Culturally Responsive Practices (CRP):

Content development (product) & implementation (process)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy** | **Strengths** | **Limitations** |
| **Community-driven design** | * The process and as a product are autonomous by design, and reflect the concepts, views, and values of the community they are intended to serve
* Social, cultural, and linguistic ties of the community are positioned at the center of the process and product
* Expertise, knowledge, and “ways of knowing,” in many ways, extend beyond the confines of Western-dominant perspectives
* Minimizes the dominant voice and power afforded to Western-based perspectives
 | * Sourcing examples
* Topic relevance may be specific to the target community
* May be perceived as “counter” to the voices and interests of Western-dominant traditions for educational design and delivery
 |
| **Co-construction** | * Often represents a collaborative effort between stakeholder groups of different social positioning
* Community-based perspectives mutually contribute to shaping content and delivery
* Extends to include measures that are also linguistically appropriate
* Dominant perspectives are examined, creating space for social, cultural, and linguistic ties of the community to be moved “toward the center”
* Shared voice among stakeholders aims to balance power dynamics
 | * Despite the balance of stakeholder perspectives, the process and product can [still] favor dominant perspectives
* Content development is dependent on the experience, skills, and knowledge of stakeholder groups
* Perspectives of community-based stakeholders can be misinterpreted as *the* voice of a community rather than *a* voice within the community
 |
| **Adaptation / localization** | * Contemplates the needs of the target community (e.g. geographical location, language, topic relevance, and others)
* Offers flexibility in producing and delivering content that is both culturally responsive *and* linguistically appropriate for the community it is intended to serve
 | * The process and product favor the dominant group
* “Retrofitting” the content and delivery methods can be problematic
* Places authority for creation in the hands of those speaking *for* a community
 |
| **Accommodation** **(e.g. translation & interpretation)** | * Bridges an immediate gap that inhibits access to content
* Intended to all provide all participants with “equal footing” despite differences
 | * No flexibility for shaping the content
* Added constraints to the delivery process
* Only affords participants with partial access to content
 |