are and help students recognize the multiplicity and complexity of their intersecting identities. Students' intersecting identities may include religion, language, gender, sexual identity, or aspects of their identity that do not fit into any preexisting categories. (p. 35, this volume)

Additionally, CIPs are identity affirming in that they enable students to authentically share who they are when instructors (and classmates) provide the necessary "support to explore as well as pressure to interrogate [their] own identities and how they interplay" (Ghabra et al., p. 191, this

volume). In this sense the notion of creating identity-affirming classrooms is not simply a matter of reinforcing and/or meeting students where they are, but also involves pushing students to deconstruct and extend their understanding of their individual and group sense of self. Whether instructors realize this or not, we as educators are in the identity-development business in that the pedagogical decisions we make inform how students think about their instructors, themselves, and their overall sense of belonging in the classroom. Accordingly, instructors seeking to create critical and inclusive learning environments need to be very thoughtful and just in their attempts.

In his *Letter from Birmingham Jail*,⁶ Martin Luther King Jr. (1992) wrote that “any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust” (p. 7). Correspondingly, in critical and inclusive learning environments, instructors must take great care to ensure that the pedagogical decisions they make are designed to uplift the humanity of their students and avoid activities that “distort the soul” or cause damage to the multiple intersectional aspects of their identity. In following Martin Luther King Jr.’s definition of a *just law*, in just learning environments instructors would not ask their students to engage in any pedagogical activity that they themselves are not willing to model. Moreover, in seeking to create identity-affirming and just learning environments, instructors would keep in mind that “there are some instances when a law (pedagogical decision) is just on its face and unjust in its application” (p. 8) and not only consider the theoretical intention behind their pedagogical decisions but also interrogate its application. Therefore instructors seeking to enact a CIP will draw upon a range of sound and tested instructional activities to create their inclusive and equitable learning environment.

Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies Employ a Variety of Interactive and Dynamic Teaching Practices

Building upon the work of bell hooks (1994), in *Enacting Inclusivity Through Engaged Pedagogy: A Higher Education Perspective* (Danowitz & Tuitt, 2011b) I argued that:

In addition to being meaningful, education should be exciting. It is rare that any professor, no matter how eloquent, can generate through [their] actions enough energy to create an exciting classroom. Excitement is generated through collective effort. The classroom should be an exciting place, never boring. And if boredom should prevail, have in your teaching repertoire a variety of pedagogical strategies that can intervene, alter, or even disrupt the boring atmosphere. (p. 50)

Throughout this volume, contributors provide examples of different pedagogical practices they employ to create interactive, inclusive, and equitable learning environments. For example, in Chapter 9, Gaitanidis and Shao-Kobayashi write that “it is not difficult to imagine . . . a situation of near-zero interaction between students and instructor during a class on contemporary Japanese culture” (p. 152, this volume). To combat this, they seek to construct engaging and creative learning environments, “in which polyphony and dialogism are orchestrated effectively . . . carefully planned, designed, and implemented” (p. 153, this volume). At the heart of their CIP are group activities, presentations, reflective writing assignments, lectures, readings, public speech critiques, and instructor and peer group feedback sessions. Similarly, in Chapter 5, Goldstein describes his use of the Barnaga Card Game Simulation to develop deep cross-cultural thinking and empathy. Recognizing that “genuine learning comes from doing” (p. 84, this volume), Goldstein found that experiential learning activities “help clear the intellectual and emotional path to the deeper understanding” (p. 86, this volume) that CIPs seek to create. Carter Andrews and Castillo (Chapter 7) also use a variety of interactive and dynamic teaching practices to create critical, inclusive, and equitable learning environments. Specifically they utilize writing assignments, group work, ice breakers, discussion-based activities (e.g., K-W-L-H and the Diversity Toss), and field placements to challenge their:

Students’ understandings of normality and privilege, promote marginalized voices and experiences, engage in critical self-reflection, counter [their] inclinations to engage in “othering” individuals and groups, and consider how [they] can be transformative participants in the struggle for educational equity. (p. 119, this volume)

All of the interactive and dynamic practices described in this volume are supported by and grounded in interdisciplinary readings and perspectives with the clear understanding that the content instructors choose signals to students what matters and what does not.

Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies Utilize Diverse and Interdisciplinary Content and Perspectives

In Chapter 11, Ghabra and colleagues describe their instructor’s intentionality related to the inclusion of diverse perspectives through interdisciplinary readings. Specifically, their professor writes:

In my classroom, difference lives in the center not the margins, meaning that I choose to have students read noncanonical scholarship throughout

the course. Difference shapes the course. . . . I hope to create a syllabus that allows cultural Others to find a place of possibility and home. (pp. 188–189, this volume)

For her students, the centering of voices that are often absent in the world of academia by including their writings, performances, videos, and more created a critical and inclusive learning environment “that lifted up difference and focused on the Other” (p. 192, this volume). According to Koshino (Chapter 6) lifting up the *Other* is essential in increasingly racially diverse classrooms “because the Eurocentric values and perspectives embedded in the educational curriculum” (p. 107, this volume) can limit the ability of racially minoritized students to access meaningful learning opportunities.

Carter Andrews and Castillo (Chapter 7) remind us that we must be thoughtful and critical in our consideration of what content and perspectives to include. They contend that in order to create critical, inclusive, and equitable learning environments some ideological perspectives may have to be excluded, such as those “ideas [that] represent deficit orientations about individuals and groups” (p. 121, this volume). They try to navigate the delicate balance between including diverse perspectives and content but not at the expense of any student. They also advise that we should resist the desire to indoctrinate our students for “that indoctrination is not humanizing pedagogy nor does it facilitate the critical awareness” (p. 125, this volume) they seek to develop. Finally, when including diverse content and perspectives, instructors should draw from multiple disciplines. For example, Williams (Chapter 4) contends that “fields and disciplines such as ethnic studies, African studies, women and gender studies, and Black feminist anthropology were created to trouble oppressive systems of power and provide tools for changing the ways we experience our lives” (p. 79, this volume). To her these interdisciplinary research areas are “dedicated to connecting praxis and theory and founded on principles of truth-telling, truth-seeking, critique, and transformation” (p. 79, this volume), which is at the center of critical and inclusive pedagogies.

Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies Are Equity Minded

In my own pedagogical praxis, I combine inclusive pedagogy with critical race pedagogy to “challenge students to use the knowledge they acquired to promote equity and social justice for society, in general, as well as for [racially minoritized] groups and communities, in particular” (Danowitz & Tuit, 2011b, p. 48). Like many of the contributors to this book, my hybridization of inclusive and critical race pedagogy seeks to help students develop a critical [race] consciousness through the intentional facilitation of “teachable

moments” that force students to explore their collective lived experience and make connections between their own assumptions related to race and racism, and explore how those assumptions can come to life in their everyday experiences (Yosso, 2002). Similarly, Stewart (Chapter 1), Martinez and colleagues (Chapter 8), and Carter Andrews and Castillo (Chapter 7) advocate for the use of a variety of equity-minded pedagogical practices designed to leverage their students’ experiences as individuals and as a community of learners and encourage them to reflect and act. Collectively, by challenging students to move from theory to practice, and vice versa, those who employ CIPs can inspire students to engage in learning for the public good (Bowen & Bok, 1998). This teaching and learning philosophy is based on the premise that the best way for a student to learn how to engage in transformative work is to create opportunities both in and out of the classroom; to recognize that as educators each encounter we have with our students has the potential to profoundly impact their lives, the people they come in contact with, the organizations in which they work, the communities in which they live, and society as a whole; and to reject learning for learning’s sake and embrace the notion that education should be used for social and political change.

CIPs Require Courageous and Transparent Instructors

According to Smith (Chapter 10), educators must develop the courage and fortitude to resist the traditional Eurocentric perspective of the role of the administrator (teacher)—student relationship and develop engaged pedagogical relationships with students. Recently, I experienced such a moment in my Diversity in Organization course when I approached a sense of vulnerability and transparency that for a fleeting second had me seriously considering retreating to a less risky zone. In my retelling of yet another encounter with racial microaggression, I was attempting to model for my students how to engage in what Williams (Chapter 4) refers to as radical honesty. Specifically, Williams states:

Radical honesty emphasizes the significance of personal narratives and opens a space for creating strategies that enable scholars and students to bring their “whole self” to the classroom, while getting rid of the shame that frequently accompanies their bodies in academic settings. (pp. 72–73, this volume)

However, bringing the “whole self”—mind, body, and soul—into the classroom can be risky business, especially for racially minoritized faculty members who dare to “acknowledge the failings of an academic system with

which we remain engaged” (p. 81, this volume), as Williams puts it. In that moment, instead of retreating to a less risky form of safety, I remembered that CIPs require that instructors, according to Williams, “acknowledge [their] vulnerabilities, and most importantly, share—with colleagues and students—[their] strategies for self-care and self-love” (p. 81, this volume).

In order to authentically bring our “whole self” into the learning environment, instructors need to critically engage in the self-work of getting to truly know their inner soul. Like Stewart (Chapter 1), the contributors to this book understand that using CIPs require that the instructor engage in critical self-work and be vulnerable in the teaching–learning process. When instructors are successful at bringing their whole self into the learning environment by modeling this type of self-awareness of their positionality, it allows students to emulate their own reflexivity, resulting in a more dynamic space (Ghabra et al., Chapter 11). According to Ghabra and colleagues, CIPs recognized that instructors, like their students, consist of hosts of identities. Modeling “intersectional reflexivity acknowledges this and encourages [our students] to examine how [their multiple] identities interact and what lens(es) they bring to various lived experiences” (p. 201, this volume). Moreover, this type of transparency in the learning environment helps our students to see how our identities inform the pedagogical decisions we make.

de los Reyes and colleagues (Chapter 3) argue that for instructors “to become compassionate and effective agents of change, we need to engage in the process of introspection, reflection, and action” (p. 63, this volume). They define *introspection* as the systematic and careful linking of the personal, the political, and the intellectual in a system of beliefs and values that allows instructors to know who they are, what they are able to do, and what contradicts their deeply held beliefs. Specifically they write:

By being clear about who we are, what political principles and theories support our vision, and what our dreams are, we insure that we remain firm in our practice and that our principles are not compromised. We believe that to disconnect the practice from theory—the personal from the political and the intellectual—is a very dangerous approach to social change leading to confusion, vacillation, reaction, and mistakes. (p. 63, this volume)

This transparency, like Williams’s conceptualization of radical honesty, is not simply about truth-telling for the sake of speaking truths (although this is itself a valuable exercise) but more about the development of a critical eye toward analysis, intention, and authenticity to identify beneficial and effective pedagogical practices for creating inclusive, affirming, and equitable learning environments.

Conclusion

CIPs offer multiple opportunities for creating affirming and equitable learning environments where all students, regardless of their prior lived experiences, can be the best that they can be. In order for that to be actualized, instructors need to be the best they can be. Overall the chapters in this book remind us that teaching and learning are deeply interrelated. To create inclusive, affirming, and equitable learning environments for *all* students, but especially racially minoritized students, educators must reject the temptation to revert back to traditional pedagogical practices and at the same time confront dominant ideologies and conceptualize a pedagogy of hope. Specifically, the authors in this book share a common belief that by utilizing CIPs they are able to engage in a meaningful praxis that empowers them to lift up the souls of their students and engage in what bell hooks (1994) refers to as education as the practice of freedom. This pedagogy requires that educators embrace their students as whole human beings consisting of mind, body, and soul and create interactive and dynamic classroom environments that inspire deep and meaningful transformational learning. The authors in this book also remind us that enacting CIPs can be costly. Whether it is being emotionally drained from frequent expressions of radical honesty, fighting racial battle fatigue from everyday encounters with micro and macro aggressions, teaching in the line of fire as you address attempts to dehumanize you or others in the classroom, and/or dodging the dismissive bricks from oppressive institutional structures like tenure or colleagues and administrators who fail to appreciate your commitment to a liberatory pedagogy—giving up a little piece of your soul in the name of education is a price you must be willing to pay.

In closing, I have come to understand that utilizing CIPs is not a form of praxis that all educators should embrace. In fact, educators who fail to do the self-work may cause more harm than good and, as a result, engage in the creation of unjust learning environments. Although this concluding chapter attempts to lay out a series of pedagogical considerations related to enacting CIPs, potential converts should be wary of trying to put them into practice without careful consideration of their capacity to do the work. Advancing CIPs requires self-awareness, courage, and continuous commitment, and it should, as teaching in racially diverse classrooms is a lot harder than teaching in classrooms where all our students are the same. In that sense, diversity matters, context (both institutional and external) matters, and identity matters in that they all work together to shape how students experience our classrooms. And for those of you who are not new to the praxis of critical and inclusive pedagogies, please keep in mind that we can always do better and that our good intentions in and of themselves will not produce the progressive outcomes we seek. Fifteen years later, after my initial intellectual

excursion to imagine a pedagogy of possibilities, I end this volume more convinced than ever before that even with all our limitations, CIPs provide us with potential to create equitable learning environments, to labor for freedom, and to “demand of ourselves and our comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress” (hooks, 1994, p. 207).

Notes

1. I advocate the use of *traditionally* opposed to *predominantly* White because “PWI [predominantly White institution] would not include those higher education institutions whose campus populations have been predominantly White but now have students of color in the numeric majority. I argue that even though institutions like MIT and Berkeley have more students of color than Whites on campus, the culture, tradition, and values found in those institutions remain traditionally White” (Tuitt, 2008, pp. 192–193).

2. As an aside note, I must share how blessed I am to have former students build upon my original work and in their own scholarship take it to places I never dreamed.

3. I would like to acknowledge and thank my graduate assistants Kristin Deal and Varaxy Yi Borrromeo for their research and editing in support of this chapter.

4. See *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education* at www.jbhe.com/incidents for the most recent list of campus racial incidents.

5. Chase, Dowd, Pazich, and Bensimon (2014) define the term *minoritized* as referring to both the objective outcomes resulting from the historical and contemporary practices of racial–ethnic exclusion as well as the continued social, political, and economic existence of marginality and discrimination though compositional racial–ethnic parity may have been achieved in particular contexts.

6. I would like to thank Dr. Bianca Williams for pointing me to Martin Luther King Jr.’s *Letter from Birmingham Jail* for a way to explain my conceptualization of a just learning environment.

References

- Andrews, K. (2015, August 12). Why Britain’s schools are failing to tackle racism. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/aug/12/racism-schools-government-reforms-targets>
- Barbara, V. (2015, March 23). In denial over racism in Brazil. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/24/opinion/vanessa-barbara-in-denial-over-racism-in-brazil.html?_r=0
- Beason-Hammon Alabama Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act, Alabama House Bill, 56. (2011).

- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river. Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Ewing, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chase, M. M., Dowd, A. C., Pazich, L. B., & Bensimon, E. M. (2014). Transfer equity for “minoritized” students: A critical policy analysis of seven states. *Educational Policy*, 28(5), 669–717.
- Coble, B., Cobb, F., Deal, K., & Tuitt, F. (2013). Navigating the space between: Obama and the postracial myth. In D. J. Carter Andrews, & F. Tuitt (Eds.), *Contesting the myth of the “postracial” era: The continued significance of race in U.S. education* (pp. 25–41). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Danowitz, M., & Tuitt, F. (2011a). Changing curriculum and changing students’ lives. In J. Tienari, S. Katila, & S. Sumerila (Eds.), *Working for inclusion: Positive experiences from across the world* (pp. 33–47). Glos, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Danowitz, M., & Tuitt, F. (2011b). Enacting inclusivity through engaged pedagogy: A higher education perspective. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 44(1), 40–57.
- DeRuy, E. (2015, May 18). Unfairly rejected: Why 65 Asian-Americans advocacy groups are suing Harvard for discrimination. *Fusion*. Retrieved from <http://fusion.net/story/136188/why-65-asian-american-advocacy-groups-are-suing-harvard-for-discrimination/>
- Douglass, J. A. (2012, July 15). The rise of for-profit universities and colleges. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20120710160228719>
- Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin et al., 570 U.S. (2013).
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (Rev. ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Garza, A. (2014, October 7). A herstory of the #BlackLivesMatter movement. *The Feminist Wire*. Retrieved from <http://www.thefeministwire.com/2014/10/blacklivesmatter-2/>
- Gratz v. Bollinger et al., 539 U.S. 244 (2003).
- Gutter v. Bollinger et al., 539 U.S. 306 (2003).
- Guinier, L., & Torres, G. (2002). *The miner’s canary: Enlisting race, resisting power, transforming democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- hooks, b. (1994) *Teaching to transgress*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Howell, A., & Tuitt, F. (Eds.). (2003). *Race and higher education: Rethinking pedagogy in diverse college classrooms*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- King, M. L., Jr. (1992). Letter from Birmingham jail. *UC Davis L. Rev.*, 26, 835.
- Maoláin, A. Ó. (2013, November 2013). Access to higher education must be a global priority. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20131105105454648>
- Rubin, A. J., & Breeden, A. (2015, April 17). France announces stronger fight against racism and anti-Semitism. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/04/18/world/europe/france-announces-stronger-fight-against-racism-and-anti-semitism.html>
- Sanderson, A. B. (2015, May 25). Children take to Amsterdam streets to demand White classmates. *Breitbart*. Retrieved from <http://www.breitbart.com/london/2015/05/25/children-take-to-amsterdam-streets-to-demand-white-classmates/>

- Schuetz v. BAMN, 572 U. S. (2014).
- Sheehy, K. (2013, November 13). Undergrads around the world face student loan debt. *US News & World Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.usnews.com/education/best-global-universities/articles/2013/11/13/undergrads-around-the-world-face-student-loan-debt>.
- Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act, Arizona State Senate Bill 1070. (2010).
- Tuitt, F. (2000). *Towards a more inclusive pedagogy: Rethinking how we teach racially diverse college classrooms* (Qualifying paper). Harvard Graduate School of Education, Boston, MA.
- Tuitt, F. (2003a). *Black souls in an ivory tower: Understanding what it means to teach in a manner that respects and cares for the souls of African American graduate students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.
- Tuitt, F. (2003b). Afterword: Realizing a more inclusive pedagogy. In A. Howell & F. Tuitt (Eds.), *Race and higher education: Rethinking pedagogy in diverse college classrooms* (pp. 243–268). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Tuitt, F. (2008). Removing the threat in the air: Teacher transparency and the creation of identity-safe graduate classrooms. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 19(2), 167–198.
- Tuitt, F., Agans, L., & Griffin, R. (in press). Embracing the tension: Using teachable moments to explore the racialized educational experiences of students in traditionally White classrooms. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege*.
- Yosso, T. J. (2002). Toward a critical race curriculum. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 93–107.

