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 |