Deaf Accessibility in a Three-Day Instructional Skills Workshop: An Explorative Study

BY

Monte Hardy

Applied Disability Studies

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Masters of Arts

Faculty of Applied Disability Studies,
Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario

© 2018

Acknowledgement

My thesis, "Creating Deaf Space in the Instructional Skills Workshop: An Explorative Study", is one person's examination of a brief professional development training from a culturally Deaf perspective.

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the support of a number of people. I am thankful to Dr. Maureen Connolly, as my supervisor, who provided me with guidance and feedback towards the completion of this thesis. Along with Dr. Connolly, Dr. Tom Craig were professors who opened my eyes to a different way of perceiving the world and challenging my preconceived notions, for that I am grateful. I am also thankful to Dr. Kimberly Maich and Dr. Nicola Simmons for their feedback and for being part of the committee.

I am also grateful for the support and encouragement I received from Cathy Hardy, my life partner and my solid rock. You allow me the freedom to soar and walk with me when I am earth-bound.

"One can never consent to creep when one feels an impulse to soar." – Helen Keller

Monte Hardy

Table of Contents

Abstract

This study focused on the learning experience of a culturally Deaf person in a workshop milieu where training is short and intensive. The researcher is a culturally Deaf person who signs fluently and was raised in a Deaf family. The research examined and evaluated the Instructional Skills Workshop through a CDS orientation to identify possible barriers and sites of potential accommodation for Deaf learners, specifically American Sign Language instructors. The researcher participated in a three-day Instructional Skills Workshop and maintained a journal of his experiences. The research journal and the workshop manuals constituted the data sets. Data analysis involved a) selecting salient episodes from the researcher' journal and applying Galloway et al's Ethic of Accommodation to the episodes and b) applying a SWOT analysis to the overall experience including the manuals. Findings indicate that well-meaning people who assisted in accommodations soon became focused on the ISW process, and that the ISW 3-day structure format, the intensity of the schedule and quick exposure to the foundational premises may not fit a Deaf approach to this short, intensive professional development. Further study should be conducted in a pilot of a Deaf-friendly ISW using the recommendation of a 4-day format.

Definition of Terms

Term	Definition
Bicultural-Bilingual approach to Deaf education	An approach that is called Bi-Bi, meaning bi-cultural/bi-lingual approach to Deaf education that encompasses Deaf culture, hearing culture, ASL and English.
Computer Assisted Real-Time captioning (CART)	A trained individual who uses a court-like stenographic machine to type captions of spoken words in small or large group settings which are projected onto a large screen (or computer) for deaf, hard-of-hearing, or other people with hearing loss.
Constructed	Describes the idea that disability is a creation of a society that builds barriers and perpetuates marginalization and oppression of individuals with impairments, i.e., disability is constructed.
Critical Disability Studies (CDS) orientation	An orientation that focuses on "social, political and intellectual re-evaluation of explanatory paradigms used to understand the lived experience of disabled people and potential ways forward for social, political and economic change." (Meekosha & Shuttleworth, 2009, p. 49).
Culturally Deaf	A person who has a positive identity as a Deaf person, is a signer (sign language user), and participates in Deaf community activities.
Culturally Deaf (visual) perspective	Considered from a culturally Deaf perspective, ensuring that activities have visual elements.
'D'eaf vs. 'd'eaf	While this usage may not be universal it is endemic to the North American Deaf community. The capitalized 'D' refers to signing Deaf people who are part of the Deaf community and identify as culturally Deaf. The small case 'd' is a term used to denote those who have hearing loss but do not identify as culturally Deaf or participate in Deaf communities.

Deaf vs. hearing	A binary view of how the world is divided into Deaf people and hearing people. This view also recognizes diversity in terms of gender, race, and religion.
Deaf community	A term that can either mean a localized community of culturally Deaf people or the larger Deaf world.
Deaf-centric	An approach that promotes the view that Deaf approaches to education, communication, and services that uses sign language, cultural behaviours, and visual cues are Deaf-friendly and meets culturally Deaf needs.
Deaf-friendly	A term used by Deaf people to describe an approach that meets the needs of the Deaf in communication, in building design, and in services. Typically, it means that accessible communication is available and that services and building design and meets the visual needs of the Deaf.
Deaf Lens	An evaluative and analytical examination of a phenomenon through culturally Deaf values, beliefs, and behaviour.
Deaf Space	"The deafening of the public space and the emergence of inclusive practices among hearing people constitute one dimension in the construction of a Deaf space. Another dimension concerns providing excellence in communicative accessibility." (Solvang & Haualand, 2014, p. 5).
Deaf world	All that encompasses a community of culturally Deaf people including language, culture, behaviours, and the arts.
Deafening	A phenomenon where Deaf people take over a public space (Solvang & Haualand, 2014).
Disabled	An activist identity designation based in the collective experience of disablement.

Hard of hearing	Describe someone who has some hearing loss and may utilize technology to maintain accessibility.
Hearing	An adjective used by culturally Deaf people to describe a phenomenon that is hearing-centric, i.e., hearing instructor.
Hearing-centric	A culturally Deaf perspective that any education, communication or services that are based on sound or speech and disregards Deaf approaches, needs or input.
Hearing world	A term used by culturally Deaf people to refer to people who are not part of the Deaf world.
Intersectional disabled	A disabled person who may also have other characteristics that are oppressed including race, sex, and gender, and class.
Intersection oppression	A person who experiences oppression in more than one characteristic including disability, race, sex, gender, and class.
Mainstreamed	An American term to denote the inclusion of disabled students in a normative population. Although the Canadian term is inclusion, Deaf use the mainstream nomenclature.
Medical model	A notion that describes a perspective that disability exists in the individual and that disability must be fixed.
Neurodiverse (Neurodiversity)	A perspective that emphasizes differences of bodies as "an aspect of naturally occurring and inherently desirable human variability" (Strauss, 2013. p. 467).
Neurotypical	An accepted normative premise about bodily function and development that applies to humans in ways that uphold standards of health, productivity and predictability.

Oral deaf	Refers to deaf people who do not use sign language and communicate through lipreading and speech.
Oral interpreter	A trained individual who facilitates communication between deaf and hearing individuals using lipreading and speech.
Participant-instructor	I use this term to identify the instructor role of participants during the mini-lesson cycle. This is my term and not an ISW term.
Participant-learner	I use this term to identify the learner role of participants during the mini-lesson cycle. This is my term and not an ISW term.
Phonocentric	A focus on sounds, speech and hearing in areas of knowledge, cultural, and social production.
Sign Language Interpreter	A trained individual who facilitates communication between d/Deaf and hearing individuals using sign language and speech.
Visual noise	A concept referring to an environment that has too many visual distractions for Deaf people to attend to presenters or instructors. This may also include environments that allow bright sun to shine in a window or one that has too many patterns.
Visually accessible	Accessible to Deaf, deaf, hard of hearing where information is visual. This may include sign language interpreter, oral interpreter, CART, information that is visually available such as projected PowerPoint.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Culturally Deaf adult learner experiences of mainstreamed post-secondary education and professional training are fraught with barriers, disappointments, and frustration. Many of their frustrations are related to the instructional process, the access supports that they receive, and the unstated normative assumptions of adult learners. Instructional methods, activities, resources, tools, and curriculum are developed without a consideration for accessibility and inadvertently creating poor learning experiences. Many well-meaning disability support services staff in postsecondary institutions are not qualified to assess the requirements of Deaf learners, resulting in a barriered learning environment and experiences.

My research focused on the learning experiences of a culturally Deaf person in a workshop milieu where training is short and intensive. In particular, my research examined and evaluated a three-day Instructional Skills Workshop through a CDS orientation to identify adaptations that might enhance accessibility for Deaf learners, specifically American Sign Language instructors.

Context

A cursory review reveals that scholarship regarding accessibility and professional development for disabled adult learners is sparse. Professional training and postsecondary ancillary education are designed

with broad normative assumptions about the adult learner. Adaptation and accessibility considerations for disabled learners are often an afterthought.

Most current preconceptions about adult learners are based on Malcolm Knowles premises regarding these assumptions, termed andragogy, which was introduced in the late 1960s. According to Cyr (1999), Knowles' andragogy theory outline four assumptions regarding adult learners: "adults become increasingly independent and self-directing; they accumulate experience that becomes a resource for learning; they orient their formal and informal learning around their social and work roles; and they orient their learning toward performance rather than subject." [abstract]

While all four assumptions can apply to many adult learner, including disabled people, there is an unstated assumption that such assumptions are normative in nature. The experiences of Deaf learners are significantly different from that of a neurotypical adult learner, in that, they experience barriers, marginalization, exclusion, oppression, and pejorative attitudes across all aspects of society.

Disability and Postsecondary Education in Ontario

Accessibility in society has become an important focus for disabled people and government, both in Canada and internationally. The passage of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)

(Government of Ontario, 2005) in Ontario, and the Canadian government's ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCPRD) (Government of Canada, n.d.) in 2010 signalled the importance of accessibility. For instance, in Article 24.2 (c), signatories of the UNCPRD are expected to make reasonable accommodations that meet the accessibility needs of disabled people (United Nations, 2006). Both human rights codes in Ontario and Canada ban discrimination on the basis of disability in every sector of society including postsecondary education (Ontario Human Rights, n.d.; Government of Canada, n.d.).

In Ontario 5% of 432,426 of postsecondary students received accommodations in 2001-2002: a mere 21,737 (Ontario Human Rights, n.d.a). In their analysis of several data sets between 2005 and 2011, McCloy and Declou (2013) determined that disabled Canadian postsecondary students' usage of accommodation services differed between colleges (10 to 15 percent) and universities (5 to 7 percent). According to the Ontario Human Rights, accommodation for students is overseen by two statues: The Charter of Rights and Freedom (Government of Canada, n.d.); and, provincial human rights laws and policies (Ontario Human Rights, n.d.). Most post-secondary institutions in Canada have established disability support personnel to address the accessibility needs of disabled learners. Disability support personnel look at the disabled learner's needs and provide assistance through personal or technological

assistance. For instance, Brock University's student accessibility services website advertise supports such as note taker, alternate text formats, and assistive technology (n.d.). However, the Ontario Human Rights (n.d.) notes that many postsecondary disabled students face difficulties including: environmental barriers, timeliness of access, transition issues, changing course formats (i.e., computer-provided courses), institutions admission policies (graduate schools often refuse part-time studies), transportation, costs of access, complex funding supports, intersectional discrimination, literacy competency barriers, and attitudinal barriers.

Disabled postsecondary learners have the ability to obtain access at postsecondary institutions. However, there remains the question of understanding accessibility needs that continue to create barriers in a postsecondary learning environment.

Self-reflexivity

I am a CODA, a term applied to children of Deaf adults by the Deaf community. As a CODA I have internalized certain values of Deaf culture such as valuing sign language, understanding the importance of Deaf institutions and Deaf community, a strong sense of collectivism, a sensitivity to injustice, and activism in addressing oppression of Deaf people and working towards the improvement of Deaf people's lives. Medically, my hearing level is diagnosed as moderate to severe hearing loss. I use hearing aids as a tool to access the hearing world and yet, I

identify most closely as Deaf. According to Shield (2004), CODAs (specifically hearing children) live in liminal space as they are considered both insiders and outsiders in the Deaf community. Yet these values influence how I understand the world and how I approach my analysis of issues, problems, and understanding.

I have worked in Deaf services for over 25 years in a variety of direct services and management of services for Deaf children, youth, and adults in British Columbia and Ontario. My experience spans the breadth of services including advocacy, residential programs, family support services, youth transition programs, sign language services, and adult support services for Deaf, hard of hearing, Deafblind, vision impaired, and blind people. I have also provided and facilitated adult education and training. My participation in Deaf communities allowed me to be an activist in obtaining an apology from an oppressive educational congress (International Congress of Educators of the Deaf) as well as advocating for the establishing of a video relay services in Canada (a telephonic, visual interpreter relay service for the Deaf).

In my professional experience, I have also encountered many Deaf post-secondary students in both British Columbia and Ontario who are included with the support of sign language interpreters and note takers and have indicated a high degree of dissatisfaction with the quality of support they received. In my experience, many Deaf postsecondary students have expressed a frustration with the support services, sign language

interpreters, and instructors. There is a disconnect between the accessibility requirements and the actual experience of adult Deaf learners in Canadian higher education institutions.

Theoretical Framework

My research uses a Critical Disability Studies (CDS) theoretical framework since the notion that disability and normalcy are both constructed in our society has become a foundational component in examining systemic oppression. Siebers (2001) describes how the disabled body promotes the idea that all bodies are socially constructed and hence the compulsion to fix bodies that are deemed abnormal. Further to this, Critical Disabilities Studies focuses on the source of such oppressive behaviours, systems, structures, and attitudes as emanating from the hegemony of normalcy (Michalko, 2009). According to Davis (2013), the notion of normalcy and disability are historically and socially constructed resulting in social and structural barriers for disabled people. The propagation of normalcy permeates societal institutions and systems including that of the higher education systems. Many systems, structures, and attitudes of normalcy are unwittingly promoted by people who mean well, even though they are supportive of accessibility for disabled people. I use the term 'meaning well' as a notion where able-bodied people engage in an action to assist disabled people often without consultation or permission. Assistance is provided to the disabled person that the 'well meaning' able-bodied person believes to be the correct way.

Conceptual Framework

  The critical components of this research are the understanding of what constitutes CDS research and the evaluative framework from which the ISW is scrutinized. Scholars including Couser, Cameron and Priestly have described the requirements for CDS research which are the guiding conceptual framework for my research.

  Couser (2005) focuses his criteria on the writer/researcher in his description of what constitutes life writing or perhaps in this instance life research on disability. Cameron (2014a), in his discussion of disability research emphasizes that the research questions and findings should focus on changes to the social and structural world to benefit disabled people. Priestly (1997), on the other hand, describes six fundamental elements for what he calls "emancipatory disability research" (p. 34). He proposes six fundamental elements are required and addresses some of the problematic core values of traditional research such as the goals of ontology, epistemology, objectivity, how research benefits the disabled, the control over research, giving voice to those studied, and accepting varied methods for data collection.

  The second part of the conceptual framework consideration was choosing a set of accommodation values to evaluate the ISW. The rationale for choosing such guiding values as a means to evaluation is that they provide the overarching framework in accommodation requirements. The Ontario Human Rights and the UNCPRD documents both have

guiding values for the development of policies (see Appendix A). Both of these documents provide helpful guiding values, but they do not push the envelope that meet the components of CDS research laid out by Couser, Priestly and Cameron. In reflecting on the CDS viewpoint, I chose to use Galloway, Nudd and Sandhal's Ethics of Accommodation (2007) (see Table 4).

The Ethics of Accommodation (EoA), an accommodation manifesto developed for disability theatre, provides a penetrating vision of what accessibility looks like in action where marginalized disabled people have equal power and value. Further to this, the use of The Ethics of Accommodation in the analysis of the ISW aligns this research with the foundations of CDS research as laid out by Couser, Priestly and Cameron.

Background

As a culturally Deaf person, I am exploring my accessibility experiences in a professional development instructional training module known as the Instructional Skills Workshop. My findings will be a benefit to Deaf professionals, specifically Deaf sign language instructors, who wish to enhance their instructional skills.

As an insider, a culturally Deaf person, I recognize that the context has significant information that needs to be explained in order to understand my study. Therefore, in order to understand my experiences and findings I will need to contextualize three areas: (1) What does it mean

to be culturally Deaf? (2) What is the Instructional Skills Workshop? (3) What is a CDS orientation?

What does it mean to be culturally Deaf?

The term 'culturally Deaf' is a complex notion that must be unpacked to provide an understanding of Deaf culture, language and history. My intent here is not to provide an exhaustive treatise on Deaf culture, language and history but to provide enough information to be able to contextualize my study. There are more exhaustive works in this area by Tom Humphries, Carol Padden, Harlan Lane and Paddy Ladd.

Before engaging in a discussion of Deaf culture, there are some terms that will need some clarification. The first clarification is between the capitalized Deaf and the lower-case deaf. The capitalized 'Deaf' refers to those who have a shared understanding of what it means to be culturally Deaf in values, beliefs and behaviour. Gertz and Boudreault (2016) proposed that the capitalized 'D' describes those who participate in Deaf communities where they choose to 'subscribe' to the values, beliefs and behaviours of Deaf culture (p. xxxii). The lower-case 'deaf' refers to the broad spectrum of people who have hearing loss but who do not necessarily share culturally Deaf views. Gertz and Boudreault (2013) use the lower-case 'd' to delineate those with hearing loss who identify more closely with "hearing world" (p. xxxiii) (see explanation below). The use of the capitalized and lower-case 'd' in D/deaf is not universal and there is ongoing dialogue regarding to how this distinction is used. However, for

the purpose of this thesis I will adhere to Gertz and Boudreault's use of the d/Deaf terms.

Deaf culture is a set of values, beliefs and behaviours that enact a positive socio-cultural view of Deaf people as opposed to a medicalized view of deafness (Canadian Hearing Society, 2015; Canadian Association of the Deaf, 2015a). To be Deaf is to be one who participates in a community of Deaf sign language users and who share values, beliefs and behaviours. Ladd and Lane (2013) identify Carol Padden and Tom Humphries as the originators of the term 'Deaf culture' and highlight Deaf cultural values, beliefs and behaviours including: valuing visual language (sign language), strong sense of belonging (community), rules of behaviours (allegiance, community), valuing institutions (Deaf schools), rich essence of arts (visual arts, stories, humour), history (shared experiences of oppression), kinship (solidarity amongst Deaf), socialization of Deaf children by Deaf adults, and boundaries (rules for social interactions between Deaf and hearing). However, Ladd and Lane (2013) also caution that the idea of Deaf culture as a uniform representation of all Deaf signers in the world does a disservice to the diversity within the Deaf community.

According to the World Federation of the Deaf (n.d.), there are an estimated seventy million Deaf people with more than three hundred sign languages around the world. In Canada, the population of culturally Deaf people is not well known and estimates vary widely depending on where

statistics are retrieved from. The Canadian Association of the Deaf asserts

that "no fully credible census" have been conducted in Canada for Deaf,

deaf, oral deaf, hard of hearing or deafened (2015b). There is a recognition

that there are commonalities in the values, beliefs and behaviour, and one

must understand how diversity shapes each Deaf community. Ladd and

Lane (2013) further emphasize that, while the idea of Deaf culture is

important, a recognition that the historic and larger cultural locations

interacts to form diversity within and throughout Deaf communities.

In my case, much of what I understand is reflective of a Canadian

Anglo middle class socioeconomic Deaf experience, especially when I re-

connected with my Deaf identity during the 1990s. Gertz and Boudreault

(2016) highlight many of the events that I followed in the US impacting

equality and participation in US society. The events in the Deaf

community in the US in the late 1980s and 1990s influenced the

perspective of Deaf Canadians. For instance, Gallaudet University, a Deaf

university in Washington DC where many Deaf Canadians attended, had a

protest in 1988 where they demanded that the university president must be

a Deaf person. The US Deaf community won the battle when I. King

Jordan, a Deaf man, was installed as president (Gallaudet University, n.d.).

Other event such as the passing of the American with Disabilities Act in

1990 provided many disabled Americans including Deaf people with the

tools to ensure that they had equality in areas of communication,

education, employment and other areas of society (National Deaf Center

on Postsecondary Outcomes, n.d.; Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, n.d.). An example of this was the enshrinement of the rights to captioned television in the passing of the Television Decoder Circuitry Act in 1990 (National Association of the Deaf, n.d.-a). Other examples include the introduction of Video Relay Services, where a Deaf person could connect by video (computer or equipment) to a sign language interpreter who then called a hearing person to improve the fluidity of communication (National Association of the Deaf, n.d.-b). Gertz and Boudreault (2016) identified all of these advancements as "revolutionizing Deaf communities around the world" (p. xxxi).

Impact was felt by the Canadian Deaf community as many followed the events in the US, and Deaf Canadian students returning from Gallaudet often brought ideas and the motivation to improve the situation for Deaf Canadians. However, changes for Deaf Canadians were slow and often met with disappointment. Much of the advancements by Deaf Canadians came as a result of legal action which was onerous (Bauman, H-DL, Simser, S, Hannan, G, n.d.). Deaf Canadians won the right to sign language interpreting for postsecondary education (1993), medical services (1997), elementary/secondary education (1997), federal government services (2006), and the right of the Deaf child to access sign language (2005). Additionally, a series of accessibility decisions under the Accommodations for Ontarians with Disability Act (2005) also benefitted Deaf Ontarians (Bauman, Simser, and Hannan, n.d.).

In addition to these legal cases, the British Columbia Deaf community formed a committee to ask the Vancouver conference of International Congress of Educators for the Deaf in 2010 to issue an apology for its previous decision in Milan (1881) to ban sign language as a communication in schools for the Deaf which impacted many Deaf schools internationally. The apology was issued by the conference committee and accepted by the conference attendees as a significant step towards reconciliation. Finally, in 2016, the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (2017) approved Video Relay Service for Deaf Canadian consumers.

Along with these historic event, there are a number of notions that are part of my Canadian Deaf experience that shape my perspective and understanding. For the Deaf person, there are two worlds: Deaf and hearing. In the Canadian Deaf perspective there are two ways of being in the world that reflect an understanding of the distinction of beliefs, values and behaviours. This is not to say that either the 'Deaf world' or 'hearing world' is viewed as lacking diversity within each sphere. The emphasis is more on the perception of how being in the world is for each community from a Deaf view. For example, Deaf sign language as manual (use of hands, face and body) and visual versus hearing language as auditory and verbal. Deaf people value a separate Deaf institution education experience versus hearing emphasis on inclusion in education. Deaf as a vibrant sociocultural community versus deafness as a disability and medical issue

to be fixed. What is important to understand is that the Deaf categorize
Deaf education, communication, community, the arts, and other such areas
as having two views: The Deaf way and the hearing way. The contrast of
the Deaf world with the hearing world is important for understanding the
Deaf perspective.

An important notion for the culturally Deaf person is a strong
adherence to the idea that the Deaf community is a cultural-linguistic
minority rather than disabled. The Canadian Association of the Deaf
(2015a) and the Canadian Hearing Society (2015) reject the medicalization
of hearing loss and lean towards the cultural-linguistic minority view of
being Deaf. The Canadian Association of the Deaf emphasizes the
character of a culturally Deaf person is not so much measured by hearing
loss but by positive attitudes towards Deaf, how involved one is in the
community, and the signing ability of the person (2015a). However, most
culturally Deaf people grudgingly and pragmatically identify as disabled
where it is required to receive funding or benefits from the various levels
of government in Canada.

Further to the perspective of how culturally Deaf people contrast
the Deaf and hearing worlds, there are some further areas that reflect their
values. Deaf Canadians do not see all people with hearing loss as part of
the culturally Deaf community. Deaf children and youth who attend Deaf
institutions are enculturated by older Deaf students and Deaf adult staff
into the Deaf community. Through this process they come to adopt the

values, beliefs and behaviours of Deaf. Distinctions are made for those

who are more socially aligned with hearing ways of being in the world.

For example, orally deaf, those who are schooled in lip reading and speech

methods of communication rather than sign language are typically not seen

as culturally Deaf. However, those who learn sign language and adopt

Deaf values, beliefs and behaviours can eventually become part of the

Deaf community. Further to this, deaf people who are mainstreamed

(Canadian Deaf people use this word although it is American in origin),

those who attend hearing schools having access to education via sign

language interpreters, can also be adopted into the Deaf community as

they learn the values, beliefs and behaviours of their community.

The importance of connectedness with the Deaf community entails

several different values, beliefs and behaviours. One such characteristic is

the collectivist nature of the Deaf community. Triandis (2002) describes

collectivism as having identity defined by a group, sharing group

intentions, "communal" relationships, as well as emphasis on in-group

epistemology and ontology. The communal nature of the Deaf community

starts in the institutions where the emphasis on conforming to in-group

norms is significant. This is not necessarily a negative experience; rather,

it lends to the understanding of how culturally Deaf people form values,

beliefs and behaviours that are long lasting.

The importance of the Deaf institutions is important because of its

role in the enculturation of deaf children and youth into Deaf culture.

Deaf staff and older Deaf children and youth mentor younger children and youth in what is acceptable in values, beliefs and behaviours. This enculturation process is often extracurricular for children and youth who stay at the residence often attached to Deaf institutions. Such processes of enculturation are done through socialization and modelling. Kinship is also developed through shared experiences as many who attend Deaf institutions remain friends and associates through life in communities across many areas in Canada. Geographically located Deaf associations can be found in geographic locations, provincial, and national levels. Social loyalty is also developed as the sense of the dichotomous nature of Deaf versus hearing world becomes a deeper reality.

Shared experiences also become a continuing critical element in strengthening the Deaf communities beyond school years. Shared experiences of barriers in communication with the hearing world, marginalization, oppression, exclusion, attitudinal barriers, and other daily encounters become common bonds that fall away when Deaf people come together. The freedom of being able to communicate fluently in sign language without confusion and misunderstanding is appreciated by Deaf people. This freedom in communication results in frequent gathering of Deaf people in a geographic area.

Deaf art is often an expression from a location of oppression in areas of visual arts such as drawings, paintings, and plays. Other such art forms include storytelling, poems, playing with visual language, and

humour. Often storytelling regarding their daily experiences is empowering especially when corresponding stories of how to overcome, outsmart and show up the oppressive society is a means of teaching one another how to survive and thrive. Poems are artistic means of storytelling either with the story as the main thrust or as a visual play using sign language as a prop and expression. Playing with sign language is a cultural tradition using the visual representation of numbers or alphabets to tell a story. Finally, humour is valued as a means of retorting to the hearing oppressors through outsmarting them or making them look foolish (Sutton-Spence & Napoli, 2012). Such thematic humour is also found in disability, black slave, and aboriginal humour stories as a response to their oppressors (Coogan & Mallett,2013; Lalla, 1990; Linton, 1999). These artistic endeavours are supported by Deaf cultural organizations across Canada.

One last element to keep in mind regarding Deaf culture is the concept of 'Deaf-way." The idea of a Deaf-way is that there is an unspoken and often instinctual approach in areas of communication, education, accessibility. An obvious Deaf-way example is that communication is through sign language using American Sign Language, a visual language. American Sign Language, as other foreign sign languages, has a grammar and syntax different from spoken languages. There are invented sign languages such as Signed Exact English (signing in exact English word order), Sim Com (signing and speaking at the same

time), Cued Speech (a complex approach to aid speech using hand cues) which are not considered Deaf-way. Deaf-way can also be thought of as Deaf-centric or Deaf-friendly which essentially means that it is an accepted Deaf approach in areas such as education, accessibility, using sign language interpreters, collectivism as opposed to individualism, artistic expressions (i.e., sign language interpretations of music lyrics may be frowned upon), rules of greeting, and departure, ways of using communication technologies in a Deaf settings, and many other areas that require a much more exhaustive explanation.

As a person who was raised in a Deaf family with Deaf parents and participated in the Deaf community both as a child and as an adult I use a number of terms that may be understood amongst Deaf people but not hearing people. Please see Definitions of Terms (at the beginning) for explanation of terms in order to help the reader to understand how they are used in my thesis.

What is the Instructional Skills Workshop?

Adult education, by design, is structured to address additional knowledge, skills and abilities with short-term training provided for a few hours to a few days. Notzer and Abramovitz (2008) found that a one-day workshop on instruction has resulted in long-term improvements in clinical instruction. The Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW) is a short

professional development training in a model of instruction applicable for a wide range of training scenarios including colleges, universities, and training in professional fields. The Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW) instructional model is based on Kolb's experiential learning premises (Morrison, 1985). The ISW uses a facilitated peer-based learning approach through multi-modal feedback and reflective practices (ISWIAC, 2006a & 2006b). The ISW has become the standard training at many post-secondary institutions in Canada and internationally. Dawson et al. (2014) found that instructors who participated in the ISW were found to be less teacher-focussed and more attentive to active engagement of students.

I have completed the ISW and the Facilitator Development Workshop (FDW), an advanced training that certifies me to provide the ISW. Hence, I also have the training manuals both as a resource and data set for my thesis. I will be using the 2006 version of the ISW and FDW manual as a resource and as a data set. The scholarship on the ISW is somewhat limited, so the information in this section is drawn from the ISW and FDW manuals, my experiences of both training levels, and the scholarship that is available.

Brief History of ISW

The ISW has its Canadian roots in British Columbia where it was developed at the request of the Ministry of Education to address instructional skills of college instructors. Doug Kerr, a consultant with the Vancouver Vocational Institute, was tasked with developing the ISW

along with ancillary module training for facilitators (FDW) and for training to train people to provide the FDW (Morrison, 1985). In 1979, the initial round of training focused on developing facilitators who were then able to provide the ISW in British Columbia (Morrison, 1985). Most of the early years of the ISW training were focused on college instructors who did not have instructional training but were experts in various disciplines (Morrison, 1985). In 1992, the ISW was introduced to provide training for teacher's assistants at the University of British Columbia and later also included faculty and sessional instructors (ISWIAC, 2006a). The strong response and results were noticed by institutions in other provincial jurisdictions and international institutions. The offering of the ISW soon spread to other Canadian and international postsecondary institutions (ISWIAC, 2006a). According to the ISW Network, the ISW have been conducted in Canada, the US, and in twenty-seven countries around the world (2018).

Some of the characteristics that infused the development of the earlier ISW included a "peer training model" and continuing learning through the lifespan (Morrison, 1985, p.77). According to the ISWIAC (2006a), the early ISW was based on a "competency-based adult education" model (p. iii). Later versions of the ISW also introduced a "learning outcomes approach" and the scaffolding of concepts through the course for participants to improve instructional skills and concepts (ISWIAC, 2006a, p. iii). The ISW manual indicates that the ISW is a

"laboratory approach" to enhance instructional skills and learning
(ISWIAC, 2006a). The ISW I experienced encompasses all of these
descriptions of the ISW including Kolb's experiential learning cycle which
is foundational.

There are descriptions of the purpose of the ISW both in
Morrison's (1985) research and the ISW manual (ISWIAC, 2006a). The
ISW manual provides us with a clear description of the purpose of the
ISW: "the ISW is to help participants develop increased competence and
confidence as facilitators of learning and to provide resources to assist
individuals to become more reflective teaching practitioners" (ISWIAC,
2006a).

Morrison (1985) describes the purpose of the ISW as "the development of
the fundamental skills of writing objectives, preparing lesson plans, and
conducting instructional sessions" (p. 77). My understanding from my
experience of the ISW is that these purposes were enacted but also
included notions such as discovering effective teaching, feedback,
instructional models and learning styles.

Structure of ISW

The ISW is a training module in instructional skills that can be
offered in different structural formats. The core structure of the ISW is a
scaffolded learning approach with several mini-lessons presented by

participants integrating introduced concepts, peer feedback and self-reflection over a 24-hour time period distributed over several days (ISWIAC, 2006a).

While the ISW is a flexible model in terms of how it can be offered there seems to be some difference between what is encouraged by the FDW manual and what is described in the early days by Morrison. Morrison (1985) describes a variety of formats which include four- or five-days or sections offered over longer periods of time (i.e. weekends). The FDW manual describes more options such as three days, four one-day segments, eight three-hour segments two two-day segments, and five five-hour segments. The core requirement of the ISW offering is a total of twenty-four to thirty hours in total (ISWIAC, 2006b). My experience was an intensive three-day format (eight hours each day). It is this format that I will be describing, analyzing and critiquing in my thesis, specifically, as it relates to me, as a Deaf participant, and more broadly as it might apply to future potential Deaf participants.

The practical core of the ISW is the cyclical mini-lessons that each participant-instructor prepares for the ISW. The number of mini-lessons over the course of the ISW may vary depending on how the training is structured. My three-day ISW required me to prepare three mini-lessons with the idea of integrating notions such as instructional modelling, participatory learning, and engaging learners in the full Kolb experiential learning cycle.

The mini-lesson is a forty-minute segment divided into several sub-segments: preparation (ten minutes), mini-lesson (10 minutes), self reflection (instructor), written feedback (learners) (7 minutes), small group peer feedback (13 minutes). The small group usually includes four or five participants who take on several roles during the cycles: instructor, learners, and peer feedback. Each participant is to take on the role of the instructor (participant-instructor) once during the rotating cycles so they will be conducting three mini-lessons. The facilitators for each small group are essentially neutral and are responsible for guiding the process of the feedback. The participant-instructor is to integrate both new learning and peer feedback into their successive role as the instructor.

The ISW combines large group learning and reflecting, small groups that cycle through the mini-lessons where participants take on different roles, receiving peer feedback, engaging in self-reflection and individual objective setting. An abbreviated three-day schedule would look like this:

Table 1

Abbreviated sample ISW content for a three-day schedule

Day 1	Concepts taught, activities	Time
Large group instruction	Introduction to ISW. Workshop goals. Discussion: Effective teaching/feedback. Group agreements. Introducing, modelling and deconstructing BOPPPS (model of instruction)	2 hour and 45 minutes
Small group mini lesson cycles	Developing personal goals. 4 or 5 cycles of mini-lesson depending on participant numbers in small group. Evaluation/Feedback	3 hours and 20 minutes

Day 2		
Large group instruction and activities	Discussing formative feedback. Learning Style Inventory, Kolb's theory of learning. Areas to think of in lesson planning: head (intellect), heart (emotion), and hand (physical action).	1 hour and 15 minutes
Small group mini-cycles	Formation of day's objectives. Mini-lesson cycles	4 hours
Large group instruction and activities	Participatory learning Evaluation/Feedback	1 hour 15 minutes
Day 3		
Large group instruction and activities	Discussing formative feedback Answering questions from participants	1 hour
Small group min-cycles	Mini-lessons cycles	4 hours
Large group wrap up and reflection	Reflection Wrap-up	1 hour

Adapted from Brock Centre for Pedagogical Innovations schedule

Note: A detailed three-day schedule can be seen in Appendix A

The scaffolding of concepts through the three days allows the participant to integrate new learning in the next cycle of mini-lessons. For example, the model of instruction (BOPPPS) is introduced on the first day. BOPPPS is the acronym for the segments of the instructional model: Bridge-in, Objective, Pre-test, Participatory learning, Post-test, Summary. The participant-instructor then has the opportunity to integrate the BOPPPS model into their second mini-lesson. The second day of my experience, the Kolb's theory of learning and the notion of stimulating the cognitive, behavioural and affective is explicitly introduced to the participants. Again, the participant-instructor is able to integrate the new learning into their third mini-lesson.

The feedback process is multi-modal: peer feedback, guided reflection and self reflection. The ISW integrates the three modes of feedback into the mini-lesson feedback to provide the participant-instructor with multiple forms to absorb and apply in their next cycle. These feedbacks will include how the participant-instructor utilized the concepts of BOPPPS, Kolb's learning theory, and the three elements of participatory learning. Finally, the participant-instructor receives a video recorded copy of their mini-lesson to observe their instruction for the purpose of self-reflecting and integrating new concepts and feedback.

The facilitated peer model of the ISW is characterized by Socratic-style question driven guided discovery pedagogy resonates with some of Deaf cultural norms. Deaf cultural norms such as Deaf storytelling and the collectivist nature of the Deaf community are two areas that intersect with ISW approaches. For instance, the instructor in a mini-lesson provides a type of storytelling as is the feedback that the learners provide. In addition, the experiential guided discovery of peers is a process experienced by the small group, a type of community. While there are elements of ISW and Deaf cultural norms that resonate, there are limitations. A singular Deaf participant's experience of the ISW is dependent on a highly skilled, contextually sensitive Sign Language Interpreter. The dynamic communication between peers in an ISW demands a high level of interaction that can impinge on the Deaf participant connection with peers in a small group.

Understanding Lenses and Orientation

A lens is a way of looking at something for the purpose of examination and evaluation from a specific perspective. In my professional life in the public service we were encouraged to look at our policies, programs and services with a "disability lens" to ensure they were accessible. The Canadian Disability Alliance produced a list of questions by McColl and Jongbloed (2006) to help in evaluating government policies through a "disability lens". The idea of a "disability lens" implies a unified singular orientation in disability studies. However, in the years since, I have become informed by more critical orientations to disability as a phenomenon rather than a condition of the body. I have come to understand the limits of single identity thinking, and the problems with assuming there is one overarching disability orientation. Therefore, I am using this Critical Disability orientation in my thesis.

A Critical Disability Studies (CDS) orientation explores and interrogates taken for granted and unquestioned interpretations of disability, thereby proposing disability as a complex phenomenon, requiring ongoing critical engagement. The "interrogation of discourses and cultural meaning" as well as "theorisation of diversity" are important tenets of CDS (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009, p.56). CDS research is the interrogation of normalcy as an assumed, natural and unquestioned worldview. Normalcy is an invisible and assumed starting point for assumptions about the body that excludes disabled bodies yet requires

them to conform to its normative parameters (Cameron, 2014b; Garland-

Thomson, 2009). Challenging cultural meaning and knowledge production

is essential in CDS to expose how pervasive normalcy is in our

westernized society. Cultural meaning is assigned to differentiated bodies

resulting in an exclusion from "privilege, status and power" in society

(Garland-Thomson, 2009, p. 63). Michalko and Titchkosky (2009)

propose the study of normalcy as the crux of CDS, thus shifting the focus

away from the visibility of 'defective bodies' and onto the invisible

standards that construct the artificial 'defective' category. A CDS

orientation also recognizes that disability has diverse intersections with

other identity locations of oppression including race, gender, sexuality,

and class. Such influential orientations as critical race theory, critical

feminism, queer theory, and critical social theory strengthens CDS as a

flexible orientation (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009).

The purpose of disability research is to "produce new knowledge"

to make changes in the social setting or the environment (Cameron, 2014.

p. 34). The purpose of CDS is to interrogate existing practices of

disability research that result in a narrow focus of rehabilitation (Cameron,

2014a). The influence of critical race theory, critical feminism, queer

theory and critical social theory on CDS highlights four core principles:

"(1) the irreducibility of social life to objective facts; (2) the requirement
of linking theory with praxis in the struggle for an autonomous and
participatory society; (3) the necessity that a discipline or field of study be
aware of its own historicity and critically reflect on its conceptual
framework; and (4) the need to engage in a dialogue with other cultures on

the issues and concepts of current significance" (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009, p. 47).

These principles influence how I approach my thesis and the tools that I choose to use in my analysis.

The first principle emphasizes the fluid nature of social life where natural science approaches (quantitative research tools) cannot be used as it demands enduring truths across social interactions (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009). The recognition that social life is dynamic influences me to choose a qualitative approach based on my thesis. The qualitative approach is appropriate in studying social life because it offers design flexibility, empathic neutrality and context responsiveness. Qualitative research also defies the requirement to be an objective observer of social life. I recognize that my thesis is based on my experiences of a phenomenon and while relevant, it may be different for another person. This principle accepts the inherent biases and experiences that influence researchers in their efforts to produce knowledge and defies the requirement to be neutral.

The second principle emphasizes that theory should not exist in a vacuum but has practical relevance in disabled people's efforts to participate in society as equal and self-sufficient people (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009). My approach to research is rooted in pragmatism. The philosophy of pragmatism emphasizes finding knowledge that is meaningful and practical. Danforth (2006), describes pragmatism as an

approach that seeks practical applications in creating "communities of equality and respect" (p. 338). Creswell (2013) describes pragmatism in research as focused on the "outcomes of the research – the actions, situations and consequences of inquiry" (p. 28). Essentially, CDS provides the orientation that allows for emancipatory action that critiques oppressive systems, structures and attitudes towards disabled people.

The third principle highlights the notion that social knowledge is always grounded in history. As a result, it becomes important that the CDS orientation is self reflexive in its theories and practice (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009). Self reflexivity becomes important in that one recognizes how understanding of social phenomenon from fifty years ago is very different than today (or perhaps not). The exercise of self reflexivity also includes the understanding that sociopolitical forces are continuously swirling in every time periods.

In the same vein, as I approach this study I need to be self reflexive in understanding my biases and assumptions. I recognize that my cultural Deaf understanding is reflective of a middle class, Anglo-Canadian, westernized orientation influenced by the Deaf community experiences of the last forty years (1980 to 2018). I am also influenced as a child of Deaf parents (CODA) with their views and experiences. In addition, I recognize that my understanding and knowledge will continue to grow and change as time moves forward.

The awareness of one's own historicity also should be applied to the facilitators of ISW. CDS approaches would require ISW facilitators to examine and be aware of: (a) their own unacknowledged phonocentrism, and (2) that the phonocentrism is built into the ISW. Such phonocentrism is not a deliberate oppression rather it is a series of best practices that does not take into consideration participants who are Deaf or hard of hearing. These best practices, as a result, morph into hegemonic normalcy.

This leads to the fourth principle that Meekosha and Shuttleworth identify, the need for CDS to dialogue cross culturally on issues and notions that may be common (2009). As mentioned, I am influenced by my North American westernized Deaf cultural experiences and I recognize that the experiences of Deaf people in other places in the world may not be similar. Openness to dialogue with other cultures helps to discover knowledge in observing phenomenon with different perspectives, experiences and orientation. CDS as an orientation also includes concepts like production of knowledge regarding disability, biopower, identity, disability discourse in gender, feminist and race studies, and intersectionality (Meekosha and Shuttleworth, 2009). While these concepts are significant in westernized societies, I also understand that emphases in different cultures exist and that I must be open to ideas that are different from mine.

As I have mentioned, the four principles of CDS as outlined by Meekosha and Shuttleworth influence how I approach research, that being,

a qualitative approach that honours the experience of disabled people which, in my experience, includes Deaf people. The stories and narratives ferreted out by qualitative research allows for differing experiences of phenomenon. In this thesis, the phenomenon is a brief training regimen that many have experienced since the Canadian inception of the ISW. The four principles of CDS also influence my choice of an evaluative framework for accessibility, the Ethics of Accommodation, developed by Terry Galloway, Donna Marie Nudd, and Carrie Sandhal (2007), for a disability theatre group (See Chapter 3), as well as the SWOT tool, an organizational analysis technique that evaluates an experience from a wholistic potentials perspective.

Research Question

The formation of my research question is drawn from three areas: my experience in the Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW), my experience managing ASL instructors during my time as an administrator, and my own experience of being culturally Deaf. I took the ISW in the hopes of improving my instructional skills and this led me to reflect on my experiences of managing ASL instructors. As a manager I received feedback on many ASL instructors and I interacted with ASL instructors. The feedback was often varied and I wondered how to improve the ASL class participants' experience of taking ASL. I would often sit with ASL instructors to examine how to improve the participants' experience through innovative approaches. I realized that some of the inconsistencies

of feedback might be related to instructional training. However, I also realized that no offering of instructional skills was available that addressed this need given that there is a significant culturally Deaf consideration when providing such training. When I looked at the ISW I wondered if this instructional training could be utilized to address the instructional training needs of Deaf ASL instructors. Hence, these considerations led me to pursue research on integrating ISW with Deaf cultural notions.

My research focused on the learning experiences of a culturally Deaf person in a workshop milieu where training is short and intensive. In particular, my research examined and evaluated a three-day Instructional Skills Workshop through a CDS perspective to identify adaptations that might enhance accessibility for Deaf learners, specifically American Sign Language instructors.

Brief Description of research process

The research approach of my thesis was to examine my experiences of the three-day ISW as a culturally Deaf person through a Critical Disability perspective. My data sets are drawn from multiple sources including my journals, a reflective analysis of my experience of a three-day ISW, the ISW and FDW manuals, and consults with expert ASL instructors. My experiences along with the two manuals would be evaluated through a CDS orientation using Galloway et al.'s Ethics of Accommodation, a criteria for accommodation. The second step of the research process was to engage in a SWOT analysis exercise to ferret out

synergies and gaps between the ISW and my understanding of Deaf

cultural norms. Both of these are engaged as analytical tools with the

intention of assessing how the ISW might fit as an instructional training

tool for Deaf ASL instructors.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In order to understand the review of literature, in the area of Deaf postsecondary experience, the postsecondary readiness for accommodation and, sign language instructor training experiences, it may be helpful to understand the context of the deaf person's general experience. This brief summary will not be able to discuss the depth and nuances in describing the deaf person's experiences in upbringing. Generally, most deaf people are born to hearing parents who become enveloped into a world of a myriad of opinions about how to support their child's language development. Essentially, the tension between the two approaches of communication, signing and speaking, for the deaf is complex as it reflects the differing perspectives of disability between the CDS and the Medical Model of disability respectively.

One such outcome is the general tension between the different approaches to language development between sign language and oralism. Sign language is a visual-spatial language that uses expressions and manual use of hands, face and body to communicate and has a complex grammatical syntax (Baker & Cokely, 1980; Lane, 1992). Oralism is an approach that trains deaf people to use speech and to read lips. The sign language approach also includes a rich cultural and expressive component that is known as Deaf Culture (Baker and Cokely, 1980). The oralism approach is focused on rehabilitation of the deaf person to make them fit into the 'hearing' world.

My research approach is a CDS orientation as I believe there are

some compatibility with Deaf Culture. This compatibility is not to say that

there are not tensions between the disabled and Deaf movements.

According to Corker (2002), the tension arises out of the development of

disability and Deaf orientations, not to mention the "marginalization of

Deaf people in disability politics." (p. 1). In addition, there are differences

in whether or not 'culture' has a place in Deaf movements and disability

politics (Corker, 2002).

In many jurisdictions throughout the world laws and policies have

been implemented to ensure accessibility for disabled people, so that they

have a perceived or real equality in their participation in a variety of areas

of society. Many of the changes are the result of disabled people lobbying

for change to create equality for many who had been disenfranchised. The

effort to make society accessible continues to be difficult with significant

resistance, patchwork successes, and piecemeal changes. In Canada, there

is no federal legislation to enforce disability rights although the Charter of

Rights has enshrined in law the rights for disabled people to be treated

equally (Government of Canada, n.d.).

Some explanation in regards to my use of different group

categories in the literature review are necessary. The available research in

the area of accessibility often does not delineate the finer categories of

different disabilities. This challenge is a conundrum in my efforts to

organize my literature review. The various categories in the literature

includes Deaf, deaf, hard of hearing, disabled, and invisible disability. I use the term that the literature uses in order to ensure that I remain consistent with the group the authors were studying.

The more recent literature on accessibility on accessibility in postsecondary education is most prevalent in Australia, the UK and New Zealand. The review of such literature for this research is presented in three areas: the experience of the Deaf in postsecondary education; postsecondary education readiness for Deaf learners; and Deaf Culture and the ASL Instructor training. The rationale for reviewing literature in these three areas is that the ISW is primarily offered through postsecondary institutions and is relevant to this study.

Experience of Deaf in Postsecondary Education and Professional Development

There is a significant gap in the scholarship regarding Deaf educational experiences in professional development training outside of the postsecondary education setting. Most sources of scholarship regarding the education of the Deaf beyond elementary and secondary schooling is postsecondary education. The US offer two fully Deaf institutions: The National Technical Institute for the Deaf (Rochester, NY) and Gallaudet University (Washington, DC). However, Deaf students attending postsecondary institutions in most countries, including Canada,

will experience what is considered a mainstream setting requiring accommodations to ensure accessibility.

Unfortunately, accommodations for disabled postsecondary students are less than satisfactory. In Ontario, the Ontario Human Rights (n.d.) notes that many postsecondary disabled students face difficulties including: environmental barriers, timeliness of access, transition issues, changing course formats (i.e., computer-provided courses), institutions admission policies (graduate schools often refuse part-time studies), transportation, costs of access, complex funding supports, intersectional discrimination, literacy competency barriers, and attitudinal barriers.

In other jurisdiction, Fuller, Healey, Bradley and Hall (2004b) found that 44% of disabled students at a UK university felt that the lecture as a pedagogical approach was not accessible in their study of 173 disabled students. Further to this, 22% of the students felt that other learning milieus (such as seminars, group work, oral presentations, and laboratory) were inaccessible. According to Power, Hyde and Punch (2002), 53% of Australian sign language users reported significant difficulty with accessibility in workplace training. In spite of accessibility laws, inaccessibility is endemic in our society including professional development and postsecondary institutions in many countries.

Accommodations for Deaf students usually includes one or a mix of sign language interpreter (SLI), oral interpreter, Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), and notetaking. Most Deaf people are very

appreciative of the work of sign language interpreters in enhancing the access to a variety of interactions with hearing people in many situations including higher education. An oral interpreter who sits close to the deaf or hard of hearing student is one who repeats verbatim what is said in mouth movements only so that the student can read lips. CART is the process of typing (using a court reporter machine) what is being said and projecting it on a screen in the room or onto the student's laptop. Notetaking is simply a situation where another person shares her/his lecture notes with the deaf or hard of hearing student. For the purpose of this study, I will focus on the literature regarding sign language interpreters (SLI) as it is the preferred access for Deaf student in mainstream education venues.

Deaf or hard of hearing students will usually register themselves at the disability support office in the postsecondary institution in order to obtain one or more accommodations for their education. Regardless of the support and accommodation offered by student support personnel at postsecondary institutions, there are problematic aspects in each of the supports. Deaf students may face challenges with sign language interpreter's abilities and subject matter knowledge, accessibility in lectures and other educational modalities, accessibility in academic curriculum/information, and attitudes towards Deaf students' academic abilities.

Culturally Deaf postsecondary students tend to choose sign language interpreters as a means to access lectures and other interactive learning situations. In a 2009 survey of Canadian sign language interpreters, Gordon and Hardy found that 32% of 140 respondents indicated that postsecondary interpreting is over 50% of their interpreting work.

Sign language interpreting is a complex process where a person is translating not only the content, but also the context, the culture and cultural information. The complexity of interpreting introduces some challenges for Deaf learners in postsecondary education. In Napier's study (2004) of Sign Language Interpreters (SLIs) omissions, he discovered that not all translation omissions were errors. However, 56% of significant loss of important information were a result of unconscious (27%) and unintentional (14%) omissions and unclear reception (15%) (Napier, 2004). Good SLIs are regarded as allies and are highly valued in the Deaf community universally. The discussion regarding challenges about sign language interpreters, in this thesis, in no way diminishes the value Deaf community members place on good sign language interpreters. Most SLIs will join national or provincial interpreting association as a means of ensuring that high standards are maintained.

According to Johnson and Fann, SLIs are viewed as the "gatekeepers" for access to all aspects of the student's postsecondary institution experience including lectures, other learning modalities,

academic supports, and other support services (2016, p. 249). In addition,

Deaf students are also reliant on the same SLIs if they have a complaint

about interpreter services. Foster, Long and Snell (1999) indicate that

SLIs are seen as central figures in both positive and negative experiences

in postsecondary institutions.

Many SLIs are able to provide a high level of accessibility to the

educational experiences of Deaf students. However, there is a recognition

by Deaf students who use sign language interpreting services expect

variation in quality and availability. The variations include how

information is interpreted (Marschark, Sapere, Convertino and Seewagen,

2005; Foster et al., 1999; Napier and Barker, 2004;), skills/abilities of

interpreters (Marschark et al., 2005; Foster and Snell, 1999; Napier and

Barker, 2004; Johnson and Fann, 2016; Russell and Winston, 2014),

availability of interpreters (Johnson and Fann, 2016; Hyde, Punch and

Power, 2009), and interpreter's knowledge of subject matters (Napier and

Barker, 2004). Further to these skill variations, Russell and Winston

(2014) found that SLIs who provided "effective interpreting"

demonstrated "higher order cognitive thinking skills and attended to

teacher intent and student language preferences" (p.102).

Barnes and Atherton (2005) in their study of British Sign

Language instructors pointed out that providing SLIs does not allow the

Deaf student to be involved in the "learning process" (p. 428). Further to

this, Barnes and Atherton (2015) discovered that the Deaf student cannot

be able to be fully engaged in the class. The access to postsecondary education using SLIs has many limitations as it has benefits.

In a three-year comparative study of Deaf and hard of hearing students in interpreted and direct instruction of a continuing education workshop the preference is for direct instruction in sign language over interpreted instruction (Long and Bell, n.d.). The continuing education classes were technological knowledge and skills in content. The respondents in the study expressed frustration and difficulty understanding course content when provided by a hearing instructor using a sign language interpreter (Long and Bell, n.d.).   Deaf and hard of hearing signing participants in mainstreamed classes identified issues such as interpreter lag time, fatigue, reluctance to ask questions and exclusion during interaction during breaks from other students because interpreters were not available (Long and Bell, n.d.). These students indicated that the benefits of an all-Deaf class in direct instructional training (by signing or Deaf instructors) provided the ideal learning environment (Long and Bell, n.d.).

Disabled students, including Deaf students, also identified the various learning milieus were barriered including lectures and other vehicles of learning. Fuller, Healey and Bradley and Hall (2004a) indicated that over half of the involved Deaf students cited lectures as problematic beyond the interpreters. Factors such as lecturers speaking too quickly, removing visual information too quickly and the quality of

notetaking. Fuller, Bradley and Healey (2004b) found that disabled (including deaf) students felt that lectures and assessment were barriered. Further to this, disabled students struggled to participate in discussions or questions/answer dialogs because of difficulty in hearing or seeing (Fuller et al., 2004b). In addition, Deaf and hard of hearing students indicated that they were challenged in accessing information. The literature also showed that many disabled students were faced with problems in accessing academic curriculum and important information endemic to successful learning experiences (Hyde et al., 2009; Fuller et al., 2004b).

Furthermore, a challenge arises in the area of attitudes towards Deaf students and accommodation required to access learning. Instructors view Deaf students as unprepared, unmotivated, having poor English, and a over dependence on support systems (Foster et al., 1999; Albertini, Kelly, and Matchett, 2012). Hearing instructors in mainstreamed classes also identified problems with information interface (SLIs & CART) and held beliefs that mainstreaming students was a poor pedagogical practice (Foster et al., 1999; Albertini, Kelly, and Matchett, 2012). Deaf students also indicate higher stress levels and low confidence as well as real or perceived barriers in their education (Albertini et al., 2012). To demonstrate that these issues are not limited to Deaf students, a study of learning disabled students found that there was frustration that instructors often misunderstood their access needs (Denhart, 2008).

Deaf and disabled students face a multiplicity of barriers that turns into a frustrating and discouraging postsecondary experience. The drop-out rate for Deaf learners is significant. According to Marschark, Lang and Albertini (2012), the graduation rate for the Deaf from postsecondary institutions in the U.S. is lower than their hearing peers, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2

US Deaf versus hearing postsecondary graduation rate

	Deaf Graduation Rate	Hearing Graduation Rate
2-year program	35%	40%
4- year program	40%	70%

Marschark, Lang, Albertini (2012)

The findings in the literature regarding Deaf experiences of accessibility begs the question: Are postsecondary institutions ready for learners in policy and practice?

Postsecondary and Workplace Readiness for Accommodation

Student services or disability services are offered to postsecondary students in Canadian institutions as a means of providing supports to enhance their learning experiences. Provincial and territorial governments are mandated to develop legislation and policies that provide guidance to postsecondary institutions in terms of access.

Deaf and hard of hearing students indicated an appreciation of the supports they receive from student disability centres (Hyde et al., 2009). However, accessibility is not necessarily as simple and straightforward as many education practitioners might believe. According to Cawthon and Leppo (2013), many nuanced intersecting elements contribute to accommodation including the access to, quality of, and consistency of the supports given to Deaf students. The Ontario Human Rights (n.d.b) reports that the provision of disability services varies from postsecondary institution to postsecondary institution creating more challenges for disabled people. In my experience the quality and supports vary and largely depends on the person providing the service.

According to Guzman and Balcazar (2010), of 430 US postsecondary disability support services staff approached accessibility in different ways. They describe three worldview approaches to accessibility and accommodation:

(1) Individual Approach: Looks at the individual and seeks strategies that will compensate or level the playing field.
(2) Social Approach: Looks at the environment and seeks strategies to remove barriers.
(3) Universal Approach: Looks at the design and seeks to develop an environment inclusive of the largest number of persons possible. (Guzman and Balcazar, 2010, p. 51)

Their study indicate that disability support staff responded to disabled postsecondary students according to their worldview. Guzman and Balcazar (2010) found that support staff was that most used an "Individual Approach" that focused on the disabled student to provide them with tools

or services in enhancing accessibility. To a lesser degree disability support staff used a "Social Approach" or a "Universal Approach" (Guzman & Balacazar, 2010). These findings seem to support the tendency of support staff choosing an approach where accommodation depended on the individual disabled students to manage accommodation technology, tools and services. While the "Individual Approach" appears to provide disabled students with autonomy, a consequence that places more pressure on disabled students to advocate for themselves.

An additional challenge for postsecondary institutions is the process of providing accessibility supports relying largely on self-disclosure. Some Deaf people whose disability may not be evident will avoid self-disclosure to avoid being singled out and perhaps to pass as normal. According to Wendell, passing has the benefit for the invisibly disabled person to avoid being subject to attitudinal and behavioural discrimination not to mention pity and patronization by others (1996). The avoidance of self-disclosure can also be found in most oral deaf or hard of hearing students. The literature indicates that many disabled students have a fear of self-disclosure (Cawthon et al., 2013; Denhart, 2008; Fuller et al., 2004b). Hiding disability from supports often result from fear of misunderstanding by instructors and other students as well as fear of stigma of being identified as disabled (Denhart, 2008; Fuller et al. 2004b).

Furthermore, disabled students often have to educate instructors and manage their access in the classroom setting. Many disabled students

encounter instructors who do not feel that it is their responsibility to support the students' accessibility needs. The literature shows that there is a range of responses by instructors to participate in the accommodation process from refusal to full participation (Foster, Long, and Snell, 1999). Magnus and Tossebro (2012) found that disabled students have to negotiate their accommodation as many instructors view the responsibility of accommodation as belonging to the disabled student or the support services.

Given the challenges deaf, hard of hearing and other disabled students face in ensuring equitable access to learning environment and processes, it is no wonder that many are influenced to pass or to accept less than high quality accommodations. The supports from student disability services and well-meaning instructors are appreciated by disabled students but often the barriers they face are a result of lack of understanding and perhaps lack of control given to the students to determine how, what and where they need accommodation.

ASL Instructors Training, Deaf Pedagogy, and Deaf Space

The literature in the area of instructor training for ASL instructors and some elements of Deaf culture is important as understanding in this area is critical in evaluating the Instructional Skills Workshop from a Deaf perspective.

Gordon and Hardy (2009), in their review of ASL Studies and interpreter training programs, found that there was a shortage of ASL instructors in British Columbia. According to their review they noted that an ASL Instructor program was offered at Douglas College in British Columbia but because of low enrollment and financial pressures the program was frequently cancelled (2009).

In Ontario, there appears to be no clear process for Deaf people to train as sign language instructors. Many of the experienced ASL instructors learned through trial and error and the pool of instructors developed through practice and reputation. The more recent group of sign language instructors may have a postsecondary degree and through interest become sign language instructors (J. Lange, personal conversation, November 29, 2017). The demographic of sign language instructors is not well-known. Sign languages (usually American Sign Language) is taught in a variety of venues including non-profit agencies, colleges, universities or through local adult education offerings.

A review of the literature on the training of sign language instructors shows limited scholarship. However, what is available contribute to an understanding of the state of ASL instructors in North America. In the US the American Sign Language Teachers Association (ASLTA) appears to be the only national organization that provides certification for ASL instructors (ALSTA, n.d.). The purpose of the organization is to ensure a level of quality in certifying ASL instructors.

A person can receive varying levels of certification depending on their experience and training. However, the ASLTA does not offer training as part of their service offering but provides workshops at their national conferences. In Ontario or Canada, there is no local or national bodies overseeing training or certification of ASL instructors. However, in Ontario, the Canadian Hearing Society does require their ASL instructors to view the curriculum video to ensure that they understand the curriculum (personal conversation with Pizzacalla, March 6, 2018).

Jacobwitz (2007) examined six national US ASL instructor preparation standards. In her study only two agencies certified adult education instructors: American Sign Language Teachers Association (ASLTA) and the Association of Teacher Education (ATE; [Note: not ASL instructor specific]). The ASLTA certification has requirements in areas of experience, skills, and knowledge in Deaf culture, ASL, and instruction. In her analysis of the various organization, Jacobwitz (2007) noted that the standards were more heavily weighted to knowledge, scholarship and experience than the instructional skills. ASLTA also places the responsibilities of professional development on the individual ASL instructors.

In Barnes and Atherton's (2015) study of professional standards for British Sign Language (BSL) instructors found that there were challenges in attempting to access professional development training. According to their study, they found a significantly high level of BSL

instructors worked less than 10 hours a week. In addition, the work of BSL instructors were tenuous at best in postsecondary institutions.   Further to financial barriers, there were "wide range of pedagogical and practical barriers" for Deaf people to obtain instructor certification (Barnes & Atherton, 2015, p. 425). The instructor training courses in the UK were not Deaf-friendly in "the mode of delivery nor the academic content" (Barnes & Atherton, 2015, p. 426). Barriers such as English-based content, nonvisual materials, and the use of sign language interpreters in a phonocentric learning process were cited as problematic for Deaf BSL instructors (Barnes & Atherton, 2015). In my experience the same barriers and challenges exist in providing instructional skills to ASL instructors in Canada. British Columbia Deaf members were either unable or unwilling to pay the tuition fee to undertake ASL instructor training (Gordon & Hardy, 2009).

According to Lange (personal conversation: November 29, 2017), her non-profit organization oversees the coordination of Forty-one ASL instructors in Ontario. Recent overhaul of the Signing Naturally curriculum and the organization's ASL program has provided the non-profit organization an opportunity to return to basics. The Signing Naturally curriculum is produced by DawnSign Press in the US. The Signing Naturally curriculum is used by most ASL instructors in Ontario. The curriculum was first printed in 1988 and was updated in 2008. In our conversation, Lange indicated that the ASL instructors were all strong in

their use of ASL and knowledge of Deaf culture but there were some gaps (November 29, 2017). She said that the new and upcoming group of ASL instructors were varied in the area of instructional skills, classroom management and providing feedback. She indicated that a professional development workshop such as ISW will help to strengthen the instructional skills of new and upcoming ASL instructors.

Providers of professional training or postsecondary education must acknowledge the barriers Barnes and Atherton highlight when they provide training in hearing-centric training processes. O'Brien et al. (2005) completed a comparative study of academic culture and Deaf culture. In their conceptual framework, they recognized that academic culture is founded on phonocentric norms. Their comparative analysis also extends to the use of language in support services: phonocentric language of supports using words such as "integration, immersion, mainstreaming and inclusion" as opposed to CDS language using words such as "agency, self-definition, and self-advocacy" (O'Brien et al., 2005, p. 106). They further argue that the phonocentric approach to accommodation often is designed to assimilate the Deaf person into hearing-like behaviours in their well-meaning efforts.

Paddy Ladd (2014), in his lecture on Deaf Pedagogies (geared to K-12 but with application in adult education), highlighted some of the strategies that have their roots in Deaf culture and behaviour. Some of the pedagogical methods Ladd suggests are, in fact, best practices in

instructional process. For example, processes such as warming up and winding down are good pedagogical practices in student engagement. However, other suggestions, include creating Deaf space, visual engagement, adjusting language register, and visual periphery awareness are part of behaviours a good instructor of Deaf students should practice (Ladd, 2014). Other elements include the concepts of micro-stories (sidebars), sign language-first/English-later, bluntness of sign language users and discussions of relevance are significant in Deaf culture communications and instruction (Ladd, 2014).

Given the challenges and barriers Deaf learners face whether they are engaged in professional development or postsecondary learning, what needs to change? Solvang and Haualand's study of how Deaf gathering in transnational events such as Deaflympics (Deaf Olympics) and the annual World Deaf Federation conferences give rise to some potential applications to learning venues. They describe these gatherings as based on common language (sign language), common histories of oppression/barriers, and cultural similarities (Solvang and Haualand, 2014, p.3). They also describe the creation of a 'Deaf Space', which they term as the 'deafening' of an area where the majority are Deaf and the hearing are the minorities (Solvang and Haualand, 2014, p. 5). In such places, the Deaf transform such venues or environment and accommodations, and communication is on their terms. Such "deafening" guides the type and

quality of communication and interpreting accommodations (when

needed) (Solvang and Haualand, 2014, p. 6).

The review of the literature provides a complex picture of the

challenges that many Deaf people face in their pursuit of training in the

postsecondary and the work environment. Deaf learners face systemic,

quality and consistency of services, pedagogical, and attitudinal barriers,

not to mention, financial and employment limitations in their pursuit of

education and training. Given that the literature provides a broad brush

look at the challenges, a study is needed to look at specific training. A

study that looks at barriers in a specific training and to make

recommendations for enhancing accessibility from a CDS perspective.

Chapter 3: Design

My research focused on my own learning experiences as a culturally Deaf person in a workshop milieu where training is short and intensive. In particular, my research examined and evaluated a three-day Instructional Skills Workshop through a CDS orientation to identify barriers to be removed and adaptations that might enhance accessibility for Deaf learners, specifically American Sign Language instructors.

Criteria for Critical Disability Studies Research

A CDS orientation has principles to consider when conducting disability research. A CDS orientation demands that disability research must include: (1) an understanding that researchers are not objective; (2) that the goal is to change the environment or social setting; and, (3) an emancipatory emphasis (Cameron, 2014, p. 34). Priestly (1997) has proposed guidelines for carrying out emancipatory research. As a result, I chose to align my research with some of Priestly's six core elements of disability research (See Table 3).

Priestly's (1997) first criterion of research demands that the project aligns with the epistemological and ontological foundations of CDS. I approached my research using a CDS orientation to disability. CDS proposes the idea that disability is constructed with the outcomes being marginalization and exclusion of disabled people through oppressive attitudes, beliefs, systems, structures and processes. The second criterion identified by Priestly (1997) is to recognize that disability research cannot

be neutral and must work towards unshackling disabled people from the

permeating influence of hegemonic normalcy in all arenas of life. In

essence, disability research must be grounded in the real world and

emancipatory in its efforts. In my thesis, I examined my experience as a

culturally Deaf person and my experience of barriers in the ISW. My data

analysis generated findings that suggest alternative ways of enhancing

accommodations within an ISW context.

Table 3

Priestly's Core Elements of Disability Research

1. The adoption of a social model of disability as the ontological and epistemological basis for research production.
2. The surrender of falsely-premised claim to objectivity through overt political commitment to the struggles of disabled people for self-emancipation.
3. The willingness to undertake research where it will be of some practical benefit to the self-empowerment of disabled people and/or the removal of disabling barriers.
4. The devolution of control over research production to ensure full accountability to disabled people and their organisation.
5. The ability to give voice to the personal while endeavouring to collectivise the commonality of disabling experiences and barriers.
6. The willingness to adopt a plurality of methods for data collection and analysis in response to the changing needs of disabled people.

Priestly, 1997(as cited in Cameron, 2014, p. 34-35)

Priestly's (1997) third criterion emphasizes that disability research must

have pragmatic outcomes so that disabled people can be empowered and

barriers can be removed. The result of such research has actionable and

practical outcomes for disabled people in the dismantling of socially

constructed barriers. In the fourth criterion, Priestly (1997) also

recommends that disability research become accountable to disabled

people and their organizations. In order to meet the third and fourth

criteria, the recommendations must be tested in the real world rather than

only adding theoretical knowledge to the scholarship. As my thesis is

focused on my own experience, my thesis is but taking a step in the

direction of meeting the third and fourth criteria in Priestly's core

elements. However, I recognize that I did not be meet these criteria in the

thesis.

Priestly's (1997) fifth criterion is that the research provides

opportunity for "voice to the personal" with the intent to add

understanding of the collective experiences of disabled people (p. 35).

Essentially, it answers the question of how the new knowledge resonates

within the experiences of disabled people and adds to the common

experiences. The final criterion Priestly (1997) proposed is the

willingness to adopt a multiplicity of methods in data collection and in

analysis. The emphasis here is that data collection must consider the

various forms and sources of information as the design flexibility must

ensure that the experiences of disabled people are clearly and authentically

documented and represented. The data analysis must be layered, iterative,

recursive, responsive and sensitized. I outline below how my data

collection and analysis addressed these criteria.

Role

I took on the full role as participant as I participated in a three-day ISW offering at Brock University on February 18-20, 2015. Creswell (2013) outlines the full participant role as one of the four possible data collection approaches in site-based qualitative studies. Marshall and Rossman (2011) believe that the participant role is important in collecting data in social settings. The purpose of this role is to gather subjective data and engage with participants in the ISW (Creswell, 2013). My role as full participant meant that I was not engaging in structured or formal observation of ISW participants. Rather, I kept retrospective field notes of my experiences and performed ongoing reflective analysis of my journal entries.

Data Collection

Cognizant of Priestly's criteria of disability research, especially in data collection, I am mindful that a multiplicity of data collection should be used. The sources of data are: (1) my journal notes during the experience of ISW; (2) my reflective analysis of the description of my ISW experience; (3) the ISW and FDW manuals; and, (4) consults with expert sign language professionals in the field. These various sources of data provided information and experiences from multiple viewpoints and multiple sources.

In order to validate the journal descriptions and reflective analysis notes as valid data sets representing disability writing, I turned to Couser who provided the rationale for using such personal writings. Couser developed four criteria as guidelines for disability life writing:

Table 4

Couser's Four Criteria for Disability Life Writing

1. The life writing should be authored by the individual with the disability.
2. The life writing should address traditional misrepresentations of disability.
3. The individual should remain authentic in her/his life writing, and not worry about the comfort (or discomfort) of the readers.
4. The life writing should provide readers with controlled access into lives and lifestyles which they may not have had access to before.

Couser (as cited in Davis, 2013)

Couser's first consideration is that any life writing considered by research as sources of information must be authored by the disabled person. As already mentioned, I am culturally Deaf in my thinking, behaviours and attitudes. My journal descriptions meet this first criterion. A second component that defines disability life writing is that it provides a response or rebuke to misrepresentations of disability (Couser, 2013). I anticipated that the use of the Ethics of Accommodation (Galloway et al., 2007) and the Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) would identify gaps in the ISW allowing me the opportunity to evaluate the existing three-day format. I intended to use my journal descriptions

and reflective analysis notes to identify those areas that were problematic in regards to accommodation and to utilize the two tools in identifying those gaps.

Couser (2013) also proposes that disability life writing should be authentic and true to one's own self. My journal notes, made during my participation in the ISW, describe the experience I had as a Deaf participant in the ISW. As a culturally Deaf person in the phonocentric approach of the ISW, I encountered experiences highlighting the difficulty in such an approach. My journal is an eight-page, doubled-spaced descriptive rendition of my experiences over three days. The journal also includes notes on the preparation day before the commencement of the ISW training. I also used my reflective analysis notes, a five-page reflection of my ISW experiences. Finally, disability life writing must offer controlled access to experiences of disability that many neurotypicals do not have. I own my journals and they reflect my thoughts during the ISW. By analysing and disclosing, I am granting controlled access.

Data Analysis

I took a two-pronged approach in analyzing my data sets. First, I used the Ethics of Accommodation (See Table 4) as a standard of accommodation derived from a CDS perspective. Second, I performed a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (better known as a SWOT) analysis of the ISW and a culturally Deaf perspective that was informed by sensitizing concepts from the literature of Deaf experiences in

postsecondary education. The intent was to help me to identify areas for consideration in the three-day format processes of the ISW that I experienced.

Table 5

Galloway, Nudd, and Sandhal's Ethics of Accommodation

1. At its core, an Ethic of Accommodation means that the majority does not rule. Instead, accommodation means including everyone wanting to participate, often necessitating that the majority make difficult changes in its practices and environment. These changes are not made begrudgingly, but with goodwill, creativity, and a strong dose of humor, elements that often find expression in the performances themselves.
2. The ethic includes the politics of listening as well as the politics of speaking. Whereas most minority groups maintain that they have been 'silenced' by the majority and thus place speaking at a premium, disability communities often place listening on the same plane. People with disabilities often feel they have not been listened to or even addressed. In this context, listening does not have to happen with ears. Listening here, means being taking into consideration, being attended to.
3. The Ethic of Accommodation means making room for difference possible, letting go of preconceived notions of perfectibility, and negotiating complex sets of needs. Often these 'needs' compete with one another. Accommodating disability or other forms of difference often does not seem practical or marketable, since doing soften raises costs or necessitates work that seemingly benefits only a few. Marketability is not our concern.
4. The Ethic of Accommodation inspires creative aesthetic choices from casting, choreography and costuming, and also the use of space for the creation of new material. Practicing the ethic enhances theatrical practice.

Galloway, Nudd and Sandhal (2007) (as cited in Kuppers, 2014, p. 8)

The Ethics of Accommodation (EoA) was developed by

Galloway and her colleagues Sandhal and Nudd in the context of theatre

where they, as intersectional disabled actors, experienced marginalization,

exclusion and oppression. Siebers (2013) describes intersectionality as an

"overlapping" of oppressed identities including race, sexuality, class,

gender, socioeconomic status and disability (p.291). Galloway, Nudd and

Sandhal's experiences of intersectional oppression impacted them

exponentially leading them to create the EoA. Galloway (2016) describes

the purpose of the EoA as:

an ethic that could help a diverse community—those who are not just
under-served but overlooked—develop its own artistic voice; an ethic that
would allow us to explore any and all ways of accomodating (sic) each
other so we can all get our voices heard; an ethic that would allow us as
often as possbile (sic) to say "yes" to anyone who wanted to work with our
company. (p. 151)

This description is important, as accommodations can be tokenistic or

inadequate, and accommodation should allow full participation in all

arenas of society. In addition, this description of the EoA emphasizes the

value of being heard, consulted and respected, especially in

accommodation needs.

Kuppers (2014) challenges readers of her book, Studying

Disability Arts and Culture, to consider how the EoA (see Table 4) can be

applied to a classroom, or in this case a professional development

workshop. She asks the question, "Can an ethic of accommodation inform

a classroom environment?" (Kuppers, 2014. p. 8).

The question that Kuppers asks is an important one for my thesis as I am examining accommodation in a simulated class setting, the ISW. I examined several incidents from my journal, ones that I described after my experiences in the three-day ISW that can be identified as barriers or challenges for me as a culturally Deaf person. I described these incidents from my journal and reflected on why the incident was an issue. I used the EoA to inform how the incident could be read or understood, and how it could be different.

For each of the identified experiences I chose, I looked to each of the EoA's four ethics for how each, if any, could have prevented or mitigated the experience. I asked myself the following questions: (1) Could the ISW allowed me, as a Deaf person, to stop the process and modify it to allow me to participate fully? (2) How would the EoA's approach to listening (attending and taking into consideration) would have mitigated the negative experiences? (3) Is it possible that the ISW and facilitators would have let go of their pre-set processes to improve accommodations? And, (4) Are there other choices that may be creative in implementing an inclusive ISW? These questions allowed me to explore the challenges and possibilities in my experiences and in the ISW format.

My second analysis used a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis. A SWOT analysis is typically applied to businesses and organizations to provide an understanding of the internal and external environment that describe the strategic positioning and

characteristics. Helms' metanalysis of 10 years (2000-2010) of research literature revealed that SWOT analysis was used in studying countries, industries, as well as being used as an educational tool by instructors and consultants (2010). In two instances, the SWOT analysis was used in assessing social work education in Canada (Westhues and Schmidt, 2001) and understanding social science research contributions to psychiatry (Huxley, 2001).

The SWOT analysis has some limitations in that it can be considered somewhat vague and superficial and should not be a substitute for in-depth analysis (Helms, 2010; Panagiotou, 2003). However, it is an effective first step in further study or planning (Helms, 2010). As such, I used the SWOT to compare the three-day ISW training along using the ISW manual with Deaf cultural norms and behaviours. The purpose in using the SWOT analysis was to discover if there were synergies and challenges between the ISW and Deaf culture. Essentially, I was exploring whether the ISW is a good fit for training ASL instructors in addressing their instructional skills development.

Chapter 4: Findings and Analysis

Findings

This chapter is divided into two parts: (1) identified scenarios where I experienced barriers which will be examined through the Ethics of Accommodation values; and, (2) a SWOT analysis comparing the ISW with Deaf cultural requirements. The purpose of the two-prong approach is to identify and examine barriers that will need to be addressed and to examine the synergies and challenges of offering an ISW for Deaf participants, particularly ASL instructors. Below I have identified several situations in my experience of a three-day ISW offered at Brock University through the Centre of Pedagogical Innovation.

Situation #1 – Negotiating Accessibility

On the morning of the ISW, I was feeling a "level of anxiety", as this was a new situation and as with most, I would be educating people about my hearing loss. My initial response is not because I am afraid to self-identify and educate people, it is based on my life experiences of having to manage people's responses and discomfort and having to repeatedly negotiate my accessibility in these situations.

My disability self-disclosure to the facilitators was met with support. The one facilitator checked with me periodically over the three days to ask how I was managing. My response was that I was managing. The reality was that there were ideal and not so ideal circumstances through the three days. Some of the ideal circumstances were the circle

seating format in the large group and the small group format for the mini-

lesson cycles. The not so ideal circumstance was the noise level during

large group activities and activities with two or more concurrent groups in

the same room.

Negotiating accessibility is a theme in my life as a culturally Deaf

person and it was a theme in my ISW experience. My journal highlights

my experience of having to negotiate my accessibility:

> As a hard of hearing person, managing noise and
> people because of my accommodation needs is a
> challenging, tiring, and ongoing task. When I assert
> myself, most are willing to accommodate while others
> become uncomfortable. However, in most
> circumstances I have to remind people several times as
> awareness of my needs become pushed aside in the
> efforts of people to participate and communicate in
> groups. When I have to remind people several times
> then most people become uncomfortable while others
> become irritated. Finding balance between asserting
> my rights and when to let the issue go is something I
> wrestle with in every social situation. In an ideal
> situation I should only have to mention it once and then
> consideration for accommodation becomes an accepted
> norm. Unfortunately, the reality is the opposite.
> (Hardy, M. Reflective Analysis Journal, 2015)

My experience of negotiating accessibility is not a one-time effort rather it

is ongoing and I describe it as 'tiring'. While Magnus and Tossebro

(2014) focus on negotiating accommodations from a systemic viewpoint,

my experience focuses on negotiating accommodations from an individual

experience. The act of negotiating accommodation is perpetual requiring

that people are reminded again and again of my access needs. As a result,

I end up having to either continue reminding people or acquiesce to a less than ideal learning environment.

The EoA emphasizes the importance of ensuring that everyone who wants to participate is included and that changes are made by the majority to ensure that essential accommodations are made (Galloway et al., 2007). The essence of participation means that I would not need to remind people of what access needs I have, or that if I do need to remind others that I would not be subject to attitudes of tolerance. The question that arises out of my ISW experience is how this negotiation can be done given that the participants do not understand the lived experience of a culturally Deaf person? Is it possible for those who do not live with neurodiversity to be cognizant of accessibility needs given the time- and content- intensive training process?

Situation #2 – Manual

I received an introductory e-mail prior to the ISW. The information included the outline, the instructions for our preparation and the time commitments. We also received instructions in an e-mail prior to the three-day ISW was that we were to prepare three 10-minute mini-lessons. Upon arrival on the first morning, we received our ISW manual, a binder with a 95-page topic driven information about various aspects of the ISW. The manual includes an overview of the ISW, explanations about the mini-lessons, feedback, lesson formats, reflective practices, and resources regarding effective teaching and learning. The manual provides

comprehensive explanations on each of these topics and is a resource for participants.

I wrote in my journal that we were told that we would not be referring to the manual during the training given that the training approach was experiential. As stated, the ISW uses a facilitated peer-based learning approach through multi-modal feedback and reflective practices (ISWIAC, 2006a & 2006b). It was clear to me that I would not have time to read the manual over the three days given the demands of the tasks and learning of the ISW. The three-day ISW covered much of what was in the manual and I was able to learn, apply and practice the key areas of learning successfully. While I was able to learn the main components of the ISW through the experiential approach, a review of the manual provided many significant pieces that I wish I had known prior to the ISW. For example, an understanding of the overview of the ISW, elements of lesson planning, a comprehensive explanation of feedback, synthesizing exercises on reflective practices, and discussions about teaching/learning.

Situation #3 - Closed eye exercise

In my three-day ISW, I offered feedback to one of the participant-instructor in the feedback circle. One of the emphases of the instructional process is to engage learners in the 10-minute mini-lesson. Such engagement is described as participatory learning where the learner is given an opportunity to practice or engage with the new learning (ISWIAC, 2006a). As previously cited, accommodation is an ongoing

negotiation between the disabled person and the hegemony of normalcy: be it environment, process, attitudes, and ignorance (Magnus and Tossebro, 2014). During one mini-lesson where a teacher conducting an exercise in participatory learning, the participant-instructor led the learners in a closed-eye exercise. As a Deaf person, this kind of exercise does not work well as I cannot read lips of the person talking as we were supposed to imagine a circumstance and apply the new learned concept.

In the feedback circle, I disclosed that as a person with different hearing abilities, the closed-eye exercise does not work for me. I described how such an exercise shuts me out of the experience as I could not follow the auditory guided process. I was under the impression that he understood and acknowledged my accommodation needs. The next day we all had an opportunity to apply the ISW structure of a lesson as well as the feedback provided from our peers the day before. The person who received my feedback about closed-eye exercise proceeded to use the same closed-eye exercise on the second day.

Situation #4 - Line exercise

On the third day of the ISW after reviewing feedback from the previous day we were informed that we would be doing an exercise. Our large group was divided into two groups and lined up facing each other. I was led by one of the facilitators to the end of one line with no explanation. The exercise was for the one line of participants to spend one-and-a-half minutes sharing our insights or questions regarding our

learning. One line shifted so we faced another participant. This continued until we had a chance to talk to each participant in the other line. My line was the static line so I remained at the end of the line. After the exercise, I approached the facilitator to ask why she placed me at the end of the line. She responded that she thought it would be better for me as the exercise was noisy with ten participants all talking at the same time. At the time I thought it was considerate, but the effort was not an accommodation as it was still far too noisy for me to hear the participant facing me.

Situation #5 – Feedback

An important applied concept in the ISW's mini-lesson cycle is feedback. The participant-instructor receives feedback from participant-learners. Feedback in the ISW comes in three ways: (1) written feedback by participant-learners; (2) verbal feedback by participant-learners guided by the facilitator; and, (3) video feedback where participant-instructors were able to review their instructional behaviours after each day. Over the three days a participant-instructor will receive three sets of written feedback and three sets of verbal feedback. The ISW has ten different written feedback forms that can be used over the three days. The facilitator chooses the feedback form for the first two mini-lesson cycles and the participant-instructor chooses one form for the last mini-lesson cycle.

In my experience of the three-day ISW, a half hour was spent on discussing a combined topic of what effective teaching and what effective

feedback looked like. This was a large group guided discussion by the

facilitators. The discussion was brief and reflected the opinions of the

participants. The feedback behaviours of participant-learners were guided

by the facilitators in the feedback circle as part of the mini-lesson cycle.

According to the ISW manual feedback is considered an important part of

the learning and development for the participants (ISWIAC, 2006a). My

experience of the feedback was that it was an important part of the process

in the ISW and I gave feedback as I saw fit. I received some guidance in

some of the feedback that I gave by the facilitator. The facilitator asked

me to rephrase my feedback to instructional behaviours that helped or

hindered the instructional process. I also remembered some of the

guidance by facilitators to avoid telling the participant-instructor what they

should do. The focus was to share observation of the instructional

behaviours and the impact on us as learners from our viewpoint as

learners. The process was to identify how we provided feedback and

through guided discussions on how to modify our feedback to be

constructive.

Situation #6 - Kolb

On the second day of the ISW in the large group we were introduced

to Kolb's Learning Style Inventory. The participants were handed the

Learning Style Inventory to complete a series of questions and to score our

results. The resulting scores would indicate our preferred learning styles:

Accommodating, Assimilating, Diverging, and Converging. We were also

to map our scores on a pictograph as well as a X-Y axis with each of those

characteristics. We were also to place ourselves on a X-Y axis taped out

on the floor. Each of the quadrants were one of the four preferred learning

styles. We were then handed a five-page information handout titled, "Do

you Teach the Way You Learn?" In this information handout were

explanations about learning:

1. "Everyone is capable of learning in all the modes indicated in the Experiential Learning Cycle: concrete experience, abstract conceptualization, reflective observation, and active experimentation.
2. Any individual may have a preferred learning style and yet not exhibit some of the 'characteristic shown.
3. Any individual who does have some of the characteristics of learners shown may not necessarily teach in the ways indicated.
4. Any individual may choose to use different learning styles in different contexts."
(Handout: Do you Teach the Way You Learn?)

In the handout each page identified the characteristics of each learning

style and how these characteristics look in a teaching style. We were to

discuss what we learned with people within our quadrant to share insight.

The completion of the LSI, the scoring, the mapping, reading the

handout, and discussions with like participants were all done in 40

minutes. The Instructional Skills Workshop (ISW) instructional model is

based on Kolb's experiential learning premises (Morrison, 1985). While I

understood the broad concept of the learning styles, I was unable to

process the information regarding the Learning Style Inventory in the brief

time we were introduced to it. The intent was to highlight the idea that we

had different learning styles and that it potentially influenced how we

taught. The challenge in learning a foundational premise of the ISW in 40 minutes led me to question whether this was an important notion.

These six identified experiences met my criteria of experiences that were barriers for me as a Deaf participant and also created challenges for me to access. These experiences are examined from the values of the EoA in assessing what the challenges are, why they were challenging, and how the experiences could be modified (if any).

Analysis

Galloway, Nudd, and Sandhal's Ethics of Accommodation

The first criterion is that accommodations required by disabled people, who are often in the minority, allow them to fully participate. The majority, often those who are nondisabled, need to adjust in order to ensure that all are able to equally participate in the activities of a classroom in the spirit of full willingness.

Accommodation in any setting is an ongoing negotiation for disabled people. The typical initiation for accommodation in postsecondary education is to register with a student support or disability support office. In other cases, the disabled person self-discloses to the instructor or program coordinator of their need for accommodation and adjustments may be made to make the course or training accessible. Accommodation is certainly the legal requirements for postsecondary institutions as stated in the Ontario Human Rights legislation, the

Canadian Human Rights legislation and the AODA. Someone or some department in the postsecondary institution is responsible for ensuring that the accommodation is available for the student. Accommodation expectations is definitely true for the professional training Instructional Skills Workshop which is provided by staff of the Centre for Pedagogical Innovation at Brock University.

Galloway et al.'s (2007) first component considers the idea/expectation that the minority has the ability to instigate changes in practice and the environment to ensure that accommodation meets their needs. The key component of this ethic is that the majority willingly makes changes with understanding. In my experience, I do not think that accommodating changes would not have been acceptable if I had made the request that changes be made to the ISW process and structure. The ISW process appears somewhat ironclad in terms of schedule and processes, yet there is some flexibility to negotiate accommodation needs.

For example, on the first day of the ISW, I self-disclosed to one of the facilitators that I had some accommodation needs as a Deaf person. She was approachable and checked with me throughout the three days as to how I was experiencing the training. She made some adjustments that made my experience somewhat accessible. For example, she placed me at the end of one of two lines where participants faced each other for discussions, so that I would not be struggling to hear the person on the opposite side. This was a well-meaning adjustment but the exercise was a

struggle for me because the participants were all talking at once creating a noise-intensive environment. I would have suggested changing the exercise or adapting the environment to mitigate environmental noise.

Further to this, the facilitator decided what I needed as an accommodation rather than asking me for suggestions. The issue here is that rather than making major changes (meaning a different exercise perhaps) the hearing facilitator decided what accommodation would meet my needs.

In order to be able to meet this criterion, the facilitators should meet with the disabled person(s) prior to the course to review and modify the structure, process and activities to ensure that this EoA criterion is met. The Brock three-day offering of the ISW is time and schedule intensive which is problematic because of the pressure in ensuring all of the ISW material is covered. In my Facilitator Development manual for the ISW, there is an allowance for four and five-day schedules which may meet the needs of Deaf participants (ISWIAC,2006b). The negotiation around accommodation also require that the facilitators modify significant elements of the activities and/or the schedule to ensure that the Deaf person(s) are able to be fully able to participate and/or contribute as every other participant.

The EoA's second criterion emphasizes the importance of listening in communication. Galloway et al. (2007) emphasizes the importance of engaging the mind when listening. "Listening here, means

being taking into consideration, being attended to" (Galloway et al., 2007, p. 8). Corker (2002) asserts that the phonocentric world-view excludes Deaf people "from the dominant areas of social and cultural reproduction" (p.1). Consider the challenge for Deaf people in being heard as they are competing with a cultural phonocentric that dominates social and cultural knowledge and understanding in various contexts. In my ISW experience there were a few instances where feedback was either challenging or unsuccessful.

The process of ISW includes the idea of peer-based feedback and the role of the facilitator is to support the participants in listening. For instance, in the feedback circle, the participant who provided the 10-minute mini-lesson was asked to attend to the peer feedback without responding. The goal is to listen without defending or justifying their approach. The process is effective in aiding participants in listening and attending to what is being said. There is a significant alignment between Galloway et al.'s emphasis on listening and attending and the process supported by the ISW facilitator. However, the intention of the ISW and EoA emphasis on listening is very different. The goal of the ISW, in listening, is for the participant to be receptive to feedback so that they can improve their instructional skills. The goal of the EoA is so that the disabled person can express what accommodations are needed.

The instruction on feedback during my ISW was scheduled for five minutes on the first day. The emphasis during that instruction was

that feedback should be constructive and focused on behaviour of the instructor that could be changed. The FDW manual emphasizes that feedback would be the most significant information participants received during the ISW (ISWIAC, 2006b). Given that feedback was a significant part of the ISW cycle including written and verbal feedback, I would have thought that a feedback discussion may have been given more consideration for the larger group. Granted, as I took my FDW training, the emphasis was on the facilitator to guide and manage feedback from participants to the mini-lesson instructor. In fairness, the facilitator I had emphasized the importance of listening to the feedback without defensiveness.

The FDW manual, however, provides some tips that encourage facilitators to assist participants in generating their guidelines for feedback (ISWIAC, 2006b, p. 17). This provides an opportunity for participants to develop their own values around feedback but was not an experience I had in my three-day ISW. The potential to introduce the value of listening as highlighted in the EoA could have been beneficial for my mini-lesson group. The value of listening can be nullified if there is no connection to changes in behaviour.

In my three-day ISW, I offered feedback to one of the participants in the feedback circle. One of the emphases of the instructional process is to engage learners in the 10-minute mini-lesson. Such engagement is described as participatory learning where the learner is given an

opportunity to practice or engage with the new learning (ISWIAC, 2006a).

As previously cited, accommodation is an ongoing negotiation between

the disabled person and the hegemony of normalcy: be it environment,

process, attitudes, and ignorance (Magnus and Tossebro, 2014). The

example of the closed-eye exercise and the consequent feedback I gave is

an example of negotiating accessibility. Although I thought the

participant-instructor heard me I found myself having to repeat my need

on the second day.

I thought that the person heard my feedback and acknowledged

the barrier that the closed-eye exercise is for me. Galloway et al. states,

"In this context, listening does not have to happen with ears. Listening

here, means being taking into consideration, being attended to" (2007, p.

8). I wonder, did he listen with his ears? Did he attend to my feedback?

While there is a significant alignment between Galloway et al.'s

value of listening and the ISW emphasis on listening and attending to

feedback, there are challenges when attending and listening requires

adjustment. The adjustments are preceded by acknowledgement that the

existing processes and behaviours are problematic as they perpetuate

exclusion and marginalization of disabled people. The acknowledgement

also exposes assumptions made by facilitators and demonstrates that

perhaps the ISW has processes that are unwittingly oppressive.

In the third principle, the EoA requires an open-minded approach

to doing things differently as it is a negotiation of complex needs when

people come together for a period of time. Galloway et al. (2007) is clear

that "traditions or marketability" (p. 8) are not important and falls further

down on the list of priorities. This requires acknowledgement that perhaps

current practices, unknowingly, excludes and marginalizes disabled

people.

My own experience of ISW was an intensive three-day process

that left very little room for negotiating accommodations. One facilitator

in my ISW was very supportive in ensuring that attention was paid to

accessibility needs were attended to. The facilitator was well-meaning and

quite supportive, yet I was left to wonder that if I was to suggest

significant changes to the set-up to truly accommodate my needs, would

there have been any adjustments? For example, in activities where

simultaneous talking was taking place, I may have suggested that I have

the opportunity to relocate to another room. If I were to suggest extending

time to discuss the Learning Style Inventory and how Kolb theories

integrated, would that flexibility have been allowed? The intensity of the

three-day ISW was overwhelming and the activities was focused on an

experiential process with some reflection. While this is in line with Kolb's

theories, one wonders what assumptions are made of the learners who

participate in such training.

The fourth principle of the EoA says that accommodation

potentially results in "creative choices and a change in the use of space"

(Galloway et al., 2007). Since the EoA was formulated with theatrical

creation and performances they naturally focus on the elements of theatre. However, in a classroom setting the impact of introducing a more visual or Deaf centric approach can positively impact the environment, processes, behaviours and attitudes.

The three-day ISW is fairly scripted in its approach to training participants in an instructional model. Learning is predicated on a scaffolding process with time-based structure. The three-day model of ISW does not allow for much deviance to encompass Galloway et al.'s fourth Ethic of Accommodation. Hence, the relative inflexibility of the three-day ISW structure means that any introduction of 'new material' or Deaf space concepts requires preplanning or perhaps significant modifications.

SWOT Analysis

The findings in this SWOT analysis are that there are synergies and challenges in assumptions, norms, behaviours, experiences, needs and values.

Strengths

a)   Class Seating formation – Sign languages of the Deaf are essentially visual and the circle format in both large group exercises and small groups is a good fit. Most Deaf meetings have formations that allow for visual lines to all participants.

b)   Small Groups – The small group has benefits in many settings and is also important in providing in-depth attention being provided to participants in their learning.

c)   Check-in – The check-in perhaps is a significant component that will support learning by Deaf participants in that it gives them an opportunity to raise questions and explore clearer understanding. The challenge is that more time may be needed to contextualize learning and to check assumptions of both the facilitator and learners.

d)   Process and content – The repetitive cycle of mini-lessons and feedback is critical as it provides opportunity to practice and experiment.

e)   Pedagogical structure – The pedagogical structure: Bridge-in, Objectives, Pre-test, Participatory learning, Post-test and Summation (BOPPPS) is a common-sense approach that is simple and straightforward. The challenge in this area is choosing the right signs (Note: the term 'sign' denotes singular form of sign language) to describe each of the components of the BOPPPS which can be rectified in planning.

Weakness

a)   Scripted and scheduled process – The three-day ISW, as I discovered, is time-intensive and provides limited opportunities for questions and for discussing understanding of the foundations of Kolb and experiential learning. While opportunities exist for asking questions about the content and aspects of the process, they are often restrictive.

For example, I discovered that forty minutes was scheduled to complete the Kolb Learning Style Inventory, discuss the results and to answer any questions. Kolb's theories provide a significant underpinning of the ISW. As I was unfamiliar with educational theories I faced challenges in contextualizing their learning.

b)   The need for ongoing self-advocacy – The experience of most (if not all) disabled people is the need for continual self-advocacy and negotiation of accessibility (Magnus and Tossebro, 2012). In situations where disabled people are the minority, the need for reminding others of accessibility needs become frustrating and tiresome. The learning experience of many disabled people is less than optimal.

c)   Facilitator neutrality – One of the underpinning values is facilitator neutrality and their focus on process. Deaf educational experiences are often didactic and not interactive resulting in the expectation that the facilitator is the expert (Wood, 1995). A paradigm shift in understanding the idea that participants are the experts in their own learning will require time.

d)   Feedback process – The shift in how feedback is given is a challenge for all participants of the ISW. The shift from a 'you should' to a 'my experience' mode of feedback may require some time to practice new skills.

e)   Environmental challenges – Auditory noise, visual noise and communication barriers in large group settings is often problematic for Deaf and hard of hearing participants.

f)   Lack of Deaf-friendly Space – Most educational or training situations will be comprised of a majority of nondisabled participants and some minority disabled participants. The results often are the marginalization of access needs by the process or educational objective of the phonocentric majority. Given this situation, it will not result in the creation of positive Deaf Space as it requires that the majority and even the facilitator to be culturally Deaf.

g)   Ignorance of participants to Deaf needs – Consideration must be given to the activities in that they must be visually accessible to Deaf participants. The planner of the training should be conversant in activities or ideas that are effective in emphasizing concepts and ideas.

Opportunities

a)   Creating Deaf Space – The creation of Deaf Space in the ISW where a group of Deaf participants can carve out place where Deaf norms in communication are accepted and respected. For example, an offering of an ISW can include a cohort of Deaf participants to form one group of a mini-lesson (usually four or five participants) with a Deaf facilitator. This scenario could provide an opportunity where Deaf norms and

behaviours influence the larger group. This scenario will necessitate the use of sign language interpreters. This scenario can work well if steps are taken to ensure quality sign language interpreters are available and that they have been familiarized with ISW notions and nomenclature.

   b)   All Deaf workshop – An all Deaf ISW would mean that all of the participants and facilitators are Deaf. This scenario eliminates the need for sign language interpreters and allows for fluid communication using sign language. This also necessitates a requirement that all participants are fluent signers. The rationale for the participants to be Deaf is to optimize the fluidity of communication. Introducing non-signing deaf participants would create the same challenges in a mixed Deaf-hearing ISW where translation hampers the communication.

 c)   Pedagogical Structure: Diamond vs. Triangle – There is a synergy of process between the BOPPPS structure and what is often described as Deaf communication norms. The Deaf-centric approach to learning and education is to use what is called the "diamond" approach: i) tell the audience what you will be talking about; ii) talk about it; and, iii) Tell the audience what you just talked about. This approach is similar to the Objective, Participatory Learning and Summary components of BOPPPS.

 d)   Mixture of didactic and experiential learning – Contextualizing learning is critical for understanding concepts and how to apply such concepts in real-life situations. Given that most Deaf learners experience

a didactic approach in their educational life, it becomes critical to understand how to balance providing information and context and experiential learning. As experiential learning and peer-based feedback is the foundation of the ISW, the approach with Deaf participants may require a different role for the facilitator that may need to balance neutrality and direction in their feedback.

e)   Culturally sensitive activities – The library of activities used in typical ISW training will need to be viewed from a culturally Deaf or visual perspective. See recommendations for some potential ideas.

Threats (Barriers)

a)   Identifying barriered ISW practices - In order to be able to make ISW Deaf-friendly, one must ensure that ISW practices and processes that create barriers be identified. In a mainstream scenario, nondeaf facilitators may not have the sensitivity or the knowledge to modify activities to meet Deaf learners needs.

b)   Lack of trained culturally Deaf facilitators – I know of no other ISW facilitator who can be identified as a culturally Deaf. A quick survey of ISW facilitators may ferret out those who have culturally Deaf sensitivities.

c)   Changes to ISW core ideas – The creation of a Deaf-friendly ISW that is inclusive of both Deaf culture and to the core ideals of ISW can be challenging. Integrating ISW values and Deaf cultural values may conflict in the area of facilitator neutrality. The ISW expects the

facilitator to be neutral while Deaf participants may ask for more direction and feedback from the facilitator.

d)   Finding a critical mass of Deaf participants – The challenge of attracting enough Deaf participants to facilitate a full ISW training may be challenging.

e)   Resistance by ASL instructors to change – Introducing new ideas of pedagogical practices to ASL instructors (many who have practiced for a long time) may be met with resistance.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, Recommendations

I used two evaluation tools in examining the ISW: The Ethics of Accommodation (EoA) created by Galloway et al. (2007) and the Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) tool. The EoA is intended to encourage dialog and discovery in the exploration of what accommodation means to different individuals (Galloway, 2016). Unfortunately, the reality is that most institutions and services governed by legislations guiding accessibility are also protected by the 'undue hardship' clause (OHRC, 2018) that mitigates achievement of accommodations that meet individual needs. I have used the second process, the SWOT, to ferret out possible synergies and challenges between the ISW and culturally Deaf approaches in learning. My research focused on my learning experiences as a culturally Deaf person in a workshop milieu where training is short and intensive. In particular, I examined and evaluated the Instructional Skills Workshop through a CDS orientation to identify sites for accommodation that might enhance accessibility for Deaf learners, specifically American Sign Language instructors.

Discussion

Given that research is limited in addressing the intersection of disabilities and ISW, I used my experiences of the ISW as a culturally Deaf person, the literature on Deaf experiences of postsecondary education, and a comparative analysis of ISW through the Ethics of

Accommodation. My intention was to examine the ISW process for the purpose of highlighting synergies and challenges in integrating the ISW and Deaf cultural ways of being.

As a person with a moderate to severe hearing loss, I face challenges in many typical learning processes and environments. Challenges include poor acoustics, speakers who talk softly, noisy environments, inability to see the speaking person, harsh lighting, exhaustion from struggling to hear, worrying about what I think I have heard, and having to negotiate access throughout the day. My observations are my own and they may not reflect every Deaf person's experience of postsecondary education, especially that of a professional development modality.   My intent is to set the stage for developing a Deaf-friendly model of ISW to be available to Deaf ASL instructors in enhancing their instructional skills. While the experience of professional development and postsecondary education for Deaf students is complex, there are some thematic elements.

Deaf Education

According to Magnus and Tossebro (2012), accessibility is an ongoing negotiation between the disabled person and their environment, learning situations, fellow students and well-meaning educators/instructors in postsecondary institutions. Accessibility negotiations still result in continued barriers, frustrations, and less than optimum learning

experiences. My experience of the support offered in my professional development experience was mixed as I found I had to continuously negotiate my accessibility throughout the ISW.

Fuller et al. (2004a) and Fuller et al. (2004b) identified that pedagogical and other learning milieus had barriers and my experience confirmed their findings. For example, any group discussions with multiple small groups in the same room proved to be challenging for me to hear. Some of the activities where the large group were separated in two lines facing each other to discuss new learnings from the ISW was also challenging. Attempts to hear while ten other people were talking in close proximity was not ideal. Time restricted activities where new notions were introduced was not optimal. For instance, in the introduction of David Kolb's approach to learning styles, we were required to finish the Learning Style Inventory, map our results on a diagram, and discuss the idea of being aware of learning and teaching styles within forty minutes.

While several of the ISW activities and learning milieus were good examples of Deaf-friendly practices (See strengths in SWOT analysis), others were barriered. There are two examples of barriers that stand out in my experience. First, the idea that well-meaning people promulgate normative practices is relevant. In my journaling, I noted that one of the facilitators spoke to me in regards to ensuring that I was able to hear in various activities. However, as the ISW process continued, I was left to advocating for myself in many situations. This facilitator was well-

meaning yet when the schedule-intensive nature of ISW became paramount, the attention to ensure that I had access fell by the wayside. I was hesitant to disrupt the schedule-intensive nature of the ISW to advocate for my needs as I felt I would have been marginalized. As a disabled person, I often have to weigh the cost/benefit of interrupting the heavily integrated scheduling and educational process.

The second example was one of ignorance by one participant in the mini-lesson group who repeated a closed-eye exercise although he received feedback that it was not accessible to me. I doubt that he was trying to be obtuse and that he was well-meaning. However, this experience is an example of how disconnected most people are in regards to the accessible needs of disabled people, hence, the need for disabled people to continue negotiating accessibility (Magnus and Tossebro, 2012). Having to remind the participant that the closed-eye exercise on the second day is an example of having to continuously negotiate accessibility. This lends credence to the idea of having a larger Deaf group carve out Deaf Space in a hearing ISW or having a completely Deaf ISW. The intent of an all-Deaf ISW is not to imply that learning cannot happen in an included environment but that the skill set required of facilitators is different in enhancing an accessible learning environ.

PSE and workplace readiness for Accommodation

The Ontario Human Rights (2017) indicates that the quality of accessibility varies among postsecondary institutions. In addition, Cawthon and Leppo (2013) highlight the complex nature of accommodation for many disabled students that create barriered experiences. Given the potential problems of accessibility, I chose not to apply for sign language interpreting as an accommodation because I was not confident that the interpreters would have adequate preparation to provide interpretation of the ISW.

My perspective regarding SLIs is not an implication of their skills but rather of the disability accessibility systems in PSEs. The challenges of obtaining good SLIs who meet my needs and expectations is hampered by the PSE procurement system that require use of existing contracted SLIs. Further to this, the procurement system does not recognize the supply/demand that influences the costs of obtaining good SLIs. Further to this, it was not possible to implement the idea of familiarization of SLIs to the ISW in a way that would enhance the interpreting experience

The best approach to this would have been to allow SLIs to take the ISW prior to the offering I was to take. The typical approach for SLIs to prepare for an interpreting event is for them to obtain materials and documents from the course to review. The suggested approach for SLIs to take the ISW course is somewhat different but there are precedents for such an approach in the field of SLI. Interpreters will take field specific

training beyond their original base training in areas such as medical and legal interpreting. In medical interpreting training SLIs will be trained in signs for anatomy, physiology, disease, and functions of the body. In legal interpreting training SLIs will be trained in legal terms and processes signs. Both of these intensive advanced training provides the interpreters with field-specific knowledge and sign language enhancements in order to provide a better interpreting experience for the Deaf person in such settings. In the same vein, the suggestion that a SLI take the ISW prior to interpreting the ISW training for the Deaf participant is a reasonable consideration.

The caveat in this suggestion is one of financial consideration. The ISW is a three or four full-day training that requires commitment and participation. Such commitment may be a financial challenge for SLIs as most are remunerated through contracted services. A three or four-day ISW may be a financial loss as SLIs would not be available for other paid interpreting situations. The suggestion that several SLIs take the ISW must include remuneration that may be a challenge for PSE to address. Typically, remuneration for SLIs is approximately $600 to 800 per day. A three to four-day remuneration would be $1600 to $3200 cost per interpreter. This cost is only for SLIs to take the ISW not to mention the remuneration for the actual interpreting event including Deaf participants which require two to three SLIs.

Deaf Instructors

Barnes and Atherton (2015) identified that the training offered to Deaf sign language instructors was problematic in that the courses were not Deaf-friendly in delivery and content. The significant challenge I observed in the ISW was the unidentified assumptions about the participants; namely, that they were all graduate students and hence able to process and understand the core concepts underpinning the ISW: academic content and skill such as peer-based feedback, the role of the facilitator as neutral, and Kolb's experiential learning model. This is not to say that Deaf ASL instructors could not manage the content, but that the delivery of such content in a phonocentric manner with unprepared sign language interpreters would contribute to an uneven learning outcome of gaining instructional skills.

One of the stated values of ISW is active listening and in the facilitator's manual there is a section on it (ISWIAC, 2006b, p. 49-50). On the surface, it would appear that this value is reflective of Galloway et al.'s "politics of listening" (2007, p.8). However, I believe that this emphasis in the ISW training is focused more on the feedback process and not overtly applied to negotiating accessibility. Further to this, I believe that Galloway et al. have a deeper meaning as they emphasize the idea of "being attended to" (2007, p. 8). The listening in the EoA refers to the idea that the listener is present and focused on what the minority or disabled person is saying.

I heard the term 'active listening' mentioned in my ISW experience, but it seemed like there was an assumption that everyone knew what it meant. The ISW process did not give time to discuss what active listening meant and how it is applied or enacted. There seems to be an implicit assumption that all learners understand what active listening means. In this, the ISW process should require time set aside for this discussion. The need for metacognitive level discussion of our shared understanding of what 'being present' or 'active listening' means is a significant dialogue that likely will improve the ISW experience.

Conclusions

The ISW in my experience did not meet the EoA's criteria for meeting accessibility. Both the ISW and the FDW manual do not address accessibility or accommodation (ISWIAC, 2006a & 2006b). Given this absence, it is incumbent on the facilitators to make adjustments as they encounter neurodiverse learners. While some adaptations were made to address my accessibility needs, the primary driver of the ISW was the process and the three-day intensive schedule. Galloway et al.'s (2007) EoA clearly demand that the majority make "difficult changes" to ensure that everyone is able to participate (p. 8). The ISW process is paramount and did not allow for negotiations towards modification of major components of the training. For example, I did not feel that I could suggest that an exercise that had two groups in the same room be modified to having two rooms, one for each of the groups, to decrease noise

interferences. My self-advocacy, in this instance my accessibility negotiations, potentially would have been more disruptive and hence I subsumed my needs to the process.

Galloway et al.'s EoA (2007) expected that the disabled person would have a voice and changes would be made to accommodate their needs, that they should be listened (attended to), that preconceived ideas of how things should be would be set aside, and finally, that changes would be seen as inspired creations as the EoA is practiced. I chose the EoA as an evaluative tool because it pushes the boundaries of how accommodation should be negotiated in various settings. As the values of the ISW process were laid out, there was not much room for negotiations except in small areas that did not disrupt the process. My experience in negotiating accommodations was met with ignorance and unintended resistance. The experience in giving feedback that a 'closed-eye' exercise did not work for me, only to have the participant repeat the same exercise the next day, was disappointing but unsurprising.

The second tool in evaluating the ISW was the SWOT. My intent was to examine the components of the ISW along with the values and practices of the culture of the Deaf. There are several components of the SWOT that align with culturally Deaf practices in education and group formation. These similarities support the idea that the ISW potentially can lend itself to providing ASL instructors with a pedagogical model in aid of teaching sign language. The instructional model, for instance, is similar to

Deaf presentations or instructing in Deaf educational settings. Other components such as the circle formation, small groups, and repetitive practice are all strong interconnected practices in Deaf learning.

The weaknesses of the ISW create significant barriers such as time-intensive process that gives some but too little time for contextualization of information. Specifically, the Kolb theory of learning cannot be properly discussed and contextualized in 40 minutes as I experienced. Other areas such as facilitator neutrality can be a problem because many Deaf learner's educational experience is entirely didactic in nature and to make the shift to an experiential model approach would be challenging. Finally, the experience of constantly having to negotiate accessibility is an exhausting, not to mention frustrating, experience resulting in incomplete attention to participation in the learning. I experienced, as many disabled people do, having to accept less than optimal accommodation because of inflexibility and ignorance (OHRC,2017), most of it based in meaning well regarding inclusion.

The opportunity in ISW to create Deaf Space, where all the participants and the instructor are culturally Deaf and use sign language can be successful. The ISW instructional model, modifying activities with a culturally Deaf perspective, and balancing didactic instruction with experiential learning can all lead to a positive experience for the Deaf learner. The integration of ISW and Deaf space has some challenges. The 2006 ISW and FDW manuals do not include information on accessibility.

Accessibility needs are accommodated in postsecondary institutions but the Ontario Human Rights (2017) report indicates ongoing barriers and challenges for disabled students.

On the other hand, in the SWOT analysis, there are some threats. There are no trained facilitators who are culturally Deaf and/or fluent in sign language to provide such training. This would be problematic as a Deaf-friendly ISW would need to train facilitators who are fluent signers. Further to this, finding the critical mass of interested Deaf ASL instructors who wish to enhance their instructional skills through ISW may be difficult. Finally, providing the ISW to long-time Deaf ASL instructors who feel that their approach is successful might be met with some initial resistance since it would be a significantly different approach.

.

Recommendations

This study has some limitations and hence recommendations should be considered in follow up. One limitation is that the study was unable to meet all of Priestly's six conditions for emancipatory disability research. Meeting all of the conditions is critical to ensure that the resulting information has a measure of acceptability in Critical Disability Studies oriented scholarship. Since this was an explorative and evaluative study the ideas generated in the SWOT have yet to be tested with feedback from Deaf participants. Critical to this is the first recommendation: a

development of a participatory study with an advisory of Deaf community members to guide the efforts to create Deaf Space in the ISW.

A second recommendation that is responsive to the EoA, in that, participants need to have an opportunity to be heard in ensuring accessibility. Two processes need to be implemented: pre-interview and video option for formative feedback. First, a pre-interview (face-to-face or through social media) with each participant to discuss their accessibility needs for the ISW. This approach takes into consideration that there may be other accessibility needs beyond a signing environment. This also takes into consideration the intersectionality of participants which may or may not be very evident. Sensitivity to each participant's needs is essential in constructing an accessible ISW for successful learning. The second process is a creative approach to formative feedback that participants complete at the end of the day which is in writing. The formative feedback should include the option of a video feedback for participants to sign their thoughts, critiques or needs. Video recording (or a web-based video format) stations can be set up for participants to record themselves for viewing by the facilitator(s) for a response to the group. The challenge in this approach is the concern around privacy. A participant may wish to be anonymous and the video recording approach does not meet this need. This approach is an imperfect solution that has to be reviewed by the Deaf advisory committee for discussion and decision.

A third recommendation is that a pilot test of a Deaf-friendly ISW be provided with ASL instructors and including them as co-investigators. The challenge in this recommendation is in finding a critical mass of interested ASL instructors who are willing to engage in a different model of instruction that challenges them. The ISW was created in 1979 and has been maintained as an acceptable instructional training module for postsecondary institutions across Canada and internationally. As such, there is an indication that the training program is successful in improving instructional design and can assist ASL instructors in improving how they teach ASL.

The third recommendation includes two possible scenarios. First, the ideal ISW for ASL instructors should be conducted by a fluent ASL person who is a certified ISW facilitator. The value of this recommendation is that the communication between the facilitator and Deaf learners is fluid, immediate and clear. This would be the preferred approach in ISW training. The second scenario is acceptable and would take more time but can be accomplished with willing partners. This scenario should allow for pre-ISW collaboration between Deaf learners and facilitators in constructing an enhanced accommodation process similar to Galloway et al.'s EoA. This would include sign language interpreters completing the ISW prior to interpreting the workshop. In addition, the hearing facilitators should participate in a Deaf culture

training. While the second scenario is acceptable, the first scenario is preferable.

The majority of culturally Deaf learners in mainstream classes at postsecondary institutions use sign language interpreters as a means to access lectures and other modalities of learning. Quality accessibility using sign language interpreters can be influenced by a variety of factors. Although this usually is the main means of gaining access to lectures and other modalities, culturally Deaf learners prefer direct visual linguistic access to instructors and those who provide alternate learning modalities (Long and Bell, n.d.). Given that the ISW was a mix of small group and large group, learning with a group of culturally Deaf with a signing facilitator would have been ideal.

The final recommendation would result in a piloted restructuring of the ISW schedule with some changes. The restructured workshop will look to Galloway et al.'s EoA as a guide in structuring the ISW to explore the core concepts of the ISW and to give context to the ISW process. In ISW parlance, this means a *four-day* schedule with the first day becoming a prep day learning core concepts. Core concepts in this prep day will include peer-based learning, Kolb's experiential learning premises, giving feedback, active listening, role of the facilitator, and participatory learning before starting the microteaching cycles. As the ISW allows for a four-day schedule, including the prep day will help facilitate understanding of the ISW and provide contextual information for the learners.

Enacting the ISW based recommendation

In order to understand why the recommendation for an all-Deaf and four-day approach to training Deaf participants is more ideal, we must understand them from the theoretical perspective of CDS, the conceptual analytical framework of the EoA, and Deaf culture.

An all-Deaf ISW, informed by CDS and Deaf culture, is preferable over an approach where a Deaf participant is included in a largely hearing group. An all-Deaf ISW is preferable because it removes several structural and social barriers that are inherent in an inclusive ISW. These include communication, phonocentric assumptions about the learner (that everyone can hear equally well in a noisy classroom; learners can hear the facilitator if their back is turned to the classroom), and assumptions about what accommodations are needed (all SLIs provide the same quality; the disability centres or learners are responsible for accommodations). Such barriers become locations of oppression in what well-meaning hearing people may see as unremarkable communication, behaviours, and processes. For example, with a culturally Deaf facilitator the communication is in the participants' first language, thereby engaging Deaf participants in a more direct and fluid fashion than with an SLI. Direct communication allows participant to dialog with a facilitator in real time (real time meaning instantaneous without interpreter delays). SLIs also present other unintentional barriers if they are not well-versed in the theories underpinning the ISW. In another example, often phonocentric

facilitators, without consultation, may set up what they think are good accommodations such as moving a person closer to the front of a classroom only to create further barriers such as inability to hear other students when in a classroom discussion.

Meekosha and Shuttleworth (2009) emphasize the need for acknowledgement of historicity of theory and practice. The recognition that some ISW practices stem from phonocentric values is a step towards allowing changes to meet the visual and cultural needs of Deaf participants. Activities can be planned with sensitivity to how concepts can be emphasized in a visual-centric modality that understands Deaf cultural approaches. An example of a visual-centric modality has all of the material projected on the screen so that learners can maintain visual contact with the instructor rather than paper handouts. Meekosha and Shuttleworth (2009) recognize that CDS strives to engage with other cultures in order to understand differing perspectives on phenomena, in this case, engagement with Deaf cultural approaches towards an accessible ISW for Deaf participants.

Galloway et al.'s (2007) EoA must also must be considered when examining the reorientation away from phonocentric approaches in developing an all-Deaf ISW. The EoA emphasize the need for engaging disabled people towards an openness to the potential of creative changes, and letting go of "preconceived notions of perfectibility" (p.8). ISW facilitators must be prepared to make changes in activities (i.e., using the

Learning Styles Inventory to introduce Kolb's Learning styles premises)

that have worked well for them (their notions of perfectibility) in the past

and be prepared to consider different activities that are more inclusive and

not phonocentric. The EoA must be kept at the forefront in the

construction of an all-Deaf ISW as well as the process of facilitating the

training. An example of applying the EoA would be the implementation

of a Deaf advisory committee to plan and structure the ISW to ensure

accessibility and engagement of Deaf perspectives. The planning of an

ISW must be cognizant of the oppressive character of some Deaf

education such as concrete approaches in Deaf sites of learning and

literacy challenges. One also must be cognizant of the challenges of habit-

based behaviours of Deaf learners from such sites of learning. For

example, binary thinking in ways of instruction, in which a Deaf learner

may be indoctrinated into believing that there must be one correct way to

learn rather than learning that there are many ways to learn and teach. The

EoA principles are critical considerations for Deaf participants and

facilitators to keep in mind throughout the training. For example, in an all-

Deaf ISW there will be those who have intersectional identities and are

minorities and hence the EoA principles must be kept in the forefront. The

EoA strongly emphasizes the importance of listening and attending with

the goal of allowing full participation, and in this applies to those with

intersectional identities.

Deaf culture has much to contribute to the development and process of the all-Deaf ISW. In the development of activities to relay notions such as Kolb's premises of learning, peer-based learning, Tuckman's group development, and the instructional model there are numerous Deaf cultural considerations to leverage optimal learning. For instance, the ISW instructional model is similar to how signing Deaf people communicate. The instructional model has six components Bridge-in, Objective, Pre-test, Participatory Learning, Post-test, and Summary. In ASL grammar the topic often is the first part of communication (similar to the objective in BOPPPS). This allows the recipient of the communication to know what topic the signer is referring to. The signer then expands on the topic and then summarizes. This is similar to what occurs in the instructional model of the ISW. In addition, drawing on the Deaf participant's experience of peer learning from their own cultural history where Deaf people taught other Deaf people can be leveraged in a peer-based learning approach.

The structure of the four-day all-Deaf ISW (see Appendix B) would be designed to create the context on the first day for participants to understand the premises that are foundational to the instructional model of the ISW. As mentioned in the section above, the syntactic structure of ASL requires the topic to be introduced before expansion such as explanation, background and details. English speakers in Canada often introduce the topic later in communication that often is challenging for

SLIs to interpret. The introduction of the topic at the beginning is critical in ASL because it gives recipients a context. SLIs often delay their interpretation when English speakers present because the topic or context is introduced later. Without a topic, communication is compromised because the recipient is attempting to grasp the communicator's intention without a context. Fluid communication in ASL requires a clear topic to proceed with successive and progressive reasoning. For this reason, front-loading a four-day ISW with a 'context day' sets up Deaf learners with a contextual reference for all the activities that follows the next three days. This structure is critical for Deaf learners, not only for its relevance to Deaf culture, but also for how cognition and reasoning progresses in a signed form of expression.

This acknowledgement of the specific requirements of manual communication as a foundation of Deaf culture demonstrates the application of the awareness of culture demanded by Meekosha and Shuttleworth as well as the sensitivity to change and context demanded by the EoA. A context day would also allow for Deaf participants to reconnect with each other on a social basis. Such reconnecting is also an important part of the social process in gathering of Deaf people that allows them to socially 'catch up' with each other. While this is not necessarily a part of the professional instructional training, recognition of this important social process allows for fuller attention to the training.

With these recommendations, the hope is the development of an ISW that is Deaf-friendly and provides equitable access to the benefits of such training. In many fields, professional development is a critical element in allowing professionals to gain opportunities as a result of their growth. More study of short-term professional development with Critical Disability Studies orientation is recommended. Deaf and disabled people need to be assured equal access in order to continue to develop knowledge, skills and abilities for the benefits of their career.

Appendix A

ISW Three Day Cycle

Brock University ISW Training

Brock University Centre for Pedagogical Innovation

Day One

Large Group

Welcome & Introduction	8:30-8:40
Workshop Goals/ISW Introduction/Manual	8:40-8:50
Opening Activity	8:50-9:00
What is effective teaching?	9:00-9:30
What is effective feedback?	

Break

Agreements/Ground Rules/Confidentiality	9:40-10:00
Introducing BOPPPS	10:00-10:15
Modelling a mini-lesson	10:15-10:45
Deconstructing BOPPPS	10:45-11:00

Break

Small Group

Personal Goals	11:10-11:30
Mini-lesson cycle #1	11:30-12:10

Break

Mini-lesson cycle #2	1:00-1:40
Mini-lesson cycle #3	1:40-2:20
Break	
Mini-lesson cycle #4	2:30-3:10
Mini-lesson cycle #5	3:10-3:50
Revisit Personal Goals	3:50-4:10
Instructions for Day two and reviewing your video	4:10-4:20
Group reflections on BOPPPS	
Formative Evaluations	4:20-4:30

Day Two

Large Group

Issues and questions from Day one	8:30-8:50
Feedback from Day one	
Hoop exercise	8:50-9:05
Learning Style Inventory	9:05-9:35
Learning Style Inventory enacted	9:35-9:45
Introducing Head, Heart, Hands	

Break

Small Group

Personal Goals	10:00-10:15
Mini-lesson cycle #1	10:15-10:55
Mini-lesson cycle #2	10:55-11:35
Mini-lesson cycle #3	11:35-12:15

Break

Mini-lesson cycle #4	1:00-1:40
Mini-lesson cycle #5	1:40-2:00
Challenge	2:00-2:30
Revisit goals	

Large Group

Participatory Learning activity	2:45-3:45
Formative Evaluations	3:45-4:00
Wrap up and instructions	

Day Three

Large Group

Issues and questions from Day two   8:00-8:45

Feedback from Day two

How are you feeling activity? (one word)

Ask it Basket/Burning Questions activity   8:45-9:30

Break

Small Group

Personal Goals   9:45-10:00

Mini-lesson cycle #1   10:00-10:40

Mini-lesson cycle #2   10:40-11:20

Break

Mini-lesson cycle #3   11:30-12:10

Break

Mini-lesson #4   1:00-1:40

Mini-lesson #5   1:40-2:20

Break

Revisit goals   2:30-2:50

Reflection on progress

Group appreciation activity   2:50-3:10

Break

Large Group

Quotes activity   3:25-4:00

Graduation

Appendix B

Four-day all-Deaf ISW

Day One Schedule – 6 hours instructional time

Day's Goal: Introduce and familiarize participants to Foundations of ISW

Welcome and Introduction

Ice Breaker

>Activity #1 – Experience of ASL instruction: Success and Challenges (*this activity engages the cultural element of storytelling with the handshapes of the ASL alphabet)*
>
>Description: Use ASL alphabet to describe your Successful and unsuccessful teaching moments.
>
>Purpose: to utilize Deaf creative storytelling skills to share

experiences.

>Activity: Assign three or four letters of the alphabet to each participant to tell their story of their teaching moment that succeeded and failed.
>
>Debrief: Discuss how our experiences in instructional situations shape how we currently teach.

ISW Workshop Goals

Group Agreement

Peer-based Learning

Introduce the concept of Peer-based learning and how the ISW is set up to leverage participant's experience to help us understand the impact of our instructional technique, behaviour and communication on learners.

>Activity #2 – Learning from Peers Activity (*this activity leverages the experiences of Deaf participant of learning about being Deaf in their schooling years)*
>
>Use participant's elementary/high school/college experience where Deaf staff/students taught them important life lessons.
>
>Purpose: To highlight experiences in the Deaf participants' life where they learned from peers and how this is foundational to the ISW training experience.

Activity: Provide a few moments for participants to pick a story from their life where they learned important life lessons from a Deaf peer in their schooling experiences.

Kolb's Learning Styles

Activity #3 – Experience of Best Teacher (*this activity leverages participant's experiences by recalling and identifying what 'behaviour, communication, approaches' their teachers used as an introduction to Kolb rather than the Learning Style Inventory which is a written inventory*)

Purpose: Introduce Kolb's Learning Styles

Reflective identification of experiences where participants encountered a learning experience that was positive and to identify what it was: comment, actions, approach, et c.

Discuss Kolb's learning styles and how instructors must plan lessons that use all four styles of learning in order to engage learners.

Giving Feedback

Activity #4 – Feedback Activity (*this activity is intended to raise awareness of what feedback means and what it looks like in action, words and body language*).

Purpose: To practice providing reflective feedback that emphasizes attending with emphasis on participants' experiences of events.

Activity:

1) Large group break up into smaller groups (groups that will form the teaching cycle groups).
2) The participant providing feedback may choose any one of three experiences from the first three activities.
3) Facilitators will provide guidance in each of the smaller groups.
4) At the completion of feedback activities, participants will discuss how the feedback felt for them and what they need to work on.

Tuckman's Group Formation

Activity #5 - Understanding Tuckman's Group Formation theory (*this activity is intended to leverage instructional experiences of the characteristics of Tuckman's Group Formation theory*)

1) Introduce Tuckman's Group Formation theory

2) Break up into small groups (pairs/threes) to discuss experiences.
3) Return to large group to share experiences for each stage and share how this knowledge helps instructors to respond to each stage.

Formative Feedback on Day 1 (*video or written)*

Day 2

Review of Feedback from Participants

Questions regarding Day 1

Introducing BOPPPS

      Mini-lesson

Break-up into small groups

Questions/Discussions with Facilitator in small groups

Personal objectives/goals

Mini-lesson Cycle 1

Mini-lesson Cycle 2

Mini-lesson Cycle 3

Mini-lesson Cycle 4

Mini-lesson Cycle 5

Revisit objectives/goals

Watching videos and instructions for Day 3

Questions and discussions on BOPPPS

Formative Feedback (*video or written)*

Day 3

Review of Feedback from Participants

Questions regarding Day 2

Introducing Head, Hearts, Hands: Kolb

Break-up into small groups

Questions/Discussions with Facilitator in small groups

Personal objectives/goals

Mini-lesson Cycle 1

Mini-lesson Cycle 2

Mini-lesson Cycle 3

Mini-lesson Cycle 4

Mini-lesson Cycle 5

Revisit objectives/goals

Instructions for Day 4

Questions and discussions on BOPPPS

Formative Feedback (*video or written*)

Day 4

Review of Feedback from Participants

Questions regarding Day 3

Break-up into small groups

Questions/Discussions with Facilitator in small groups

Personal objectives/goals

Mini-lesson Cycle 1

Mini-lesson Cycle 2

Mini-lesson Cycle 3

Mini-lesson Cycle 4

Mini-lesson Cycle 5

Revisit objectives/goals

Graduation Ceremony

Appendix C

Guiding Principles of Accommodation

Ethics of Accommodation

1. At its core, an Ethic of Accommodation means that the majority does not rule. Instead, accommodation means including everyone wanting to participate, often necessitating that the majority make difficult changes in its practices and environment. These changes are not made begrudgingly, but with goodwill, creativity, and a strong dose of humor, elements that often find expression in the performances themselves.

2. The ethic includes the politics of listening as well as the politics of speaking. Whereas most minority groups maintain that they have been 'silenced' by the majority and thus place speaking at a premium, disability communities often place listening on the same plane. People with disabilities often feel they have not been listened to or even addressed. In this context, listening does not have to happen with ears. Listening here, means being taking into consideration, being attended to.

3. The Ethic of Accommodation means making room for difference possible, letting go of preconceived notions of perfectibility, and negotiating complex sets of needs. Often these 'needs' compete with one another. Accommodating disability or other forms of difference often does not seem practical or marketable, since doing soften raises costs or necessitates work that seemingly benefits only a few. Marketability is not our concern.

4. The Ethic of Accommodation inspires creative aesthetic choices from casting, choreography and costuming, and also the use of space for the creation of new material. Practicing the ethic enhances theatrical practice.

Galloway, Nudd, and Sandhal, 2007

Ontario Human Rights Commision: Principles of Accommodation in Education

Accommodation is a means of preventing and removing barriers that impede students with disabilities from participating fully in the educational environment in a way that is responsive to their own unique circumstances. The principle of accommodation involves three factors: dignity, individualization and inclusion.

1.   Respect for dignity

Students with disabilities have the right to receive educational services in a manner that is respectful of their dignity. Human dignity encompasses individual self-respect and self-worth. It is concerned with physical and psychological integrity and empowerment. It is harmed when individuals are marginalized, stigmatized, ignored or devalued.

2.   Individualized accommodation

There is no set formula for accommodation. Each student's needs are unique and must be considered afresh when an accommodation request is made. At all times, the emphasis must be on the individual student and not on the category of disability. Blanket approaches to accommodation that rely solely on categories, labels and generalizations are not acceptable.

3.   Inclusion and full participation

As the OHRC noted in its Disability Policy, "in some circumstances, the best way to ensure the dignity of persons with disabilities may be to provide separate or specialized services." However, education providers must first make efforts to build or adapt educational services to accommodate students with disabilities in a way that promotes their inclusion and full participation. Preventing and removing barriers means all students should be able to access their environment and face the same duties and requirements with dignity and without impediment.

(OHRC, 2018)

United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disability (UNCPRD)

The principles of the present Convention shall be:

1.   Respect for inherent dignity, individual autonomy including the freedom to make one's own choices, and independence of persons;
2.   Non-discrimination;
3.   Full and effective participation and inclusion in society;

4.   Respect for difference and acceptance of persons with
disabilities as part of human diversity and humanity;

5.   Equality of opportunity;

6.   Accessibility;

7.   Equality between men and women;

8.   Respect for the evolving capacities of children with disabilities
and respect for the right of children with disabilities to preserve their
identities.

(UNCPRD, 2018)

References

Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). (n.d.). *Guide to the act*. Retrieved from http://www.aoda.ca/guide-to-the-act/#introduction on February 12, 2018.

American Sign Language Teachers Association. (n.d.). *Certification*. Retrieved from https://aslta.org/certification/ November 12, 2017.

Baker, C. and Cokely, D. (1980). American Sign Language: a teacher's resource text on grammar and culture. T.J. Publishers, Inc: Maryland, USA.

Barnes, L. and Atherton, M. (2015). 'What's the sign for "Catch 22"?': barriers to professional formation for deaf teachers of British Sign Language in the Further Education sector. *Journal of Further and Higher Education,* 39 (3), 417-434. Retrieved from https://journals-scholarsportal-info.proxy.library.brocku.ca/pdf/0309877x/v39i0003/417_tsf2btlitfes.xml

Bauman, H-D. L., Simser, S., Hannan, G. (n.d.). Beyond ableism and audism: achieving human rights for Deaf and hard of hearing citizens. Canadian Hearing Society. Retrieved from: https://www.chs.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/beyond_ableism_and_audism_2013july.pdf on April 15, 2018.

Brock University (n.d.). *Brock University Student Services: Resources*. Retrieved from https://brocku.ca/sas/resources/#sensory on February 23, 2018.

Cameron, C. (2014a). Disability research. In C. Cameron (Ed.), *Disability studies: a student's guide* (pp. 33-36). Los Angeles: Sage.

Cameron, C. (2014b). Normalcy. In C. Cameron (Ed.), Disability studies: a student's guide (pp. 107-109). Los Angeles: Sage.

Canadian Association of the Deaf. (July 3, 2015a). Deaf culture vs. medicalization. Retrieved from: http://cad.ca/issues-positions/deaf-culture-vs.-medicalization/ on April 12, 2018.

Canadian Association of the Deaf. (July 3, 2015b). Statistics on Deaf Canadians. Retrieved from http://cad.ca/issues-positions/statistics-on-deaf-canadians/ on May 4, 2018.

Canadian Hearing Society. (n.d.). Models of deafness. Retrieved from: http://www.chs.ca/models-deafness. on April 12, 2018.

Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (November 1, 2017). Video Relay Services (VRS). Retrieved from https://crtc.gc.ca/eng/phone/acces/rela.htm on April 15, 2018.

Cawthon, S.W. and Leppo, R. (2013). Accommodations quality for students who are d/Deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 158(4), 438 – 452. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED555691.pdf

Cawthon, S.W., Schoffstall, S.J., and Garberoglio, C.L. (2014). How ready are postsecondary institutions for students who are d/Deaf or hard of hearing? *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22 (13). Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED555684.pdf

Coogan, T. and Mallet, R. (2013). Disability, humour and comedy. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 7(3), 247-253.

Corker, M. (2002). Deafness/Disability – problematizing notions of identity, culture and structure. In S. Ridell and N. Watson (Eds), in *Disability, Culture and Identity. Pearson*: London. Retrieved from file:///E:/Thesis%20Research/Deaf%20Culture%20-%20ASL%20Instructor/Corker-Deafness.pdf

Couser, G.T. (2013). Disability, Life Narrative, and Representation. In L.J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp.456-459). NY: Routledge.

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*, Third Edition. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Cyr, A.V. (1999). Overview of theories and principles relating to characteristics of adult learners: 1970s-1999 [Abstract]. Florida: Cyr Consultant Services. Retrieved from: https://eric-ed-gov.proxy.library.brocku.ca/?id=ED435817

Danforth, S. (2006). From epistemology to democracy: pragmatism and the reorientation of disability research. *Remedial and Special Education*, 27(6), p. 337-345.

Davis, L.J. (2013). Introduction: disability, normality, and power. In L.J. Davis (Ed.), *The disability studies reader* (pp.1-14, NY: Routledge.

Dawson, D., Borin, P., Meadows, K., Britnell, J., Olsen, K., & McIntyre, G. (2014). The Impact of the Instructional Skill Workshop on Faculty Approaches to Teaching. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.

Day, R. et al., (October 14-16, 2005). The instructional skills workshop: The heart of an educator learning community in British Columbia and beyond. International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Retrieved from https://www.iswnetwork.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Hand_ISW_ISSoTL1.pdf

Denhart, H. (2008). Deconstructing barriers: Perceptions of students labeled with learning disabilities in higher education. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 41 (6), 483-497. doi: 10.1177/0022219408321151

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (n.d.). The American with Disabilities Act of 1990. Retrieved from www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/history/35th/1990s/ada.html on April 14, 2018.

Foster, S., Long, G., & Snell, K. (1999). Inclusive instruction and learning for deaf students in postsecondary education. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 4, 225–235. Retrieved from https://journals-scholarsportal-info.proxy.library.brocku.ca/pdf/10814159/v04i0003/225_epiialfdsipe.xml

Fuller, M., Healey, M., Bradley, A. & Hall, T. (2004a). Barriers to learning: a systematic study of the experience of disabled students in one university. *Studies in Higher Education,* 29 (3), 303-318. doi: 10.1080/03075070410001682592.

Fuller, M., Bradley, A. and Healey, M. (2004b). Incorporating disabled students within inclusive higher education environment. *Disability and Society*, 19 (5), 455-468. doi: 10.1080/0968759042000235307.

Gallaudet University (n.d.). Deaf president now. Retrieved from http://www.gallaudet.edu/about/history-and-traditions/deaf-president-now on April 15, 2018

Galloway, T., Nudd, D.M., and Sandhal, C. (2007). Actual lives and the ethic of accommodation. In P. Kuppers (Ed.), *Studying disability arts and culture: an introduction*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 8-9. Originally from, P. Kuppers (Ed.), Community performance: a reader. NY: Routledge, p. 227-34.

Galloway, T. (2016). On being told "no"- keynote for "celebrating disability through performance," Georgia Southern's Patti Pace Performance Festival. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 36(2,3), 149-155. Dx.doi.org/10.1080/10462937.2016.1195507

Garland-Thomson, R. (2009). Disability, identity, and representation: an introduction. In T. Titchkosky and R. Michalko (Eds.), Rethinking Normalcy: A Disability Studies Reader, Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, Inc.

Gertz, G. and Boudreault, P. (eds). (2016). *The Sage Deaf Studies Encyclopedia, Vol. 1*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Gordon, M. and Hardy, M. (2009). *Provincial Review of ASL/Deaf Studies and Interpreter Education in BC*. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development.

Government of Canada. *The convention on the rights of persons with disabilities*. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/rights-people-disabilities.html on October 25, 2017.

Government of Canada. *The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom*. Retrieved from https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/rights-people-disabilities.html on October 25, 2017.

Government of Ontario. (2005). Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005. S.O. 2005, Chapter 11. Retrieved from https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/05a11/v1

Guzman, A. and Balcazar, F. (2010). Disability services' standards and the worldviews guiding their implementation. Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability, 23(1), 48-62.

Helms, M. (2010). Exploring SWOT analysis – where are we now? A review of academic research from the last decade. *Journal of Strategy and Management,* 3 (3), pp. 215-251. doi: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.brocku.ca/10.1108/1755425101106483 7

Huxley, P. (2001). The contribution of social science to mental health services research and development: A SWOT analysis. *Institute of*

Psychiatry: Journal of Mental Health, 10(2), 117–120. Retrieved from:
http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.brocku.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=18&sid=7b592c78-99e3-4ee3-b6b8-1810281a36a4%40sessionmgr4007

Hyde, M., Punch, P., Power, D., Hartley, J., Neale, J., and Brennan, L. (2009). The experiences of deaf and hard of hearing students at a Queensland University: 1985 – 2005. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 28 (1), 85-98. doi:10.1080/07294360802444388

The Instructional Skills Workshop International Advisory Committee (ISWIACa) (2006a). *Instructional skills workshop (ISW): handbook for participants*. Vancouver: ISWIAC.

The Instructional Skills Workshop International Advisory Committee (ISWIAC) (2006b). *Facilitator development workshop: workshop participant handbook and facilitator resources*. Vancouver: ISWIAC.

Invisible Disabilities Association (n.d.). How do you define invisible disability? Retrieved from https://invisibledisabilities.org/what-is-an-invisible-disability/ on April 17, 2018.

Jacobowitz, E.L. (2007). A look at teaching standards in ASL teacher preparation programs. *Sign Language Studies,* 8 (1). Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.brocku.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&sid=0b513898-5676-4279-b2d1-c0f94c40c389%40sessionmgr101

Johnson, S.G. and Fann, A. (2016). Deaf and hard of hearing students' perception of campus administrative support. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice,* 40 (4), 243-253. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2015.1021404

Ladd, P. (2014). *Deaf pedagogies*. Retrieved from: YouTube: https://www.bing.com/videos/search?q=paddy+ladd&view=detail&mi

d=7D33D5C8D48FF650ACC67D33D5C8D48FF650ACC6&FORM=
VIRE

Ladd, P. and Lane, H. (2013). Deaf ethnicity, deafhood, and their
relationship. *Sign Language Studies*, 13(4), 565-579.

Lalla, B. (1990). Black laugher: foundations of irony in earliest
Jamaican literature. Journal of Black Studies, Vol. 20(4), 414-425.
Sage Publications, Inc.

Lane, H. (1992). The mask of benevolence: Disabling the Deaf
community. Alfred A. Knopf: NY.

Linton, P. (1999). "And here's how it happened": Trickster discourse
in Thomas King's "Green Grass, Running Water". *Modern Fiction
Studies*, 45(1), 212-234.

Long, G.L. and Bell, D.H. (ND). The importance of direct
communication during continuing education workshops for deaf and
hard of hearing professionals. *Journal of Postsecondary Education
and Disability,* 18(1). Retrieved from
https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ846376.pdf

Magnus, E. and Tossebro, J. (2014). Negotiating individual
accommodation in higher education. *Scandinavian Journal of
Disability Research*, 16 (4), 316-332.
doi:10.1080/15017419.2012.761156.

Marschark, M.; Sapere, P.; Convertino, C. and Seewagen, R. (2005).
Access to postsecondary education through sign language interpreting.
Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 10(1), 38-50. Retrieved
from http://www.jstor.org.proxy.library.brocku.ca/stable/42658735

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B. (2011). Designing qualitative
research, Fifth Edition. USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

McCloy, U. and DeClou, L. (2013). Disability in Ontario: Postsecondary education participation rates, student experience and labour market outcomes. Toronto: Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario.

McColl, M.A. (2013). The disability lens. Derived from M.A. McColl and L. Jongbloed, *Disability and social policy in Canada* 2nd edition (2013). Toronto: Captus. Retrieved from www.disabilitypolicyalliance.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/disability-lens-300913.pdf on April 23, 2018.

Meekosha, H. and Shuttleworth, R. (2009). What's so 'critical' about critical disability studies? Australian Journal of Human Rights, 15(1), p.47-75.

Michalko, R. (2009). Introduction. In R. Michalko and T. Titchkosky (Eds.), *Rethinking Normalcy: a disability studies reader* (pp. 1-14). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, Inc.

Morrison, D. (1985). The instructional skills workshop program: an inter-institutional approach. Nebraska. Nebraska: Digital Commons @ University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/podimprovecad/81

Napier, J. (2004). Sign language interpreting: The relationship between metalinguistic awareness and the production of interpreting omissions. *Sign Language Studies*, 4(4), 369-394. doi:10.1353/sls.2004.0020

Napier, J., & Barker, R. (2004). Accessing university education: perceptions, preferences and expectations for interpreting by deaf students. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 9(2), 228-238. doi:10.1093/deafed/enh024

National Association of the Deaf (n.d.a). Television Decoder Circuitry Act. Retrieved from https://www.nad.org/resources/civil-rights-laws/television-decoder-circuitry-act/ on April 18, 2018.

National Association of the Deaf (n.d.b). NAD History. Retrieved from https://www.nad.org/about-us/nad-history/#1990s on April 18, 2018.

National Deaf Center on Postsecondary Outcomes (n.d.). American with Disabilities Act (ADA) Video. Retrieved from https://www.nationaldeafcenter.org/resource/americans-disabilities-act-ada-video on April 2, 2018.

Notzer, N. and Abramovitz, R. (2008). Can brief workshops improve clinical instruction? *Medical Education*, 42, 152-156. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.brocku.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=13&sid=ed22833c-2be8-4710-905e-028e89fc36db%40sessionmgr102

O'Brien, C., Kroner, C., and Placier, P. (2005) Deaf culture and academic culture: cultivating understanding across cultural and linguistic boundaries. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8 (2), 104-119. doi:10.1037/a0038821

Oliver, M. (2009). The social model in context. In R. Michalko and T. Titchkosky, T. (2009), *Rethinking normalcy: a disability studies reader* (pp.19-30). Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press, Inc.

Ontario Human Rights Commission. (n.d.a). The opportunity to succeed: achieving barrier-free education with disabilities: post-secondary education: overview. Retrieved from http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/opportunity-succeed-achieving-barrier-free-education-students-disabilities/post-secondary-education on October 26, 2017.

Ontario Human Rights Commission (n.d.b). Principles of Accommodation. Retrieved from

http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/guidelines-accessible-education/principles-accommodation on April 19, 2018.

Ontario Human Rights Commission (2018). Undue hardship standard. Retrieved from http://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/guidelines-accessible-education/undue-hardship-standard on April 19, 2018.

Panagiotou, G. (2003). Bringing SWOT into focus. *Business Strategy Review,* 14 (2), 8-10. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.brocku.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=19&sid=ed22833c-2be8-4710-905e-028e89fc36db%40sessionmgr102

Powell, D., Hyde, M. and Punch, R. (2014). Inclusion in postsecondary institutions with small numbers of deaf and hard of hearing students: highlights and challenges. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 19 (1), 126-40. doi: 10.1093/deafed/ent035.

Power, D., & Hyde, M. (2002). The characteristics and extent of participation of deaf and hard of hearing students in regular classes in Australian schools. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 7, 302–311. Retrieved from http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.brocku.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=22&sid=ed22833c-2be8-4710-905e-028e89fc36db%40sessionmgr102

Priestly, M. (1997). Whose research? a personal audit. In C. Cameron (Ed), *Disability studies: a student's guide, pp.33-36*. Sage, Los Angles. Originally from, C. Barnes and G. Mercer (Eds.), Doing Disability Research (2014a), Leeds: The Disability Press, p. 88-107.

Russell, D. and Winston, B. (2014). Tapping into the interpreting process: Using participant reports to inform the interpreting process in educational settings. *Translation & Interpreting*, 6 (1). doi: ti.106201. 2014.a07.

Shakespeare, T. (2013). The social model of disability. In L.J. Davis (Ed), *The disability studies reader*, pp.214-221. NY: Routledge.

Shield, A., (2004). Ideological conflict at group boundaries: The hearing children of Deaf adults *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual symposium about Language and Society*. Austin. April 16-18, 2004.

Siebers, T. (2001). Disability in theory: From social constructionism to the new realism of the body. *American Literary History, 13*(4), 737-754. doi:10.1093/alh/13.4.737

Siebers, T. (2013). Disability and the theory of complex embodiment. In L.J. Davis (Ed), The Disability Studies Reader, 4th edition. Routledge: NY.

Simms, S. and Thumann, H. (2007). In search of a new, linguistically and culturally sensitive paradigm in Deaf education. American Annals of the Deaf, 153(3), 302-311.

Solvang, P.K. and Haualand, H. (2014). Accessibility and diversity: deaf space in action. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, 16 (1), 1-13. Doi:10.1080/15017419.2012.761158

Strauss, J.N. (2013). Autism as culture. In L.J. Davis (Ed), The Disability Studies Reader, 4th edition. Routledge: NY.

Sutton-Spence, R. and Napoli, D.J. (2012). Deaf jokes and sign language humor. Humor, 25(3), 311-337. Doi 10.1515/humor-2012-0016.

Trinandis, H.C. (2002). Individualism-Collectivism and Personality. *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 69(6), abstract. Doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.696169

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)*. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/article-24-education.html

United Nations (2006). Article 3- General Principles. Retrieved from https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/article-3-general-principles.html on April 19, 2018.

Wendell, S. (1996). The rejected body: feminist philosophical reflection on disability. Routledge: New York.

Westhues, J.L. and Schmidt, G. (2001). A SWOT analysis of social work education in Canada. *Social Work Education*, 20 (1). Retrieved from Shttp://eds.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.brocku.ca/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=42&sid=ed22833c-2be8-4710-905e-028e89fc36db%40sessionmgr102

Wood, D. (1995). Communication and cognition: how the communication styles of haring adults may hinder – rather than help – deaf learners. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 136(3), p. 247-251.

World Federation of the Deaf. (n.d.). Our work. Retrieved from https://wfdeaf.org/our-work/ on April 20, 2018.