Teaching Philosophy
Online First: April 23, 2019
DOI: 10.5840/teachphil2019417102

Diversity Is Not Enough: The Importance of Inclusive Pedagogy

MELISSA JACQUART
University of Cincinnati

REBECCA SCOTT
Harper College

KEVIN HERMBERG
Dominican College

STEPHEN BLOCH-SCHULMAN
Elon University

Abstract: In philosophy, much attention has rightly been paid to the need to diversify teaching with regard to who teaches, who is taught, and which authors and questions are the focus of study. Less attention, however, has been paid to inclusive pedagogy—the teaching methods that are used, and how they can make or fail to make classes as accessible as possible to the diverse students who enter them. By drawing on experiences from our own teaching as well as research on student-centered, inclusive best practices, we advocate for five principles of inclusive pedagogy: fostering a growth mindset, examining inclusive conceptions of authority, promoting transparency, encouraging flexibility, and, finally, continually promoting self-reflection for both students and teachers.

1. Diversity and Inclusivity: An Introduction Locating Ourselves

For good reasons having to do with unjust exclusions, there is an active and vigorous discussion about the need to diversify philosophy curricula and persons who compose our discipline. These kinds of diversity are necessary in order to account for multiple philosophic voices and perspectives and to undo the historic injustice of excluding them. However, as much as diversifying the curriculum, the professoriate, and the student body are critical and necessary, this particular focus on diversity is not sufficient. For instance, even a philosophy

course taught by a female philosopher who assigns work from diverse authors can be taught in a way that silences the voices of some students within the class. It seems hard to imagine that such a class would have really met the larger and deeper goal many philosophers have been advocating for: making philosophy open, available, and *for* all students, particularly given the challenges created by the educational, political, economic and social injustices that define our, and their, lives. Similarly, a course with more traditional content taught by a cis, straight, white, male could be taught in a way that is welcoming and, thereby more inclusive than it otherwise would be. Although for a course to be as inclusive as possible, it would be necessary in our view to both diversify content and adopt inclusive pedagogical strategies.

Our goal in this paper is to address what we see as a gap between the focus on demographic diversity within the field and within the philosophical canon, and developing (what we will refer to as) inclusive pedagogy. In preparation for a series of workshops for the American Association of Philosophy Teachers (AAPT), the four of us, along with David Concepción and Alida Liberman, started to focus on this difference between diversity and inclusive pedagogy. Our goal was to give name to this difference and to articulate some key principles for teaching methods that would move towards making philosophy more inclusive. The principles do not have to dictate content selection and are applicable in a wide range of courses, traditional and non-traditional. Our method for identifying these principles stems from approaching teaching through a scholarly and student-centered framework. Higher education has seen a recent shift in emphasis away from teacher-centered pedagogies towards student-centered ones, highlighted in recent scholarship of teaching and learning. In a teacher-centered framework of education, the focus is placed on the instructor, selection of course content, and the instructor's dissemination of that content.[1] When approaching teaching through a student-centered framework, the guiding consideration is the student, and what the students need in order to learn and develop.

What happens, then, when one takes the student-centered framework seriously? Student-centered pedagogy often takes a generic ideal as the norm; when we recognize that we have real students in the class, in all of their wonderful (and challenging) diversity, we recognize that a fully student-centered pedagogy must be inclusive; it must be about *students* and not "the student." Our goal as inclusive pedagogues is for as many of the students who come into our courses (especially those students who are marginalized) to have the greatest chance to learn as much as possible and to welcome a diverse body of students at our schools into philosophy.[2] We see extending the aims of student-centered teaching as the key to making the transition from only being concerned

about diversity in the profession and canon towards these bigger issues of inclusivity in philosophy classes. Identifying principles that emerge when this task is taken seriously is how we propose to address this gap. Through a series of reflections on our own teaching (as teachers who consider themselves committed to taking these issues as central to our teaching practices), we argue for five principles of inclusive pedagogy: fostering a growth-mindset, examining inclusive conceptions of authority, promoting transparency, encouraging flexibility, and, finally, continually promoting self-reflection for both students and teachers. We will discuss each of these in turn by providing an overview of the principle, some background reflection on our teaching, as well as some practical considerations when adopting the principle.

Additionally, writing about philosophy pedagogy has traditionally been teacher-centered, focused on the teachers and teaching, rather than on the students, their learning needs and possibilities. This dichotomy is noted as far back as 2005, in Michael Goldman's review essay,[3] and is taken up in greater detail in Stephen Bloch-Schulman's "The Socratic Method: Teaching and Writing about Philosophy's Signature Pedagogy," where he notes that most work in philosophy pedagogy cannot really be seen as a scholarship of teaching *and* learning: rather, "they appear to be solely a scholarship of teaching, *not* the scholarship of teaching and learning."[4] In this article, we center the learning and learners, by writing in the first person about the interactions between us as individuals and the classes we teach and highlighting the particularities of each teaching context. Though is it unusual within mainstream philosophy, speaking in this way fits into our overall goals: because our students are diverse and our teaching practices are intentionally attuned to the particular students we are teaching, and we explicitly advocate for that attunement as essential to inclusive pedagogy. Furthermore, this type of dialogic work is well situated within the scholarship of teaching and learning more broadly, even if it is less common within philosophy.[5] Though it can make for a less smooth read, our approach is our attempt, as is the goal of feminist ethics, to uplift the "actual experiences of concrete individuals, paying special attention to the formerly neglected experiences of women and other marginalized groups."[6] One might ask, from a feminist perspective, why philosophers—overwhelmingly male-identified—so often neglect the experiences and voices of their students, who are much more likely to be women, as they write in philosophy pedagogy.[7]

Relatedly, it is important to mention the fact that our pedagogical approach is already situated in relation to our own social positions. We write as four cis, straight, able-bodied, white people, and as white people who developed these pedagogies and this approach largely with other white people. Obviously, our perspectives of the classroom

are in relation to this context and, though we read widely in feminist and critical race theory, and though some of us are women, we are not going to be able to offer first-hand perspectives of many different underrepresented groups. It is the case that we are writing this (largely) from the dominant group perspective in philosophy, but hope this may help others reflect on their own pedagogies. Attending to the issues of diversity and inclusivity cannot just be the responsibility of those in marginalized groups. Given that white instructors are often the problem, it seems incumbent on us to do what we can to address these issues, even if we do so imperfectly. Our pedagogical goals involve finding meaningful ways to incorporate the critiques made about the discipline and traditions of philosophy, as well as the educational, economic, political and social systems in which we live, and incorporating those feminist, critical race, non-Western, Indigenous, and discourses from the Global South into our ways of teaching.

2. Overcoming Pre-Existing Obstacles (primarily authored by Kevin)

Overview

Some barriers to inclusion come into the course with the students rather than with things like course design and reading lists. For example, being reluctant to try something new, or even being averse to risk getting something wrong can have a student thinking she cannot do what the course requires and being hesitant to give the course a genuine attempt. When a number of educational, political, economic, and social factors make it so students cannot even imagine themselves belonging in or succeeding in a course, those students are excluded from genuine success in the course. If one's course is to be fully inclusive, one must reduce those factors and help students imagine being successful.

Background

One semester, on the first day of class in my ancient philosophy course, a student publicly asked an earnest and brave question—"is it even possible to succeed in this course?" The subsequent conversation revealed that several students in the class were entering not only with preconceptions of the challenging nature of philosophy, but having also convinced themselves that "they can't do" whatever it is the philosophy course was going to require of them. Such belief—that one cannot do something simply because of what that thing is and who one is—can be pervasive and is usually the result of a number of factors for which the individual is not responsible. That is to say, while such obstacles to success are brought into the course by the students, these barriers

are not the students' creation. As long as such obstacles are in place, a course cannot be truly inclusive.

Despite my careful work over the years to achieve coherent, integrated course design and classrooms that are ever more active and student-centered, some students in my classes were still excluded. Coherent, integrative course design is always better than incoherent design. Good, student-centered, active pedagogies are better than bad pedagogies. However, some fundamental obstacles students were facing in my courses appeared to have to do with their sense of self and what skills they had, what kind of person they believed themselves to be, and what they thought about philosophy as they entered the course.

Growth Mindset as a Principle of Inclusivity

Carol Dweck and her colleagues offer a terminology with which to talk about these hindrances to inclusivity.[8] According to Dweck, academic success is not determined by innate talents and intellect. Rather, success on a particular task depends upon the degree to which we believe we have the capacity to cultivate our intelligence and grow our abilities to accomplish that task, what she calls "mindset."[9]

Like those students who have convinced themselves that they "can't do philosophy," folks with a fixed mindset believe that intellectual ability within a given domain is something someone either has or does not have, that we each have a fixed, unchangeable, amount of it. Because they believe learning in a field is impossible (or at least impossible for them), students with a fixed mindset tend to focus on looking smart, or not looking dumb, rather than learning; they tend to give up in the face of adversity rather than work harder and smarter; and, as a result, their mindsets block learning and the efforts needed to improve in a field and thus run counter to our efforts at implementing truly inclusive courses.[10] People with a growth mindset, on the other hand, believe that they have the ability to change, to improve in the task or field they are working in. They believe that intellectual ability is something that can be grown or developed over time. They tend to have the goal of learning, rather than looking smart; they tend to work harder and more strategically in response to challenge, rather than giving up; their mindsets help them to stay engaged with their work rather than feel defeated or shut out.

The idea, then, in working toward genuine inclusivity, is to encourage students to develop a growth mindset. In general, we establish a classroom as a growth mindset environment when we (1) establish high expectations (not just standards);[11] (2) challenge students so they know they have the ability to meet those expectations; (3) create a risk-tolerant learning zone by providing an environment that values challenge-seeking, learning, and effort above perfection; (4) give

feedback focused on process and on explaining the importance of their actions and strategies toward success (things students can control) while avoiding praising students for their intelligence and talent (which are less directly in students' control); and (5) introduce students to the concept of a malleable mind and the notion that our brains develop through effort and learning.[12] This can be reinforced in many ways, including through feedback: for example, instead of providing feedback like, "What a smart comment to make!," instead say, "you have done a nice job of connecting X with the discussion we had before about Y."

Additionally, we need to take stock as instructors. Studies suggest that if we want our students to develop a growth mindset, we need to adopt one ourselves.[13] We do not need to believe that any of our students can be the next Anscombe, Appiah, Wollstonecraft, or Kant, only that with hard and strategic effort, they can improve. Recognizing the way we speak to students, the way we develop a syllabus, grade and give feedback all impact students' mindsets, we can set out to both hold a growth mindset and encourage the same in our students. This is now one of the objectives of my courses, regardless of their content.

Practical Considerations

In order to accomplish that objective, the course needs be a place where taking risks or seeking challenges (e.g., offering interpretations that might surprise people in the room, suggesting an example before one knows for certain it will work out well, and so on) is not only tolerated but encouraged. If errors are not tolerated and students do not feel safe to take risks, creative, engaged, exploration is shut down. Such classes can quickly divide into the engaged and the unengaged, the included and the excluded.

Any work in the direction of a growth mindset, or any objective for that matter, should be integrated into the course and not something extra "tacked on." Nearly everything we do as instructors, mentors, and advisers can be put to the service of fostering a growth mindset. In discussing authors and texts in class, for example, when we focus an argument's weaknesses as well as strengths, we show that even the best philosophers make mistakes, and that this doesn't disqualify someone from offering insight worthy of serious consideration. We can also show how philosophers are indebted to other philosophers, thus showing how ideas grow and are built upon each other and talk about what appears on the "acknowledgements" page of contemporary texts to show how even great thinkers rely on the help of others to develop their ideas. Focusing our assessment of student work on formative assessment (i.e., framing feedback in terms of what the student should continue to do and what the student should work to improve next time) reinforces this message and puts the student in the same group as the

great philosophers—contributing something of value but being able to improve or be improved upon.

We can also encourage intellectual risk-taking by means of assignment design. As one example, we can integrate "heroic missteps"[14] into our courses. Missteps are encouraged by making 5 percent of the course grade based on students' heroic missteps (or productive failures). This makes clear to them that getting something wrong, or not quite succeeding with a line of thought or analysis, is expected and important. It is part of "doing philosophy." We cannot advance if we are not willing to get it wrong.[15] Having this in the syllabus and including it in early semester discussions makes it available as a tool during the semester. When someone in the course says or writes something that is inaccurate, problematic, or superficial, students see that they are getting some credit for their willingness to offer an interpretation and this helps students shift away from that fixed mindset model of looking for the magical, single right answer. Near the end of the semester, students write a short reflective essay in which they remind me and, more importantly, themselves of their heroic missteps or productive failures, what they learned from the missteps (if there were any), and how they would score themselves on that intellectual risk-taking aspect of the semester. The reflective piece specifically reinforces a growth mindset.

Besides engagement with errors or shortcomings of the philosophical content, feedback, transparency, and reflection on the course and assignment design, it can be terribly powerful vis-à-vis the development of growth mindset to have some of the reflective work students do be focused on student strategies and processes, things they would do differently next time, mistakes students made and how to avoid them in the future, or on something from the course they first thought was impossible but that had some level of success. If those sorts of reflection remind students that sticking with it and being open to seeing things other than a perfect score as successes, the reflections will likely help students adopt a growth mindset.

Since I ask students to reflect on their work and what they do, we also use some of our class time reflecting together on what I've asked the students to do. Rather than tacking it on to some other discussion, I reserve this for those moments in which student facial expressions, body language, or sometimes voices/words indicate that they think what I've asked them to do is too hard or, in some other way, uncomfortable for them. When that happens, we take some time to discuss the issue. Rather than engage a "why do you think the assignment is unreasonable?" or "what's so hard about it?" conversation, I start by asking students why I would ask them to do that, or to do it that way. It takes real patience, and sometimes they say things that are not comfortable

for me to hear, but if I let the discussion develop organically rather than guide it in a particular direction, it is almost always the case that students in the class say things like, "this assignment [or course] requires us to think differently than we do in other courses and that will make us better thinkers in general" or "doing it this way made me realize we don't always know what we think we know and so we need to be willing to re-think rather than assume those who disagree with us are wrong" or something like that. After the students reflect on and discuss for a few minutes why that might be important to and for them, I can excitedly reveal that I think they have come to some very important insights and quickly summarize the concept of neuroplasticity to support or complement the student comments.[16] Because I am usually fairly even-toned in class, the show of excitement makes an impression and is quite effective.

That is, we use the moment of frustration—a moment that might cause students with a fixed mindset to shut down or give up and self-exclude, a moment in which students who might otherwise have thought they are not the kind of folks who can do philosophy—as an opportunity for the students to notice what is being encouraged in terms of growth. The transparency of these moments also helps students trust that there is some method behind course and assignment design and that makes it easier for them to trust that if they give the course and its assignments their best effort, they will take something positive away from the experience. This trust goes a long way in complementing things like the heroic missteps work or the formative assessment feedback. The elements all complement and support each other in the work of fostering a growth mindset and greater inclusivity.

The development of growth mindset in students makes pedagogical sense. Regardless of our course content, if we design our courses and assignments to help students take on a growth mindset, we dramatically increase the likelihood of their genuine engagement with the course. In doing that, we are helping students see that they can do philosophy. That is a sort of diversity that far outpaces the decisions we make about what thinkers and texts to cover in our courses.[17]

3. Examining Authority in the Classroom (primarily authored by Stephen)

Overview

In this section, I argue that a learning-centered approach to authority, the Scott Principle, as I will call it, is a principle of inclusivity. This principle reads: faculty should have and should exercise that amount and that kind of authority that can best lead to student learning, and students should have and should exercise that amount and that kind

of authority that can best lead to their learning. I will show how this principle came about in my own development and why it is both a principle of effective teaching, generally, and why it is particularly important in inclusive pedagogies.

Background

Working with Rebecca, I co-taught a class to Elon Academy students about rap music. Elon Academy is a high school access program for poor, underserved students within the county in which I teach with no (or little) family history of college matriculation. The program has more female-identified students than male-identified students, and about a third of the students identify as black, a third as Latinx, and a third as white. While there were multiple reasons to want to teach a rap class, in part it was because Rebecca and I had long noticed that the young black men at Elon Academy were the most quiet and least engaged. We considered it an advantage to focus the class on content so clearly identified with this group, hoping that it would be a topic they would know a lot about, feel comfortable with, and thus bring their expertise to class. It goes without saying that not all black men like rap and that lots of other people do like rap. Still, rap remains within our cultural imagination closely identified with black men, for a number of important historical, political and economic reasons.[18] We were thrilled to find that, as we had hoped, this group of students—many of whom we had had in previous classes and had been quiet and less engaged—came to life and were the center of the classroom discussion, referencing rappers no one else (including Rebecca and I) knew, bringing knowledge of the history of rap that was surprising, and emerging as the real leaders in the classroom.

I have continued to teach rap by offering it to undergraduate students (as PHL 363: Rap, Race, Gender and Philosophy): the class attracts a high proportion of black students (compared to the campus average, and a very high percentage compared to the average in philosophy classes and in the major).[19] The class focuses on mainstream rap, and is thus centered on the lives of people of color, their experiences and forms of musical expression; almost all of the authors we read (Tricia Rose, bell hooks, John McWhorter, Immortal Technique, Michelle Alexander, Angela Davis) are people of color as well. In this way, I have at least anecdotal evidence to support the idea that, as conventional wisdom suggests, teaching classes focused on black authors and themes (or other classes focused on other groups underrepresented and underserved within philosophy), when it is the focus of the class—rather than merely 20 percent of the class—might make a huge difference in who is attracted to our classes.[20] The class therefore is diverse and its diversity matters. But this diversity is not, as we have suggested,

sufficient for the success of the students who take the class; what is needed, also, are inclusive pedagogies.

Teaching rap, particularly as a middle-aged, highly educated white man, also had a profound impact on the quality of the discussion in these classes (though, frankly, less so now that I have taught it multiple times and read more widely in the field), which is the opportunity to teach content about which I am not an expert and about which the students are. This has fundamentally transformed my relationship with students in those classes, where students know that I know little about rap after 1990; students regularly reference rappers I have never heard the music of (or who I have literally never heard of before) and regularly recommend rappers for me to listen to. I get more emails from students about ideas and things to check out in that class than in all other classes I teach. My not knowing the rappers themselves decenters my role in the class; even while decentered, I remain central to the philosophic approach that we take to these texts, knowing how to relate them to larger questions of political, critical race and feminist theory with American history. They may, and I do not, know Migos's new song, but none know much about deindustrialization and its impact on the Bronx in the 1970s, for example. What emerges, therefore, is a sharing of expertise and authority where students know that I recognize their knowledge, experience and authority even as they recognize and appreciate mine. This feels and leads to quite different experiences from, say, teaching Plato or Aristotle or Hannah Arendt, where I have read and thought through the work with skills I have honed over decades and where I have read the material innumerable times. While this focuses on changing the curriculum, as diversity-advocates do, it changes the inclusiveness of the classroom, too, by shifting the power, rather than merely the content. One of my favorite classes in graduate school was a class where the professor announced his vulnerability, recognizing that he was writing a book on the subject our class was focused on, how many questions he still had about what we were reading, and thus how important our contributions were to him. If, as Jeanine Weekes Schroer so eloquently argues, we need to be vulnerable along with, and so that, our students can be vulnerable and open to learning, teaching what we do not know can have a huge impact[21] and can shift how authority works in the classroom.

Part of what we see in this case is a larger question that many young faculty and graduate students have about authority in the classroom. The first thing to say about authority (and power) in the classroom is this: I have worked with students as partners for many years (see, for example, Manor, Bloch-Schulman, Flannery, and Felton 2010 and Bloch-Schulman and Castor 2015) on a host of projects about pedagogy, and in virtually every case, students want to start talking about teach-

ing and learning by talking about power in the classroom. Even very small changes to power-dynamics—e.g., placing tables and chairs in a circle rather than having students in rows and a faculty member in the front of the room—are very much on the minds of students; from what these students tell me, even these small changes are overwhelmingly seen as positive by them. At the same time, when discussing a more (or even an only slightly more shared classroom dynamic), faculty often assume an all or nothing stance, and see any sharing as a slippery slope to students grading their own work and selecting their own texts. In my twenty years of teaching at the college level, I have met almost no students who want that at all; but as they say to me, they would like to see their own engagement in learning and the learning environment respect their own experiences and knowledge, rather than assuming that they are, at best, blank slates upon which we imprint new knowledge.[22]

Practical Considerations

Young faculty and, especially graduate students, often struggle with questions of authority in the classroom. When I talk to them in contexts like the AAPT workshops, they reveal, in part, twin worries: first, a desire to be taken seriously and have "control" of the classroom, for fear that they will be embarrassed by their lack of knowledge or that they will get questioned by students, particularly around the content of the classes and, maybe even more, around grades. These challenges can be, no doubt, all the harder for faculty who are underrepresented within philosophy and who are outside of students' expectations, including women, faculty of color, trans-faculty, faculty with disabilities, people who speak with an accent assumed to be foreign, and Indigenous faculty.[23] Second, a desire not to seem like an asshole,[24] which may well come from a discomfort that many have about the role of power, namely, that because power is so often only noticed when it is used for harm, that we readily equate power with its abuse.

When I started teaching, I was very much worried about classroom control, and had strict and unwavering rules and demeanor to which I virtually never allowed exceptions. And while many students seemed to have no problem with this, it made for a teacher-centered classroom space, where I was the focus of conversation and where, importantly, students were quite reluctant to question me and my authority even when such questions would have led to more learning on their part. For example, there were times that a description of an assignment was unclear, students knew it was unclear, and this only came to my attention when students submitted very different work than what would have met the criteria, as I understood them, and when I asked the students about this, they readily admitted that they had questions

the whole time. But they did not ask. This was particularly harmful to the students who were most likely to be new to the language and norms of the academy and those who were reluctant to ask questions that they might see as overstepping their place; and often, these two were the same students.

I then went to the other extreme, trying to make the classroom space as horizontal as possible and trying to give students as much power as I could; I went all the way to having students by themselves (with only occasional guidance from me) construct the syllabi, grading rubrics, assignments and lead class discussion. While exceptionally powerful and beloved by some of the students—typically the most metacognitively aware and prepared students with the most leadership skills—I quickly found that many other students did not like this, and for good reason: many do not yet have the skills needed to organize themselves and make wise decisions in their own best interest; for example, they often assigned grade weights that would overvalue minor assignments and undervalue major ones. I saw them struggle because I was asking them to do things outside their zone of proximal development: that area where the richest learning happens, where the challenge is so great that students need guidance from an expert (rather than being able to do a task on their own), but not so great that with the guidance of an expert they are overwhelmed and unable to make progress on a task or assignment.[25] And in addition, I was not even offering the guidance they did need. I found that asking students to do too much of the structuring of the class—making it too horizontal—has this overwhelming effect that limits student learning and engenders confusion and frustration on their part, not excitement and openness.[26]

The Scott Principle as a Principle of Inclusive Pedagogy

I have now come to see that I want to help students develop these skills, particularly the skills Iris Marion Young describes (1990) as "task-defining" skills (rather than merely "task-executing skills"). Young argues that businesses embody forms of injustice by placing the "task-defining" work—that work of determining the goals and agenda of an organization and determining the main ways that organization will meet those goals—in the hands of the few, while leaving the "task-executing" work—the activities to achieve these goals—in the hands of the many. Teaching students to set appropriate goals for their, and the class's, learning and to set the agenda allows them to gain these invaluable skills. But the most learning, on task-defining, happens when I meet students where they are, that is, where they remain in the zone of proximal development. And this means re-thinking both my power and theirs. I now use what I call the *Scott Principle* (after our co-author, Rebecca Scott), which, as I understand it, is that we, as

instructors, ought to have, upkeep, maintain and foster our own power to the extent and only to the extent that it helps students learn, and that students should have, upkeep, maintain and foster (and be allowed to do all of these) their own power to the extent and only to the extent that it will help students learn. This means that if I am the expert on a subject that it is good for the students to learn, I ought to act like one and not pretend otherwise, and if I am not, I ought not act like one. Similarly, I ought to be sure to let students use the skills, habits, and knowledge they have in the classroom whenever possible, because it will foster their own and their classmates' learning better than my doing it alone. Additionally, as Young's work on tasks shows, through the lens of the work on the zone of proximal development, we ought to find ways to foster and scaffold the development (or further development) of student's skills, habits and knowledge, particularly those that include "task-defining."

In many classes that I am the instructor for, this means starting two things: first, I often do not write on the white board, but explain that I am not the owner of it and that the task should be shared to organize our collective ideas. Practically, this means that I tell students that if they think their learning will be well-served by seeing something written on the board, that they should go ahead and do so (this was a technique I learned from Megan Stephens née Leder). Getting students habituated to taking this kind of ownership of the classroom space often takes some prompting in the beginning of the semester, but becomes a habit through being reminded; typically by half-way through the semester, students are popping up in class, when appropriate to write on the board, unprompted by me (hence, evidence that it is within the zone of proximal development).[27]

Second, I ask students to co-construct the criteria for the grading of assignments, including homework, quizzes, papers and tests, I ask them to look at short samples of their and their classmates early work and, from these, to start listing elements that make work more and less effective. I typically also add some things, myself, as the conversation goes forward, but only after they have done a significant amount of the work. Importantly, it helps them develop metacognition about what good learning looks like, the purpose of the assignments, and how criteria can and ought structure their work. It also as this helps develop their task-defining skills, it also allows them to put the criteria in language that *they* understand, surfacing questions among themselves they would be less likely to ask me. This makes the criteria more transparent and more accessible. But it is also often the case that students need help in constructing criteria, as they are likely to focus on lower-level thinking (grammar, citations, organization) and are likely to omit or not pay sufficient attention to what the real purpose

of writing is, what good writing does, and how thinking that is not formulaic can be evaluated.

4. Double Transparency of Norms and Expectations (primarily authored by Melissa)

Overview

In this section, I argue that transparency of norms and expectations creates a more inclusive classroom. This sense of transparency involves an instructor communicating the norms and expectations of their course to their students, but also a dimension of purposeful internal inclusion. That is, there are two dimensions to this transparency: to the student, and to oneself. It is important to identify when students' norms and expectations may not be aligned with those of the instructor. I draw on my experiences working with international students as a catalyst for my thinking about transparency in this way. I discuss course participation as a concrete example of what this conception of transparency of norms and expectations looks like when considering the cultural norms of academic philosophy classes.

Background

During graduate school I worked as an instructor for graduate student TA training programs, one of which was a certificate program for international graduate students. Through the certificate program, the international graduate students learned about cultural differences in patterns of communication and acquired strategies to maintain positive interactions with supervisors, peers, and students.[28] My responsibilities were to run "micro-teaching" and "micro-presentations," in which small groups of TAs each deliver a ten-minute teaching lesson or conference presentation. While I had run these sessions for our "standard" TA training workshops, I was quite nervous to run the sessions for international TAs, and be seen as the authority on "North American" norms. I had not spent much time reflecting on what the norms of North American classrooms are, so who was I to tell these TAs how we do things? Since I wasn't sure what to say, I left time in the sessions for the graduate students to request specific feedback. Almost always, these questions about how to teach led to bigger-picture discussions of their own personal struggles with North American academia.

Some graduate students said they really struggled with the emphasis North American teaching places on active learning and group work. They expected to learn from the professor, not from their peers. After all, the university has hired the faculty member to teach because of their expertise. So, peer-based learning was a big change and challenge for

some. Others said they really struggled to figure out what it was they were supposed to do when they were put in small groups to discuss the material, and so, as an instructor, were unsure how to structure a group assignment. Several were worried that their North American peers and students would not take them that seriously because of their accents. Some worried their students would feel they ended up in a bad discussion section where they were not going to learn as much because it was taught by a non-native English speaker. Others flagged their biggest challenge as acquiring the capacity to focus during lecture on difficult material in English. As students, they found it intellectually exhausting to listen to long lectures in English. As instructors, they often would prepare their entire lesson plan twice, once in their native language, and then again translated into English. These experiences are not isolated to the international graduate students I worked with; these are common themes that have emerged in a number of studies in higher education on international students.[29]

Hearing these incredibly thoughtful and insightful worries was striking to me. Identifying the North American academic norms was, for them, easy because they were the aspects that stood out so significantly as a set of tacit knowledge they needed to have, which no one really told them about, and which they had to discover themselves. But what worried me the most from this experience was that, while these graduate students had spent so much time and effort in learning and conforming to the norms of the North American classroom, I had not given much thought to what the North American norms were until I began working with the certificate program. I felt terrible for not spending time before this thinking about what these challenges were. After working with these TAs I became incredibly frustrated with the fact that the burden is placed on them to put in the effort to learn North American norms, while instructors do little to learn what these norms are, so that we can understand that they can be challenging and disorienting. While it's wonderful that some universities help international students adjust to North America with these kinds of programs, I think it's problematic there are no programs for people native to the North American educational context to think through and reflect what our academic norms are.

Double Transparency as a Principle of Inclusivity

This experience led me to think about what the implicit norms, expectations, and tacit knowledge might be in philosophy classes—both for international students and for students encountering the world of philosophy for the first time. What can I do to make these norms of academic philosophy as explicit as possible? Not every student is coming into the philosophy classroom with the same set of expectations,

skills, or knowledge of how to do academic philosophy (or even what the point of philosophy is). And much like playing a game can be challenging, frustrating, and even disheartening if you do not know the rules, how to win, or what the purpose of the game even is, the same can be said for participating in the "game" of academic success. So, as instructors, we need to be as transparent as we can be.[30] We need to make the implicit explicit. Transparency attends to diversity in the classroom in a leveling, welcoming way, and helps cultivate a space where everyone—regardless of their background—knows what success would look like, and how to focus their efforts to achieve it.[31]

Yet transparency is not solely about explaining instructor expectations, it is also about purposeful internal inclusion. As understood in Iris Marion Young's language, this is where, as much as possible, "the terms of discourse [do not] make assumptions some do not share, the interaction [does not privilege] specific styles of expression, the participation of some people is [not] dismissed as out of order."[32] If the goal is to prioritize student-centered teaching and to cultivate an inclusive space, then "inclusion is not bringing people into what already exists; it is making a new space, a better space for everyone."[33] It is about being ready to reflect on where we may need to learn about our students' backgrounds and norms, to be willing to adapt to those of our students, and develop that new space together. In applying transparency to the various aspects of teaching, we need to keep thinking about what the rules of the game are, where rules are different, and why the rules are the rules. That is to say, we need to reflect on the "So What" factor: Why do we do this? What is its value, and why does it matter? To further illustrate the importance of this conception of transparency of norm and expectations, I want to focus on the case of participation, as it is representative of the kinds of norms that I think can be confusing for students new to philosophy, but also a norm philosophy instructors need to reflect on in the way described above.

Participation is a graded component of many philosophy courses. In light of my experiences with international students and cultural norms, I asked my undergraduate students why participation is important, and what participation looks like.[34] Some students considered participation to be defined as talking in class, with those who talk the most in class getting the highest participation grades. Others thought having something really insightful to say was more important, and so the quality of their participation might make up for the quantity. Some students thought participation is how professors test to see who actually read the readings, or was a way to figure out who is smart and insightful. Another student was worried about the participation grade because, though they completed their readings and had thoughts about the arguments, they felt shy and nervous about sharing them out loud. Anther

still said they think best through writing, and preferred to take notes on the class discussion and reflect on them in writing later. This student saw themselves as participating in class, just not in the "normal" way.

Similarly as I had seen when working with the international graduate students, my undergraduate students and I had misaligned, and perhaps mistaken, understandings. I realized the definition of "participation" often focused on *verbal* participation. As a teacher, I consider clear communication of ideas as an essential skill to develop, and value participation as a way for students to learn and practice engaging in philosophical thought, discussion, and reflection. This isn't a skill that some students have and some do not, but rather one they can all cultivate through practice. If my goal is to be more inclusive, to pay attention to the backgrounds of students coming into the class, and find space for students who do not necessarily participate in discussion in the traditional ways, then simply asking questions or talking in class is too narrow of a definition of participation. My definition of participation needed to broaden to be more pluralistic, to include other kinds of participation (particularly the kind that introverted, non-native English speaking, or anxious students may feel more comfortable with).

Practical Considerations

Broadening definitions does not need to come at the expense of the skills we try to teach in philosophy. In the case of participation, thinking about what participation *is*, and what *counts* as participation, requires spending time reflecting on two important questions. The first question is *why* we think participation is important and something we want all our students to be doing this in the first place. The second question is what we think "participation" looks like. For example, Wright (2015) and Norlock (2016) distinguish between classroom participation and course participation, as well as silent participation. The essential task, once we've answered these two questions for ourselves, is to communicate this reasoning to our students. How we define and view participation can impact the classroom dynamics and students' willingness to participate. Thinking we must get each and every student talking and participating in the traditional format of class discussions is perhaps a mistaken norm. In light of this, we perhaps should not force participation upon students, but instead try to cultivate in our students genuine course engagement (rather than merely traditional participation). This involves cultivating an environment maximally welcoming to taking risk in participation, explaining why trying to express one's ideas is valuable, and setting up a classroom community where engagement is meaningful.

My approach to establishing this environment, again, is making the implicit explicit. I have a conversation with my students about the ways they can participate in a course and what I see as the point of speak-

ing in class. I let them know that I want them to practice formulating, articulating, and expressing their thoughts and ideas out loud (and the classroom is a great place to practice). Speaking is a different skill from writing, and there is a reason that when people are asked what their greatest fear is, number one fear is public speaking. Speaking puts the speaker in a vulnerable position. So, some of the classroom expectations I develop with my students involve asking what they expect from others when they speak. Often students say they want others to really listen, and to disagree with them but at the same time to be respectful. I also ask what they expect from themselves when they speak. They often say they expect they will have developed an idea before they speak, which gives me an opportunity to say it is actually alright not to have an idea perfectly formulated, as that is part of what we're trying to develop in a philosophy class. I let them know that if they don't like speaking, that's okay, but that I want them to set goals for themselves that help them work to develop this skill. For instance, if they consider themselves shy or anxious then they could set a goal of speaking up once a week. I also talk about the variety of course participation they can undertake, and I incorporate many of the strategies Norlock and Wright suggest throughout the semester. At the end of the day, it's the student's choice whether they actually do participate. I cannot force them. This can be frustrating, particularly in the cases where I feel like a student could really contribute a different perspective or idea to the class. But one of the dangers in forcing people to participate is tokenizing them, or treating their experience as representative of a larger collective. I think this is hard for us as instructors at times because we want to hear and learn from all our students. We want everyone's voice to be represented and part of the discussion.

As a result of this experience, I also begin all my courses by having my undergraduate students help establish what our classroom norms and expectations are. It makes my expectations of them as students explicit, and it makes their expectations for me and their peers explicit as well. It also provides students an opportunity to feel more invested and have a sense of ownership of the class, and that I am not the sole authority on what makes for a good classroom environment. It also seems to encourage students to interact with each other in a respectful manner since they, as a group, decided on the classroom expectations. In terms of in class discussions and assignments, I explain the motivation for why they are doing what they are doing. I also explain what "success" looks like for any assignment or classroom activity.[35] Finally, I give students an opportunity to discuss what is new, different, or challenging for them, so that I can better identify instances in which my norms or conceptions of something are different from my students'.

5. Increasing Pathways to Success with Flexibility (primarily authored by Rebecca)

Overview

In this section, I argue that increased flexibility, especially with regard to how students engage with course material and complete assignments, creates a more inclusive classroom. Given our understanding of inclusive pedagogy as the creation of a learning environment in which as many of our students as possible have the greatest chance to learn as much as possible, *how* students arrive at the learning goals of our courses becomes less important than *that* they arrive at them. If, therefore, there are reasonable things that we can do as teachers to expand the number and kinds of pathways to success for our students and give them more control in utilizing their skills and interests, doing so gives more students a greater chance at success.

In what follows, I explore one way of expanding these pathways that I have found works well for my students and me, namely, giving students the option of engaging with course material through creative projects. But while I will examine the specific use of creative projects here, flexibility is a broader strategy of inclusivity that can extend to other elements of our courses, such as how students access course material, when they turn in assignments, how they participate in class (as Melissa discusses above), how students earn points on assignments, and so on. The specific assignment described here is intended as a concrete example of only *one* way of increasing flexibility, and it may or may not be appropriate for every reader's courses. Further, flexibility must always be balanced with other concerns, such as fairness, instructor expertise, and time limitations. Nevertheless, whenever it is reasonably possible to be flexible, I argue that doing so is more inclusive.

Background

In fall 2016, I was teaching a course at Elon University which included a unit on justice and schooling. For this unit, we read Jean Anyon's influential 1980 article, "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work."[36] Through a study of five elementary schools in the Boston area, Anyon shows that schools were perpetuating inequity by preparing students from different class backgrounds for different kinds of work. Schools with higher populations of students from working class families were taught to be obedient rule followers, while students from families with more wealth were taught how to express themselves and exert influence over dominant power structures. Alongside Anyon's work, students in my course also read a recent meta-analysis of work in education, psychology, and sociology that shows that our mainstream

institutions continue to promote a "hidden curriculum," insofar as they value middle/upper middle class ways of being and often fail to value working class ways of being in the world.[37]

The authors of this latter analysis argue that in working class contexts, a lack of access to resources leads to an increased emphasis on what they call "hard interdependence." Because people in working class contexts often lack access to resources, the authors argue, they learn to navigate complicated and unpredictable systems and come to value resilience, toughness, and reliance on one's community. In middle/upper class contexts, by contrast, emphasis is placed on what the authors call "expressive independence." Expressive independence involves the ability to pursue one's own interests and encourages being different and questioning authority. The authors argue that mainstream institutions, like universities and many corporate workplaces, perpetuate injustice by valuing expressive independence over hard interdependence, thereby possibly alienating and disadvantaging students who come from working class contexts. For our own classes to be as inclusive as possible, we must, therefore, ensure that our classes are spaces in which multiple ways of being are welcomed and valued as means of successfully achieving the learning outcomes in our courses.

At Elon, the students in my class overwhelmingly came from wealthy backgrounds. When asked, more than half of my students reported having never attended public schools and most acknowledged that they largely identified with the values and norms of expressive independence. After we read these two articles, I wanted to give students a sense of what it would be like to be in a context in which the norms, values, and expectations were foreign to them. To do this, I told them that for the next assignment, inspired by my work with Stephen in the Elon Academy rap class, they were going to be required to write and perform rap songs about the article, and that I was going to grade them on their performances. While I was not actually planning on requiring the students to perform (something I quickly told them), I asked students what it would have felt like if I *had* made performing in front of their peers a requirement of the class. The students expressed that it would have been "unfair" and that they wouldn't have known how to do well on the assignment. Several even said that they would have refused, saying, "I wouldn't have done it; I would have taken a zero."

I asked students to reflect on this experience and they began to see how a disconnect between the expectations and values of an institution and one's typical way of being in the world can be unfair. Students who are well-versed in the norms of academic work have learned how to "play the game." Requiring them to do something that they had never done before and that they were not expecting seemed to them as though I was unfairly changing the rules. This activity helped students

to realize what it might be like when the norms that one is used to fail to cohere with the expectations of a mainstream institution like a university or a corporate office.

The important takeaway here is not that we need to do a better job at helping students whose ways of being are undervalued to transform *themselves* in order to be more valued by mainstream institutions. Doing so does nothing to rectify the underlying injustice of the system. Rather, to make our institutions more just, we need to transform our institutions so that they value multiple ways of being in the world. To emphasize this point, for the culminating assignment of the unit, I gave students the option of either writing a more traditional academic paper or composing a song, which they would annotate with commentary connecting their lyrics to the texts we were reading in class. In this way, the assignment itself was intended to be an enactment of the core idea that I hoped to convey—that one way of combating inequity is to make space in institutions for multiple and diverse ways of being successful.

While many students opted to turn in a more traditional paper, about one third of the class elected to write and annotate a song, which they either recorded or performed for the class. As a result, not only did we build community in the class through the vulnerability of creative expression, but I also discovered new talents of many of my students. One student, who was typically very quiet in class, stood in front of the room and gave one of the most enthusiastic rap performances I have ever seen. Another student, who had also been extremely quiet in class discussions, recorded a track that showcased her incredible talent as a singer and songwriter, a talent that she herself was only beginning to discover.

Flexibility as a Principle of Inclusivity

The success I found by opening up the assignment in this way has led me to continue to expand the ways that students in my classes complete assignments and to think about the connection between flexibility and inclusivity. In my courses, I now often invite students to pair their written work with expressions in any medium that they feel best allows them to communicate their ideas. I still require students to write, but I invite them to connect their writing to a form of expression with which they may be more comfortable. And students continue to amaze me with the creativity and increased enthusiasm they bring to their work. For example, in a class with a unit on incarceration, one student filmed herself performing an interpretive dance about solitary confinement, while another student baked nutraloaf (a food used as punishment in many prisons) and served it to the class. Another student began writing letters to an incarcerated person in a nearby prison and continued to maintain that correspondence after the class ended. Other

students have made paintings, written poetry, made playlists of songs that are meaningful to them, and so on.

This experience helped me to see how offering students flexibility in how they complete assignments can help us to make our classes more inclusive. First, these kinds of assignments expand students' understanding of what counts as "legitimate" expression in an academic setting. That is, these assignments show that good, interesting, and provocative ideas do not have to come only in the forms that are typically recognized and valued as "academic" forms of expression.

In addition, the assignments provoke an authenticity of expression that disrupts the normal flow of what "one does" in academic work. I have found that students often see writing papers as something alienating and not as a means of actually exploring and expressing their own ideas. This feeling may be experienced even more deeply by students who have traditionally been marginalized in academic settings. When students are given the opportunity to express themselves in a way in which they feel confident, they are less distracted by the anxiety of writing a paper, and are better able to focus on their ideas.

Furthermore, the standards of traditional academic writing favor those students who are "well prepared," i.e., those who have received the most training in how to adopt the standards of the academy. Alternative assignments, however, allow students to participate in academic discourse by bringing their individual expertise to their work. By giving students flexibility in how they complete an assignment, we create a greater opportunity for students to find ways to relate their already existing interests, concerns, skills, and questions to what they are learning, which allows them to see that their experiences and ideas are valuable and valued.

Practical Considerations

Some teachers might worry that offering students alternatives to traditional assignments will deny students the opportunity to learn important academic skills. But if we reframe our understanding of how traditional academic skills can be displayed, it becomes clear that it is possible to help students sharpen these skills while allowing for flexibility in how they engage with the course material. While different teachers may have different reasons for their assessment criteria, I take it that some of the reasons we find writing academic papers valuable are as follows: First, writing a paper with a thesis requires students to distill their thoughts into a clear and concise form that gives their work an orientation and a structure. Second, requiring students to give evidence/reasons for their views ensures that students think through their positions carefully and consider why they believe what they believe. Finally, we ask students to engage with the texts that they read and

to cite other authors to emphasize that doing philosophy involves an engagement in a dialogue with others. Furthermore, requiring students to engage with the texts they have read is a way of assessing student understanding of required readings.

If these are indeed some of the reasons that we ask students to write papers, alternative assignments show that these goals can be achieved through modes of expression that do not take traditional academic forms. For example, if a student writes a song, we can understand the chorus/verse structure as parallel to the thesis/evidence structure of a paper. A thesis statement can be reframed as the chorus or hook of the song insofar as a chorus/hook expresses the main idea of a song and is repeatedly returned to, giving the song a clear structure. Similarly, we can tell students, a thesis statement is the guiding idea of a paper to which each section of the paper must return. To continue the analogy, the verses of a song often provide examples or stories that reveal the theme presented in the chorus. We can show students that reasons to support a thesis can be given in the verses of a song. Finally, engagement with other texts can be included through "sampling" the work of other authors or through additional commentary on lyrics. In my assignments, I ask students to provide additional analysis and explanation through commentary on their lyrics using footnotes. This format not only allows students to expand on the ideas presented in their lyrics but also helps students to become familiar with using footnotes, something many undergraduates struggle with.

For work presented in non-linguistic media, like painting and dance, I ask students to submit an artist's statement explaining their work. In their artists' statements, students are asked to explain the central idea/thesis expressed in their art. They are also asked to explain the genesis of the piece, giving their reasons for creating the work and the influences/texts that they drew on in doing so. While this assignment closely resembles a traditional paper, students often experience the writing of an artist's statement quite differently than they experience writing a traditional paper. Many students have expressed to me that they feel anxiety and dread at the prospect of writing papers. An artist's statement, however, allows students to approach the task of writing from another direction, which can lessen anxiety and break bad writing habits (e.g., waiting until the last minute, imitating academic writing at the expense of clarity, completing work as quickly as possible, etc.).

In these ways, we can achieve our goals as teachers by giving students the opportunity to bring their own experiences to bear on their academic work. In my own classes, doing so appears to have increased student motivation and time on task and also decreased anxiety. And, as argued above, such assignments also legitimize voices and modes of expression that are less often found in academia and are found in

students' lives, thereby making the classroom more welcoming of a variety of ways of being in the world.[38]

Of course, using creative assignments may or may not be appropriate for the goals of every philosophy course (although I would argue they are often more appropriate than they seem at first glance, especially given how few undergraduate students in philosophy will go on to graduate school in philosophy). Instructors who are seeking to foster a different set of academic skills than those outlined above or instructors who are less comfortable with assessing creative projects may find that the assignments I have described are not the best means of introducing flexibility into their courses. For a philosophy teacher with more traditional aims, a small increase in flexibility might involve giving students the opportunity to explore their own paper topics or the option of using philosophical texts to analyze non-traditional works. Or if an instructor does not wish to change their assessments, they could give students the opportunity to engage with the text in non-traditional ways through in-class activities. In general, instructors will have to decide for themselves how the principle of flexibility can be concretized in their own particular contexts. The important strategy articulated here is that being an inclusive teacher requires that we open up multiple pathways to engaging with philosophical texts and achieving the learning goals of our courses, whatever those goals are. Doing so helps to ensure that students with different backgrounds, strengths, and obstacles, have a greater chance of feeling welcome in our classes and of achieving what we hope for them.

6. Looking in the Mirror . . . and Other Conclusory Remarks

Despite our best efforts to make our classes as inclusive as possible, it is inevitable that we will make mistakes or otherwise fall short of cultivating a fully inclusive classroom. For all of us, but especially for those of us who occupy social positions of privilege, we are at risk of perpetuating domination and marginalization despite (and sometimes even *as a result of*) our best efforts, as well as remaining ignorant to these very problems. Should we make a mistake, or in some way fail to create a classroom that is as inclusive as it could be, we need to be ready to repair any harm that may have occurred, and reflect on the experience so as to transform our pedagogical practices accordingly. We must, therefore, have structures set up so that we can hear and respond to our students' needs. To this end, we would like to bring to the foreground a critical aim: building strong, trusting relationships with students.

First, it is important to work deliberately to build relationships with students that help us to hear concerns and, if needed, apologize or otherwise respond to challenges in a context of mutual trust, respect, and vulnerability. Relationships can be built in a number of ways throughout the semester. For example, learning students' names, if at all possible, as soon as one can is one way to do this. One might also begin the semester with an introductory survey asking students about their interests, background in philosophy, preconceptions about the discipline, and anything you might need to know to help them be successful. Asking students for this information shows them that you are interested in who they are, what they care about, and what they need. It can also help to shape course material and assignments to the unique needs of the particular students in your classes.

As the semester moves on, it is important to incorporate regular avenues for feedback and communication. One option could be to require students to come to office hours, even if only for five minutes, during the first half of the semester. If such meetings are not feasible due to large classes or heavy course loads, it may be worthwhile to set aside several class periods to be used for one-on-one meetings. While doing so means covering less material, in our experience, these brief meetings are invaluable. Another way to solicit feedback from students throughout the year, is through a "Stop, Start, Continue" exercise, in which students are regularly asked to anonymously give feedback on things they would like to see the class stop, start, and continue doing. Gathering and acting on such feedback shows students that we take their experience of the class seriously, and that we care about their concerns.

Building positive relationships throughout the course, however, isn't solely about focusing on concerns; it is also important to give kudos, not just reprimands. For example, if a student who is typically quiet offers an especially insightful contribution to a class discussion, you might send the student a quick email after class affirming their decision to speak up and thanking them for helping to move the discussion forward. Or if a student has expressed a particular interest in a topic, you might send them an article that they might find interesting. These quick informal communications take very little time but can make a huge difference in student engagement by helping students feel seen.

In addition to building relationships with students, it is also important for us to reflect on our own experience with the course as the instructor. This brings us to our fifth and final principle: deliberately engaging in perpetual self-reflection and self-critique by turning the four principles outlined above back on ourselves as learner-educators. Doing so recognizes that we, like our students, are also learners, and that these principles are important for supporting our own learning as educators. This process of self-reflection and critique is crucial, espe-

cially for those of us in dominant social groups who must continually be skeptical about whether our practices are truly student-centered and inclusive.

To turn the four principles back on ourselves involves, first, maintaining a growth mindset about ourselves as teachers. Just as we hope that students overcome a fixed mindset about their philosophical abilities, we also need to see ourselves as capable of growth as educators through feedback and deliberate practice. Doing so requires that we identify areas in which we need to improve and elicit feedback specific to our pedagogical goals. Second, in addition to recognizing the authority and expertise that students bring to our classes, it is also important to recognize and utilize our own authority in a way that is just. We ought not (and cannot) give up our authority entirely, but must perpetually reflect on where our power comes from, and how and why we use it in the classroom. Third, making norms transparent for our students also involves making them transparent for ourselves. It is essential that we not only consider the assumptions and expectations that students have coming into the classroom but also our own assumptions that derive from our own social positions. And finally, just as we need to be flexible in our understanding of success for students in the classroom, we must also be flexible about our understanding of pedagogical success. There is no one size fits all way to be an inclusive, student-centered teacher. We have to take into account our social positions, strengths and weaknesses, personalities, interests, and so on, to teach in a way that allows us to flourish so that our students can flourish; having tired, defeated, unbalanced faculty does little to enhance student experience and learning.[39]

Engaging in this kind of self-reflective practice is difficult. It requires vulnerability and humility. Becoming an inclusive educator is an ongoing process of not only developing our craft but also coming to better know and improve ourselves. Through this paper, we hope to have demonstrated this metalevel engagement in self-reflection. While we have offered a few tips and tricks along the way, we have given careful attention to highlight broader strategies that we believe, and evidence shows, can help teachers to develop pedagogies that work best in their own contexts. As instructors think about incorporating aspects we have discussed into their own classrooms, it is important not to take on too much all at once. These issues are integrated, overlapping, and complex. A change of one aspect can change every other aspect in a course. Utilizing inclusive pedagogies carefully changes the meaning of what the instructor and students do during classroom time, what and how one assesses work, and the goals of a philosophy course more broadly. As such, it should be done carefully, thoughtfully, and with kindness to our students as well as ourselves.

Notes

We would like to thank the participants of the AAPT workshops on Inclusive Pedagogy at the University of Western Ontario (2016) and University of Pittsburgh (2017), we are indebted to their participation and the excellent discussions. We would also like to extend our deepest thanks to David Concepción and Alida Liberman as fellow facilitators at these two workshops, and for their insightful feedback on earlier drafts of this paper. Though they are not authors on this paper, their influence is seeded throughout. Finally, we would like to thank our anonymous reviewers for their feedback on earlier drafts.

1. See Whetten 2007 for further discussion on teacher- vs. student-centered education.

2. That is, we see parallels between the teacher-centered framework and diversity, where the focus is on who teaches and what is taught; and student-centered framework and inclusivity, where the focus is on how to optimize the learning of students so that they have the greatest chance to learn as much as possible. Again, we want to emphasize that we take diversity in philosophy as necessary (just not sufficient).

3. Goldman 2005.

4. Bloch-Schulman 2016.

5. For examples of different types, see Cook-Sather and Motz-Storey 2016; Manor, Bloch-Schulman, Flannery, and Felten 2010; Foot, Crowe, Tollafield, and Allan 2014; Healey, Flint, and Harrington 2016; and Yeo, Manarin, and Miller-Young 2018.

6. Brison 2003: 25.

7. This is the norm, though not always true: see Paxton, Figdor, and Tiberius 2012.

8. See, for example, Dweck 2006; Yeager and Dweck 2012; Yeager, Paunesku, Walton, and Dweck 2013.

9. While the emphasis here is on growth mindset as a principle of inclusivity, it should be noted that this principle also plays prominently in work on student motivation and on self-directed learners. See, for example, Green 2015 and Ambrose et al. 2010, esp. chaps. 3 and 7.

10. Fixed mindset not only hinder students who think they cannot succeed, it also hinders those who overestimate their abilities. See Pintrich 2003: 671.

11. One can establish high standards for passing a course or earning the grade of "A" without truly expecting students to meet those standards. To establish high expectations is to expect that students will perform at a high level and to communicate that to students in a way that allows them to see the possibility.

12. Carol Dweck and Lisa Blackwell in Ferlazzo 2012. See also Dweck 2006: 141.

13. See, e.g., Dweck 2006: 221. In order to be fully successful in establishing inclusivity, we need to adopt a growth mindset about our students in order to help them develop the same about themselves. In order to do that, we need to adopt a growth mindset, generally. A bit about this as it applies to striving to achieve inclusivity is in the last section of this paper.

14. This is adapted from a piece Edward Burger wrote for *Inside Higher Ed*. Burger calls his version "quality of failure." I experimented with various names (e.g., "quality of failure," "productive failures," "intellectual risk taking," and so forth). Informed by student comments and course evaluations, I decided to find a term with more positive connotations than "failure." The "heroic" part of the label reminds students that I realize

it can be scary or intimidating to take the intellectual risks I am asking them to take and that it requires some courage on their part. More of my students seem to respond positively to, and comment positively about, "heroic missteps" than the other names I've used for this aspect of the course.

15. I usually begin to set the stage by opening the first class meeting with a video of a video of failed attempts at flight or of children trying to learn to walk followed by a discussion during the next class meeting in which I solicit the students' thoughts about why I asked them to view the video and what my point might have been.

16. Sometimes, depending on how the student-driven conversation is going or the nature of the course, I will turn us to a short video on neuroplasticity to touch on the "science" behind the course asking them to do things that are new or different for students. This is one way of introducing students to the concept of a malleable mind without it being a clumsy detour or feeling "tacked onto" the course.

17. If one wants to make the teaching about growth mindset a bit more central to the course, there are quite a few resources available online and many of the published studies outline the "interventions" used. In "Reducing the Effects of Stereotype Threat on African American College Students by Shaping Theories of Intelligence," for example, Joshua Aronson, Carrie B. Fried, and Catherine Good suggests a very brief summary of mind-growth or neuroplasticity followed by a brief writing assignment can have a significant impact.

18. I will leave aside the question of what possible harms and benefits there are, and to whom, by having rap so identified.

19. Students who have self-identified in class as being people of color have made up 38.2 percent of the four Rap classes I have taught at the undergraduate level; this ought to be compared with the 19 percent of the student population. We have only had one student of color who was a philosophy major in a number of years.

20. On this question, see Thompson, Adleberg, Sims, and Nahmias 2016.

21. Schroer 2007.

22. See Freire 1972 for a critique of this "banking model."

23. There are a number of hurdles one may encounter when attempting to adopt these inclusive practices, particularly for those who belong to an underrepresented group. We suspect it is not *more* hurdles one must face by adopting inclusive practices, just different hurdles. For an extended discussion of the variety of challenges teaching and issues of authority may pose to those who belong to an underrepresented group, see the collections of essays in *Presumed Incompetent* (2012).

24. See James 2012.

25. See Shabani's synthesis of Vygotsky on this matter (Shabani 2010).

26. It is important that students came to the class with very different levels of preparation for task-defining, some of whom I had worked with on these skills for multiple years. And I found that students responded very differently, based on these skills and experiences, with some enjoying the opportunity, and others feeling overwhelmed.

27. Interestingly, because writing is typically not seen as a male activity—a point some of the male-identified students sometimes make clear, claiming for example, that "women have better handwriting"—this is rarely dominated by those who typically have social and political power. Students do not seem to realize how much power "the marker"

comes with, even as the person with the marker often directs the discussion in explicit and less direct ways.

28. See https://teaching.uwo.ca/programs/certificates/cigs.html.

29. See Carroll and Ryan 2007, Dimitrov 2009, and Dimitrov and Haque 2017.

30. Additionally, see Winkelmes 2013 and Anderson, Hunt, Powell, and Dollar 2013 for studies on the benefits of transparency in student learning.

31. For extended reflection on norms, see Dotson 2011, Graff 2002, and Morton 2014.

32. Young 1990: 53.

33. Dei et al. 2000.

34. This activity is also another example of how once can help students develop their task-defining skills.

35. For extended discussion of what it might mean to demonstrate "success" to students, see Mulnix and Liberman 2017.

36. Anyon 1980.

37. See Stephens, Markus, and Phillips 2013.

38. For more on assessment strategies for non-traditional assignments see Zemits 2017 and Clegg and Bryan 2006.

39. That is to say, self-care is critical. But we also recognize that opportunities to engage in self-care are unevenly distributed. (Parents of young children, we are talking to you!)

Bibliography

Ambrose, Susan A., Michael W. Bridges, Michele DiPietro, Marsha C. Lovett, and Marie K. Norman. 2010. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1111/teth.12013

Anderson, Alecia D., Andrea N. Hunt, Rachel E. Powell, and Cindy Brooks Dollar. 2013. "Student Perceptions of Teaching Transparency," *Journal of Effective Teaching* 13(2): 38–47.

Antony, Louise. 2012. "Different Voices or Perfect Storm: Why Are There So Few Women in Philosophy?," *Journal of Social Philosophy* 43(3): 227–55. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9833.2012.01567.x

Anyon, Jean. 1980. "Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work," *The Journal of Education* 162(1): 67–92. https://doi.org/10.1177/002205748016200106

Aronson, Joshua, Carrie B. Fried, and Catherine Good. 2002. "Reducing the Effects of Stereotype Threat on African American College Students by Shaping Theories of Intelligence," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 38: 113–25. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.2001.1491

Bloch-Schulman, Stephen. 2016. "The Socratic Method: Teaching and Writing about Philosophy's Signature Pedagogy," in *Exploring More Signature Pedagogies: Approaches to Teaching Disciplinary Habits of Mind*, ed. Nancy L. Chick, Aeron Haynie, & Regan A. A. Gurung, 15–26. Sterling, Va.: Stylus.

Bloch-Schulman, Stephen, and Maggie Castor. 2015. "I Am Not Trying to Be Defiant, I Am Trying to Be Your Partner: How to Help Students Navigate Educational Institutions

That Do Not Value Democratic Practice," *Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning and Civic Engagement* 6(1): 161–80.

Brison, Susan. 2003. *Aftermath: Violence and the Remaking of a Self*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.

Burger, Edward. 2012. "Essay on the Importance of Teaching Failure," *Inside Higher Ed* (August 21). https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2012/08/21/essay-importance-teaching-failure.

Carroll, Judith, and Janette Ryan, eds. 2007. *Teaching International Students: Improving Learning for All*. London: Routledge.

Case, Kim, ed. 2013. *Deconstructing Privilege: Teaching and Learning as Allies in the Classroom*. London: Routledge.

Clegg, Karen, and Cornelia Bryan. 2006. "Reflections, Rationals, and Realities," in *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*, 216–27. London: Routledge.

Cook-Sather, Alison, and Damon Motz-Storey. 2016. "Viewing Teaching and Learning from a New Angle: Student Consultants' Perspectives on Classroom Practice," *College Teaching* 6(44): 168–77. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2015.1126802

Dei, George J. Sefa. 2000. *Anti-Racism Education: Theory and Practice*. Halifax, N.S.: Fernwood Publishing.

Dei, George J. Sefa, Irma Marcia James, Leeno Luke Karumanchery, Sonia James-Wilson, and Jasmin Zine. 2000. *Removing the Margins: The Challenges and Possibilities of Inclusive Schooling*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

Dimitrov, Nanda. 2009. *Western Guide to Mentoring Graduate Students across Cultures.* Available at https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=tsc-purple-guides.

Dimitrov, Nanda, and Aisha Haque. 2017. "Intercultural Teaching Competence in the Disciplines: Teaching Strategies for Intercultural Learning," in *Promoting Intercultural Communication Competencies in Higher Education*, 89–118. Hershey, Pa.: IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-1732-0.ch004

Dotson, Kristie. 2011. "Concrete Flowers: Contemplating the Profession of Philosophy," *Hypatia* 26(2): 403–09. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2011.01176.x

Dweck, Carol S. 2006. *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Random House Incorporated.

Ferlazzo, Larry. 2012. "Response: Classroom Strategies to Foster a Growth Mindset," October 15. http://blogs.edweek.org/teachers/classroom_qa_with_larry_ferlazzo/2012/10/response_classroom_strategies_to_foster_a_growth_mindset.html.

Fink, L. Dee. 2013. *Creating Significant Learning Experiences: An Integrated Approach to Designing College Courses*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Foot, Rachel, Alicia Crowe, Karen Andrus Tollafield, and Chad Everett Allan. 2014. "Exploring Doctoral Student Identity Development Using a Self-Study Approach," *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* 2(1): 103–18. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.2.1.103

Freire, Paulo. 1972. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

Goldman, Michael. 2005. Review of *Teaching Philosophy: Theoretical Reflections and Practical Suggestions*, *Teaching Philosophy* 28(3): 277–79. https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil200528333

Graff, Gerald. 2002. "The Problem Problem and Other Oddities of Academic Discourse," *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 1(1): 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022202001001003

Green, Paul. 2015. "How to Motivate Students: A Primer for Learner-Centered Teachers," *American Association of Philosophy Teachers Studies in Pedagogy* 1: 47–60. https://doi.org/10.5840/aaptstudies20159184

Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella, Yolanda Flores Niemann, Carmen G. González, and Angela P. Harris, eds. 2012. *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt4cgr3k

Healey, Mick, Abbi Flint, and Kathy Harrington. 2016. "Students as Partners: Reflections on a Conceptual Model," followed by Student Response by Lianne van Dam, *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* 4(2): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.4.2.3

Heldke, Lisa. 2004. "A Du Boisian Proposal for Persistently White Colleges," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 18(3): 224–38. https://doi.org/10.1353/jsp.2004.0022

James, Aaron. 2012. *Assholes: A Theory*. New York: Doubleday.

Manor, Christopher, Stephen Bloch-Schulman, Kelly Flannery, and Peter Felten. 2010. "Foundations of Student-Faculty Partnerships in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning," in *Engaging Students Voices in the Study of Teaching and Learning*, ed. C. Werder and M. M. Otis, 3–15. Sterling, Va.: Stylus.

Morehead, James. 2012. "Stanford University's Carol Dweck on the Growth Mindset and Education," June 19. https://onedublin.org/2012/06/19/stanford-universitys-carol-dweck-on-the-growth-mindset-and-education/. https://doi.org/10.1037/e524952015-005

Morton, Jennifer M. 2014. "Cultural Code-Switching: Straddling the Achievement Gap," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 22(3): 259–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopp.12019

Muller, Cathleen. 2017. "Journaling and Pre-Theoretical Discussion as Inclusive Pedagogy," *American Association of Philosophy Teachers Studies in Pedagogy* 3: 72–86. https://doi.org/10.5840/aaptstudies2017111729

Mulnix, Jennifer Wilson, and Alida Liberman. 2017. "Philosophers Folding Origami: Illustrating Essential Strategies for Learner-Centered Teaching," *Teaching Philosophy* 40(4): 437–62. https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil201812579

Norlock, Kathryn J. 2016. "Grading (Anxious and Silent) Participation: Assessing Student Attendance and Engagement with Short Papers on a 'Question For Consideration,'" *Teaching Philosophy* 39(4): 483–505. https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil201612259

Paige, R. M., and M. L. Goode. 2009. "Intercultural Competence in International Education Administration: Cultural Mentoring; International Education Professionals and the Development of Intercultural Competence," in *SAGE Encyclopedia of Intercultural Competence*, 333–49. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483346267.n177

Paxton, Molly, Carrie Figdor, and Valerie Tiberius. 2012. "Quantifying the Gender Gap: An Empirical Study of the Underrepresentation of Women in Philosophy," *Hypatia* 27(4): 949–57. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2012.01306.x

Pintrich, Paul R. 2003. "A Motivational Science Perspective on the Role of Student Motivation in Learning and Teaching Contexts," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 95(4): 667–86. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.667

Preston, Jane P., and Anhui Wang. 2017. "The Academic and Personal Experiences of Mainland Chinese Students Enrolled in a Canadian Master of Education Program," *International Journal of Comparative Education and Development* 19(4): 177–92. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijced-05-2017-0006

Saunders, Shari, and Diana Kardia. 2009. *Creating Inclusive College Classrooms*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Center for Research on Learning and Teaching. Retrieved October 12, 2009.

Schroer, Jeanine Weekes. 2007. "Fighting Imperviousness with Vulnerability: Teaching in a Climate of Conservatism," *Teaching Philosophy* 30(2): 185–200. https://doi.org/10.5840/teachphil200730225

Shabani, Karim. 2010. "Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development: Instructional Implications and Teachers' Professional Development," *English Language Teaching* 3(4): 237–48. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p237

Stephens, Nicole M., Hazel Rose Markus, and L. Taylor Phillips. 2013. "Social Class Culture Cycles: How Three Gateway Contexts Shape Selves and Fuel Inequality," *Annual Review of Psychology* 65: 611–34. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115143

Thompson, Morgan, Toni Adleberg, Sam Sims, and Eddy Nahmias. 2016. "Why Do Women Leave Philosophy? Surveying Students at the Introductory Level," *Philosophers' Imprint* 16(6): 1–36.

Vaccaro, Annemarie, and Melissa J. Camba-Kelsay. *Centering Women of Color in Academic Counterspaces: A Critical Race Analysis of Teaching, Learning, and Classroom Dynamics*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016.

Whetten, D. A. 2007. "Principles of Effective Course Design: What I Wish I Had Known about Learning-Centered Teaching 30 Years Ago," *Journal of Management Education* 31(3): 339–57. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562906298445

Winkelmes, M. A. 2013. "Transparency in Teaching: Faculty Share Data and Improve Students' Learning," *Liberal Education* 99(2). Available at https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/transparency-teaching-faculty-share-data-and-improve-students.

Wright, Jessey. 2015. "Course Participation: Defining and Evaluating Student Participation," *American Association of Philosophy Teachers Studies in Pedagogy* 1: 219–32. https://doi.org/10.5840/aaptstudies201510115

Yeager, David S., Dave Paunesku, Gregory M. Walton, and Carol S. Dweck. 2013. "How Can We Instill Productive Mindsets at Scale? A Review of the Evidence and an Initial R&D Agenda," White Paper prepared for the White House meeting on Excellence in Education: The Importance of Academic Mindsets, available at http://homepage.psy.utexas.edu/HomePage/Group/YeagerLAB/ADRG/Pdfs/YeageretalR&Dagenda-6-10-13.pdf.2013.

Yeager, David Scott, and Carol S. Dweck. 2012. "Mindsets that Promote Resilience: When Students Believe that Personal Characteristics Can Be Developed," *Educational Psychologist* 47(4): 302–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2012.722805

Yeo, Michelle, Karen Manarin, and Janice Miller-Young. 2018. "Phenomenology of Surprise in a SoTL Scholars' Program," *Teaching and Learning Inquiry* 6(2): 16–28. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.6.2.3

Young, Iris Marion. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Zemits, Birut Irena. 2017. "Representing Knowledge: Assessment of Creativity in Humanities," *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education* 16(2): 173–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022215601862

Melissa Jacquart is a postdoctoral fellow in the Philosophy Department at the University of Cincinnati, and UC Center for Public Engagement with Science. Her main research interests are in philosophy of science, philosophy of astrophysics, and philosophy education. melissajacquart@gmail.com.

Rebecca Scott is an assistant professor of philosophy at Harper College in Palatine, Illinois. Her research interests involve bringing philosophical concepts and methods to the scholarship of teaching and learning. rscott1@harpercollege.edu.

Kevin Hermberg is a professor of philosophy and Chair of the General Education Curriculum at Dominican College and co-editor in chief of AAPT Studies in Pedagogy. *His research interests include the scholarship of teaching and learning, phenomenology, and the intersections of philosophical traditions. kevin.hermberg@dc.edu.*

Stephen Bloch-Schulman is associate professor and chair of philosophy at Elon University. He works at the intersection of political philosophy and the scholarship of teaching and learning and was the inaugural (2017) winner of the Prize for Excellence in Philosophy Teaching, awarded by the American Philosophical Association, the American Association of Philosophy Teachers, and the Teaching Philosophy Association. sschulman@elon.edu.