

Critical Commentary

DECOLONIZING THE UNIVERSITY: THE CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

GEORGE J. SEFA DEI
OISE, University of Toronto

Biographical Note

George Sefa Dei is Professor at the Department of Social Justice Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. He is currently the Director of the Centre for Integrated Anti-racism Studies at OISE/UT. Professor Dei's teaching and research interests are in the areas of anti-racism, minority schooling, international development and anti-colonial thought. He is the author, co-author, and editor of several books on anti-racism and education, including *Anti-Racism Education: Theory and Practice*, *Hardships and Survival in Rural West Africa*, *Reconstructing 'Drop-Out': A Critical Ethnography of the Dynamics of Black Students' Disengagement from School and Indigenous Knowledge in Global Contexts*. He may be reached at george.dei@utoronto.ca.

Abstract

This article argues for a reframing of the curriculum within the academy in order to make the academy more inclusive and more accessible to a diverse student body. Reframing the curriculum is seen as an aspect of decolonizing the university. Many questions emerge from this argument to include the following: What curriculum informs the education contemporary learners receive and how do they apply this to their academic and work lives? How do educators re-fashion their work as educators and also as learners to create more relevant understandings of what it means to be human and to determine what is human work? What are the limits and possibilities of visions of and counter and anti-visions to contemporary education? How do educators and learners challenge colonizing and imperializing relations within the academy and that influence the academy and its learners? How does curriculum become inclusive through teaching, research and graduate training and how does it make space for Indigeneity and multi-centric ways of knowing? How do we frame an inclusive, anti-racist, and anti-colonial global future and what is the work that is required to collectively arrive at that future? These complex questions, stimulated by my decolonizing curriculum work and experience, are engaged through the body of this article.

Keywords

Inclusivity, indigeneity, multicentricity, schooling, education

Acknowledgement

This paper was first developed as an Invited Address, to Academic Colleagues at the Council of Ontario Universities (89 Chestnut Street, Dundas & University, Toronto, Ontario on May 24, 2012). It was also presented at the end-of-year Department meeting of Faculty and Staff, General Arts and Science, George Brown College, Toronto, Ontario, May 24, 2012. Furthermore, the notes served as the basis of a Keynote Address, at the 2012 Diversity and Equity Office Conference on: *“Teaching for Equity and Social Justice”*, Wilfrid Laurier University, Kitchener/Waterloo, Ontario May 25, 2012. I want to thank the various audiences for their inputs, comments and critical observations. I am also extremely grateful to Drs. Arlo Kempf, Philip Howard, Meredith Lordan, Marlon Simmons, and Jagjeet Kaur Gill; as well as Min Kaur, Rick Sin, and Mairi McDermott of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto for their inputs in shaping my thoughts for this paper. Finally, thanks to Yumiko Kawano and Jacqui Jesso of the Department of Humanities, Social Sciences and Social Justice Education of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto for reading through a final version of the paper. I thank the anonymous reviewers of the Journal for their comments as well.

Overview

This article argues for decolonizing the university in order to make the academy more inclusive and more accessible to a diverse student body. Many questions emerge from this argument to include the following: What curriculum informs the education contemporary learners receive and how do they apply this to their academic and work lives? How do educators re-fashion their work as educators and also as learners to create more relevant understandings of what it means to be human and to determine what is human work? What are the limits and possibilities of visions of and counter and anti-visions to contemporary education? How do educators and learners challenge colonizing and imperializing relations within the academy and that influence the academy and its learners? How does curriculum become inclusive through teaching, research and graduate training and how does it make space for Indigeneity and multi-centric ways of knowing? How do we frame an inclusive, anti-racist, and anti-colonial global future and what is the work that is required to collectively arrive at that future? These complex questions, stimulated by my reframing curriculum work and experience, are engaged through the body of this article.

Seven sections make up this paper. In the first section, the Introduction, I establish my location in relation to this paper’s argument and the colonial context out of

which the academy and this argument emerge. This is followed by a discussion of what it means to decolonize the university in section two and is based on my experience as leader and learner in this field. The case for an inclusive decolonizing curriculum follows in the next section and rests on its capacity to destabilize the power arrangements that embed and limit the academy and its local and global transformative capacity. The concepts of inclusion, curriculum, and decolonization permeate this paper from beginning to end and are explained fully in section four. Section five theorizes a decolonizing and an inclusive education within, but not limited to, the academy. Practical considerations follow in section six and are of critical importance to the mobilizing decolonizing intention of this paper. These considerations emphasize specific and concrete practices and processes that enhance the decolonizing and inclusive curriculum's traction within the academy and eventually beyond the academy. The last and final section, Discussion, brings together salient elements of the prior sections; foregrounds colonial education's easy submission to and reinforcement of neoliberal market forces; and identifies ways to enhance the capture of an "inclusive and decolonial curriculum agenda" through programming and training within the academy. I end with an acknowledgement of the deep importance of establishing, maintaining, and strengthening a decolonizing and inclusive curriculum within the academy as essential and urgent social justice work. This work extends beyond the boundaries of the academy to condition multiple scales of transformation. Because of this, decolonizing and inclusive curricula cause much energetic contestation and are often actively and (un)consciously undermined. In such cases a "politic of rage" is required to ensure its survival and the mobilization of transformative human potential that, not limited to humans, extends to and through the land to impact the natural world. This is the challenge that I consider myself part of, and it is the challenge I invite us all to engage more critically, more transparently, and with more Indigeneity.

I. Introduction

Let me begin by recognizing our Ancestors and our past and present Elders as I pay homage to the Indigenous Turtle Island where I currently reside and Ghana my home. I share with the Indigenous Peoples of Turtle Island, known to many as North America, a past and a present of land dispossession, genocide and colonization by outsiders whom we graciously welcomed. And I share with Indigenous Peoples of Turtle Island and throughout the world an understanding of land as a site and a source of teachings and of spiritual regeneration. When the land is engaged through its teachings and its spirit by every soul it offers up healing paths that allow us to wrestle collectively and holistically (earth-centrally and multi-centrally) with the challenges of contemporary life and to unburden those deeply inscribed by the unfreedoms that have

for too long been denied, ignored, submerged, repressed, compressed, thwarted, re-written, and forgotten to profit the colonial. My project through this article, both academic and political, and beneath these spiritual, is one of decolonization broadly and reframing the curricula more specifically. To effect this project I invite the reader to join me in a purposefully and a necessarily provocative conversation, one that began long before this article among our Ancestors and our Elders and one that must continue in order to expose the concealed and embedded processes and practices of colonization that persist this day in the institution of school. Both the broader global project and the specific focused school curricula project of reframing that I endorse demand a courageous confrontation with colonization; it must be named clearly, called by this name and faced directly; it must be mined thoroughly to expose its cumulative scaffolding and its long penetrating roots; and we must mobilize collectively and indigenously as we do so to effect a transformative momentum. I provide an entry point into this process of mobilization by employing several African proverbs that catalyze the indigenizing trajectory that underwrites my scholarship generally and this article specifically. African proverbs are shared as wise sayings that have deeply conceptual meanings as well as simple and literal meanings. At these two interdependent and coincident meaning levels African proverbs can be experienced within communities as enhancing and altering knowledge through their cryptic capacity to: expand and collapse meaning; facilitate embodiment of that which is important, contentious, abstract, or requires synthesis and integration; and empower the educator/provider and the learner/receiver through the provision of a structure that seeds resolution or determines direction for a problem, an issue, or an experience. In this way proverbs like this article are political/relational and academic/confrontational and so serve my purposes well. I however limit my analysis of and engagement with these proverbs solely to the extent that they advise the school curricula decolonization project.

The first proverb I bring forward is from the Akan people of Ghana. The Akan people say that “*if you want to know how heavy a bag of salt is ask the one carrying it*” [*Wo pese awuhu nkyene mu duro a bisa dea eso nno*]. From this we are directed to ask the bearer of knowledge as knower of this knowledge, its contents and its spirit for information. The Akan people suggest through this proverb that knowledge cannot be acquired through observation or through the fragmentation of measurement. Knowledge comes from and can only be voiced by one, the one who bears the felt and lived experience of this knowledge, the bag of salt, and therefrom knows. This proverb challenges and confronts the historical and contemporary assertion of dominance in relation to their right to know, to show, and to tell that which they have not experienced, do not or have not embodied or sensory-somatically engaged. Through this process dominance assumes the role of expert; assigns itself primary and global discursive authority; ascribes value to appropriated knowledge; and easily dispenses with the emptied knower. This, the Akan proverb argues, and many Indigenous people would

argue is not knowledge. We have come however to understand this method of knowledge appropriation as the formulaic assertion of power that characterizes dominance and its colonial work. We are invited through this proverb to critique knowledge; the knower; and how one has come to assert, contest, capture and purportedly to embody knowing. This proverb also gestures a return to the human who bears knowledge and its knowing while simultaneously acknowledging and legitimizing the bearer as knower. This return is what Indigenous, inclusive, and decolonizing education desire and rely on also. In this article I ask that we find ways to unveil the colonial and its distortions, fragmentation, and uneven usurpation and disavowal of knowledge through and in colonial curricula. I envision this happening by including knowers, their ways of knowing, their knowledges, and their voices in curricular content, its design, and the processes of its transmission, discernment, contest, and embodiment. The Igbo People of Nigeria argue through two proverbs that when particular things are taken back this taking back or return cannot be concealed they make too much noise: *“stealing a drum is very easy but where to play it is the challenge”* [Izuru igba di mfe ma ebee ka a ga-anọ kuọ ya]; and *“crabs legs cannot be stolen and eaten in secret”* [“anaghi ata okpa nsiko n’ulu”]. I bring these proverbs forward as teachings and as warnings for those involved in decolonizing work. Decolonizing work requires critique both from within and without and it is work that must not be hidden. The proverbs suggest that when we think we are decolonizing we may not be at all, the drum must be played and the crab legs consumed openly for the full decolonizing turn. Decolonizing works and projects cannot be hidden and I would say that we should feel proud when we challenge the status quo around issues of social justice, fairness and equity. I say this because I view our capacities to contest, communicate, and establish reference points and trajectories for the ideals of social justice, fairness, and equity; and our capacity to materially express these ideals make us human and are what restore Indigeneity. Our humanness is founded on these capacities in relation to these ideals which I suggest flow from and reinforce a caring ethic.

By “reframing curriculum”, I mean a way to think through and pursue the school curriculum primarily as a decolonizing project. I am fully aware of the contested meanings of ‘decolonization’ and how the term can be problematic, especially in the North American context, when it is liberalized as not to address key issues of Land, Indigeneity and settler colonialism (see Tuck and Yang, 2012 - when they write about “decolonizing is not a metaphor”!). There are many paths to decolonization. Thus, I am also different readings and interpretations to decolonization in search of an international appeal. Today “decolonization” is mainstreamed and when a decolonial practice is mainstreamed it is no longer decolonial. As critical anti-racist and colonial scholars cannot give up on the term to liberal articulations. We must be asking new questions. The importance of grounding scholarship in Indigenous perspectives and the epistemic traditions of knowledge of colonized/oppressed/Indigenous peoples. The land constitutes a basis of onto-epistemological existence and pursuing strategies of resistance and anti-colonial

politics. Colonialism did its dirty job over/on Indigenous peoples Lands. Indigeneity and, particularly the question of Land, is significant unifier of the colonial encounter and experience among Indigenous and colonized peoples. Yet, we must bring multiple readings of the relations to Land so as to trouble/complicate ontological claims to the primacy of the Lands as starting point for all decolonial/anti-colonial engagements (see Dei, 2016). For example, while Land is sacred, revered and has a sanctity that is shared by all Indigenous peoples, it is also important to understand Land as a site of violence, pain and suffering. To this end decolonization as a knowledge consciousness about identity, sense of place, location, the ways we produce and legitimize knowledge and social existence, as well the climates, environments and social organizational aspects of education as broadly defined is significant to my project of “decolonizing the academy”. Within global educational systems one of the major problems we are dealing with is the subjectification and delegitimation of particular bodies, experiences, histories and local cultural resource knowledge base as constitutive significant aspects of education practice.

Similarly, there exists a corpus of work on “inclusive education” from the social justice perspective that highlights significant theoretical, philosophical, conceptual and practical questions about inclusive education (see Ainscow and Dyson, 2006; Ainscow and Miles, 2008; Ainscow and Sandhill, 2010; Armstrong , Armstrong, and Spandagou, 2010; Peters 2005; Peters and Oliver, 2009; Slee 2001; 2011; Slee and Allan, 2005). I am taking inclusion as “radical inclusion”, i.e., beginning or creating anew realizing the limits of integrating into what already exists when ‘that which already exists’ (i.e., the current school/education system) is the source of the problem in the first place! Appreciating, sharing and validating values, histories, experiences, knowledges and experiences are relevant; yet these are still not enough. What we need is a fundamental structural change for a deeply flawed system notwithstanding educators and administrators “good intentions”. Hence, the question of how much of inclusive education is about teaching Indigeneity and resistance and rewarding [rather than punishing] resistance on the part of young learners is important to me.

Consequently, a discussion of “decolonizing the academy” through a reframed school curriculum is about subversion, putting a critical gaze on structures and processes of educational delivery (structures for teaching, learning, and administration of education) that continually create and reproduce sites of marginality and colonizing education for learners. It is also about how we see race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality, class, religion, language and disability as important identities that learners bring to school; and also, as significant social categories and relations of power and domination. Decolonizing the academy through a reframed curriculum helps me bring to the fore as well, spiritual, emotional and socio-environmental dimensions of schooling and education.

Decolonizing/ation is to my mind radical politics and this work must always be visible; it must be always be part of academic discourse; it must infuse academic projects

and systems of governance; and must be popularly disseminated to move it from places of fringe or *undercover scholarship* to its true, transparent, and multiple centers. This transparency however puts decolonizing scholarship and communities at risk. I have witnessed and have experienced some of these risks through time as have so many others going back to our Ancestors and our Elders. I acknowledge this because the colonial is still present and it will not allow itself to be pushed over or out without contest. Risk is inherent in all decolonizing and all transformative processes and we must not let this stop the advancement of our work. The consequences of not risking and not engaging are destructive, not only for those persons, communities, collectivities and nations who carry the unfreedoms and non-freedoms of the colonizing project but also for the land and natural world who suffer colonial unfreedoms and non-freedoms also. Subversive work that is truly decolonizing is also about radical inclusion. This work will allow us to collectively and multi-centrally mobilize to indigenize our relationships to each other, the natural world, and the land and facilitate indigenizing processes within the academy, through its curricula, and will transform our shared world. We must face the risks and consequences of engaging in this work transparently; of hidden engagement in this work; and of not engaging in this work. Each path has risks and each has consequences. The consequences of not centering this work and addressing the issues of social justice and inclusion within the academy will see the progressive and global emptying not only of knowledge but of bodies, of diversity, of creativity, of potential and kinetic energy, and of life. Transformation can only be realized when there is a space and place for the natural world, the land and for bodies that hold and carry knowledge to engage their right to know, to show, and to tell their knowing their way transparently and without negative repercussion or obliterating neutrality.

Colonizing /colonial/ imperial knowledge has long been with us. Ever since the colonization of time, knowledge production has been eurocentrically imbued and hegemonically installed within the structure, the hallways and the consciousness of academia. Decolonizing work must point to the varied aspects of the “crisis of knowledge” some of which include: the acceleration and reach of colonizing knowledge with globalization; the colonial mining of knowledge within Indigenous communities and within Indigenous bodies that decontextualize and disembodiment knowing and view the knowers as disposable or objects to be emptied; the colonial tendency to measure, name and claim as their own; and the colonial tendency to evaluate and hierarchically stratify knowledge based on parameters that it has designed and to which it subscribes. As a scholar of African descent and as I continue to trouble my own work in the academy I must constantly ask myself, again and again, how do we come into theory and practice as embodied through our African human-hood?

For educators and learners we must ask questions about radicalizing education to begin our inquiry. I present a list of questions to begin the process of unlocking the analysis of contemporary colonizing education and to invite a decolonizing education.

These questions will not be answered specifically but provide multiple trajectories for inquiry through problematizing contemporary education and the desired decolonizing education. These questions follow below and although do not exhaust the possibilities for inquiry provides us with a good beginning:

1. How do we frame an inclusive anti-racist and anti-colonial global future and what is the nature of the work required to collectively arrive at that future?
2. What education are learners of today going to receive and what are they going to do with it? The era of neo-liberalism and global capitalist modernity has not only implicated us in terms of how we think of our identities and subjectivities, but fundamentally, what collective meanings we produce and bring to the sense and purpose of education;
3. How do we “refashion” our work as a teaching faculty to create more relevant understandings of what it means to be human? And how do we work with the knowing and cultivate and instill the knowing that “something different is possible”.
4. What sort of education should be taking place in the academy today?
5. How do we equip today’s learners now, using multiple lenses of critical inquiry of knowledge? What I am gesturing to here is that fact that no one tells the full/complete story, so how do we tell multiple stories to get the whole story? How do learners of today read and understand our worlds in different ways, and further to this share such multiple knowings as a “community of learners”?
6. How do we challenge colonizing and imperializing relations of the academy? If we are to be critical scholars, then we must challenge our investments in colonial intellectuality and understand the relations of “politics to territoriality” (see Abraham 2011) as far more complex than simply who owns and claims to be entitled to certain spaces. It also involves the particular subject and intellectual praxis and politics that the “coming into a given space/land” requires us to uphold.
7. How do we engage “theory with a practice to boot”? That is ensuring that the theories we work with in the academy truly have “legs” and a “grounding” in local peoples’ experiences;
8. How do we bring “humility of knowing” to our work? And how do we acknowledge and disrupt the power of “not to know” and replace the fears of reprisal of “to know” in the academy.

II. “Reframing the Curriculum”: A Theory of Change

Reframing the curriculum calls for a critical reconsideration of the history of the academy/University itself. The academy is a site of uneven access, exclusion, one that sheds bodies and knowledges, and through spatial arrangements and absences limits the reach of alternative knowledges to colonial knowledges. It may be argued that “university curriculum” is really in the hands of the individual professors and deans. If that is so then how do we suggest changes that do not impinge upon the “academic freedom” that professors and researchers’ value and “keep the university marketable”? Can we rethink this question by calling for academic responsibility and the need to make education more relevant to the diverse communities our institutions they serve? The main issue is what bodies, histories and philosophies are conjured in our academies when our disciplines are named in the current conventional way? What bodies (students) are in the classroom and who is teaching, and who is the teacher ultimately speaking to and what and who is being represented in the text, what theoretical framework are taken up, how and in what ways are lived experiences spoken about? Also, there are questions about what constitutes an academic text, what is the form of this text and who is given authority of voice, what courses are offered, and what is the purpose of curriculum – is it to meet market needs or is it to promote genuine learning?

In effect, there are fundamental questions around the silences and negations that routinely occur in many courses and departments. A reframed curriculum would mean addressing race, gender, class, sexuality, and disability in all disciplinary areas and within all faculties. We must challenge the troubling trends, especially during difficult economic times, of taking very liberal approaches to difference, which undermine race particularly, and progressively streamline out or siphon the academy of critical thought. Said another way the tendency is to eliminate that which is on the edge and not centered, that which troubles the status quo and the bodies it serves and that would include the study of inequality in anti-racist, anti-colonial, feminist, disability, and disability programs as well as others. To the liberal emptying I ask how we can develop new approaches to inclusion when for example departmental posters mention innumerable social issues but exclude race and class. The focus of Faculties of Education in Canada is now on teacher education in specific subject areas (such as math and language), and less on the broader sociology and equity themes that undergird education! Issues of equity and race are often discussed in a limited way or over the course of one week; they are never truly integrated in the curriculum in way that forces teacher candidates to think about race and to incorporate equity issues in their own practices in a meaningful way. In this way decolonizing work becomes arrested by the reduction of sociology and equity issues to a topic, a lesson, a special issue, and this work (decolonizing, critical, inclusive) consequently operates non-performatively (Ahmed).

To move forward and to mobilize a radical curricula there needs to be some attention paid to the centrality of the issues of race, gender, and class in all scholarly disciplines, and we need to consider how budget considerations force faculty and departments to consider how they address issues of race, equity, and diversity and whether they in fact do this at all. When departmental re-organization occurs there is also the risk of further diminishment and fragmentation. This has significant implications for recruiting faculty who may be interested in critical race studies for example and the support and collaboration of critically informed and engaged faculty.

Paying attention to the scope of topics covered in courses in a department or faculty so that a well-rounded, critical education is at least possible for those who choose to pursue it is very important to the spirit of decolonizing schools and decolonization globally.

Universities also have a responsibility to address public education system gaps and to develop courses that expose new students to critical equity thinking and knowledge of racism and its various forms and practices. As an example black face and racist graffiti need to be understood as racism and when practiced there must be severe consequences. My experience in this regard however has been that black face and racist graffiti have minor consequences which is itself a teaching or pedagogical, this is part of the broader curriculum that I will discuss in the next section. These events must be critically analyzed for what they teach, for whom, at whose expense and why. In the case of the graffiti it is both text and pedagogy, and the tokenistic disciplinary response is as well and they communicate the ongoing presence of racist violence and racist work. There also needs to be support for scholars who are doing critical race and equity work, who often are subject to negative student evaluations, which in turn, consequently affects their tenure applications. Critical race and anti-racist courses are very confrontational to students of the dominant culture. And these students do not always appreciate being unsettled by the deeper workings of societies and nations and globalizations. Such courses challenge their sense of the everyday and this generates multiple tensions that are directed at their educator, the critical race scholar.

III. Making the Case for an Inclusive and Reframed Curriculum

History and Eurocentric science have always been tools of colonization. Science has been colonizing by its omission of certain bodies of knowledge and by its celebration of certain bodies and knowledges. A critic might ask how “reframing” curriculum and education impacts the natural sciences. I would argue that it is precisely the so-called natural and physical sciences that are at greatest risk for landing on the colonial runway and sliding quickly into reductivity, arrogance, and exclusivity. Indeed, this is a familiar path for science, natural or otherwise. The truth is that all subjects and their curricula –

whether physical, biological or medical to name a few – have histories of developing, interpreting, applying, testing, and collecting knowledge in oppressive, if not genocidal ways. What come to mind in this regard are, but certainly not only, the following uses of science and its knowledge: the Tuskegee experiments; the development and deployment of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; eugenics; lobotomy and bloodletting practices of psychiatry; and craniometry. It is difficult to simply claim that applications such as these were objective knowledge used in objectionable ways. At the time, all would have said they were simply involved in pure and objective science and indeed all have and this rationalization persists through multiple scales that span the classroom, the court room, policy development and its absence, and global responses to deprivation, violence, and transnational practice as a starting point. I raise this because there needs to be a serious acknowledgement of these histories with a view to understanding the politicized nature of all knowledge, and how it is mobilized in the interest of power and hegemony. And I raise this too so that I might underline the ethic of a reframing curriculum as one that is inclusive and does not harm and engages in critical analysis of what science is asking and for what purposes and for whom. Since we have not solved the problems of social power imbalances, we need to acknowledge how vulnerable we all are to misuse science in the interest of power. These discussions need to be had in conjunction with “learning the facts” that science provides and continuously engaging them in a critical analysis and comparative analysis with the facts that non-western science offer. Any other approach is irresponsible to say the least and violent, to be more frank. Other approaches that are not critical and not inclusive and allow power to mobilize science selectively ethically are evidence of colonial work which science has through time been willing to serve.

I know there are ethics courses – particularly in medicine, but even these tend not to (as far as I know) take a critical equity stance that takes up issues of race, gender, class, and such issues seriously. It seems that medical ethics for instance has walked through the sociological reality to land with hands on the human body and to engage in ethical analysis from this vantage point and without engaging in a full analysis of race or class or gender although perhaps attending to apparent vulnerabilities without necessarily organizing these vulnerabilities sociologically or from a critical equity perspective. Attention is being paid to the social determinants of health which do bring the issues I mentioned to the foreground although the response is not to change the burden of these social determinants it is to have them inform and guide the intervention. In essence situations such as these add something to their science that may or may not change their approach and does not always address these issues in a way that changes the health care system to one that is more inclusive. In fact racism, for example, precludes and interferes with care and with health.

Contemporary education then must deal with the “coloniality of Eurocentric science”, “knowledge” and “history” and this Coloniality determines what it is that

science must know and the knowledge that science must disseminate through courses, books, research, curricula and what it celebrates knowing. This colonial germination selects for and excludes certain types of knowledge, engages in a downstream analysis of science and its applications, and misses, ignores, and denies the colonial as source or generator of the variables that condition the knowledge of science. In this way colonially germinated and informed science is severely constricted and is unable to tolerate the tension of multi-centric knowledges and approaches to science and limits itself to a single interpretation that is viewed as superior and as the only valid and reliable knowledge. How then do we come to know multiple perspectives of science and knowledge that provide new analysis of phenomenon and therefrom new responses to phenomenon? Also dominant conceptualization of Eurocentric “science” must be thoroughly questioned since Indigenous science knowledge has its own ontological, conceptual, philosophical, methodological, and axiological groundings (Asabere-Ameyaw, Dei & Raheem, 2012). There are other robust theories and philosophical perspectives that inform Indigenous Science knowledge that are as rigorous as Eurocentric science. It is delusional to view one’s reality as the only reality worth talking about and one’s tools for assessing this reality as the only tools available for understanding this reality. These delusions are the most dangerous of all delusions and these delusions allow colonial striving to ensue unabated taking hostage a substantive portion of the world’s peoples, the world’s land, and their knowledges. Colonial harms have and continue to be rationalized through this system of delusion through the knowledge of colonial science.

Our students must be informed about the complete genesis of ideas, events, occurrences, and developments that have shaped and continue to shape human history and development. This challenge in part calls for responding to the question of representation as bodies, as well as knowledges, through our curriculum and classroom pedagogies. That is, engaging multiple voices, bodies, knowledges, and experiences through a representation of who teachers are, what is taught, why, and how? We engage philosophies of circularity, knowledges of multi-centricity, as a way of coming to know holistically. It may also imply engaging the connectedness of body, mind, soul and spirit and other; and the nexus of nature, culture, and society to know more wholly.

We must be “teaching to transform” (hooks, 1994) – that is, to be self-reflective in our teachings and to ensure our teaching leads to structural transformation. We must use expansive pedagogies – i.e., expanding our pedagogical frameworks for teaching, including our curricula and texts. As educators it is imperative that we acknowledge and work with our vulnerabilities through critical inquiry and regarding critical inquiry to both prepare and strengthen our capacity to “enter the unfamiliar territory” that such inquiry opens up and to endure the risks of this entry. The risks of entry include dissonance, discomfort, disorganization and disturbance generally or broadly and although desirable for the transformative learning that bell hooks speaks of, transformative learning is not always desired and in such cases these embodied

disturbances of consciousness are not welcome and will be resisted. This is particularly the case in the departmental restructuring and collapsing that is occurring. Those departments that stir “trouble” tend to be threatened at various scales in subtle and overt ways. So the crucial question then becomes how do we bring teaching and learning into a “full circle for everyone involved” (Simpson, 2006, p. 196). And how do we establish this circle within the academy and eventually globally? I suggest that we use texts and other curricular and instructional materials to assist learners to engage from positions of power, resistance, and agency. For educators in particular, it is crucially important to acknowledge there are multiple literacies and multiple ways of coming to know and of “reading” information. As educators we must bring an embodied connection to our teaching, research, and scholarship. In other words, we must connect the relationship between the “body”, as self, identity and the subject, and “embodiment” as a constitutive set of relations that structure, feelings and values. Embodied connection is also about ethics, consciousness, and responsibility.

IV. Key Concepts for Decolonization

a) The Curriculum

The curriculum can be understood as broadly encompassing the hidden and tacit elements of the academy. Curriculum is about everything in the school system that is felt and directs both the body, mind, strivings, aspirations and desire. These include such subtle pedagogies regarding: the implicit and explicit order of society; what is valued and how these values must be expressed; what paths are available for different strata of society; what actions are worthy of denial, recognition, humor, discipline and eviction and who and what is desired and how is this desire pursued; a path to follow, a course of action to take, etc. (Apple, 2004; Giroux, Penna & Pinar, 1981). Curriculum includes the official written rules and regulations of the school, as well as the hidden norms and unwritten codes and stipulations that capture and release bodies differently. I have used the term “Deep Curriculum” elsewhere to denote the intricate relations of culture, climate, environment, and the social organizational lives of schools, including the texts, instruction and pedagogies which crystalize into the form of the taught curriculum (Dei, et al., 1997). The curriculum, “Deep” and taught, is power-saturated and it is deeply social in its ordering and evaluating and severe in its discipline when this order and evaluation are not conformed to. To speak of curriculum in any meaningful way or from a critical equity frame we must ask: who has the power to construct, validate and legitimize knowledge, and what is acceptable and what is not and does what is acceptable change with the body that is performing the acceptable or the not acceptable? Curriculum then is about values, ideas, practices, as well as identities, race, class, gender, sexuality, disability

and more; and these values and identities are linked and placed through the curricular processes of instruction to produce and induct knowledge that vascularizes the colonial. Curriculum and instruction go hand in hand given that a curriculum only achieves its effect through its instruction to learners. In fact, curriculum and instruction can be said to be interlocking and to interdepend to give learning the desired inflection. Neither can generate the inflection fully in isolation and each requires the other for the final inflection and final measure to determine how important what is being learned truly is. One cannot function in isolation of the other. This acknowledgment also speaks to the power saturated issues around selection and engagement of texts, the content and forms of these texts, what mode of instruction and pedagogies are used to convey or dismiss meanings of texts, and how experiences of students and teachers become central to knowledge production.

b) Notion of Inclusion

Notwithstanding the insistence on inclusion as about beginning anew, we must still engage multiple readings of the term. A critical view of “inclusion” highlights questions of power and social difference and addresses questions of difference, diversity and power as defined through the lens of race, ethnicity, class, gender, disability, sexuality, religion, language and Indigeneity. The meaning of inclusion can be so liberalized as to imply merely adding to what already exists and in fact strengthening what exists through this process. However, a more subversive take on inclusion is about beginning “anew” and to engage this through creating new tools, spaces/places with a new vision. Inclusion is not bringing people into what already exists; it is making a new space, a better space for everyone. Such space is about structures and instructional processes and places. As educators and policy makers we must ponder over a question: How we can hope to address an existing problem by simply adding to what already exists when what already exists is the source of the problem to begin with? Inclusion works with an understanding of multiplicity of views, ideas, knowledge and practice. For example “success” in the academy is very different from “success” within a critically inclusive academy. Critical inclusion demands that we redefine success more broadly. That is, moving away from a model of education which reserves attention and praise solely for those who fit narrow definitions of success, for example the best and brightest, toward an accessible framework for student achievement which recognizes not only barriers to success for many, but also multiple paths to success for all and multiple endpoints and time frames and configurations to completion for success. Success from a decolonizing framework is not confined to the singular path of liberalism; it is many paths with many openings and many endpoints. Moreover, the best and brightest (and often whitest) definition of success assumes that the achievement is atomistic, it is an individual

achievement and the process and people involved in achievement are not considered as part of the outcome which steeps us further in the atomizing and individualizing process of liberalism. We rarely pay attention to the processes that condition success despite knowing that success is never an individual effort but involves collective efforts. Learning among peers for example depends on that entire peer group and occurs through the collaborative efforts of peers or alternatively can occur for some at the expense of certain peers so that learning is variegated and uneven. The later typifies a liberally informed educational environment that includes the atomistic and independent individual; competition; stratification; power bargaining; and not the least of which is primacy of reason and the exclusion of the body.

c) Decolonization

As alluded to earlier, decolonizing is about reframing and decolonizing the curriculum and entire approach to schooling and education. Decolonization is an on-going, and an unending process; it is a collective journey and one that has not yet arrived (see also Benita, 1995; Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin, 1989; Loomba, 1998). Maori scholar Linda Smith (2012) argues “*decolonization is a process which engages with imperialism and colonialism at multiple levels*” (p. 21). In this way it is a process that proceeds in stops and new starts as different levels of colonialism and imperialism need to be approached and a path for the next phase of decolonization cleared. Decolonization requires an “epistemic community” to develop and nurture hope, dreams, and aspirations and to transmit the energy for this work. Decolonizing goes against the norm and is work that is opposed in practice, in theory, in the material, and not least in the (un)conscious. If decolonization efforts end up being normalized or domesticated then it is hardly subverting the status quo. Decolonizing work must refuse the seduction of incorporation and inclusion that will disable it. In fact, the project and politics of decolonizing generally and of curricula specifically threatens identities, histories and subjectivities. The struggle over such dominant knowledge in the Western academy can only take place in the field of intellectual combat. Within this field of combat, we sow the seeds of our own decolonization (see Fanon 1963; Abraham, 2011; Cesaire, 1972). “Decolonizing Education” teaches and engages students in the discourses of colonialism, Indigeneity, anti-racism, social oppression, ableism, heteronormativity and patriarchy. It is also about instructors and learners co-creating a learning space for resistance. “Decolonizing the academy” is as much about “Indigenizing the Curriculum” (see also wa Thiong’o, 1986) as it engages Indigenous and non-Western concepts, philosophies of education, ethics, values, and social norms in the education of the contemporary learner. It also about the academy working with Indigenous principles of community responsibility, mutual interdependency, ethics, sharing and reciprocity. “Decolonizing education” is about an

educational approach, a practice that questions knowledges and bodies. It includes a search for an anti-colonial curriculum that allows us to re-engage questions of pedagogies, classroom instruction, teaching materials, including texts and other non-texts that may include: social events, oral cultural stories, and arts-informed pedagogies (see also Dei, 2012). Decolonizing curriculum takes an inquiring stance in terms of how what is presented came to be what is being presented and what purpose could imaginably be served by this and how has this purpose been enacted with or against. Ultimately, it is a position of intelligent inquiry that is meant to unsettle and disturb, which when synthesized transforms. Decolonizing curriculum is a changing curriculum, one that engages bodies in the spaces and places of living and strengthens the capacity to engage politically, socially, spiritually, bodily and most importantly intimately with themselves, their communities and collectivities and their surround of land and built and natural worlds.

V. Re-Theorizing from Decolonial Perspectives, Inclusive Education: Multicentricity, Indigeneity, Reflexivity

Multicentricity

Fundamentally, “decolonizing education” involves three central tenets – Idea of “multicentricity”, “Indigeneity”, and “Reflexivity”. These tenets are appropriate to all disciplines and academic interests and apply across disciplines. Regarding “multicentricity”, there is a need to fully acknowledge multiple civilizations in the human world. Multicentricity requires a critical review of university curricula to identify the pervasive universalization of particular knowledge frame, more specifically a colonial, neoliberal and Western knowledge frame. For example, political theory is poorly served if Western democracy has primacy at the expense of the exclusions of ideas and practices of other civilizations like Chinese, Egyptian, Indian and Mayan. Furthermore, students would be best served if they were encouraged to establish dialogic relations between these sets of ideas and practices. And indeed I suspect that subjects that would quickly become of interest, and indeed are of interest, and would elicit more creativity and new formulae, content and contest with respect to practice, theory, and research. This of course says nothing about opening up space within the academy for students who have these knowledges to some or great degree and whose experience of exclusion and devaluation of this knowledge has also resulted in their exclusion and their devaluation. The academy would in this way seem interested in the things that interest others who have not previously secured membership within the academy either as student or faculty. Multicentricity would be a potent stimuli to the academic community and would open up very interesting converges, divergences, and points that connect and repel that would open up new theorizing and deepen it as well for all areas of study.

Indigeneity

I bring international perspective to Indigenous/Indigeneity. Indigeneity is about Indigenous knowings; it is the knowings of bodies in relation to the spaces and places in which they have long been orchestrating and been orchestrated by life and lives. Indigeneity is advanced in the earlier proverb as the knowings of the salt bearer. I view Indigeneity as process and as identity. In either case, process and identity, Indigeneity emphasizes context and it emphasizes the engagement of local communities and students as active knowers. Knowledge is not limited to the esteemed faculty of the Western Academy it is within communities, collectivities and societies that are not Western or who create spaces of Indigeneity within the Western. It is this non-Westerness and the contextual embodiment that occurs from the dialogue with and through, and then responsibility to, the land that makes for an earth-centric knowing and responsive knowledge that is about relationship not about objectification and reduction and then recuperation into measure, theory, and practice that characterize Western knowledge. It encourage us not to perpetuate the lineage of European scholarship and practice, but to bring education down to and back to the earth, to indigenize it so that education reflects the lived experience and lives of our students and their communities.

It is impossible to capture truly and to cover meaningfully all ideas that have emerged from the thousands of year devoted to the human civilizing project. And I suspect that there are many ideas, theories and practices that are well bound and secure within the world's Indigenous knowings that the Western world has not yet even imagined nor has it acquired the capacity to sense or to gather meaning from. I say this because I do not think it is necessary nor conducive to student intellectual development to know or to learn all and I do not view the knowing of all as a condition for engaging with and transforming the world. I do believe however that Indigeneity and multicentricity will make this realizable and so view strongly their inclusion within the academy and within curricula. To my mind, the starting point and the finish line of education are most desirably, most meaningfully, and most ripe transformatively when it is the place and the space of students' immediate lived experience. Because students cannot be expected to know all, and because through Indigeneity and multicentricity we encourage place based engagement, theorizing, and knowledge development it is imperative that we engage students in a learning process that is problem-based and a teaching process that is inquiry based and that both gesture toward social action and ethical practice. This is how the curricula, the academy, their learners and educators can seed the global movement of decolonization.

Curricula and instruction interdepend through the complementary actions of problem-based learning and inquiry-based teaching to prepare learners and to continuously vitalize educators and researchers. With the acceleration of knowledge and its production we must prepare learners for life-long learning and so I emphasize the

importance of the tools of continuous learning that students gather through problem-based learning approaches and inquiry based teaching approaches. Learners must develop the flexibility to move into and through these two locations, as learner and as educator, to prepare for present and future work and to prepare for present and future engagement with their communities and the earth or global community. Failures to engage in problem based learning and inquiry based teaching results in fixed knowledge sets that are time specific and relentlessly obsolete. They become obsolete because of the acceleration of knowledge exchange, acquisition, and production and the acceleration of sophisticated knowledge supporting and knowledge building technologies that transmit, mutate, and disseminate new knowledge immediately and constantly. An example will provide clarification of the point I am trying to make.

An engineering science student enters university and spends a minimum of four years in their program. At the end of their academic experience engineering knowledge may have gone through several revolutions to result in an almost completely new body of knowledge and a new or almost new knowledge terrain when seeking employment. These engineers must be equipped with the skills of critical inquiry to ensure that despite the absence of specific present knowledge they have the skill to: locate new knowledge; critique this knowledge; unpack this knowledge; and to determine its efficacy, its ethics, and its sustainability; and then to discern how best to interrogate this knowledges capacity to generate the desired outcomes in relation to the contexts and zones of its deployment. These skills go beyond science that has typified colonial education and I argue that the critical inquiry and interrogation that embeds decolonizing education and the multicentricity that it invites prepare the Western engineering student far more effectively than the presiding and/or prior alternative. The only ethical way to equip learners today, I argue, is to teach them how to problem solve; how to employ multiple lenses and to seek out multiple circles of knowledge and multiple knowers for supportive collaboration and a deepening critique; and to develop skill in their capacity to attune themselves fully to the context of the problem they are solving and the methods that have been used and work from the point of exploring how these methods can be enhanced for sustainability and to honor and support Indigeneity.

I summarize the analysis of the engineering student by speaking of decolonizing education less specifically and more broadly. Decolonizing education is one that prepares students through relationship for relationships at multiple scales and across scales. The capacity to develop relationships is essential for a decolonizing education that demands as education include: many knowers; the built and natural worlds both familiar and new; and clear-sightedness and responsivity to colonialism's deep prints and capacity to track these prints through structures, through project design, through the knowledge that they produce or that they secure for new production, and the knowledge that its presence must necessarily exclude for its centering, and most importantly they must track the vestiges of the colonial in their approach to and tools for solving the problems that are there work.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity is required to (re)connect individuals and environments, self and society, identity and reality in social and scientific inquiry. Every discipline, be it the humanities, pure science, medicine and other professional trainings, must invariably include the interrogation of interconnectivity of self and external world, and our responsibilities to our social, physical, and ecological environment. Reflection, particularly in the field of education, allows the practitioner to think about what works, what does not work, what can I change next time with this lesson plan/curricula, and how is what I am doing applicable to my practice? We need to ensure that the theory and practice of reflexivity is included in our curricular. Practically speaking this can occur or be structured in a variety of ways some of which include: reflective journaling; creative group inquiry; mentorship; and community project participation. Reflexivity helps to capture and lift out of the culture and (un)consciousness of academia that which is repressed, suppressed and disavowed. This can include very interesting and disturbing findings which may include: the absence of specific cultures and collectivities; the hidden rules and concealed practices that service without full conscious engagement particular academic goals and structuring; and also through exclusions and inclusions and the varied inflection and intonation within each that establish bodily sensed norms and assumptions of schooling. Through reflexivity educators bring integrity to their curricular and pedagogical practices. And through reflexivity the subtle perfusions of the colonial and its concealed self-reinforcing mechanisms and forms can be exposed for contestation and therefrom changed.

VI. Decolonizing the University from the Perspective of a Reframed Curriculum: Some Practical Institutional Approaches

At the wider institutional level, as part of the practical institutional action strategies to decolonize the university from the perspective of a reframed curriculum I strongly urge that we develop an “Institutional Policy Framework”. What I mean by this is that we work to collaborate on the development of a specific policy document. This document, through the contest of the collaborative process, must have clear and concrete strategies to generate and to strengthen inclusive practices within the academy. This documents clarity must not be compromised and it must state clearly specific the mandate and the tasks of faculty, staff, students, families, and of communities. This would provide a shared responsibility for and shared right to inclusion and for inclusive teaching. The shared sense of purpose of this sanctioned direction would provide the impetus for transformation within the academy and would germinate conditions for a broader social transformation. Higher education has an important role and must act as

catalyst for a transformation that must extend into the global world. The academy must recognize and come to terms with its role in global transformation through the development of a culture and praxis of inclusion and decolonizing education and it must overcome its infatuation with the market and the promises it easily makes and breaks.

To begin this policy framework process we must start by troubling the institutional exclusions that Sara Ahmed (2006) aptly describes as the “non-performative speech acts” of institutions. Sara Ahmed warns that written policies can be the terminal act toward the goal of inclusion. That the policy is written and emplaced administratively relieves institutions of the practice of inclusion and the clear action directives to realize inclusion. Institutions need only say for example that we have a diversity policy and we encourage and value diversity but do not move beyond this. The policy becomes a speech act from which right action or the action required to realize the policy do not and are not expected to follow. For a policy to be performative it must materially realize inclusion not simply aspire to it. For this reason I suggest that the university must have a clear policy that identifies processes and practices and ways to measure the realization of inclusivity, diversification of programs, and decolonizing methodologies. The concrete expression of timelines, academic expectations, and specific accountability determinants must be included in this document. In addition it must provide a mechanism and process for an annual review to determine how it is or is not applied.

To augment the institutional decolonizing and inclusive policy framework the university is best advised to develop an equity standard that is implemented across all courses and faculty groups. While I remain mindful of the academic freedom desired by and provided to university faculty it is imperative that university courses and the deep curriculum of the university speak too and reflect the broader ethical issues of equity and fairness. I ask that faculty members, like me, engage this freedom from an ethically inclusive foundation that is fully attuned to the responsibility all faculty and universities share in terms of using their privilege of freedom in such a way that does not harm through exclusion, irresponsible freedom, and/or a colonially informed and enacted culture. I suggest we approach the current state of exclusion that underpins the colonial history and present of the academy from a position of absence not as an attempt to impose political views upon students and faculty within the academy. What I mean is that it is best to assume that the discussion has not happened but needs to and there is urgency in the need to foreground the discussion of equitable, inclusive, multi-centric, indigenizing and decolonizing education and how this is imagined to impact on faculty freedom. It is necessary to connect, through this dialogue, “academic freedom” and/with “academic responsibility”. After all, there is nothing “free” about freedom! Freedom is fought for and is maintained at the expense of the non-freedoms and the cumulative unfreedoms of others. I strongly assert that there is no freedom without matching responsibilities and an ethically conscious engagement in this freedom.

To extend the practical work that the academy must engage in I ask that faculty

take an ethical stance in relation to the various front end exclusions and engage the academy courageously in dialogue that illuminates and responds to these. Tuition fees are a clear example of these front end exclusions which disproportionately impact and exclude marginalized and impoverished groups. The question of entry into the academy must not be determined solely by budgets and finances and a decolonizing academic culture must act on behalf of marginalized, impoverished and/or absent student groups and communities who are not represented or under-represented in the academy. We must make entry accessible to all groups not some at the expense of or on the backs of others. The university must solve this accessibility issue and refrain from making it a budgetary or financial issue.

I will step back from the particularities of change for a moment to open this article more broadly to a change in the foundation of the academy as a colonial institution after which I will proceed to highlight once again particular entry points through strategic action policy. I make particular suggestions because they provide the living traction for a decolonizing and an inclusive educational culture and curricula. What I am suggesting here is that the academy begins from a different beginning, a non-colonial beginning. I suggest that the academy begin with inclusivity and world representation as its root value, its primary goal, and its greatest measure of achievement. A foundational value of inclusivity that invites a world's breadth of human experiencing, knowings, and knowledge systems would immediately alter the culture of the university. If the university reflected the world community there would be different dialogic potential and learning trajectories cast in each class room and the informal learning spaces of the university. This change would lead to other changes and if engaged fully by the academy could develop into more expansive initiatives both within and beyond the university. To ground the value of inclusion and to stabilize and strengthen the more expansive membership of the university community several steps need to be taken with haste.

First the university must implement an academic requirement that cuts across all degrees to include course work and study that focuses on critical analysis of knowledge systems. These courses would provide students with tools for engaging in deeper academic and transformative work within their classrooms, the research and study circles, and through their research projects. These courses would teach students about and also teach them how to uncover bias, exclusions, hegemonies, and deliberate productions of knowledge to serve specific ends such as colonization, capitalism, individualism and all varieties of fundamentalisms. Another performative policy action would include equity development initiatives that course through each department, unit, and/or division within the university to include both academic and non-academic clusters. An example of such an initiative follows: every cluster within the university would be engaged in the frank analysis of how and who is permitted entry into their cluster. A simple visual scan of the department and the placement and space allotment for certain bodies can reveal vast amounts of information about the actual entry filters and

practices despite the reference to non-performative policies or speech acts that Sara Ahmed so very effectively illuminates for us.

What would be required and demanded to ensure performativity is a problematizing and inquiry based approach to the expressed mission, mandate, objectives, policies, and practices and their thorough interrogation for exclusion in each cell of the university. It is best to my mind to approach this work by assuming, not necessarily wrongly, that each cell does in fact operate exclusively. The collaborative and interrogative work of each cell is to unpack the mission, mandate, objectives, policies, and practices in terms of the following questions: where does exclusion happen; under what conditions is it happening both within and beyond the university; how does it actually happen; and who does it exclude and when; and importantly what are the exceptions to exclusion. This process would ensue most thoroughly if in fact a tracking sheet of assumed exclusion was designed and each point of exclusion had a box where specific features of the particular category could undergo thorough analysis. Exposing exclusion in its particularities and in its exceptions would provide clear pathways to remove the barriers to inclusion and thereafter to monitor inclusion in cell specific ways. An example of some starting points may include: review of admission committee membership; review of students who apply to programs and who and why certain students get in and what impact this has for the cell or department; review of specific hiring and firing procedures and the conditions and exceptions for each; review of tenures function in the university and under what conditions professors are granted or not granted tenure and what the visual scan of tenured members reveals about the concealed policy directives; review of how students are supported during the first year of the program, which students this support engages and misses and what efforts are made to include new students in departmental activities and processes and who in fact participates. I offer many possible entry points into inclusivity that if pursued with full effort will begin to catalyze the change necessary for a more inclusive deep curriculum.

Curriculum review is of critical importance and is a more material step along the transformative trajectory. Curriculum review calls for academic programming that ensures inclusive education. Having diverse student, staff and faculty and developing a decolonized curriculum all require leadership, foresight and sustained support from the academy. Curriculum review has additional importance beyond critiquing what is already installed; review is essential to create resonance between what is within the academy and its relevance the real world and real lives outside the academy. Alignment and design of curricula and programmes that stimulate an inside-outside resonance bring emerging realities into the university where they can be engaged critically and subjected to a deepening ethical analysis. Program planning for emerging and minority interests draw different bodies with different knowledges into the university who seek faculty members who can engage them critically in these interests and facilitate the development of new practices and methods of analysis and study. To say this differently, if the university offers

courses that engage this emerging and minority areas of interest students will come and they will stay if their engagement with these areas and knowledges is meaningful, rigorous, and substantive.

My experience has been that the number of racial minority students increased with racial minority presence among faculty. Minority faculty presence conveys to these students that the experiences of their lives matter to the academy and there is space for you, your experiences, and your interests here. This has been communicated to me over and over again by courageous students who wanted to share their experience and to share their knowings through the study of race, social justice, Indigeneity, colonization, marginalization, violence, gender and (in)equity for example. With each additional minority faculty member more diverse students came and then more diverse faculty. The point I wish to make is simple the students will come if the deep curriculum says yes to them and is visible through faculty members, the courses offered, and the alternative approaches to research methodologies. The other important point that cannot be missed in this is that these students strengthened the faculty and their work and expanded and deepened the emphasis on race and equity issues which elicited further curriculum development work and new and more complex research projects. The students add to what is there and expose what is not when there, not beforehand, and then faculty respond with new courses, new study groups, and new article and research topics. This generative and cyclical process occurs when minority presence is installed; minorities do not make demands of the university from outside. When the deep curriculum and the curriculum say yes to minority students, and when they can see reflections of themselves in the bodies of faculty members they will be more interested in coming. When this is not the case minority students and faculty do not come because of the long history of exclusion of particular bodies from these “high places of learning”. So if the university chooses to act on this understanding and begins to build initiatives and to develop trust with communities this code can be broken and the student membership will reflect this. If however it is not broken the student membership will show us this also. We must, therefore, be critical of what David Theo Goldberg (1993) calls “consumer directed discrimination”. In other words, the justification that is constantly used to silence what I and others suggest is that the market should drive the course offerings. David Theo Goldberg and my own experience however say the complete opposite. The market logic excludes certain bodies long before they even get to the point of applying to the university which is rife with exclusions that continue at every juncture thereafter. The academy is a closed door and there is no one there to meet them.

The supply and demand argument is used in a variety of ways in the academy. Very often it is used to silence requests and demands for respecting diversity mandates, policies, and implementation strategies. These arguments appear to conceal a more complicated and seemingly in-articulable politic, a prodrome of sorts of something coming or the beginnings of an unfavourable turn. I bring the supply and demand

argument to the increasing recruitment of international students. International students pay the full cost of university and are relied on to cover the rising cost of higher education. We must stop here and ask many questions. Of the many I ask these: Who is served by this selection process? What does financially incentivized inclusion do to and for the bodies and identities that it includes and what does it do for those it does not? What are the long range impacts of this inclusion and its complementary exclusion? How did this become the solution rising costs? Who is appeased by this practice and by what means? We must ask what deeper motivations and strivings are operating within the academy and how have these deeper motivations and strivings been sated in the past?

I am brought now to proactive strategies. The most important of these are the proactive inclusive recruitment and representation within the university. We include diversity as part of the ethical praxis of leadership. Department heads have the ethical imperative then to ensure diverse faculty presence and must be willing and also be rewarded for providing diverse faculty members with the resources they need to engage fully in their roles and with the students and their communities. Acknowledgement and/or incentives would desirably be forthcoming to those departments that reach diversity and inclusivity goals. For example, funds can be created and initiatives developed that strengthen diversity within departments and also celebrate diversity. These funds and initiatives can be used: to develop mentorship and financial resources for racial minority students; and to promote counter and oppositional discourses such as non-Western epistemologies, anti-colonial thought, among others. The possibilities of decolonizing research and of having courses that aim to promote multiple/Indigenous Knowledges and critical perspectives is enhanced when we have Indigenous and racial minority faculty in the teaching pool. No one needs any research to confirm this. It is common sense. With a diversified faculty we stand a better chance of developing strengthening practices for the mentoring young faculty and students who are diverse and who bring this experience to the academy when the academy says yes to them and joins them.

All proactive strategies interdepend on all the others and become more effective through this interdependence. Educational outreach is the next proactive strategy that I highlight. There must be a plan of action around educational outreach for diversity policies to be performative. Educational outreach however will not happen if our academic work does not have any relevance to communities, to societies and to the natural world. It is imperative then that our work if it is truly decolonizing and inclusive and through these transformative, must be community-centric and have relevance to the problems that occur in the real world. We must make our work relevant to the diverse communities from which we draw our students. This outreach and engagement in and with diverse communities breaks the perception of the university as ivory tower. Departments and universities must continue to work collaboratively with communities to engage in truly transformative work that benefits all and includes: faculty, students,

institutions, local and distant communities, and ultimately responds to the crisis of knowledge and the global problematique that opened this paper. Through this of course there are strands of power that will inevitably trip up our objective and our plans. We must have sufficient grounding to first know this will happen and second to mobilize a response and recovery to these experiences. These moments will certainly come and no planning, pro-action, or forethought can defend against this.

It is in fact the very nature of our work and these moments, painful and disorganizing, when we overcome or derail them strengthen our work and our approach.

I extend the proactive strategy for outreach a little further before moving onto the next strategy. I want to be very clear about the position I take and about the position that universities must ethically assume in terms of diversity and inclusivity and the necessity of outreach to effect realize these goals. Students will not simply walk in to the university as a colonial space of exclusion even if they are interested. It is important to “stand in their shoes” and to acknowledge first that schools have been places of multiple forms of violence for marginalized and minority groups. They have also been places that in innumerable ways have said no to them and have not recognized them. The impact of the violences and the erasures within schools is sensibly a space that is to be avoided. With this in mind it is unfair and David Theo Goldberg’s consumer discrimination is clearly operative here. To bring students who have been excluded into the university means that we must go to them and meet them on their terms. We must make this effort because this is what will make it possible for these bodies to imagine themselves in the academy, a school and so too a place of many negative associations, and then to move to considering what they might do if they were to participate in the academy. And then of course they must know what the academy will do to help them get there and to help them through to completion. It is important to go to reach these students through community initiatives and community mentorship programs. We must share with them possible paths and learning trajectories that are of interest to them. We must also be able to find places for them in power saturated programs such as science and medicine. And we must inspire them through our own work in their community and our engagement with them. It is important too that connections are made across educational settings and diverse groups of university students visit high schools and grade schools within multiracial communities as ambassadors and as inspiration. Programs could be developed that reverse the flow of ambassadorship and inspiration also, high school youth with specific interests can be encouraged to develop and present these interests at universities through special programs or events. These programs and events give the university a glimpse into the community and convey that which is meaningful or of concern to them. It is clear that the bidirectional flow and stimulation would prove valuable for the university and for the community, and ultimately for society as whole. These efforts can lead to transformation by bringing in different perspectives and using them to affect policies and procedures that facilitate rather than interfere with entry. Educational outreach must aim

to ensure the presence of a diverse student body on our campus and must do what is necessary to help them to complete their education, attention to entry is not sufficient. Links must be made between identity, knowledge production and schooling and we must make the university accessible to diverse student groups through proactive measures that support their engagement all the way through.

Turning to the issue of pedagogy and methodologies we must take practical steps to diversify the curriculum through the infusion of multiple teaching methodologies, pedagogies, courses and study groups. For example, Indigenous and Aboriginal initiatives have been pursued and developed to affect both pedagogy and methodologies. These initiatives have broadened and extended our critical understandings Canada, Canadian history, and Canada's relationship with Indigenous and Aboriginal communities. Pedagogy and methodologies could be further advanced through ethics and the establishment of ethical protocols and ethical methodologies that would place value on and allow value to gain from oral history and other non-traditionally academic sources including for example the voices of Elders and Healers. And as mentioned earlier advancement of and space for the development of a robust dialogical curriculum that is co-created through relationships and links between students of the academy and members of the local communities. University faculty and universities broadly need to advance methodology training opportunities for undergraduates and graduates; and provide opportunities and sessions for faculty to study anti-colonial methods and anti-colonial sources of knowledge. For instance faculty may be provided with a period of study where they learn how to use traditional knowledges to address contemporary or global problems and issues; or faculty may participate in a period of study that helps to develop their understandings and research methodologies for holistic and sustainable approaches to teaching and learning where there are no "trained" teachers. Curriculum development and program initiatives would flow easily from these types of experiences and it would seem worthwhile for universities to invest in such efforts particularly those which enhance or germinate diversity and inclusion both within the academy and to foster multi-centering processes within the global community.

When we broach the topic of evaluation and assessment we are deep in colonial territory and must deal with the rigid Euro-centered evaluation methods. Reconceptualization of evaluation and reconceptualization that is non-Eurocentric are possible and can easily be generated within the classroom by students. The decentering of the written text would allow orality to be considered an equal and equally efficacious medium. With this in mind students could engage in oral assignments instead of or as well as written assignments. The voiced or the oral text is equal to the written text in terms of its capacity to articulate theory and praxis; as is the educators capacity to track and evaluate the students ability to synthesize and integrate class materials, readings, and lived experiences through the oral or voiced analysis and the visual-cognitive of written analysis. Further to this I suggest that we do not limit text to academic projects only and

that we include community based events and experiences as sites of learning and as multi-sensory texts. To validate this position and the community as multi-sensory text I feel strongly that students at all levels of education be given opportunities to attend community events and to participate in the organization of community events. These experiences provide reflexive opportunities that could be written or spoken of and presented to the class so that the multiplicity of experience can be conveyed and provide opportunities for deepening dialogue and theorizing. Often community events provide access to Elder, healers, community leaders, and other “teachers” which can open up different modes of inquiry and of problematizing what is learned in the academy to deepen, contest, and expand knowing and knowledge. Learners must be able to connect community work to their learning for it to be meaningful. Community agencies and community partners however are often so divorced from academia that the conceptualizations of each appear on the surface difficult to integrate or to engage in comparative analysis. This must not arrest the work of collaboration and in fact I view collaboration and the fortification of links as a way to establish a shared language or alternatively to understand each other’s frames of analysis and through this to deepen each other’s analysis and to revise these analyses to reflect new knowings. To act on this, the academy needs to encourage student’s participation in and preparation and presentation of non-traditional papers through arts based and multimedia methods. In this way students are not only given the opportunity to be creative and to think outside the box, but educators reciprocate and complement this through recognizing and honouring multiple ways of knowing and being.

There must be sufficient research and infrastructural support to promote decolonized curriculum an inclusive education in our universities. We can seek more partnership opportunities with the public and private sectors to expand and “normalize” the use of anti-colonial knowledge. We can also have research partnership development initiatives where issues of funding, release time, and related supports for more trans-cultural and progressive academic partnerships can be negotiated. An example of this would be to partner with Indigenous scholars and Elders across communities in multiple world spaces in regards to the issue of youth leadership development processes. Our universities would do well to serve their diversity and inclusivity goals by lobbying funding agencies and private funders to expand and reframe success criteria to include the use of qualitative (anti-colonial) research methods and topics. We can also expand partnerships with access programs that are provided with secure, dedicated funding to achieve their goals. For example, in Ontario, Canada we have the Pathways to Education and the Transitional Year Programs at the University of Toronto, Trent University and Sir Sandford Fleming College to name a few. In eastern Canada we have similar programs at Dalhousie University as well as other eastern colleges and universities. These programs provide bridges for young adults and adults generally who may have been out of school for a while to re-enter through the University education system where they can advance

toward higher education. These programs have been highly valued by the communities and the students they serve and have proven valuable to the university also in terms of drawing upon a larger and more diverse student body with diverse knowledges and who through participation in these and regular university programs change the university and help to produce it in a new way. Universities must fully support and sustain transitional programs geared at bringing marginalized, Indigenous bodies into the academy rather than cutting these programs as part of austerity measures. Secure funding and the academies dedication toward these programs will ensure that the academy is a transformative space and place through its processes and programs of inclusion.

Besides institutional practices and policy changes towards equity and inclusivity the university classroom teacher is ultimately responsible for bringing about change through effective teaching. We can pay closer attention to the whole area of classroom teaching strategies. It is important that besides what we expect of our students we also highlight the responsibilities of educators in today's classrooms. It may be argued that a major constraint any faculty/teacher faces when trying to create an inclusive teaching approach and classroom is the absence of texts and other resource information to achieve such educational ends. While we may argue that our university libraries are well-resourced there is still an argument to be made that our resources are not diverse enough to speak to concerns of inclusion and decolonization as articulated in this article. The counter argument is that there are enough resources around us to effectively engage these resources in the work of inclusive teaching. To respond to this argument one can only call for creativity and resourcefulness on the part of educators. We can do more with what we have if we develop skills and engage in training that teaches us to find ways to put into action inclusive and decolonized education. Below I highlight some of the sites and sources of resource information and teaching strategies an educator/faculty might employ in their classrooms to make possible inclusive and decolonized education.

On the use of teaching and instructional resources for reframed education, faculty/teachers must critically engage the available texts at hand. Where possible we can use cultural events and other "non-conventional" teaching resources and we must bring in Indigenous guest speakers, parents/Elders and community workers in meaningful and relevant ways in response to and to address power and colonial relations. Teachers can regularly organize and use conferences, workshops, seminars involving students and particular local communities as key players. Students can be encouraged to engage the print media and television and to write articles and commentaries on social justice, human rights and environmental concerns or other hot button social issues. Such engagement should ensue responsibly and ethically and must situate discussion in their appropriate historical contexts which is often not done by the media. Absences such as these reveal the complicity of the current generation in historical wrongs associated with colonialism, imperialism and genocide of Indigenous peoples and local cultures. The use of alternative bookstores usually located in more peripheral communities or on the

margins of mainstream communities are important. Most often these community-based sources carry books very critical of society and/or have works by radical scholars that hardly find their way into conventional/mainstream bookstores. Also, the use of public, local and academic libraries is important as usually the public libraries have resources for the lay public more than the academic. The provision of visual aids to augment what is being communicated by educators is helpful to learners generally by providing multiple portals of entry for new or complex material in addition to being specifically helpful to students who learn in primarily or more powerfully in visual ways. My earlier assertion of meeting students where they are at compels educators to engage in popular culture and to join students here in processes of critical inquiry and analysis. Online resources (visual, audio, talk, etc.) can also be augmentive when used critically to engage issues related to social justice, human rights and environmental matters. These resources to can seed social transformational purposes and must be viewed from that perspective.

Effective classroom instructional strategies should involve students, parents, Elders, and community knowledges. Classroom teaching must stress history and context; aim to centre the learner; and must pursue critical teaching for the purposes of social and educational transformation. Classroom instruction must also draw on the school-community interface in order to address the relevance of academic knowledge for local communities. Faculty/Educators can have students speak to their own experiences in order to critically analyze the traditional curriculum of academia; but not in tokenistic way. This pedagogic approach must be from standpoint knowledge, which centers personal experience and recognizes the epistemic saliency of the voices of the oppressed, marginalized, excluded and/or colonized peoples. Educators must critically use history as an access point to develop inclusive teaching practice through student and local community experiences. Instructors must aim to co-produce knowledge with their students by creating the synergies of teacher and student knowledge production introduced earlier. The importance of using teachable moments; social or case scenarios or studies; and the media and other forms of texts cannot be overemphasized. They bring knowledge down to earth for learners who are able to identify with the complexity of what is being taught and can easily express a sense of ownership for this knowledge.

The success of an effective reframed curriculum cannot be measured simply in terms of how students do on test scores. Educators can determine the instructional effectiveness of an inclusive, decolonized curriculum by asking and responding to key questions: Are students able to ask new and critical questions from what they are learning? How are students defining/articulating questions of ethics and social responsibility? How do students apply their learning in their classroom to their own communities? Are learners able to identify power relations and to deconstruct the curriculum? How do students place social justice, equity, fairness within their understanding of character and moral education? While answers to these questions can be contested, simply creating a space to ask and discuss these questions is itself productive

as it potentiates the opening of students' minds and nurtures multiple ways of knowing. Validating students' knowledge is about power and empowerment. Students must be made to feel a sense of ownership and control of their knowledge and the knowledge production process. This means a need to rethink the way we assess what students say or know. For example, an educator must also engage multiple assessment methods, including students' assessments of themselves and each other. Educators must also provide learners with tools and language to name and to articulate their experiences, anxieties, fears, hopes and aspirations.

In order to identify the relevance and practicality of inclusive curriculum and instruction for learners, faculty/educators and school administrators must engage local communities and students in the enactment and development of curriculum. Students' can demonstrate an ability to apply the curriculum in everyday life and to social practice if they have been part of its enactment and development. The practicality of the curriculum emerges when students demonstrate critical thinking skills; they come into their full voice by speaking out; and they show the ability to match rights with responsibilities to their communities. In other words, there is more to education than students having acquired mastery of the knowledge. We have to begin to think beyond test and academic performances to broader questions of social relevance; community impact; students and educators' collective responsibilities; citizenship and community building of purpose into education; and what it means to engage in and to do anti-colonial social justice education in the first place.

VII. The Start of a Conversation

In broaching the subject of "reframing the curriculum" we must think about education broadly and not just in university, school or college. Decolonizing processes must perfuse all of societies institutions including but not limited to the following: the media; the legal and penal system; workplaces; hospitals; community centers; food banks; banks; and churches. All of these institutions need to be "decolonized" and can only do so by taking "inclusion" into consideration more critically and more profoundly. Inclusion in this way is not truly occurring although it may be longed for by some. Interrogation and action policies are the antidote to non-performativity and are the method that I suggest continue ceaselessly to challenge the limits of inclusion. Heightened consciousness about the need for inclusion is not enough something more substantive has to occur and to it must be consciously enacted.

Discussions about inclusion and decolonization cannot avoid questions of who occupies positions of power in universities, schools, colleges, workplaces and other institutional spaces; and who has decision making, space and voice power. Inclusion is about power and accountability so we must ask the following question when an

individual in a position of power ministers to “inclusivity”: who is this person or body accountable to? Inevitably, this means an explicit discussion about power. A major concern for universities as they turn too corporate funding, signaled through endowed chairs, are their diminishing connections with the public whom corporate groups have little democratic accountability to or interest in. This complicates the work of scholars who emphasize critical anti-racist, feminist, and Indigenous knowledge for example and who also want to engage communities and value community based and community collaborated initiatives. Support is not easily forthcoming for such scholars because their work is not viewed as market-friendly nor is it considered monetarily profitable and hence not valuable at all. Corporate funding for scholars whose work is to wake people up from the pathos of the status quo is difficult to come by. Through this increasingly neoliberal period, who decides what to include and what not to include in the academy is increasingly out of public hands and in corporate hands and private “philanthropic” hands. This is quite scary for progressive critical research especially that which includes Indigenous knowledges and approaches, and critical race work. This becomes more profound when one takes the stance as I do, that decolonizing the curriculum is as much about indigenizing the curriculum as it is about inclusion or anything else for that matter. Indigenizing the curriculum interferes with the neoliberal momentum and the corporate trajectory. Consequently they are not considered for investment and because of this are at best devalued and at worst obliterated.

Embarking upon the “decolonizing project” comes with huge risks and uncertainties. As of yet decolonization is still early in its work. It is an on-going process and our arrival is still a long way off. Decolonizing processes are long journeys that demand our courage and capacity to sustain ourselves and not to lose faith in our end goals and inspired objectives for better communities and a more equitable world. In pursuing decolonizing practices, we are undoubtedly going to ruffle feathers and be seen as subversive. Decolonization requires “pedagogy of rage” as we wrestle with and contest the existing order of things. Change of course does not come easy nor happen immediately. We must therefore be prepared to challenge the resistance to decolonization that we will encounter. We must also embrace a radical politics that seeks genuine social transformation through equity, social justice, Indigenous, anti-racism, feminist and anti-oppressive work. Those who fight oppressions and colonizing relations never walk alone. In thinking through how we make our communities and their institutions inclusive, we cannot ignore the fact that we are all intimately and profoundly connected. We must use our privilege well and we must collectively share in the deep frustration of communities whose voices are not heard, and who are continually dismissed or discounted when they offer possible radical solutions to the colonial challenges that we all face. Despite this it must continue to be our collective hope that all will one day join the pursuit of justice and equity for all. Let us pick up the torch and keep the dream of a decolonizing education for all alive and let us work together collectively to strengthen the

material realization of this dream. A community is as good as we collectively work to make it and indeed we must work! And we must collectively develop the courage to subvert any form of conventional education that leads our youth along the path of cultural, spiritual, emotional, physical and mental destruction. The need to resist the colonization of minds begins by thinking outside the dominant norms and values of society. For example, in today's schools all learners must be empowered to search for their own intellectual footing outside of the dominant paradigms and hegemonies of the Eurocentric. For many learners of today the decolonizing project has become a matter of social and intellectual survival and engagement in its work is not an option.

This article has tackled the important issue of being inclusive in radical pedagogy. It has raised pertinent questions about what teaching and teachers should do laced with some practical suggestions. For educators to ask how our educational practices make us human and how we can effectively promote multiple perspectives in the classroom is not without merit. The contents of the discussion may appear overly ambitious and indeed it may be and it must be. As an overview of critical pedagogical practices, this paper must acknowledge the importance of discussions about the tensions and risks of such radical pedagogical work. There are risks for all involved in this work and we have seen teachers experience and must endure career damage for their open engagement in decolonizing education work. This type of punishment has many repercussions not the least of which is the absence of teachers who courageously create inclusive educational spaces and develop educational aspirations. The discussion has broached curriculum, universal science, embodied connection, Indigeneity, mentorship and outreach and the dilemmas of how to bring local communities into classrooms and schools. The overarching learning objective has not been to give a full discussion to all of the issues but at least to be able to connect the possibilities and limitations of inclusive education as decolonized education. Clearly, the risks of potentially shortened careers for critical pedagogues when they embrace decolonized, anti-racist education cannot be underestimated. Similarly, the risk of not decolonizing the academy means alienating most populations from schools, colleges and universities settings. The risks and consequences of both action and inaction are large and reverberate multi-directionally. To give one example, teaching anti-racism courses in the academy will generate negative evaluations which impact career advancement, particularly from white male students. We cannot reduce the risk for the male student nor the faculty member by not teaching these courses nor can we limit anti-racist analysis and study to a fragment of time within a course. To be clear one week in the year, or one lecture in the year on the issue of racism, gender, class, ableism, patriarchy and heteronormativity can not be conceived as ethical nor does it provide a viable or sustainable entry point into these complex areas of education and social workings. Clearly, it takes courage to buck a conventional system, the academy and school, designed for middle class white students.

Education is itself power saturated. The construction of curriculum, the domain

of Western science, the ability to connect bodies, embodiment and knowledge, and the whole recourse to Indigeneity as a legitimate site of knowing beyond the process of identity are fraught with key questions of power. An anti-capitalist critique of schooling and education must be courageous and embrace race and Indigeneity. These are the areas least talked about even in progressive movements. In many ways this paper has highlighted the political economy of education. Race, gender, sexuality, ability, and other inequalities are part of the contemporary capitalist political economy. Education today is generally in the context of Western capitalism. Schooling cannot escape questions of marketability and academic freedom even as critical educators begin to question what bodies are present in our schools; who is doing what and why; and what histories and knowledges are told in conventional classroom discussions. In so far as socialism is about actually challenging existing world capitalism, this essay (as an intellectual exercise as well as concrete classroom practice and research orientation) can inform socialist studies in entirely relevant ways. We need to rethink the current brand and practice of socialism that has aggressively ignored some of the concerns raised in the paper. Communists have not been supporters of decolonization but socialists might have a better record on that score. But the work of socialists in transforming our schools has to center questions of race, Indigeneity and the “terror of Whiteness”.

In conclusion I would reiterate that when teaching is subjected to market pressures this in itself constitutes tremendous “challenges” for educational change and social justice work. During these times the colonial matrices lift out of its deep bed within the institution and begins to align the deep and overt curriculum of the academy with its desires and strivings to keep things on course. These challenges we can see are not simply about the academy and money only they extend far beyond the academy and extend far back in time. For this reason these challenges must be faced squarely and approached directly knowing that something more is at work. For instance, pressures to offer “marketable” courses often means anti-racist, feminist and anti-class bias. These courses and others that are of interest to racially minoritized students and students of other oppressions and violences must be in place and we cannot expect that requests will be made within a dominant institution for courses that are of interest to those who are excluded and for whom exclusion is ensured through the different scales of curriculum. Combating this pressure will require mobilizing simultaneously against current neoliberal pushes for the commodification of formerly public services, including education, with a strong message, backed by community support, in favor of anti-racist, feminist and anti-class bias coursework. Consequently, such work inside the classroom must be linked to anti-capitalist struggles across scales and they must be linked to building community solidarity and to movements outside the walls of the Western academy. The struggles of the academy are the struggles of the global world and frank acknowledgement of this will prove valuable in future mobilizing work.

References Cited

- Abraham, A. 2011. "African and Western Knowledge Synthesis". Unpublished course paper, SES 1924H: "Modernization, Development and Education in African Context". Department of Sociology and Equity Studies, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto [OISE/UT].
- Ahmed, S. 2006. "The Non-Performativity of Anti-Racism". *Borderlands e-journal: New Spaces in the Humanities* 5 (3): 1-10.
- Ainscow, M., Booth, T., and Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. New York: Routledge.
- Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2008). Making Education for All inclusive: Where Next? *Prospects*, 38, 15-34. doi: 10.1007/s11125-008-9055-0
- Ainscow, M., and Sandill, A. (2010). Developing inclusive education systems: The role of organizational cultures and leadership. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 14(4), 401-416. doi: 10.1080/13603110802504903
- Apple, M. 2004. *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Armstrong, A. C., Armstrong, D., and Spandagou, I. (2010). *Inclusive Education: International policy and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Asabere-Ameyaw, A., Dei, G.J.S., & Raheem, K. 2012. "Introduction; Introduction to contemporary issues in African Science Education". In *Contemporary Issues in African Sciences and Science Education*, edited by A. Asabere-Ameyaw. G.J.S. Dei. & Raheem, K. Raheem, 1-15. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. and H. Tiffin. 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Postcolonial Literatures*. London: Routledge, 1-13.
- Battiste, M. and J. Youngblood Henderson. 2000. "What is Indigenous Knowledge?" In *Protecting Indigenous knowledge and Heritage*. Saskatoon: Purich, 35-56.
- Benita, P. 1995. "Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse". In *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* edited by B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Thiophene.

- New York: Routledge, 36-44.
- Cajete, G. 1994. "Living the Vision". In *Look to the Mountain: An Ecology of Indigenous Education*. Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.
- Cajete, G. 2008. "Seven Orientations for the Development of Indigenous Science Education". In *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* edited by Denzin, N., Y. Lincoln and L.T. Smith, 487-496. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Castellano, M.B. 2000. "Updating Aboriginal Traditions of Knowledge". In *Indigenous Knowledges in Global Contexts*, edited by G.J.S. Dei et al. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 21-36
- Cesaire, A. 1972. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Clifford, J. 1986. "On Ethnographic Allegory". In *The Poetic and Politics of Ethnography: Experiments in Contemporary Anthropology* edited by J. Clifford & G.E. Marcus, 98-121. California: University of California Press.
- Dei, G. J. S. 2009. "Resistance to Amputation: Spirituality, Embodied Knowing and the Materiality of Everyday Existence". In *Racists Beware: Uncovering Racial Politics in Contemporary Society*, 67-80. Rotterdam/New York: Sense Publishers.
- Dei, G. J. S. 2012. "Indigenous Anti-Colonial Knowledge as 'Heritage Knowledge' for Promoting Black/African Education in Diasporic Contexts". *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1): 102-119.
- Dei, J. S. S (2016). *Reframing Blackness, Anti-blackness and Black Solidarities through Anti-Colonial and Decolonial Prisms*. New York: Springer Publishing.
- Dei, G. J. S., James, I. M., James-Wilson, S., Karumanchery, L. & Zine, J. 2000. *Removing the margins: The challenges and possibilities of inclusive schooling*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Dei, G. J. S., James-Wilson, S. & Zine, J. 2002. *Inclusive schooling: A teacher's companion to 'Removing the margins'*. Toronto, ON: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Delpit, L. D. 1988. "The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children". *Harvard Educational Review* 58 (3): 280-298.

- Delpit, L. D. 1995. *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Fanon, F. 1963. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Giroux, H., Penna, A., & Pinar, W., eds. 1981. *Curriculum and instruction: Alternatives in education*. California: McCutchan Publishing.
- Goldberg, David T. 1993. *Racist Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Hastings, C. 2012. "The Professional is Political: Tenured Activism in the Becoming Crisis", Paper read at the Annual Conference of Sociology and Equity Studies, Ontario Institute for Studies in education of the University of Toronto [OISE/UT].
- hooks, bell. 1992. *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Boston: South End Press.
- Howard, Philip S. 2009. "The Double-Edged Sword: A Critical Race Africology of Collaborations between Blacks and Whites in Racial Equity Work". PhD dissertation, OISE/University of Toronto.
- Levine-Rasky, C. 2009. External examiner's Comments on: "The double-edged sword: A critical race Africology of collaborations between Blacks and Whites in racial equity work".
- Lomba, A. 1998. "Situating Colonial and Postcolonial Studies". In *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge, 1-103.
- Maurial, M. 1999. "Indigenous Knowledge and Schooling: A Continuum Between Conflict and Dialogue". In *What is Indigenous Knowledge? Voices From the Academy*, edited by Semali, L. and J. Kincheloe, 59-77. New York: Falmer Press.
- Nines, P. 1999. "Representations of Indigenous Knowledges in Science Textbooks in Canada and Australia". Paper presented at the Annual conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, Toronto, April 14-18.
- Peters, S. (2005). Inclusive education in accelerated form and professional development schools: A case study of two school reform efforts in the USA. In J. Rix, K.

- Simmons, M. Nind, & K. Sheehy (Eds.), *Policy and power in inclusive education: Values into practice* (pp. 144-159). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Peters, S. and Oliver, L. (2009). Achieving quality and equity through inclusive education in an era of high-stakes testing. *Prospects*, 39(3), 265-279. doi: 10.1007/s11125-009-9116-z.
- Simpson, J. 2006. "Racism is not a theory: Racism matters in the classroom". In *I have been waiting: Race and U.S. higher education*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 155-196.
- Shahjahan, R. A. 2004. Centering Spirituality in the Academy: Toward A Transformative Way of Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Transformative Education* 2 (4): 294-312.
- Slee, R. (2001). Social justice and the changing directions in educational research: The case of inclusive education. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 5(2-3), 167-177. doi:10.1080/13603110010035832.
- Slee, R. (2011). *The irregular school: Exclusion, schooling and inclusive education*. New York: Routledge.
- Slee, R., and Allan, J. (2005). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. In J. Rix, K. Simmons, M. Nind, & K. Sheehy (Eds.), *Policy and power in inclusive education: Values into practice* (pp. 13-24). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Sleeter, C. 2009. "Politics of justice more than politics of recognition". Interview with Arvind Mishra.
- Smith, L. 2012 (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies*. London: Zed Books.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, K.W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 1(1):1-40. Retrieved from: <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.]
- wa Thiong'o, N. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: the Politics of Language in African Literature*. Oxford. EAEP, Nairobi. Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.

Recommended Readings and Resources

Ahmed, S. 2004. "Declarations of whiteness: The non-performativity of anti-racism". *Borderlands e-Journal* 3: 2.

Ahmed, S. 2006. "The non-performativity of anti-racism". *Borderlands e-journal: New Spaces in the Humanities* 5 (3): 1-10.

Banks, J. 1993. "The Canon Debate, Knowledge Construction and Multicultural Education". *Educational Researcher* 22 (5): 4-14.

Battiste, M. & Barman, J, eds. 1995. *First Nations education in Canada: The circle unfolds*.

Dei, G. J. S. 1996. "The challenges of inclusive schooling: Multi-centric curriculum and pedagogy". In *Anti-racism education in theory and practice*, edited by G.J.S. Dei. Halifax: Fernwood, 75-105.

Kovach, M. 2009. *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Lund, D. E. & Fidyk. A. 2006. "Desperately seeking anti-racism resources". In *Anti-racism education: Moving yet standing still* edited by Dei, G. J. S. Special issue of *DIRECTIONS, Journal of the Canadian race relations foundation* 3 (1): 53-64.

Goldberg, David T. 1993. *Racist Culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Osborne, M. D. & Barton, A. C. 1998. "Constructing a liberatory pedagogy in science: dilemmas and contradictions". *Journal of curriculum studies*, 30 (3): 251-260.

Skelton, A. 1997. "Studying hidden curricula: Developing a perspective in the light of postmodern insights". *Curriculum studies* 55 (2): 177-193.

Yee, J., ed. *Feminism for real: Deconstructing the academic industrial complex of feminism*
http://www.blogger.com/goog_2134922757
<http://www.policyalternatives.ca/publications/ourschools-ourselves/feminism-real>
(115-126). Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Report by Susan Dion - Decolonizing our schools
http://www.tdsb.on.ca/wwwdocuments/programs/aboriginal_voices/docs/Decolonizing%20Our%20Schools%203.pdf

This blog is from a graduate student in BC. She's from the Tsilhqot'in Nation who is currently pursuing graduate studies in Okanagan territory and curriculum development. She posts a great deal of information on different articles and reviews articles, etc.
<http://twinkleshappyplace.blogspot.ca/2011/12/learning-place-penticton-indian-band.html>