Teaching at the Intersection of Disability, Race, and Gender: Theorizing the Disability Studies Classroom

Margaret Peters

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Doctorate in Philosophy degree in Women's Studies

Institute of Feminist and Gender Studies
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

Table of Contents

Abstract

Given the critiques by many Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour (BIPOC) scholars who argue that Disability Studies is really White Disability Studies, this dissertation explores the challenges of teaching critical Disability Studies at the undergraduate level. At the heart of the challenge of teaching Disability Studies is the conflict between disability scholars, some of whom argue against politics of desirability, pointing to the disabling/debilitating processes that make rights-based analyses inadequate. While Canadian university institutions use discourses of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, and claim to follow state recommendations for accessibility and reconciliation, universities themselves still often are disabling. Indigenous and Black students, facility, and staff still experience inaccessible study and work spaces, including carceral logics that represent Indigenous and Black knowledges as inherently intellectually inferior. I argue that these logics are not separate from ableist practices that limit disabled participation in university spaces; disability must be examined through an intersectional—and explicitly race-based—lens. Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), this dissertation takes on the problem of teaching Disability Studies in two parts: the first part gives a more theoretical examination of the conflicts within Disability Studies, the problems of accessibility/reconciliation according to university Teaching and Learning websites, and the accessibility issue of anti-Blackness in university. The second part aims to give a more pragmatic and practical examination of the same issues, pointing to a failure-based self-reflexive classroom, and giving two mock assignments for educators and students to consider their place in ableist white supremacist institutions.

Acknowledgements

In January 2015, I met Kathryn Trevenen in a Feminist Theories graduate seminar. It was during this class that I began to think more critically about my own experiences with disability and race. Over six years later, it is through Kathryn's continued guidance that I am submitting my PhD dissertation. Kathryn's mentorship has been invaluable to my academic training, but also my training as an educator and frankly, as a decent human being. It is no exaggeration to say that I would not have completed this dissertation without her. I am incredibly lucky to be able to call Kathryn a friend.

A huge thank you to my committee members, Gulzar Charania, Michael Orsini, and Laura Horak for their meticulous commentary and support during this process. Each brought insights that strengthened this work significantly, and I feel lucky to have such a distinguished committee. Thank you to Nirmala Erevelles for acting as my external examiner; I feel so honoured to have been in conversation with such a distinguished scholar. Thank you also to Shoshana Magnet for graciously agreeing to both being on and off the committee; Shoshana's weekly check-ins were incredibly life-affirming and useful to keeping me together during teaching and writing periods. Corrie Scott likewise organized events over zoom that kept me together when we could no longer meet in person; thank you.

Thank you to Tricia McGuire-Adams, Danielle Peers, and Lindsay Eales for bringing me on as a Research Assistant in August 2020, helping me reconsider disability and Indigeneity and its place in this dissertation. I am lucky to be working with such kind, inquisitive, and established scholars.

Thank you to Sarah Smith, Dr. Celeste Orr, and Fiona Miller for peer mentorship, for listening to my rants, and for teaching me more about theory than any textbook. There were periods where one-on-one conversations with you Made me dramatically reconsider my research and teaching. I hold onto these friendships dearly.

Thank you to Ghaida Moussa, Stephanie Claude, Roland (RJ) Jones, and Dorothy Attkora-Gyan for conversations before and after lectures, conversations that challenged me to think deeper about race, gender, sexuality, Indigeneity, and disability.

Thank you to Tina, Anna, Kaytlyn, Marko, Clare, Marina, Gillian, Chris, Gareth, Kate, Sam, Daniel, Jeremy, Sarah, Michelle, Graeme, Kirk, Nadine, Rose Ingrid, Magalie, Lindsay, Noe, Patrick, Charlotte, Claire, Elgin, Lais, Sof, Patricia, Xavier, Emily, Melissa, Matthew, Elizabeth, and all the others who have laughed with me, danced with me, chatted with me, and held me together in friendship during graduate school. Being able to step away from work and live through a pandemic would not have been possible without you. In many ways, you kept me going, even when we had/have to social distance.

Thank you to both my cats, Mimi and Maverick, for being furry little rascals who didn’t notice when the world was in lockdown. Thank you to my mom and my sister for checking in on my progress. Thank you to the folks at Arlington Five who gave me a loving community space to work, eat, and drink coffee/tea before the pandemic hit, and for taking care of our community after.

Thank you to my partner in pandemic and in life, Mike, for helping me fall back to sleep after every panic attack in the middle of the night, for tucking me into bed when I couldn’t stop crying, and for making me laugh when the world seemed to be ending. I’m so lucky to have watched you become the lovely person you are today, and this work would not be possible without you challenging me when I wasn’t making sense, and without you believing in me much more than I believe in myself.

Finally, thank you to my students. This dissertation is dedicated to you.

Introduction: an Intersectional Disability Studies Classroom

In 2019, I had the pleasure of designing and teaching a Disability Studies class within the Institute of Feminist and Gender Studies for the first time. The process of designing and teaching this course revealed and emphasized the whiteness of Disability Studies as a field. White Disability Studies has claimed objectivity over Disability Studies, while ignoring or glossing over the ways that gender, race, class, and disability overlap and reinforce each other. For example, in living and teaching on unceded and unsurrendered Algonquin Anishinaabe territory, I began my class with a brief overview of the ways that Indigenous peoples in Canada have been continually represented as physically and mentally disordered. However, I hesitated to describe the processes of Indigenous genocide as "disabling" because of the work of many scholars who argue that "disability" should be a positive and affirming term (for example, see Kafer 2003). As a white settler feminist scholar with bodymind[1] limitations, I am struck by the conflicts within my social justice disciplines. I realized that the Disability Studies scholarship, which emphasizes disability pride, reinscribes whiteness as default and whiteness as normal, perhaps in part because of this emphasis. This dissertation was born from this moment of conflict, alongside critiques from my students that pushed me to better explore how teaching Disability Studies through an intersectional lens is necessary. In this introduction, I summarize this conflict within the fields of Disability Studies and education, briefly examining the whiteness in Disability Studies and the opposition to this

---

[1] Throughout this dissertation, I use "bodymind" to challenge the Western impulse to separate body from mind. I take this terminology from Clare (1999; 2017); Schalk (2018); and Price (2011), among other Disability Studies scholars.

whiteness, before delving into the theory and methodology used in this dissertation. I end this introduction by giving a short chapter breakdown and a recognition of the contradictory nature of this research.

Disability Studies has “emerged” (Garland-Thomson 2013) as a field of study within the humanities and social sciences that actively challenges medical or scientific studies of disability, arguing that social processes impact social constructions of bodies and therefore whose bodies are represented as desirable or normal. In the last thirty years, Disability Studies has joined other fields interested in social and embodied identity, including feminist studies, queer theories, critical race theories, and Indigenous studies. Bachelor degrees in social sciences and arts faculties across North America, Europe, and in some Global South locales, have begun focussing on Disability Studies, challenging undergraduate students to think critically about disability rights, disability representation, embodied disability, and beyond. While an increasing number of students are taught to think about disability beyond medical constructions of bodymind difference and there have been a number of important studies on education and disability, few scholarly studies exist that look at the theoretical challenges involved in teaching disability. As Disability Studies becomes increasingly pervasive across Canadian and American universities, a theoretical study of how to teach Disability Studies is necessary. By learning from feminist, Indigenous, critical race, queer, and crip pedagogies, this dissertation theorizes the Disability Studies classroom, arguing that disability must be an intersectional subject that cannot be isolated from theorizations of gender, race, class, and sexuality. More specifically, this dissertation argues that teaching about disability at the postsecondary level cannot be removed from processes of disablement, racialization, gender, sexuality, and class that are also taking place in the classroom, such that teaching disability in the undergraduate classroom necessitates not only shifting curriculum towards critical race texts, but also shifting how we interact with our students towards more critical teaching practices.

This project therefore has two main contributions to the fields of education, pedagogy, and Disability Studies: first, it theorizes disability pedagogy intersectionally using critical race theory, feminist theories, Indigenous studies, and Disability Studies; second, it provides some practical guidelines for teaching Disability Studies at the postsecondary level. Alongside the question of how Disability Studies should be taught, I ask theoretical questions, including how feminist pedagogies and pedagogies rooted in Critical Race Theory can help us teach Disability Studies, how Disability Studies is changing as a field through recent work on intersectionality and race in Disability Studies, and how recent trends in university administration affect the teaching of Disability Studies. I also ask more practical questions of access and intersectionality, pointing to the many ways that disability has often been theorized as a white, male, straight identity. How does the work of teaching Disability Studies change because of the integration of race, colonialism, and imperialism? How can we decentre whiteness in Disability Studies teaching?

Sami Schalk and Jina B. Kim (2020) have recently taken up the question of BIPOC interventions in feminist Disability Studies. Schalk and Kim (2020) extend Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (2003)'s proposal for a feminist Disability Studies that would add to Disability Studies and feminist theory, arguing that integrating feminist-of-colour scholarship into feminist Disability Studies helps clarify the ways that "ableism is inextricable from white supremacy, patriarchy, heterosexism, transphobia, colonialism, and poverty" (48). Rather than focussing on issues of representation, recognition or identity, feminist-of-colour scholarship like that of Mia Mingus, Jasbir Puar, Moya Bailey, Dorothy Roberts, Leah Lakshmi-Piepzna Samarasinha, and others that I draw on throughout this dissertation, emphasize how social and political processes affect the bodies of those in particular populations and the "social norms that define particular attributes as impairments, as well as the social conditions that concentrate stigmatized attributes in particular populations" (Minich 2016, qtd in Schalk and Kim 2020, 37). Applying these analyses to the university Disability Studies classroom clarifies how university classes are not immune to social norms, even as these norms are being examined and analysed through course material.

Disability is most often represented as a negative experience in the body, something over which medicine has a responsibility and which justifies intervention, regulation, and cure. In fact, Mitchell and Snyder (2000) argue that most narrative, including fiction and nonfiction narratives, presents disability as a plot-point in need of regulation or cure. This understanding of disability, as a problem in need of addressing, is one that coincides with constructions of other forms of perceived bodymind difference as in need of becoming closer to the norm. Processes of white supremacist cis-heteropatriarchy—including institutions like education—represent a particular kind of bodymind as normal, erasing diversities of difference that upend conformity. Teaching Disability Studies thus depends not only on alternative constructions of disability as potentially desirable in themselves but also alternative constructions of gender, race, class, and sexuality that decenter whiteness, masculinity, heterosexuality, and cisgender normality. I align my pedagogy with a lineage of BIPOC scholars and educators who advocate for learning procedures that are critical of power structures within the classroom. Critical pedagogies, beginning with the work of Paulo Freire and found also in the work of bell hooks and Sandy Grande, bridge work in critical theory into the classroom, especially critical theorizing that grapples with power imbalances between educators, students, and colleagues.

As Disability Studies courses become more commonplace in Canadian universities,[2] a study that is explicitly concerned with why, what, how, who, and to whom Disability Studies is being taught will help clarify the importance of this field. As neoliberal processes continue to present disability as an individual problem of bodymind rather than involving structural and systematic discrimination, work that acknowledges the connections between racial discrimination and disability discrimination is necessary. While Disability Studies has been often critiqued for the ways that it upholds whiteness as desirable and necessary, a new generation of Disability Studies scholars exist in our undergraduate classrooms. If we continue to present Disability Studies as a study for and about white disabled people, we replicate the cycle of racial discrimination we hope to dismantle. By centering the work and understanding of BIPOC scholars in the classroom, the pervasive oppression of ableist white supremacy can be challenged.

Whiteness in Disability Studies

---

[2] Disability Studies undergraduate degrees (minors, majors), diplomas, and/or graduate degrees are available in at least 14 Canadian universities: University of British Columbia, University of Northern British Columbia, Vancouver Island University, Pacific Coast University for Workplace health Sciences, University of Calgary, MacEwan University, University of Winnipeg, Brock University, York University, Western University, University of Calgary, Ryerson University, University of Fredericton, and the University of Windsor. Opini (2016) reviews courses offered at more universities, including King’s College University, University of Manitoba, and the University of Toronto.

Disability Studies has been largely criticized by BIPOC scholars for actually being “White Disability Studies” (Bell 2010) because of the ways it cites and supports the work of primarily white, Global North scholars. Nwadiogo Ejiogu and Syrus Marcus Ware (2018) also argue that Disability Studies, but particularly Disability Studies education, does not adequately address race. In other words, white scholars and white understandings of disability pervade not just the field of Disability Studies but also how it is taught. Finally, Batheseba Opini (2016) argues that Disability Studies refuses to adequately address the Global South, even though the majority of disabled people currently live in Global South countries. Teaching Disability Studies in what Robert McRuer (2018) calls “Crip Times” (24) necessarily involves grappling with these debates within Disability Studies, and resisting impulses to teach within strict disciplinary boundaries—that is to imagine disability can exist apart from gender, race, sexuality, or class. These disciplinary boundaries, while comfortable from an academic standpoint, often gloss over how Global South experiences challenge disability rights, for example, and erase the hard work of scholars who themselves do not fit into single identity categories.

White scholars that appropriate Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour activist slogans—for example “Disabled Lives Matter”—that compare disability to race, and that assume that white disabled experience can represent all disabled experience (see Conway 2017; Subblefield 2007; and Inckle 2015) reiterate racist understandings of disability. As Chapter One emphasizes, Disability Studies has not adequately integrated race into its main tenets, instead flattening disability experience along racial lines. This has allowed white disability scholars to enact racism in their theory. Teaching Disability Studies could easily fall into the trap of teaching White Disability Studies if we do not tend to the important bridges that exist between the fields of Disability Studies, critical race theory, feminist studies, queer theories, and other critical social theories. My project, in its explicit aim to theorize the Disability Studies classroom, acknowledges the many different identities that take place between and in each student and educator. However, in framing whiteness as the major problem or issue of my dissertation, I aim not to explore whiteness itself, but to explore the generous analyses that counter White Disability Studies, most often written and published by BIPOC scholars.

My focus on BIPOC scholarship as the solution to the whiteness of Disability Studies is in opposition to Whiteness Studies solutions that might re-emphasize the conflict that whiteness creates. Whiteness Studies has been criticized for focussing on the feelings and needs of white people in dismantling their complicity in racial oppression, rather than focussing on the actions required to support BIPOC resistance (See for example, Chen 2017). Similarly, in focussing on the whiteness of White Disability Studies, white disabled people might use their disability as a way of disavowing their participation in white supremacy. In other words, disability could allow white disability scholars to “race to innocence” (Fellows and Razack 1997). The race to innocence that white disability scholars have the potential to enact is largely a function of the complicated emotions and affects that follow from acknowledging whiteness as property (see Harris 1993) and whiteness as privilege.

While the field of Whiteness Studies has been widely criticized for recentering white perspectives, the concept of whiteness as a structure is still very useful. Whiteness as structure is not about individual white people failing to address their white experience, as Whiteness Studies' "first wave" emphasized, but about how power is mobilized through race (see Tanner 2018 for waves of Whiteness Studies). Cheryl Harris (1993) calls this whiteness as property, demonstrating the material gains from claiming and being claimed as white. Before Harris, W.E.B. Du Bois (1998) named whiteness as "public and psychological wage," or "compensation" within capitalism. Ella Myers (2018) argues that Du Bois also posited "whiteness as dominion," which she reads as "closer to an embodied faith with racialized proprietorship at its center" than only based in capitalism (7). Whiteness functions, therefore, not merely as an individual privilege that can be acknowledged through personal growth, but as a structure difficult to shake because of its material benefits. That is, white people in power are encouraged to imagine their power as gained through meritocracy, and in turn to promote and support other white people. Other theories of whiteness include those of bell hooks (1997) who presents whiteness as terrorizing, and as justification for violence, perhaps representing violence itself. Jonathon Metzl (2019) argues that many Americans within late capitalism are "dying of whiteness" because of policies that emphasize race-based fears and encourage protection of property and person through firearms; gun-violence and accidents involving firearms is responsible for deaths in the United States at alarming rates. Imagining white people to represent all people is one part of the structure of whiteness. Whiteness as a structure is therefore not only privileging, but also replicates racial tensions, even as it sometimes proports not to "see" race.

With respect to challenging whiteness, Chis Chapman (2013) argues that the work of "cultivating a troubled consciousness" (182) involves feeling bad, feeling "uncertainty, shame and anxiety, and identity destabilizations" (181); however, experiencing destabilized identity as well as the affects of shame, anxiety, and depression are often framed as negative or pathologized experiences that must be avoided. In short, Chapman argues that sanism acts as a barrier for anti-racist, unsettling, and decolonial work because of the pathologization of bad affect. Thus, while white disabled people might use their disabled identity as a race to white innocence, they might also be well equipped for the complicated and unpleasant work of acknowledging and working through a troubled consciousness. Centring the work of disabled BIPOC scholars and activists in the Disability Studies classroom may therefore help cultivate the troubled consciousness of anti-racist, unsettling, and decolonial work, while also centering the needs and experiences of all disabled people.

Opposition to Whiteness through Global South and BIPOC perspectives

In opposition to the whiteness of Disability Studies in the Global North, there is a growing subfield of Disability Studies that actively challenges the erasure of Global South perspectives on disability, including the work of Helen Meekosha (2010; 2011), Rachel Soldatic (2015), Soldatic and Meekosha (2014), Soldatic and Shaun Grech (2014), Nirmala Erevelles (2010; 2011; 2014; 2018), Shaun Grech (2011; 2015), Jasbir Puar (2007; 2017), Eunjung Kim (2017), Robert McRuer (2018), Kelly Fritsch (2015), David Mitchell (2015); David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder (2010), Rachel Gorman (2017; 2018), and Xuan Thuy Nguyen (2018). Throughout this dissertation, I go further into the specificities of the work of these scholars, who largely advocate for the necessity of Global South perspectives on disability, unsettling the focus of White Disability Studies. This work challenges disability rights policies that transfer Global North understandings of disability across nation-state boundaries and argues that Southern theory is necessary for studies of disability within the Global South. These scholars also trouble some of the main theories within Disability Studies: for example, these scholars challenge social model constructions that represent disability as a social experience that can be addressed through state intervention or social services offered by the state, instead arguing that disability in the Global South is often caused by global inequalities where state processes actively create disability. Scholars have named this process of oppression within the social and bodily experiences of disability differently in different contexts. Gordon names the process of states creating bodily impairment and social barriers as "disablement" (Gordon 2015), Puar calls this process "debility" (Puar 2017), and Raewyn Connell names this process "ontoformativity" (Connell 2014). These scholars map out the ways that disability is experienced differently across national boundaries and depending on the ways that colonialism and imperialism continues through global capitalism. Their work bridges disability scholarship with transnational feminisms, queer theory, and critical race theory.

Similarly, there is a growing field that centres Critical Race Theory (CRT) in Disability Studies and education. Beth A. Ferri, David Connor, and Subini A. Annamma's 2016 edited collection *DisCrit: Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education* makes claims for why CRT is especially relevant and useful in a Disability Studies classroom. In looking explicitly to education through a Disability Studies and critical race studies frame, they provide seven tenets of what they call "DisCrit":

1. DisCrit focuses on ways that the forces of racism and ableism circulate interdependently, often in neutralized and invisible ways, to uphold notions of normalcy.

2. DisCrit values multidimensional identities and troubles singular notions of identity such as race *or* dis/ability *or* class *or* gender *or* sexuality, and so on.
3. DisCrit emphasizes the social constructions of race and ability and yet recognizes the material and psychological impacts of being labeled as raced or dis/abled, which sets one outside of the western cultural norms.
4. DisCrit privileges voices of marginalized populations, traditionally not acknowledged within research.
5. DisCrit considers legal and historical aspects of dis/ability and race and how both have been used separately and together to deny the rights of some citizens.
6. DisCrit recognizes Whiteness and Ability as Property and that gains for people labeled with dis/abilities have largely been Made as the result of the interest convergence of White, middle-class citizens.
7. DisCrit requires activism and supports all forms of resistance. (19)

These tenets of DisCrit translate well into how to teach Disability Studies in and through race, without overshadowing the experiences of both those who experience disability as an affirmative identity and those who are experiencing disablement, debility, or ontoformativity by processes of global capitalism and colonialism. Ferri, Connor, and Annamma's collection also gives a number of different avenues to consider the intersections of disability and race that encourage an understanding of identity as dependent on intersecting realities of gender, race, sexuality, disability, and class.

Because DisCrit "requires activism," (19) the work of Disability Justice activist, Mia Mingus, who helped start the Disability Justice movement because she was tired of seeing disability as "talked about as an isolated single issue" ("How our communities can move beyond access to wholeness" 2011), is a useful resource for any study about disability and education. In a 2018 address to the Disability Intersectionality Summit, Mingus discussed her experiences in disability justice by centring her own identity:

> I often think about all the things needed to hold my story, just to name a few: someone who understands disability, ableism, abled supremacy; the medical industrial complex, histories and notions of cure, ugliness and the myth of beauty; race, white supremacy, orientalism, adoption, transracial adoption, transnational adoption, the commodification and ownership of children, immigration, forced migration; Korea, diaspora, US imperialism, war, borders; the Caribbean, colonization, the US South, anti-black racism, slavery and the US slave trade system; misogyny, patriarchy, sexism, gender, domestic and sexual violence, child sexual abuse; feminism, queerness, queer people of color; rural lands, islands, rural communities. *And how all of these intersect with each other*. ("'Disability Justice' is Simply Another Term for Love", 2018, n.p.)

For Mingus, her experiences of race, gender, and disability are intertwined so that she cannot imagine one without the other. Her experiences, alongside those of other Disability Justice advocates, including Leah Laksmi Piepzna-Samarasinha, Alice Wong, Imani Barbarin, and Vilissa Thomspon have actively challenged disability rights scholars and activists who continue to frame disability as a single issue politic.

Thus, Disability Studies has the potential to not only make sense of the discrimination against (white) disabled people in the Global North, but also the ways that disability is actively created in the Global South, as well as the ways BIPOC in the Global North experience ableist oppression. For students who experience a wide variety of oppressive forces, Disability Studies can be liberating in documenting how disabled identity need not be a negative experience, but also how impairment and bodily pain is presented as normal and perhaps even desirable in some bodies for the betterment of the nation state. Presenting disability as a structural reality, related to structures of class, gender, and race, helps challenge individualized solutions to oppressive realities. Teaching Disability Studies is necessary, especially within neoliberal times, where health continues to be constructed as personal responsibility, erasing the disabling and debilitating structures that affect bodyminds intentionally or unintentionally.

Teaching Disability Studies

The necessity of teaching Disability Studies is complicated in part because of long histories of universities as disabling/debilitating places for disabled, BIPOC, queer, and trans people—that is, when universities create disabilities in the body and maintain the oppression associated with these disabilities. Feminist pedagogies have long grappled with this reality, thinking through questions of teaching and learning through questions of vulnerability, power, and authority. For example, in the introduction to *Feminist Pedagogy in Education: Critical Theory and Practice*, Tracy Penny Light, Jane Nicholas, and Renée Bondy (2015) catalogue the ways that women, Indigenous, queer, and trans people and those who live multiple of these identities continue to experience marginalization within higher education. They ask how feminist pedagogies might be attuned to these inequalities, especially within classrooms that aim to teach feminist theory and practice. Feminist pedagogy has grown beyond just seeing and attending to gender differences in the classroom, but to the ways that many forms of identity difference impact understandings and learning processes.

However, while feminist pedagogies often begin with the work of BIPOC scholars and mention disability often as a form of difference within the long list of potential differences, feminist pedagogy at times ignores or brushes past the ways that Disability Studies can complicate the teaching and learning process. For example, Margaret Price (2011) argues in *Mad at School* that expectations of learning as an embodied experience—an arguable tenet of feminist pedagogies—erases the radical potential of those who may not be physically present in classrooms because of physical or mental disabilities. Thinking through what she calls "kariotic space" in classrooms and other physical locations of learning can point to the ways that people with disabilities perhaps experience more barriers to learning because of pedagogical expectations. Others also invested in "crip pedagogies," including Claire McKinney (2014); David J. Connor and Susan L. Gabel (2013); and Ann M. Fox (2010) also examine the ways that classroom spaces can shape learning in radical new ways, going beyond just teacher-learner relationships. Crip pedagogies largely differ from feminist pedagogies in their investment in questions of space, physical accessibility (literally fitting into classrooms), other forms of accessibility (fitting into schedules or mindsets), and larger questions of failing to fit into education paradigms. For example, McKinney (2014) extends Halberstam's understanding of queer/crip failure to the failures of the classroom and to the "misfits" that must contend with classrooms that were never constructed for their bodyminds.

In many ways, crip pedagogies, especially those that are actively invested in global Disability Studies, have the potential to better address power relationships between teacher, student, and classroom location in intersectional ways. In "Decolonization is not a metaphor," Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012) argue that decolonization has been used as a metaphor in a number of different fields in ways that fail to address ongoing imperialism and colonialism that continues to limit Indigenous peoples' access to land. Instead, they advocate for place-based education and other efforts to rectify the complicity of white settler scholars and educators within processes of colonialism. Place-based education can work alongside crip understandings of built learning environments, emphasizing the ways that environmental racism, for example, impacts particular learners. Place-based and crip pedagogies also highlight the racist, colonialist, and ableist processes inherent in historical (and ongoing) representations of Indigenous peoples as mentally disabled and incapable of learning. Decolonizing education—beyond metaphorical decolonizing of the mind—means actively challenging state and institutional forces that continue to pervade institutions of higher education, and creating barriers to alternative kinds of understandings and knowledges, alternatives to Eurocentric knowledges.

In *Decolonizing Methodologies,* Linda Tuhiwa Smith (1999; 2012) argues that Indigenous knowledges have been suppressed, erased, and appropriated by Eurocentric educators. Similarly, the work of Marie Battiste (2000; 2005; 2013; 2017) emphasizes how Indigenous Knowledges (IK) do not currently fit into higher education and must be better integrated into our curriculum. The edited collections by Njoki Nathani Wane and Kimberly L. Todd (2018) entitled *Decolonial Pedagogy,* and by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2018) entitled *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Eduation: Mapping the Long View* also bring new conceptions of how to teach, emphasizing the perspectives of the colonized rather than the colonizers. Most recently, the volume edited by Sheila Cote-

Meek and Taima Moeke-Pickering (2020) entitled *Decolonizing and Indigenizing Education in Canada* gives clear examples of the need for integrating Indigenous education models. In many ways, these works can function well in dialogue with feminist and crip pedagogies because of their emphasis on the ways that a lack of sovereignty over land is related to health disparities and inequalities. While Indigenous scholars in the colonial state of Canada do not often explicitly focus on disability, in part in order to challenge disabling representations of indigeneity—with Norris (2014) and Jaffee and John (2018) as two useful exceptions— scholars including Battiste, Audra Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, Sarah Hunt, Pamela Palmater, Kim Anderson, and Kim TallBear often reflect the complexity of gender, power, and bodies within IK in comparison to more Eurocentric understandings.

Theories of and beyond the Classroom

This dissertation begins and ends with theory; I use theory both to ground my own work and to explore new possibilities in the classroom. In this section, I outline some of the theory that grounds my research throughout this dissertation and unsettles the whiteness of Disability Studies, including Indigenous theories, Critical Race Theory, and Feminist (of Colour) Disability Theory. As I am teaching and writing as a settler on unceded and unsurrendered Algonquin Anishinaabe territory, Indigenous theories are absolutely necessary. However, for many reasons, Indigenous scholars do not often call themselves disabled. Heather Norris (2014), as one exception, connects her experience as an “Anishinabe woman whose ancestry is rooted in the Algonquin First Nations community of Pikwàkanagàn, situated on the shores of the Bonnechere River and Golden Lake in Renfrew County, Ontario” (57) to Disability Studies, arguing that Indigenous understandings of disability are not based in negativity in the ways that Western understandings are. Her work has helped me articulate the challenges and conflicts involved in Disability Studies. Laura Jaffee and Kelsey John (2018) have also outlined the potential connections between Indigenous sovereignty over land and the need for disabled peoples' sovereignty over their own bodies. Jaffee and John (2018) challenge the White Disability Studies' impulse to separate environment from impairment, arguing that violence against particular bodies should be theorized within Disability Studies. These theoretical pushes to begin from a point of intersection—disability and race/Indigeneity—help ground this dissertation away from white understandings of disability. In chapter 2, I continue to examine this intersection, arguing that Indigeneity and disability are often conceived of or presented as parallel issues, simultaneously plaguing the university in need of correction, but rarely—if ever—touching. Ironically this representation depends on an ongoing construction of Indigeneity as deficit in need of correction, a representation that Disability Studies has long struggled against with respect to disability as deficit.

Given the many criticisms by BIPOC scholars who argue that Disability Studies is actually White Disability Studies, I am particularly attentive to the ways that race is constructed or ignored in disability theory. How does work by BIPOC scholars and activists challenge disability theory? Answering this question involves work in Critical Race Theory (CRT), Feminist Pedagogies, Decolonial and Indigenous Pedagogies, Black Feminist Thought, Intersectionality, Affect Theory, and Disability Studies. Much of this work is grounded in CRT, a field that began in legal studies and has since grown into education as well. Some major theorists in CRT include Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989;

1991; 1995; 2012; 2010), Derrick Bell (1980; 1992; 2004), Patricia Williams (1991; 1997), Richard Delgado (1997; 2013), and Mari Matsuda (1996), among others, who began demonstrating the ways that legal processes in the United States are and were built upon a racist foundation that actively and purposefully oppresses BIPOC. CRT argues that race is a social construction, and that liberal policies both construct race and purport to look past race. CRT also highlights how whiteness functions as property, allowing white people access to capital at higher rates than BIPOC people, intentionally connecting race and class in a white supremacist society (Harris 1993). More recent engagements with CRT have extended it beyond law and into education, with Gloria Ladson-Billings and William Tate (1995)'s "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education" arguing that education is also similarly rooted in racism. Jennifer Nash (2017) argues that while scholars invested in intersectionality often present Crenshaw as one of its originators, these same scholars ignore or refuse the radical potential of legal frameworks. This dissertation grapples with the contradictions inherent in Disability Studies scholarship that both challenges human rights—and other legal frameworks, while also largely depending on CRT, a theory based in law.

Alongside CRT, this dissertation also depends on Puar (2007)'s differentiation between intersectionality and assemblage. While intersectional frameworks trouble notions of either race or disability, demonstrating the ways that these two pathways intersect, assemblage theory presents all identity formations as necessarily impure or fraught with difference. For example, whiteness and ablebodiedness are not necessarily easily identifiable in particular populations. Puar (2017) points to the ways that Palestinian identity is carved out to be necessarily disabled, but that Israel's disability legislation is reserved only for Israeli citizens. Denying citizenship to Palestinians is justifiable because of their debilitated bodyminds, while Israelis maintain disability rights. Such a construction is only contradictory if identity formation is taken for granted as stable. Instead, Puar argues that identity stability is itself a part of oppressive structures. Similarly, Dorothy Roberts (1997; 2011) and Kim TallBear (2013) argue that genetic markers justify seeing particular races as necessarily disabled and in need of state intervention; this solidification of racial identity through disability justifies further discrimination, particularly against Black and Indigenous peoples. Bearing in mind the nuances and disagreements between those who use assemblage theory (Puar 2007; 2017) and those who argue instead for intersectionality because of its roots in Black feminist thought and its more accessible language (Bilge 2013; Pickens 2019), I theorize disability with race at the forefront.

Much of this dissertation depends on the concept of intersectionality. Intersectionality, as a term, was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989; 1991), but, as Sirma Bilge and Patricia Hill Collins (2016) argue, has roots in the Combahee River Collective (1977) and even before within the writings of Toni Cade Bambara (1970), Frances Beal (1966), and Anna Julia Cooper (1892). Jennifer Nash (2019) cautions against equating intersectionality with Black Feminism, as this potentially limits Black Feminist theorizing to this single methodology/theory. However, as Sirma Bilge (2013) argues, presenting intersectionality apart from its roots in Black Feminism potentially allows intersectionality to be used outside of theorizations or understandings of race, recentring whiteness. As Tiffany Lethabo King (2015) argues, intersectionality has been criticized for its focus on identity, because identity politics can be coopted or subsumed within neoliberal or rights-based institutions. However, she argues that intersectionality, even within Crenshaw's earlier work, has always emphasized identity's relationship to structure, and challenged legal processes that essentialize identity because those living at the intersection do not fit within individual essentialized identity categories.

Within this dissertation, race-based theorizing is necessarily foregrounded based on current conflicts within the field of disability studies. I use intersectionality specifically because of its usefulness in connecting identity and structure, and its emphasis on race at the intersection. Like Schalk and Kim (2020), I take on both the socially constructed identity categories like disability, and also the material effects of these categorizations. In relation to identity and structure, Crenshaw (1991) reminds us:

> But to say that a category such as race or gender is socially constructed is not to say that that category has no significance in our world. On the contrary, a large and continuing project for subordinated people—and indeed, one of the projects for which postmodern theories have been very helpful—is thinking about the way power has clustered around certain categories and is exercised against others […] And this project's most pressing problem, in many if not most cases, is not the existence of the categories, but rather the particular values attached to them and the way those values foster and create social hierarchies. (1297)

In looking specifically to the values ascribed to different categories, Crenshaw's work potentially reiterates what Jasbir Puar (2017) calls debilitating and capacitating processes, demonstrating that the identity categories themselves may not be stable, but the structures around them still subordinate and debilitate alongside these shifting categories. By examining the category of disability and of race specifically, this dissertation argues that we can better understand how power is mobilized in the classroom and within university institutions more generally. Identity, I argue, is important in its relationships to the structures of power, of subordination and oppression.

Methodology

At the outset of this project, I aimed to use Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) methodology, examining scholarly literature within Disability Studies, university and other institutional policies, letters, emails, and other written documents to consider whether the recent changes in Disability Studies were being applied at the university teaching level. Given that assemblage theories emphasize the examination of the event, rather than the essence, because of the shifting nature of all assemblages (See Nail 2017), I aimed to begin with specific events in mind. For example, I aimed to begin chapter one with the event of the land acknowledgement, chapter three with the events of anti-Black racism in June 2019 at the University of Ottawa, and chapter four with the event of receiving or requesting accommodation within a university institution. In framing my chapters around specific events, I aimed to examine what Derek Hook (2001) calls "the discursive effects of the material and the material effects of the discursive" (538). That is, I was interested in examining how the texts related to actual experiences of the people at the time and place of the events, and how actual experiences of people have impacted the discursive production of these events—or how these actions produced conflicted or conflicting texts.

CDA is a methodology that begins with a text. Most often, the chosen text is an explicitly political document, like a piece of legislation, policy, or a political speech. However, Norman Fairclough (2010), one of the founders of CDA, argues that any text can be ideological and political. Fairclough initially formulated CDA as an alternative to the Chomskyan linguistic tradition, using Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL) as a point of departure. SFL looks specifically to words as they are connected to social life and social change, but CDA also uses transdisciplinary theory to complicate what might be a less complex analysis through SFL. In other words, CDA goes beyond linguistics, instead analyzing social context alongside the text itself. CDA is interested in power's relationship to discourse, asking questions regarding how discourse might reiterate, support, or challenge power relations.

Michelle M. Lazar (2007) argues that CDA needs to be more specifically feminist, examining hierarchically gendered social arrangements. CDA has always been interested in class relations, using Marxist theoretical understandings of capital as a context for many forms of state discourse. CDA has also been invested in power structures beyond the state, or including other contexts that might uphold state power through discourse. Much of this work is also already gendered. Lazar argues that because state power depends on the oppression of women, CDA is indebted to feminism and should make this debt explicit. According to Lazar, feminism does not only advocate for gender analysis but also "other categories of social identity, including sexuality, ethnicity, age, (dis)ability, social class and position, and geographic location" (141). While Lazar does not specify an intersectional praxis of feminism and CDA, she points in such a direction.

Derek Hook (2001) argues that many forms of discourse analysis do not adequately attend to Michel Foucault's theories of discourse. For Hook (2001), any discourse analysis is lacking if it does not attend to Foucault's "conception of discourse" which “is situated far more closely to knowledge, materiality and power than it is to language” (542). Throughout this dissertation, I attend to discourse’s relationship to knowledge, especially Indigenous studies and Black studies as forms of knowledge that are not often applied in university policies or within the field of Disability Studies. In chapter four, I also consider Mad/crip knowledge and queer forms of knowledge in its relationship to institutional knowledges. These knowledges of resistance to dominant Western, white, and normate knowledge are also at times taken up by institutions of power, demonstrating that the power involved in knowledge is not a top-down relationship. Foucault (1975) argues that power is never linear or top-down, but instead depends on resistance to power; the integration of Indigenous studies, Black studies, and Disability Studies within university institutions demonstrates some of this more conflicting power relation. Because Foucault also argues that knowledge is never fully uncovered or revealed, but is instead mobilized through power, this project considers knowledge’s relationship to power inside and outside of the classroom as it exists within institutions. For example, chapter four emphasizes the contradictions of bad affect in classrooms within institutions that imagine bad feelings to be directly related to poor mental health, arguing that because social justice education depends on uncomfortable/unpleasant personal growth, social justice education is inherently at odds with institutional definitions of mental health. I also attend to the material realities of discourse and the discursive reality of materiality throughout the dissertation, considering how social constructions of identity impact the material realities of those within these identity categories and how the material realities of these people impact how we discuss or think about identity. For example, the second chapter explores the risks of considering

Indigenous identity alongside disability identity within a Canadian nation state that already considers Indigenous peoples to be inherently deficient and within a geographical location where Indigenous peoples are disproportionally impacted by environmental racism and other health inequalities. Explorations of knowledge and materiality also emphasize power's relationship to language, and how written documents can help normalize structures of oppression. For example, in chapter five, I examine how accommodation policies at the University of Ottawa shifted based on COVID-19 only when these policies would benefit the ablebodied majority, demonstrating the limits of ableist power.

I examine a number of different kinds of texts throughout this dissertation, including university policies, Ontario legislation, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) final report, emails from the University of Ottawa, public statements including Twitter posts, websites, and collective letters to the University, newspaper articles, and scholarly literature. As Hook (2001) encourages, I take these texts within their historical and material contexts, reading them alongside appropriate theory and personal experiences. This dissertation does not purport to uncover or reveal some kind of inherent truth about disability and its place in university classrooms. Rather, in asking a number of questions about the discourse that I examine, this dissertation argues first that there is a current shift towards intersectionality—and race-based—disability theory, and second, that the institutional space of the university classroom is also in need of a shift in relation to this theory.

Given these aims, this project focuses on a number of different events, including the land acknowledgement as an event (Chapter One), the university website as an event

(Chapter Two), the events of anti-Black racism at the University of Ottawa in June 2019 (Chapter Three), the events of the Citizens Commission on Human Rights (CCHR) exhibit on the University of Ottawa campus in January 2020 (Chapter Four), and the COVID-19 pandemic event in March 2020 (Chapter Five). I begin each chapter with a personal anecdote, at times also integrating my own history as a member of the university—as a student, a part-time professor, a union member, and an alumnus—as it helps contextualize the texts and discourse I examine. In chapter two, I also employ a method of counting the number of clicks it takes to access specific words within the Teaching and Learning websites of Ontario universities. While chapter four does not necessarily tell us much about the actual teaching processes in Ontario universities, this chapter does emphasize how universities wish to present their teaching in relation to equity, diversity, and inclusion.

Even when considering the historical and material effects of discourse, there are still limits to discursive analysis. All discourse analysis is subjective where the analyst's perspective can influence which historical or material realities are explored in-depth. My own subject position as a white settler within a project emphasizing race makes my analysis potentially inherently flawed, especially given the ways that some of the chapters depend directly on my own experience as an educator. I intentionally relied heavily on the scholarship and work of Critical Race Theorists to help mitigate my own limitations as a white settler, but the internal workings of white supremacy run deep.

Whiteness as a structure is something that I aim to decentre within this dissertation, yet I also benefit from whiteness. In *Notes Towards a Politics of Location*, Adrienne Rich (1984) delineates the power of whiteness especially with respect to theory, arguing that often North American theorists are taught:

> That only certain kinds of people can make theory; that the white-educated mind is capable of formulating everything; that white middle-class feminism can know for “all women”; that only when a white mind formulates is the formulation to be taken seriously. (230)

As a white settler closely reading texts in the context of theory—of indeed theorizing the disability studies classroom myself—I benefit from this North American conception of who can formulate theory both because it allows me to even imagine that I could or should do this project, and it allows others to take this project seriously. It was useful for me to think through, as I do in chapter four, the ways that this work is still personal, even as my relationship to whiteness might be interpreted as somehow “objective”. Rather than depending on the analysis of others through interviews or other collective work, I began with myself in order to begin the process of unlearning the whiteness I have been taught. Far from being objective, my subject position as white settler potentially makes this project more flawed. While I intended to decentre whiteness throughout this project, I still relied largely on my own personal readings or experiences, keeping my white self at the centre. White scholars need to be held accountable to their continued impulse to centre themselves; this is one major flaw of the project overall, as I did not shake this white impulse. In the future, I will continue to centre the work of BIPOC scholars to decentre the education that I have had for most of my life that, like Rich (1984), presented white Eurocentric knowledge as more useful, productive, and “serious” than Black theory, Indigenous theory, or theories from the Global South.

Chapter Breakdown

This project is broken into two sections, the first with three chapters and the second with two. The first section is a more theoretical investigation into the necessity of teaching Disability Studies from an intersectional feminist lens. The second section focuses more explicitly on the practice of teaching disability in university settings. Throughout these chapters, I ask how and why Disability Studies needs to be taught, especially during this period that McRuer describes as “Crip Times,” or the time period experiencing increasingly austere policies that disproportionally affect queer trans BIPOC disabled people. I ask how recent Disability Studies scholars are challenging rights-based models of disability and how that might also challenge how we teach disability. I also ask how recent changes to universities in Canada, especially because of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and related commissions of inquiry also complicate our readings and teachings of Disability Studies, as Canada itself is responsible for the debility, disablement, or ontoformativity of BIPOC in Canada. How does this complicity in disabling structures interact with its promise to Indigenize the university, for example? Similarly, how do promises to maintain an accessible classroom fall flat when processes of race, gender, and class complicate simple definitions of accessibility?

The first section contains three chapters. In Chapter One, entitled “Disability at the Intersection: conflicting theory in Disability Studies,” I examine the recent changes in the field of Disability Studies, particularly the work in Global Disability Studies that emphasizes the contradictions involved in claiming disability as a positive identifier. While teaching Disability Studies often begins by challenging representations of disability as negative, scholars like Meekosha, Erevelles, and Puar complicate representations of disability as positive, arguing that state processes often create disability or frame disability as part of imperialist projects. I argue that teaching Disability Studies therefore means taking seriously the positive, negative, and never neutral ways that disability is mobilized for the benefit of some. Teaching disability also means recognizing the ways that Disability Studies might contradict other forms of social justice education because of the ways that disability is created by oppressive systems, but can still be imagined as a positive identity. I argue that students might find the contradictions of Disability Studies difficult, especially when considering the impacts of imperialism and (settler) colonialism.

In Chapter Two, entitled "Diversity, Inclusion, Disability: Accessibility and Indigeneity on Teaching and Learning Centre Websites," I examine the ways that disability is separated within Teaching and Learning "diversity and inclusion" websites from other forms of identity, erasing those that exist at the intersection of these identities. Recent efforts to Indigenize the Canadian university after decades of pressure from Indigenous educators often are separated from efforts to make education accessible, sometimes at the expense of Indigenous disabled students. Bridging gaps between the representations of "diversity and inclusion" on these websites depends on challenging the separation between disciplines and services that continue to silo students and faculty into separate identity categories. Sara Ahmed (2012)'s work *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* is a helpful grounding text for this chapter, as I examine Teaching and Learning websites in Ontario. I argue that these websites, in refusing to acknowledge race and following only legislative demands for Indigenous and accessible classrooms, potentially encourage educators to depend on "Native informants" and to see disabled students as exceptions to be accommodated through institutional means, erasing potential moments of solidarity between groups, and erasing the responsibilities of educators to design their classrooms with difference in mind.

In the third chapter, entitled "Policing Education: the Criminalization of Blackness as an Accessibility Issue," I trace the securitization of the university, asking how representations of BIPOC as inherently less capable of intelligence than their white peers further enforces their criminalization. In June 2019, a Black student was asked to show identification on the University of Ottawa campus and detained for up to two hours without cause. This moment of blatant anti-Black racism on campus came weeks after a Black student attending the largest Canadian academic conference, Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences 2019 at the University of British Columbia, was asked to show his conference badge and falsely accused of stealing a laptop. In both cases, police became involved, further placing these Black students in danger. The criminalization of BIPOC on university campuses coincides with a history of keeping Black people from accessing educational services. For example, Dara Shifrer, Chandra Muller, and Rebecca Callahan (2013), and Nirmala Erevelles (2000; 2014) argue that Special Education disproportionally affects Black students, creating classrooms that are majority white students who are not disabled, with Black students left behind. Black students are often presented as "problem children" who need extra attention because they are presented as dangerous. At the level of higher education, this trend is often tilted in the opposite direction, with BIPOC students unable to access supports that they might need (see for example Yull 2015). This is largely because BIPOC are shifted away from higher education, making white students with LDs more likely than BIPOC students with LDs to attend university. In this chapter, I argue that Disability Studies might help us understand how university policies reinforce the inaccessibility of universities for BIPOC students, faculty, and staff by allowing campus police to “protect” who they imagine should have access to campus. This policing adds a further layer to the necessity of teaching BIPOC disabled students about Disability Studies, and the history of incarceration for disabled people.

The second section is a more pragmatic (practical) exploration of Disability Studies teaching at the university, aiming to give more specific tools for educators invested in disability justice. This section has two chapters. Throughout these chapters, I ask how educators can put the theoretical pedagogies explored in section one into practice. In Chapter Four, entitled “Learning through Failure: Mad/Crip Failure in the Classroom,” I begin from a place of pedagogical failure, tracing the ways teaching Mad Studies in a university classroom becomes contradictory when universities represent neoliberal considerations of mental health as the only scientifically acceptable understanding of Mad experience. In this chapter, I explore affect as it is connected to madness, emphasizing the ways that race is already wrapped up in affect and understandings of Mad thought. I argue in this chapter that queer/crip failure can help clarify the ableist and heterosexist university invested in normativity as success. I also argue that by investing in models of abolitionist and transformative accountability, we can support failure as a part of generative learning. This chapter explores some of my own failures in the classroom in order to imagine how we might react and interact with conflict in our classes. While some have advocated for protections against conflict in the classroom, I instead ask how conflict is an inevitable part of learning and living in community. By using abolitionist strategies, I argue that we can better support Mad/Crip failure in our classes.

Initially, the fifth chapter was going to be looking at technology use in the classroom and inaccessibility issues. However, in March 2020, the global COVID-19 pandemic led to the unprecedented closure of universities across the globe. My thoughts shifted beyond the new online format I was now teaching in, to models of pedagogy and care. Chapter Five therefore looks to accessibility policy at the University of Ottawa and the ways that this policy radically changed after the events of COVID-19. Examining what Derrick Bell (1980) calls "interest convergence" and what Jay Dolmage has since explicitly connected to COVID-19 events in March-April 2020, I argue in this chapter that accessibility in university classrooms is much more possible than university policy implies. Using my own experiences with alternative accommodation methods in the classroom, I argue that accessibility should always already be an intersectional exercise rather than a gift to the students/staff that request it. I explore how the requirement for doctor's notes, for example, reinforces the inaccessibility of accessibility supports and how accommodation models frame accessibility as a gift given from professor to student, or from university management to university staff, instead of allowing all students and staff to flourish. Caring for students may require accessibility policies that potentially contradict university systems. I ask in this chapter what accessibility might look like if we actively involve students in the accessibility process.

Conclusion

This dissertation contains a number of contradictions. For one, I am a white settler scholar advocating for BIPOC scholarship to take a more central role in Disability Studies education, and discussing my own experience in order to present this argument. Further, I choose to centralize intersectionality and its own complicated relationship to identity, with some scholars arguing that “identity politics” are separate from intersectionality’s focus on structural inequality. Finally, this dissertation is being produced within an institution that has a very racist and ableist history, allowing me to make these arguments perhaps in part because I am settled into a particular identity that it reads as capable. These contradictions are not easily resolved. Instead of purporting to solve these contradictions and conflicts in theoretical, practical, and methodological scholarly production, this dissertation hopes to begin thinking through and with contradiction. Perhaps, according to academic standards, thinking with contradictions makes this dissertation a failure; as I outline in chapter 4, working through failure often brings with it bad feelings and bad mental health, but can also remind us that we are capable of imagining new worlds. I am hopeful that my failures can result in someone else’s successes and can help all of us imagine new worlds.

Part 1: Theories of the Classroom

Chapter One: Disability at the Intersection: Conflicting Theory in Disability Studies

A Land Acknowledgement: Introduction

I begin this chapter with a land acknowledgement: while writing this, I am living on unceded and unsurrendered territory of the Anishnaabe Algonquin Nation. I am a fourth or fifth generation settler on these lands, meaning that my great-grandparents on my father's side and my great-great-grandparents on my mother's side arrived here from different places in Europe. Given this history, I have benefited from Canadian policies that provided land and protection for white European settlers at the expense of those already living here. When it comes to teaching and researching, this means that my research is more likely to be taken seriously, even if and when that research concerns communities to which I do not have any social ties. My teaching is also taken more seriously, regardless of subject matter, because I am perceived as someone who holds and can dispense knowledge, regardless of my own personal experience.

Land acknowledgements have become increasingly commonplace throughout the land claimed by the Canadian nation state, but especially within university and government spaces. Indigenous scholars have advocated that these land acknowledgements, pointing to the original inhabitants of land that Canada has claimed, are only useful when accompanied by real connection to other action. Indigenous scholars have been clear about the uselessness of land acknowledgements when these acknowledgements are not accompanied by real action, or are done in a way that reinscribes colonialism as necessary or useful (see Robinson et al. 2019). For example, thanking Indigenous nations for welcoming settlers onto their land is not a useful way to acknowledge this land—unless that nation has explicitly extended this welcome—because in most cases, this welcome is coming from a settler and not a person indigenous to that area. In a classroom setting, beginning by acknowledging the land claims of the land that the university or college sits on, especially if that land does not have a modern treaty, is a useful exercise only if this work coincides with a critical reflection about the person doing the acknowledging work and other kinds of material actions. Starting the class with an acknowledgement about Indigenous land claims and never again mentioning this connection is a performative action rather that one fully invested in Indigenizing or decolonizing the classroom (Daigle 2019, pp. 711). Scholars have argued that education is a clear area where decolonizing can take place through land acknowledgement, when that acknowledgement can connect to other parts of the curriculum and/or syllabus (see for example Robinson et al. 2019). Ongoing conversations about land rights and the social impacts of these land rights can be a helpful direction within most social science and humanities classrooms.

It was within this context that I began my Disability Studies class in January 2019. I began by reading out the land acknowledgement written by Lynn Gehl (2018) that gives the history of Anishnaabe Algonquin land and river. I also acknowledged my own identity and history on this land as a settler whose ancestors came here from parts of Europe. I talked about my own whiteness and my own complicity in settler colonialism, pointing to the benefits that my family and I have had from Canada’s history and current nation state. I attempted to also extend this conversation beyond this particular moment, assigning readings that addressed the ongoing health disparities in Indigenous communities throughout Canada.

However, I was caught off guard in the second class, when a student asked me about whether we could call colonialism “disabling” to Indigenous peoples. In this moment, I hesitated to use this language because of disability scholars who have argued against using disability as metaphor. For example, Alison Kafer (2006) explains that feminist scholars often use “disabling” when describing the actions of patriarchal oppression, and she argues that this is problematic because it represents disability as negative. Christian Flaugh (2010) demonstrates how disability is also used as a metaphor for colonialism in French literature, and how this metaphor references disability as something to be overcome. In both cases, Kafer and Flaugh challenge the use of the term “disabling” because of the ways that these metaphorical representations of oppressive systems reinforce disability as something negative or something in need of repair. These uses of “disabling” likewise flatten disability experience across multiple kinds of identity, erasing the experiences of racism, sexism, cissexism, heterosexism, and other forms of oppression that impact particular groups in particular ways.

At the same time, many Indigenous scholars have hesitated to describe themselves as disabled. Part of this hesitation is based on a long history within Canada and elsewhere of representing Indigenous peoples as always already mentally and physically disordered (see for example Leuw, Greenwood, and Cameron 2010). This representation justifies further violence against Indigenous peoples, placing the responsibility for good health back onto those who experience oppression. In policy and service documents, Indigenous deficit is emphasized to justify intervention in Indigenous communities, including moving Indigenous people off of their own lands, and building invasive infrastructure in order to correct this deficit. As well, many Indigenous communities do not recognize the same vocabulary, as disability is not called disability in many Indigenous languages (Senier 2013). While naming is important, we need to acknowledge that Canada is actively disabling and debilitating—that is, creating disability—within Indigenous communities, through discriminatory policies (see Sterritt 2007), criminalization of Indigenous peoples (see Monaghan and Crosby 2018), environmental racism (see Waldon 2018), and resource mismanagement (see Reading 2011). This process of debilitating and disabling settler colonialism has not often been addressed by disability scholars who turn away from the causes of disability, instead primarily taking up questions of access or oppression based on disability identity. The moment of hesitation that I had in the second class of my Disability Studies course is representative of a larger conflict within Disability Studies that needs to be further fleshed out. If saying that Canada is disabling Indigenous peoples reinforces ableist disability representation and flattens disability difference, how can we refer to the ongoing processes that impact bodies and social representation in and through colonialism? Further, how can we reflect on the representations of disability as negative, while also acknowledging that many forms of disability happen as a direct result of colonialism or oppression towards BIPOC? In this chapter, I argue that these questions are being taken up in the contemporary moment within Disability Studies, often by BIPOC scholars themselves (see for example, Erevelles 2010; Puar 2017). While some have argued that Disability Studies is currently going through an "intersectional turn," (Davidson 2016; 434), this turn is in part because of the willingness of some disability scholars to address the contradictions around disability as affected by systems of oppression.

In this chapter, I give an overview of this conflict within Disability Studies, beginning by outlining the major arguments within the field of Disability Studies and isolating the ways that race has been inadequately addressed. I proceed by focussing more specifically on the more recent ways that critical race analysis has been connected to Disability Studies, as well as arguing for intersectionality. Many of the scholars that examine race do so through global perspectives, emphasizing the Global South's contradictory standpoint within Disability Studies. Rights-based analysis is especially critiqued within global Disability Studies, as analysis of imperialism and colonialism demonstrates that neoliberal or liberal solutions are inadequate. Finally, I theorize how we might decolonize Disability Studies, especially examining Indigenous perspectives on disability within the nation-state of Canada. I conclude this chapter by returning to the concept of the land acknowledgment, asking about the potential for decolonizing strategies that might be possible if we are willing to be self-reflexive about the land and our bodies' relationships to it. For the majority of this chapter, I am conducting a literature review of the field of Disability Studies and examining one of the major conflicts that I have isolated. However, I also begin the theorization that will continue into chapter two into how this conflict manifests for students in the classroom. Teaching Disability Studies necessitates not just a current understanding of this conflict within Disability Studies, but also how this conflict translates into the understandings of the students who we are teaching. This chapter argues that teaching disability is complicated by contradictions in the field of Disability Studies that present disability as something to be celebrated, even as impairment is created in the bodies of BIPOC through ongoing colonialism, racism, and imperialism.

Disability Studies: Evolution of a Field

Disability Studies is a relatively new field of study. Arguably beginning in 1990 with the establishment of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Disability Studies aims to counter the conventional medical interpretation of disability as a bad thing in need of rehabilitation, eradication, or cure. In 2012, the president of the Modern Languages Association argued in his presidential address that Disability Studies was no longer "emerging" but had "emerged" (Garland-Thomson 2013, pp. 915). While in other fields, disability has most often been studied apart from those who experience disability—by medical practitioners or researchers for example—Disability Studies argues that disability allows those with first-hand experience to learn and understand the world differently. Studying from the standpoint of those with disabilities is therefore the starting premise of Disability Studies. In many ways, Disability Studies has depended on other fields that also argue that first-hand experience is useful or necessary to understand how people live. Many disability scholars point to gender studies, feminist studies, queer theory, critical race theory, and other studies of identity as necessary connections to disability experience (Goodley 2016 for example).

Disability does not just help people experience the world differently, it is also a political identity, and an analysis of ableism points to the structural oppression of people with disabilities. Disability Studies argues that there is a societal bias against disability that affects those who have disabilities. Prejudice against people with disabilities (or disabled people) is arguably entrenched in many different aspects of society like education and labour, including the medical and/or social services on which many of these persons with disabilities depend. Disability scholars also point to media representations or narrative production, arguing that disability is almost universally viewed in a negative light. For example, David Snyder Mitchell and Sharon Snyder (2000) argue that disability is a large part of all narrative production as a "narrative prosthesis," presenting disability as the problem to be solved. In order to bring narratives forward, they argue, it becomes necessary to regulate or eradicate disability within these stories. Disability historians have also catalogued the many ways that disabled people throughout history have experienced harassment and imprisonment because of their disabilities (for example, see Ben-Moshe et al. 2014). In short, disability oppression has existed throughout history, through the stories we tell, and through the availability of services, resources, access, or experiences.

Given this narrative urge to rid ourselves of disability, as well as the medical industry's model of cure, correction, intervention or eradication of disability, many disability scholars have been interested in viewing or presenting disability as something positive or useful. Robert McRuer (2006), for example, asks how we might desire disability or conceive of disability as in itself desirable. Similarly, Alison Kafer (2013) argues that while disability is not often viewed as having a future, disabled experience might allow us to desire a different kind of future, one that does not include disability oppression. Tobin Siebers (2008) argues that those who experience disability also experience the body differently, allowing them to build alternative epistemologies. Representing and imagining disability not as deficit, but as something desirable, pleasurable, or useful in itself has become a large part of Disability Studies more generally.

Other scholars look beyond the desirability of disability, displacing disability as the major object of study, and instead turning to what Rosemarie Garland-Thomson (1997) has named the “normate” or the corporeal embodiment of normal physical characteristics. What might it look like, these scholars ask, to reframe the conversation around disability not on disability itself, but on those who claim not to be disabled? Lennard Davis (1995), for example, looks specifically to normalcy, arguing that normality is in need of examination. Still others have parsed the ethical considerations around the margins of disability identity, asking at what point someone is or is not disabled and how that might matter with regard to how that person experiences their social or political life. For example, Jackie Leach Scully (2008) uses disability as a point of contention in bioethics, arguing that disability is often discarded or deemed cruel.

Disability Studies has often depended on a differentiation between impairment—as something that takes place in the bodymind—and disability—as the social experience of discrimination or institutional prejudice because of impairment (Oliver 1983). However, many disability scholars have contested this model—called the “social model” of disability—arguing that this line between body and social experience is arbitrary at best. A bodymind can itself be disabling, for example, acting as a barrier for social participation in those who experience chronic illness or chronic pain. The experience of bodymind pain or illness can also be part of a social experience or created through social barriers. Mental disability is also a challenge to the social model of disability, as people who experience mental distress often seek out the medicalization of their experience in order to access supports of many kinds (Gilman 2014). Thus, social experience and bodily experience are not separable.

However, the social model is nonetheless a useful starting place for disability organizing because it clarifies the "problem" of disability being not with the disabled person themselves but with the structural inequality that disabled people collectively experience. Mike Oliver (1991) argues:

> It is society that has to change not individuals and this change will come about as part of a process of political empowerment of disabled people as a group and not through social policies and programmes delivered by establishment politicians and policy makers nor through individualised treatments and interventions provided by the medical and para-medical professions. (5)

This radical positioning of disabled people challenging the ableism that they experience through societal change has been intensely scrutinized within the last thirty years of disability scholarship (Oliver 2013). Crossing nation-state borders has also arguably impacted the social model's position on radical change, as North American scholars take on this theory developed in the United Kingdom and emphasize the separation between impairment and disability without adequately attending to ableism as a structure (see Shakespeare and Watson 2002). The American understanding of the social model as primarily invested in revealing the barriers to participation that disabled people experience has made it easier to coopt the social model into policy. The goals of these policies—the ADA being one example—involve erasing barriers to participation, without acknowledging that participating in an inherently ableist society is not necessarily liberatory. While radical societal change from disabled people themselves was a large part of the beginnings of the social model of disability, that tenet has been arguably erased within ongoing arguments about impairment, illness, and social construction of disability.

Teaching Disability Studies often begins by thinking through the ways that disability manifests in all human bodies, rather than in the marked few that we name people with disabilities. Educators can demonstrate the ways that disability is represented, both as something that is bad and in need of eradication/cure, and as something that makes people better when they can “overcome” it. We then must counter these representations, presenting the many disabled people who are proud of or like their disabilities, thus refusing to “overcome” them. This starting point can be difficult for students to grasp, because disability is often represented in the context of war or physical injustice. In the public imagination, disability is often something that is caused by negative experiences or negative actions. For those invested in social justice, for example, illness or disabilities are often represented as the result of social injustice. Gender studies students have been taught that power structures create hierarchies of health, where women and gender diverse people disproportionally experience mental illness, chronic health issues, and other physical disabilities (see McGibbon 2012 for example). That is, patriarchal oppression causes some forms of disability. In this sense, it can be a big shift for students to begin to understand disability as something that is positive or desirable in itself. Others who have been experiencing disability for most of their lives are excited to learn that their disability can be a positive or affirmed part of their identity. Especially when these students also receive accommodations or accessibility measures that acknowledge their needs in the classroom, learning about disability can be an especially affirming and positive experience. Teaching students about disability and ableism—or the structure that prioritizes or assumes ablebodied/ablemindedness—can therefore be difficult for those who understand disability as itself part of injustice, and affirming and useful for those who understand their own bodymind as already disabled.

Through these conversations, scholars have catalogued the ways that normality and disability both depend on the body and the mind. Bodymind experiences are never gender, sexuality, or race neutral. Feminist disability scholars have been especially interested in demonstrating the ways that women experience disability differently from men, and the ways that disability affects female sexuality and femininity more generally. For example, Susan Wendell (2001) looks specifically to chronic illness to argue that there are hierarchies of disability, even within disability scholarship. She argues that women, who are more likely to experience chronic illness, are particularly attentive to bodymind experiences in ways that counter masculine representations of body and mind separation. Trans scholars, including Eli Clare and Alexandre Baril have also demonstrated the ways that gender itself is impacted by disability, as disabled people experience gender differently depending on their disability experience. Trans people who wish to access transition services—whether medical or social—also experience being pathologized for their gender experience, and are thus themselves perhaps disabled. More recent work on autism and Mad Studies (see for example Brown 2017; Yergeau 2016; Shapira and Granek 2019; Smith 2018; Diamond and Kirby 2017) has also pointed to the need for more consideration of the intersection not just between trans embodiment in the body, but also in the mind. That is, if trans people are presented as inherently Mad or autistic, their connection to disability is both embodied and embedded in their mind.

Robert McRuer (2006) argues that queerness and disability are intrinsically linked, making it difficult to imagine crip sex that would not be queer. McRuer argues that compulsory heterosexuality also extends to compulsory ablebodiedness. Similarly, Alison Kafer (2013) argues that sexuality and disability are two very important axis of identity, ones that fit within other identifications as well: “We need to recognize that these forgings have always already been inflected by histories of race, gender, sexuality, class, and nation” (12). Indeed, gender and class have often been discussed as especially connected to disability identity, as gender is a visible and internal part of embodiment, and class often dictates what kind of accessibility measures can take place for any given disability. Class is especially useful for disability scholars in the United States, as the costs of medical services are explicitly dependent on job status, insurance, and therefore, class. In Canada, the costs of medication as well as optical and dental health care are often not covered by the provincial or the federal government, also depending on private insurance. As well as taking on the burden of paying for medical care, poor disabled people have, throughout history, experienced the most violent and coercive aspects of ableism, including eugenics policies that justified sterilization and incarceration. Despite attention to gender, sexuality, and class, disability scholars have been largely criticized for omitting race in their theorizations about disability and for brushing over the connections between racial and disabled embodiment and oppression (Bell 2010; Ejiogu and Marcus Ware 2018; Opini 2016). This has also translated into the Disability Studies classroom, where white students are encouraged to compare the experiences of ableism to those of racism but are not necessarily given the tools to understand how race and disability coincide with and depend on each other (for an analysis of those who compare disability to race, see Pickens 2019).

This difficulty is exacerbated by the pervasiveness of white disability scholarship. The scholarship of white Disability Studies scholars is so pervasive, it would be very easy not to cite a single BIPOC scholar when writing about disability issues. This conflict is also present in feminist or critical race work that represents disability as a negative injustice caused by imperialism, colonialism, or ongoing white supremacy. In challenging these representations, disability culture might inadvertently support racism or white supremacy. When disability is represented as a white experience, different experiences are understood as erasing the true disability experiences. Racism can be justified because of the experience of ableism. As this chapter will show, this conflict between viewing disability as a positive or affirmative identity, and connecting disability to larger oppressive structures is one that is specifically racialized. While white scholars argue that disability is something that can be positive, affirmative, or useful to our understandings of the world, BIPOC scholars often challenge the erasure of those who experience the cause of their disabilities as part of disability oppression. For many, disability can both be connected to or caused by racial oppression, imperialism, and colonialism and also a positive part of their lives.

Claiming the category of disability can also be difficult because of financial barriers to diagnosis. Disability is in itself a privileged category in the sense that being diagnosed, accommodated, and acknowledged as disabled, rather than criminalized, invisibilized, or ostracized for impairment, depends on a certain kind of racial, gender, and class clout. BIPOC who interact with medical and social service providers may not want to identify themselves as disabled, as this encourages a representation of BIPOC as inhabiting inherently different bodyminds and can exacerbate experiences of racial discrimination because of this associated inferiority. Being permitted to be both disabled and a participating member of society thus often depends on whiteness as property, where white disabled people are granted entry because disability is their only form of difference (see Puar 2017; 15). Disability identity can permit some white people to support white supremacy, military expansion, or imperialist economies—where BIPOC work at little pay so that white disabled people can participate—justified by their experiences of bodymind difference. Disability can also be used as a reason not to decolonize or not to do the complicated work of acknowledging participation in white supremacy, justified by lack of energy or need to focus energy on only one form of discrimination: ableism. When teaching disability, it is necessary to acknowledge that not all disabled people experience ableism in the same way, and for many—or perhaps even the majority of disabled people—ableism is experienced at the intersection of sexism, racism, cissexism, and classism.

An example of the ways that whiteness can also act as a point of privilege alongside disability is the work of Kay Inckle (2015). In the passage below, Inckle places the process of compulsory ablebodiedness next to her own named whiteness, and uses her position as disabled to make claims around the universality of disability experience. She argues:

> [W]hen I read theorisations that claim to speak to, or about, disability and disabled people, I do so with the hope that I will be able to make sense of my own experiences therein. If theory is about me, it should be at the very least

> meaningful to me and, ideally, politically and/or intellectually useful. If I do not recognise myself in, and thereby understand, Puar's theory, this must raise questions beyond my own (limited) abilities and query what is happening to disability discourse if it being constructed in such a way that it no longer speaks to those who it claims to speak about. (44)

Inckle here positions herself as every disabled person, arguing that her inability to see herself in theory that is explicitly based in queer theory and critical race theory, signifies that Disability Studies has gone too far. This inability to acknowledge how whiteness can impact understandings of a BIPOC scholar's disability theory acts as a barrier for Inckle to make real strides through Jasbir Puar (2017)'s work.

As Inckle explains, Puar implies that whiteness acts as a form of capacity, regardless of disability. This argument challenges Disability Studies scholarship in two ways: first, disability identity may not be entirely positive if it is caused by debilitating structures, or structures that actively harm the bodymind; and second, disability might be an affirmative identity only for a small subsection of disabled people, those who are capacitated by other processes. These challenges to Disability Studies complicate disability teaching, especially when teaching about the intersections between race and disability. In teaching Disability Studies, educators must make strides to decolonize the Disability Studies classroom, in order to decenter the whiteness that clings so firmly to disability scholarship. This process begins by parsing through one of the major scholarly conflicts in Disability Studies right now: disability caused by colonialism. Scholars, especially BIPOC scholars, are especially interested in how to represent, understand, and catalogue disability when it is created and exacerbated by ongoing colonialism and imperialism.

Race and Disability Studies

In the last fifteen years, Disability Studies has been increasingly criticized for not adequately addressing or including race. In the scholarly world, Chris Bell (2006) began this critique, arguing that Disability Studies was really White Disability Studies. Helen Meekosha (2011) argues that part of the reason that race and disability have not been adequately addressed is because of the pervasiveness of liberal disability rights analysis. When disability is represented exclusively through the struggle for disability rights, and rights-based analyses often gloss over intersectional experiences of discrimination, disability is more likely to be addressed through a single axis lens. Critical race theorists have demonstrated the necessity of intersectional frameworks within law because of the ways that rights often provide only for one axis of oppression at a time, failing to frame rights based on multiple identity formations (see Crenshaw 1989 for example). One example of the ways that disability rights have erased the experiences of disabled BIPOC is an editorial published in *Review of Disability Studies* in March 2017 entitled "Disabled Lives Matter"—and later retitled "What about Disability and Social Justice" amid protest from Black disabled scholars. This editorial argued that the "clammer [sic] of minority rights and identity politics" erases the experiences of people with disabilities (Conway, 2017, 2). The editorial—which also argued that advocacy for gender neutral washrooms takes away from advocacy for accessible washrooms—faced considerable backlash from trans, queer, and Black disabled scholars who were rightfully frustrated with the ways that the editorial implied that disabled people could not also be BIPOC, queer, or trans.

Indeed, this editorial continues the whiteness of the field, comparing disability to race as if they are separate processes that cannot be embodied within the same person.

Given the push from Bell (2006), as well as later arguments from Bathseba Opini (2016) and Nwadigo Ejogu and Syrus Marcus Ware (2018), considerations of disability and race have since been taken up by white and BIPOC scholars alike to highlight the ways that disability is socially constructed and dependent on embodied constructions of bodyminds. As Anna Mollow (2006) argues "if race and disability are conceived of as discrete categories to be compared, contrasted, or arranged in order of priority, it becomes impossible to think through complex intersections of racism and ableism in the lives of disabled people of colour" (69). Indeed, it is disabled BIPOC who are at the forefront of the analyses of disability and race. They criticize the ways that many disability scholars use race as a point of comparison, rather than of analysis. Therí Pickens (2019) points to the inadequate construction of arguments that use "like race" to describe disability experience. Sami Schalk (2018) uses the work of Octavia Butler to argue that Black and crip futures intersect. Dorothy Roberts (2011) argues that racial categories continue to be constructed through descriptions of the body or the genetics of individuals in order to justify stratified categories and inherent differences. Different social upbringings or social determinants of health are therefore ignored in favour of genetic predisposition to illness or disability. Ellen Samuels (2014) argues that categories of race are constructed alongside disability but justified through scientific measures like fingerprints or blood quantum. These scholars point to the ways that racial discrimination is justified through embodied differences as defined by scientific measures and how these scientific measures gloss over the ways that oppression can impact the body.

Michelle Jarman (2005) demonstrates that many critical race texts represent racism as a disabling structure that causes disabilities in colonized and racialized populations. While this language is ableist in constructing liberation from racism as dependent on liberation from disability, Therí Pickens (2019)'s book *Black Madness:: Mad Blackness* explores the ways that Black people are inherently understood as Mad and Mad people are seen as closer to the category of Blackness. Exploring the possibilities of this identification as both Black and Mad translates to new kinds of identity affirmation that do not depend on negative experiences. That is, Blackness and madness do not define themselves based on oppression or experiences of negativity, but on positive identification with being Black and being Mad. Pickens argues that there is a current tide of scholars interested in the intersection between disability and Blackness, one that counters claims that no scholarship exists on these matters. However, because this scholarship often contradicts or challenges Disability Studies tenets and critical race studies tenets, these scholars are not consistently given credit for their new and emerging work.

Discussions of Blackness and disability, like those found in Christopher Bell (2011)'s collection *Blackness and Disability*, often argue that there is a materiality in metaphor, thus challenging Mitchell and Snyder's claims of narrative prosthesis. Anna Mollow (2017)'s "Towards a Black Fat Disability Studies" is a good example of the materiality of metaphor, as she demonstrates the ways that Black fat people are framed as "unvictimizable," even though many of them have disabilities. This framing leads to the criminalization of Black fat people, who find themselves at the intersection of Blackness, fatness, and disability. Similarly, we might argue that calling colonialism "disabling" might have both metaphorical and physical effects on Indigenous peoples throughout Canada, as well as refugees arriving in Canada. Moya Bailey and Izetta Autumn Mobley (2019) formulate a “Black Feminist Disability Framework” that emphasizes the intersections between Black feminist understandings of bodies, illness, and disability. Bailey and Mobley give the example of Black people saying, “white people are crazy” as a statement that disability scholars might highlight as ableist, perhaps erasing the long history of white people actively oppressing Black people (31). Ongoing climate change has also had disabling effects on Indigenous and racialized peoples throughout the world. Environmental racism often affects BIPOC communities first, as they continue to be deprioritized within colonial and settler colonial nation states, and often occupy land that is most exploited or most precarious. While BIPOC people are often framed as always already disabled, this representation coincides with real material effects of structural oppression on the bodymind.

Roy Moodley, Falak Mujtaba and Sela Keiman (2017) argue that critical race theory can be helpful in examining the ways that mental health is diagnosed and formulated around race. Although race is a social category and construct, not an innate biological characteristic, race continues to be a justification for control, especially in relation to mental health. While Critical Race Theory (CRT) demonstrates the connections and relationship between race, power, and law, it is also useful for other approaches to social sciences. Moodley, Mujtaba and Keiman (2017) use CRT to trace the pseudo-scientific racist theories that live on today in the form of psychiatric diagnoses for those who experience racialization. Indeed, in his description of the whiteness of Disability Studies, Syrus Marcus-Ware (2018) describes his own experience being pathologized for the trauma of racism and cissexism in his life and medicated because of these experiences. He argues that his doctors frequently told him that if he was not "crazy" because of the experiences he had over his sexual, racial, and gender identity, he should be. Moodley, Mujtaba and Keiman (2017) similarly argue that primarily white psychiatrists are not equipped to treat Black patients, as they do not have a personal or formal education in racial issues. Physicians and therapists paint racial groups with wide brushes and view any variation as another indication of mental disability.

Nirmala Erevelles (2018) also points to the work of Susan Burch (2021) and Bradley and Jennifer Soule (2003) who examine the intersection between race and mental disability in the case of the Canton Asylum (1903-1934) that housed over 400 women, men, and children from 17 American states and 50 tribal nations. This asylum was specifically created for American Indians, operated for 20 years and "discharged" 45% of its inhabitants in the form of their death. These Indigenous peoples were all described as mentally defective and in need of containment. Similarly, the residential school system in Canada (1880-1996) forced thousands of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples to be "educated" within boarding schools that perpetuated cultural genocide, disease, and widespread abuse. This education system largely depended on an ableist representation of Indigenous peoples as incapable of learning as long as they continued to look like and identify with Indianness (see Million 2013). The school system was set up in order to "kill the Indian within" so that Indigenous children would assimilate into white settler society (Churchill 2004). Racism against Indigenous peoples in Canada continues in the form of ableism where Indigenous peoples continue to be represented as unintelligent or lacking in knowledge, even as Indigenous cultures continue to foster their own knowledges and specific languages (Battiste 2008).

Given the complexity of experiencing the intersections of race and disability, disability can be a useful lens to use as pedagogy, as it can help create deeper understandings of both disability and race. Zanita E. Fenton (2016) argues that coalition politics are possible because disability "does not discriminate" allowing the building blocks for connection between white and BIPOC students. Regardless of whether disability "discriminates"—and indeed, it is clear that it does discriminate, as oppressive systems disproportionally create disability in racialized populations—the experiences of living with disability could allow both white disabled people and non-disabled BIPOC to better understand race and disability, by reflecting on scholarship created regarding BIPOC disabled experiences. Understanding the ways that disability oppression works in and through race can be achieved through the unsettling experiences of other kinds of oppression. While white disabled people might use their disabled identity as a race to white innocence, they might also be the best equipped for the complicated and unpleasant work of acknowledging and working through a troubled consciousness. Centring the work of disabled BIPOC scholars and activists in the Disability Studies classroom may help cultivate the "troubled consciousness" (Chapman 2013) of anti-racist, unsettling, and decolonial work, while also centering the needs and experiences of all disabled people.

Acknowledging that disability can be created, regulated, and reiterated through state processes also necessitates a challenge to disability as an identity of "wounded attachments" (Brown 1993). Kelly Fritsch (2015) argues that when disabled people define themselves in relation to the oppression they feel through ableism, challenging this oppression is even more difficult, because without ableism, disability would not exist. To imagine disability beyond the causes of debilitation and beyond the experiences of ableist oppression is necessary. This perhaps also means a different understanding of disability than the social model offers. While the social model presents disability as the socially mediated identity caused through barriers to participation because of societal expectations of impairment, other more radical models, including AJ Withers (2012)'s radical model and Alison Kafer (2013)'s political/relational model, argue that disability justice and disability liberation depend on a larger definition of disability that encompasses all bodymind differences. The normate therefore becomes a very specific identity, one that is also white, male, cisgender, straight, and straight-sized. Advocating for disability justice within more radical models of disability does not necessarily depend on a definition of disability or a value judgment of disability before or after state intervention. Instead, disability justice depends on the availability of services for those who need them, whatever that need might include. Disability Justice organizing also potentially integrates early social model theorizing, emphasizing a radical dismantling of ableism at the intersection.

Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha (2018) argues that disability justice is necessarily entangled with anti-imperialism, anti-capitalism, and anti-colonialism. Listing the ten principles of disability justice, as according to Sins Invalid, a disability performance collective based in the Bay Area, Piepzna-Samarasinha argues that when anti-capitalist politics and cross-movement solidarity are connected to leadership of those most impacted, disability justice is possible. Disability justice, as Mia Mingus argues, depends on understanding that keeping social justice movements going depends on mutual care in the form of “access intimacy,” meaning that accessibility is written in and through a commitment to disability justice. Access intimacy also acknowledges the interdependence of all bodyminds, and the ways that disability makes up only a small part of a larger constellation of bodymind connection. Disability justice, according to Piepzna-Samarasinha and Mingus, need not depend on wounded attachments, but the ways that disabled people, especially BIPOC disabled people, can depend on and build with and through each other. Collective access and collective liberation therefore go hand-in-hand, so that people with disabilities can actively build the movements that will decenter normate embodiment—including whiteness.

Global Disability Studies

Pointing towards the materiality of metaphor, scholars have named this process of oppression within the social and bodily experiences of disability differently in different contexts. Gorman names the process of states creating bodily impairment and social barriers as “disablement” (Gorman 2015), Puar calls this process “debility” (Puar 2017), and Raewyn Connell names this process “ontoformativity” (Connell 2014). These three terms—disablement, debility, and ontoformativity—name the complexity involved in embodied experiences of disability. Gorman argues that Disability Studies, a framework built on human rights through the ADA, has erased the possibility of imagining disablement caused by war, arguing especially that “articulations of disablement are not intelligible through the framework of disability rights” (255). By pointing to the disablement structure of not just the social experience of certain abjected bodyminds, but also their physical bodies, Gorman (2015) argues that a continuing study of the co-constituted experience of racialization and disablement is necessary. Gorman uses

Indigenous studies to highlight the contradiction between “disability-as-identity and disablement-that-is-disappeared” (257), demonstrating that disability identity cannot provide justice for those experiencing the violent disablement of the nation-state.

Puar (2009; 2017) similarly argues that disability identity cannot necessarily help those that experience debility, her word for structural action of creating disability on the body as well as in the social experience. Puar (2017) contrasts debility with capacity, two opposites “generated by increasingly demanding neoliberal formulations of health, agency, and choice” (13), both part of “the assemblage of the abilities machine” (14). Complicating the binary between disabled and non-disabled, Puar argues that debility is a structure of the nation state that actively creates both social and physical disability, often at the expense of the individual and in the nation-state’s favour. Puar likewise critiques disability rights paradigms, arguing that critiquing “the debilitating conditions of the medical-industrial complex itself” (16) is a more useful starting place for disability activism and action. Being attentive to whose bodyminds are debilitated and whose are capacitated might be a useful strategy to simultaneously challenge ableism, as well as white supremacist heteropatriarchal structures. Puar argues that “the term ‘debility’ can attach to the global south but can also be deployed in disenfranchised communities within global north locales to suggest debility as endemic, perhaps even normative, to disenfranchised communities” (16); it is thus possible to apply the term “debility” to Indigenous communities within Canada that continue to experience health disparities, environmental racism, and other structural implications of colonialism.

Finally, Connell (2014) also turns to the theorizing of the Global South in order to conceptualize the “ontoformativity” of social process. Connell argues that while disability was once exclusively studied through the medical model, the turn to the social-constructivist model has erased the possibility for studying the bodymind alongside both social and physical structures. Connell asks what it might look like to marry the medical and social sciences in order to understand how “social embodiment is not just a reflection, not just a reproduction, not just a citation” (1371), rather, social embodiment is a process that generates new ways of living and experiencing the world. Colonialism and imperialism have a direct effect on both the social and embodied experience of life, especially with global capitalism debilitating people in the Global South.

These three terms, disablement, debility, and ontoformativity will be useful for the discussions within this chapter as well as the rest of the dissertation. For the most part, I use debility to clarify the instances when “disabling” might imply only a social phenomenon, emphasizing the material and embodied nature of debilitation. For example, processes of colonialism in Canada are both disabling to Indigenous peoples, in a sense of limiting access to culturally relevant and sustaining services, education, and health care, but also debilitating with respect to their bodies, actively creating disabilities like diabetes, asthma, and forms of trauma-induced mental illness. Many Indigenous peoples resist the violence of colonialism, in part by refusing to erase the impacts of colonialism on their bodyminds. Before returning to the land acknowledgement, as a necessary action against ongoing colonialism, I consider global Disability Studies, a critique of disability rights, and return to decolonizing Disability Studies, arguing that this turn away from the desirability of disability and towards an outlook on disabling and debilitating processes is a necessary component of Disability Studies in the contemporary setting. While representations of disability and especially disability rights, present social constructions of disability as separate from embodied experiences of disability, Disability Studies has begun to contend with the realities of global capitalism, imperialism, and nation-state dominance. By giving names to the ways that larger structures take place in and around disability—and by recognizing that disability cannot be easily represented as a positive category—these critiques of Disability Studies complicate representations of disability as completely negative or positive.

Other scholars have also advocated for this connection between larger structural factors and disability identity. Helen Meekosha (2010) argues that colonialism is in itself a disabling process that impairs people primarily in the Global South. While the majority of disability theory is written in the Global North, Meekosha's work takes seriously the experiences of organizers in the Global South who protest "war and civil strife, nuclear testing, the growth of the arms trade, the export of pollution to 'pollution havens' and the emergence of sweatshops" (667) which impair, debilitate, and disable. Meekosha argues that representations of disability celebration and pride are difficult to accept for disabled people in the Global South because celebrating disability also potentially means celebrating imperialism, colonialism, and structures that continue to actively disable. Meekosha argues for a change in the ways that disability scholars begin to solve the issues of disability justice. She argues that it is necessary to align disability scholarship with that of Global South feminists who aim to decolonize and challenge the geopolitical hierarchy of western thought. This includes challenging rights-based constructions that aim to replace or add to human rights for disabled people. Human rights are dependent on a construction of human independence that is not necessarily relevant in the Global South, but has been the bedrock of western thought. Meekosha argues that it is necessary to begin integrating decolonizing methodologies into Disability Studies to better represent and address the ways that disability functions through imperialism, war, and colonialism.

Erevelles (2011) grapples with Robert McRuer’s call to desire disability, arguing that there is a “danger in associating becoming disabled with a violent and oppressive history” because disability is already conceived of as a negative characteristic (26). Using a historical materialist understanding of disability as embodied with and through colonial powers, Erevelles argues that Margrit Shildrick and other poststructural disability theorists flatten the power relationships related to disability in their construction of disability as a positive characteristic. Instead, Erevelles argues that in order to truly desire disability, colonialism would have to be abolished. That is, in order to truly be able to represent disability as a good and useful contribution to embodied understandings of the world, war and destruction needs to be disconnected from the creation of disability. Erevelles encourages a disability justice framework instead of a theoretical flattening of disability as positive. Working for disability justice therefore means fighting for a world without imperialism, without colonialism, and without incarceration. Decolonizing Disability Studies is part of this work to create the potential for disability to be a positive experience.

Shaun Grech (2015) has argued that Disability Studies has failed to examine the ways that colonialism has created and maintained disability, while development studies also refuses to take on a Disability Studies outlook. He argues: “the Western Disability Studies and its tenets, notably the social model of disability and the language of ‘rights’, are transferred indiscriminately from North to South and absorbed almost unquestionably by development agencies, Southern organizations and other intermediaries" (88). This process of absorption of rights-based understandings of disability into the Southern context is problematic given the very different ways that disability is represented and experienced outside of a Western context. The "third world," Grech argues, has been constructed as a monolith outside of civilized Western experience, but has then been presented Disability Studies tenets without alteration. Rights-based intervention into Southern contexts overshadows the alternative understandings of personal autonomy and organizing beyond state formulations.

Jasbir Puar (2007; 2009; 2017)'s work on debility, capacity, and disability likewise challenges the desirability of disability and the rights-based representation of disability liberation, as she argues that disability is not a universal concept that affects every subject in the same way. Answering McRuer's call to imagine a future where disability is desirable, Puar argues that disability is perhaps already desirable for certain subjects, as settler states continue to colonize through debilitating the bodies of the colonized. For example, she points to the ways that disability rights policies in Israel do not apply to Palestinians who continue to be denied Israeli citizenship. At the same time, Israel continues to claim a "right to maim" in Palestine, thus creating more disabled people on the Palestinian side of conflict lines. Disability becomes desirable, then, for Israel because disabled people are less likely to resist or be able to become involved in conflict, while keeping numbers of the death toll low. Particular technologies are therefore built because of the desirability of maimed bodies, with rights given to injured Israelis and reduced mobility emphasized on the Palestinian body. Puar's claim that some bodies are capacitated and some are debilitated is also relevant beyond the

Israel/Palestine conflict, as other settler states, including Canada, also debilitate(d) their colonized populations for the benefit of ablebodied and disabled settlers. Puar's work is especially useful for the Disability Studies classroom, despite being difficult to read, because Puar presents disability not as a single category of difference, but as an assemblage of experiences that differ based on citizenship, gender, race, and class. In many ways, Puar changes the question from "how can disability be desirable?" into "in what ways is disability already a desirable outcome for the state?" thus challenging much of disability theory, but also highlighting the many ways that Disability Studies is a deeply political field that must contend with state processes in complex ways.

Describing disability as similar to race therefore is not enough to represent the ways that disability affects people differently depending on race and citizenship. Disability is already desirable for states wishing to control certain populations, or to justify continuous control over these populations in the form of medical or social services. Asking when and how disability can be desirable therefore necessarily needs to coincide with the question of desirable for whom, and why. Desire is not a straightforward metric of disability liberation. In part, this is because some would argue that liberation from disability should not necessarily be the aim of disability justice, as this replicates understandings of disability as deficit or lack. However, if disability is created and maintained through trauma and destruction, it follows that liberation from these destructive forces may also be a liberation from disability. Struggling for disability justice means necessarily holding these contradictory realities: that disability might be a positive identity for many, but for others might be a negative experience, or any combination of these experiences. Disability experience can also be a relief for those who no longer want to engage in processes of war, or a reason to care for oneself within processes that do not provide this care, or many other iterations of identity experience.

In contrast to Meekosha, Erevelles, Grech, and Puar, Eunjung Kim (2017) examines disability through another kind of traumatic injury as "curative violence" that frames state intervention not as useful for those who have rights, but as harmful to those that are not in need of cure. This framing allows for disability to still be a positive part of identity formation, one that subjects wish to hold onto: disability is therefore not just injury or sickness, but also bodymind variation. In this way, intersex people, for one example, find themselves at the hands of medical intervention despite little evidence to suggest that ambiguously gendered genitals or sex characteristics are connected to negative health outcomes (see Orr 2018 for example). Instead, medical intervention becomes in itself the "disabling" mechanism. State intervention therefore becomes invested in "curative violence" that inadvertently creates other kinds of disability. However, a conflict arises when we start investigating forms of curative violence, as lines are drawn between desirable and undesirable kinds of disability. Is intersex embodiment a form of disability before state intervention or only after experiencing curative violence? Curative violence therefore depends on a differentiation between a disabled body that is untouched by state intervention but is positive, and a disabled body that is caused in part by state intervention as negative.

These lines between the positive (original) disabled body and the negative (altered) disabled body are difficult to draw because of the ways that disability identity is diverse and complicated. Trans folks, for example, often seek out medical intervention, and are only framed as disabled—or experiencing symptoms of impairment before seeking this intervention (see Baril, Sansfaçon, and Gelly 2020 for example). Trans exclusionary feminists (TERFs) and their right-wing supporters often represent medical intervention as curative violence, arguing that hormonal procedures have not been properly researched and could potentially have long lasting effects on the children (sic) they are prescribed to (see for example Williams 2020). The construction of state intervention or medical procedure as violent overshadows the inaccessibility of medical services for trans folks who need them. While the concept of curative violence is especially useful to point out the state's desire to eradicate disability in the name of national strength, it fails to acknowledge the complicated emotional connections to bodies and to ideas of cure. How do we define which bodies are disabled enough to warrant intervention? For another example, breast augmentation surgery and labiaplasty/vaginoplasty have been criticized for representing female bodies as in need of medical intervention. However, for many trans women these medical procedures are necessary and useful. Criticism of breast augmentation and labiaplasty/vaginoplasty as curative violence erases the non-violent curative function that they fulfill for trans women.

The concept of curative violence is especially complicated given the ways that racialized bodies are given alternative diagnoses because of their race. For example, Erevelles (2018) notes that Black students are much more likely to be given diagnoses for learning disabilities than their white colleagues. These diagnoses are dependent on the ways the white teachers view behaviour and understand learning processes in the classroom. Race therefore not only affects who the state feels is in need of correction or intervention, who is debilitated by the state, and who is capacitated, but it also affects who is seen as disabled and how. While white children are also diagnosed with learning disabilities, they are more likely to be given support for learning and taken seriously in the classroom. They are also more likely to have the economic capacity to access private education or other additional supports. Similarly, Black men are more likely to be diagnosed with schizophrenia and other “severe” mental health diagnoses (Metzl 2010). Meanwhile, Black women often find it difficult to be diagnosed with anything at all (see Mollow 2006). Indeed, many women of colour (WOC) also do not identify with antipsychiatry or Mad liberation movements, preferring instead to protest for and with other WOC (Diamond 2013). In other words, taking care to understand who is capacitated, who is debilitated, and who is represented as disabled is especially important to do along racial lines.

Challenging disability rights

As the above discussion highlights, the disability rights movement has been tightly connected to the academic field of Disability Studies, with the ADA (1990) coinciding with the field’s beginnings. The disability rights movement has more recently had to grapple with the ways that rights have not necessarily brought healing and value to people with disabilities. In writing about trans rights, Dean Spade (2015) argues that “various social movements have had to contend with why legal change in the form of rights has not brought the deep transformation they were seeking” (1), and that in order to make real change, we need to be critical of all rights-based organizing. We need to ask why rights have not necessarily worked for other social movements—for example civil rights have not “solved” the problem of white supremacy. Spade argues that rights have been used as a way of justifying the narrative that the United States, as well as other nation states, have "progressed" through democracy and have overcome their racist, and sexist past. However, this narrative falls short when the realities of white supremacist heteropatriarchy are revealed within the nation state's organization. In many contexts, rights function by placing the responsibility on the individual to claim their rights, while also giving the power back to the nation state to grant these rights. With respect to disability, Mitchell and Snyder (2015) clarify this relationship between individual and nation-state, writing "within the logic of neoliberalism, this exceptional status is based upon embodiments that are the responsibility of the individual and no fault of the social order" (18-19). Disability rights then become the responsibility of the individual to regulate their own bodymind within a social order that does not fit their bodymind configuration.

As Shaun Grech (2011) argues, the historical connection between disability theory and disability rights paradigms is a contributing factor to the ways that Disability Studies has remained a Eurocentric field that erases the work of BIPOC scholars. For BIPOC disabled people especially, the nation state is more likely to be implicated in the creation or causation of bodymind difference. However, challenging rights-based constructions in the classroom is often difficult for students who have been taught that small incremental change is progressive. For many students, the reality that disability rights do not necessarily solve the problem of ableist oppression is one that comes as a shock. Grech argues that decolonizing Disability Studies begins by acknowledging this history and connection between rights-based movements of disability and more radical disability organizing that challenges colonialism. Rather than pointing to the "postcolonial," Grech prefers to use the term "neocolonialism" to describe the ways that “decolonisation not only has not fully occurred, but will remain perpetually incomplete unless the racial, ethnic, sexual, cultural, economic and the many other power disparities are shifted” (54). Shifting these disparities arguably begins by listening carefully to the ways that disability is perhaps already desirable for nation states that can control the movement of colonized peoples.

Rachel Gorman (2016) also argues that imperialism and colonialism cause debilitation for the colonized. Arguing that this turn to begin examining the global implications of Disability Studies has also begun a needed critique of the Western rights-bearing subject, Gorman argues that more explicit engagement with Southern theory is needed. The call for a decolonized Disability Studies has resulted in a push for Disability Studies from the perspective of the Global South. Xuan Thuy Nguyen (2018) argues that Southern theory creates the possibility of decolonizing Disability Studies. While Disability Studies concerns itself almost entirely with Northern understandings and definitions of disability, there is a growing group of scholars who advocate for Global South understandings and framings of disability. She cites in particular Meekosha (2011), Ghai (2012), and Grech (2016) as some examples of this shift. Grech has also begun a new open-access journal *Disability and the Global South* that specifically addresses the question of Southern theory in Disability Studies. Nguyen argues that there are three reasons why Southern theory is especially useful to Disability Studies: first, to “interrogate the domination of Northern epistemologies;” second, to demonstrate the ways disabled people in the Global South have been erased; and third, to begin the work of decolonization through Indigenous knowledges (5). Southern theory aims to privilege the knowledges of the colonized over the colonizer in order to imagine new futures beyond the desires of the colonizers. This starting point challenges Disability Studies that begin from the Global North to “deindividualize disability” (Puar 2017, p. 72), turning away from rights-based understandings of disability to more collective processes of disability justice.

Mitchell and Snyder (2015) argue that the focus on disability rights in the United States has largely been in support of neoliberalism. That is, bodymind variation is always held next to normative evaluations of what is not too disabled, or what is disabled enough to qualify for state assistance. This state assistance is still represented as something that the individual has responsibility to apply for, to maintain, and to responsibly use. The conditions of the body remain the sole responsibility of the individual, rather than something that the state acts upon or has responsibility in impacting. In short, neoliberalism frames disability as a form of difference that would be better treated within normative paradigms that reframe disability as close to the norm. In doing so, disabled subjects can work for and with the state, rather than critiquing the state’s impact on bodyminds:

> Within the terms of ablenationalism, then, disabled people are increasingly fashioned as a population that can be put into service on behalf of the nation-state rather than exclusively positioned as parasitic upon its resources and, therefore, somehow outside of its best interests. Perhaps the irony of this transition is that it could be argued to fulfill a common precept of disability rights advocacy communities: disabled people want to be treated like everyone else and in such a way that their disabilities are not defining of their value as human beings. (17-18)

Disability rights then, while useful for bodyminds already seen as useful for the state, do not extend to those who are more “severely disabled” to use Robert McRuer’s term. While queer subjects who do not fit in with homonationalism might be called “critically queer,” McRuer writes that the disabled who do not fit in within state representations might be named “severely disabled”.

In “What’s so critical about critical Disability Studies?,” Meekosha and Shuttleworth (2009) argue that all critical social theory goes beyond rights-based analyses, complicating the need for individual freedom. For them, “autonomy, as conceived by critical theorists, has always been a more complex notion that the idea of independent living which dominated much of the discourse on disability during the 1970s through to the 1990s in the US” (52-53). Rather than imagining rights as the aim of disability theory and activism, Meekosha and Shuttleworth argue that critical social theory is political, “aimed squarely at revealing the power relational dynamics within societies as manifested and reinforced via these seemingly innocuous means, at both the individual and societal levels” (53). Exploring the power relations in disability therefore means understanding the representations of disability and the ways that disability identity—like all identity—is more about interdependence than independence.

From a teaching perspective, however, turning away from individual cases of disability into larger structures with broader and more complex impacts can be difficult for students to understand. Disciplinary boundaries create silos of learning that can be difficult to break through, even if intersectional and assemblage epistemologies depend on breaking these silos. Students and faculty alike become frustrated when their prior knowledge cannot help them build new understandings, and this process can be especially difficult within neoliberal institutions like universities. Jay Dolmage (2018) and Margaret Price (2011) argue that universities are inherently ableist institutions that intentionally weed out particular bodies and minds. Universities have also had an ongoing role in imperialist projects, one that is upheld in part by these disciplinary boundaries. Students within the Global North are taught that their personal engagements with education are largely dependent on seeing themselves as individual learners separate from larger structures at hand. Objectivity is necessary in university writing, for example, where students are taught that personal pronouns remove from the usefulness of their work. Rights-based framings of disability are understandable in part because students can view disability as an individual difference that requires accommodation. In fact, the university teaches this framework of disability, giving accommodations based on limitations as described by medical professionals. Decolonizing education within the Global North therefore depends on troubling the distinctions Made between disciplinary boundaries like feminism, Indigenous knowledges, postcolonial or decolonial thought, and Disability Studies. This work is necessary because disability is necessarily always connected to processes and structures of gender, race, and class.

Meekosha and Soldatic (2016)'s book *The Global Politics of Impairment and Disability* presents an alternative view of Disability Studies, focussing specifically on the Global South. This collection, like other sources to which I have pointed in this chapter, challenges the separation between impairment and disability, arguing that disability cultures look differently in different parts of the Global South. In the introduction to the collection, Raewyn Connell (2016) argues that "the global dynamics of capitalist accumulations, and of hierarchical gender relations, change the material character and meaning of disability" (1). While these processes of control and debilitation drastically change the bodymind experiences of disabled people in the Global South, the collection as a whole also argues that the Global South contains a large variety of cultures and experiences of disability, some that do not replicate Global North formulations of disability as defect or deficit. Studying these differences depends on a willingness to acknowledge the ways that the Global North is incapable of colonizing all the knowledge of the Global South. In a similar way, Indigenous knowledges must be safeguarded and not necessarily pillaged for the work of decolonizing disability. Indigenous cultures experience disability differently, not just because of experiences of colonization and neoliberal global capitalism, but also because of different understandings and articulations of bodymind difference.

Meekosha and Soldatic's work also brings into question the possibilities of supporting disability without supporting imperialism or colonialism. If studying disability in the Global South repeats understandings of disability as deficit or makes it easier for white disabled people to distance themselves from processes of imperialism—by calling themselves not "those" kinds of disabled people—how might it be possible to challenge both the medicalization of disability and the violence of imperialism? Further, if we are beginning from the space of illness caused by environmental racism and injury caused by war, is it possible to support the healing and recovery of those experiencing these realities without repeating cure as solution to imperialist impulses? In many ways the complexity of these realities encourage creativity, especially from those who are most affected by oppression, but also by those of us who commit to collective liberation and collective access. Students can be at the forefront of this imagination, especially as they learn about these conflicts within Disability Studies, some of whom who have experienced these processes first hand without the theoretical background to articulate them.

Decolonizing Disability Studies

Teaching Disability Studies therefore entails a complicated definition of disability, one that acknowledges that imperialism and colonialism does cause a disproportionate experience of disability in the Global South and in many parts of the Global North. This causation, however, does not mean that disability is completely negative. Mia Mingus, for example, argues that her identity depends on being disabled and being an immigrant. Her experience as an adoptee speaks to disability as well, so that all identity experiences coalesce together. The impetus to teach disability coincides with a need to teach Indigeneity in the post-secondary classroom in ways that supports decolonization. If disability is represented as entirely positive, decolonization may seem counter to disability liberation. However, in acknowledging that disability coincides with colonization and informs the identities of many disabled BIPOC, decolonizing is a possible goal for the Disability Studies classroom.

In writing about Indigenous understandings of impairment, Heather Norris (2014) writes that “Indigenous approaches to impairment were likely informed by worldviews valuing difference and equality, and recognizing the fundamentality of interdependence” (58). Norris writes from the perspective of an Anishinabe woman from the Algonquin First Nations community of Pikwàkanagàn. Her ancestry is therefore linked to the land where I write these words. Norris makes connections between Indigenous understandings of body, mind, and spirit and the more Eurocentric Disability Studies that I have been challenging throughout this chapter. Like disability justice, Indigenous studies emphasizes a deep connection between humans, but pushes this connection beyond interdependence—a disability justice tenet that highlights the relations between humans—emphasizing the relationality between humans, nonhuman animals and non-animal beings as well. For example, Kim TallBear (2018)'s work explores the relationship between humans and the environment, arguing that sexuality extends beyond human-human relations and into human-environment relationships.

The definition of disability is therefore complex from an Indigenous perspective, as all humans depend on one another, but also depend on their environment and their connection to the land. Rather than representing disability, as it often is, as inability to work, Indigenous perspectives already ask what connections form beyond labour. Norris specifically argues that normality is a Eurocentric construct that is not necessarily at play within Indigenous knowledge systems. The concept of normality has been used as a method of colonization; by calling the colonized abnormal—or perhaps, by calling the colonized disabled—Eurocentric knowledge producers justify further colonization and domination. Instead, Indigenous understandings of different bodies "are not static, unchangeable phenomena, but exist dynamically in balance with all relations" (67). While disability is continually defined as abnormal bodymind within Eurocentric definitions, because of the drastically different representations of bodymind difference—as "in balance with all relations"—Indigenous peoples do not necessarily name the same kind of difference.

Because for many, disability has become an identity category that is an important part of human categories, the Indigenous understanding of disability as variation, rather than difference, might not be one that fits neatly. However, understanding the relationship between all beings means also understanding when that relationship is not in balance and needs correcting. Ingrid Waldron (2018) argues that Indigenous peoples in Canada are disproportionately experiencing environmental racism, which leads to health disparities. Waldron argues that the location of waste, chemical pollutants, and climate disaster has caused Indigenous peoples to be at a higher risk of a range of different illnesses, including cancer, diabetes, asthma, skin and eye irritation, and cardiovascular disease. Intergenerational trauma caused by colonialism—including being a survivor of residential schools and the Sixties Scoop—also causes psychological distress and a higher level of suicide, especially within younger generations. The recent final report for the Inquiry into the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (IMMIWG) (2019) demonstrates that these realities also impact the likelihood of Indigenous women and gender diverse (including Two-Spirit) people going missing or being murdered. This high prevalence of disability and sickness within Indigenous communities emphasizes the inability to isolate disability from larger structures at play.

In "Decolonization is not a metaphor," Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012) argue that decolonization has been used as a metaphor in a number of different fields in ways that fail to address the ongoing imperialism that continues to limit Indigenous peoples' access to land. From a teaching perspective, they emphasize that decolonizing the mind is not enough to enact decolonization, despite the claims Made by Paulo Freire. Instead, they advocate for place-based education and other efforts to acknowledge the complicity of white scholars and educators within processes of colonialism. Decolonizing Disability Studies therefore should not be a metaphorical exercise, but one that actively respects the needs and experiences of those who experience disability in and through colonialism, especially examining the ways that settler colonial processes disable Indigenous peoples. Decolonizing Disability Studies also necessitates an understanding of the difference between the ways that the Global North has categorized disability as deficit and negative in part to colonize those who have been debilitated by the state. Indigenous peoples in Canada, for example, experience disability in higher numbers than white settlers, and actively point to the residential schools, environmental racism, and policies that continue to create trauma within their communities. Indigenous disabled peoples in Canada might not call themselves disabled in part because disability becomes another form of colonization (Ineese-Nash 2020). What might it look like for disability scholars to actively grapple with Indigeneity and the ways that Indigenous peoples disproportionally experience disability, especially trauma-related experiences of mental disability?

As Sarah Leeuw, Margo Greenwood, and Emilie Cameron (2010) show, Indigenous peoples are already represented as inherently mentally disordered, addicted and incapable. In *Decolonizing Methodologies*, Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) argues that Indigenous peoples have been often studied from the outside, with settlers' fascination with Indigenous cultures justifying this research without any real impacts to those communities. It is necessary to keep in mind the ways that settler desires often overshadow the needs and experiences of Indigenous peoples. Decolonizing disability also depends on turning away from rights-based understandings of disability, instead emphasizing disability justice that begins from the position of those most affected by systems of oppression, that aims to dismantle systemic issues that creates impairment, and that acknowledges the difficult lines that are often crossed with disability identification or disability assignment. Mia Mingus argues that disability justice is necessary within worlds that already represent BIPOC women and gender diverse people as disabled. Representations of disability as inherently connected to and inseparable from processes of racialization means that looking only to disability as a mode of analysis does not do justice to BIPOC or white disability experience.

Conclusion: beyond citation

Disability Studies is in a state of flux, especially given the recent push to make the discipline more intersectional. Race and Indigeneity are still growing concerns within Disability Studies, bringing with them questions that are unresolved in scholarship that focusses on intersections between only gender, class, sexuality, and disability. Those working in global Disability Studies have also provided an important critique of disability rights models, demonstrating that disability rights and disability pride need to be complicated by experiences of disability that are caused or exacerbated by larger structures of oppression. Throughout this chapter, I have explored these themes, pointing to the work of decolonizing Disability Studies that is still underway. I have argued that holding all the contradictions of disability, including the desirability/pride of disability, the disablement of oppressive systems, and the complex intersections might be difficult for students to interpret in part because of an emphasis on disciplinarity that translates to an expectation that all identity can be understood in similar ways. However, inviting students to build and rebuild the field of Disability Studies could invite imaginative solutions to contradictory theory.

To conclude this chapter, I return to the question of land acknowledgements, thinking of how we might be able to decolonize the Disability Studies classroom. Part of acknowledging the land on which the classroom rests, and the rightful inhabitants of that land, also involves asking how the educator themselves have been debilitated or capacitated by owning or inhabiting this land. Asking how you, the educator, has been capacitated or experienced the benefits of disablement might be a good starting question to ask yourself. Because disability is not a neutral category, your experience of disability might drastically differ from someone who experiences race, gender, or class differently. Presenting your response to these questions might help clarify how disability is represented as negative, but is experienced as positive or negative differently depending on other forms of identification. Disability is also not fixed, so your experience(s) with disability might change over time. Checking in with your own experience might help clarify your positionality as it relates to those of your students.

While the cannon of Disability Studies is exceedingly white—indeed, you may have noticed that the vast majority of the scholars that I mentioned in the introduction to disability section of this chapter are white—it is the educator's responsibility to actively choose to cite differently. Sara Ahmed (2013) argues that citation practice is an important part of feminist action: "citation [is] a rather successful reproductive technology, a way of reproducing the world around certain bodies" (n.p.). Actively changing those who are on Disability Studies syllabi is an important part of decolonizing Disability Studies more generally. However, adding a handful of BIPOC authors to your syllabus is not enough to do this work. Just like land acknowledgements, citation practice is only useful or adequate when it actively addresses the conflicts between scholars and the reasons why these voices need to be added at all. Throughout this chapter, I have pointed to one of the major conflicts in Disability Studies right now, a conflict highlighted, emphasized, and explored by BIPOC scholars. Part of decolonizing the Disability Studies classroom must therefore begin by not only acknowledging the land that you are teaching on, but also reflecting on how the power relations on this land have capacitated or debilitated the educator, the administration, and the students. Asking not only how the educator, but also the institution might be capacitated through colonization—in their support of particular kinds of research, for example—is another good starting point. By actively supporting alternative understandings of disability in the classroom, decolonization can also begin.

In the next chapter, I turn to education and pedagogy more specifically, exploring the university as an institution and its violent histories. I examine Teaching and Learning centres in Ontario through examining their websites to see how universities market themselves as pedagogical institutions, asking how race, gender, sexuality, disability, and Indigeneity is represented to the public through Teaching and Learning centre websites. Looking at Indigenous education models specifically, I highlight the risks of bringing Indigeneity and disability together, acknowledging that universities are often unwilling to take these risks. While Chapter One looks specifically to the theoretical conflicts in Disability Studies scholarship, Chapter Two looks to education more specifically, asking how we might formulate multiple identities that at times conflict to better support students who live at the intersections of these identities.

Chapter Two: Diversity, Inclusion, Disability: Accessibility and Indigeneity on Teaching and Learning Centre Websites

Introduction

In June 2019, I completed my Certificate in Undergraduate Teaching with the Teaching and Learning Support Service (TLSS) at the University of Ottawa. Like other Teaching and Learning Centres in Ontario, TLSS offers a Teaching Certificate to graduate students and part-time professors at the University of Ottawa, which gives an introduction to the process of planning your first class, including online and blended courses. As part of the certificate, students are expected to reflect on their diversity and inclusion policies in the classroom. This reflection process includes workshops in Indigenous teaching practices and accessibility in the classroom, but does not include workshops in critical race studies or in understanding the racial dynamics of a university course. The experience of completing the Teaching Certificate encouraged me to explore the Teaching and Learning centre structure, alongside how it claims to represent racial difference in the classroom. This chapter begins the work of reflecting on why "Indigenous" and "accessibility" are themes in Teaching and Learning centres, but other forms of difference are lacking.

In the first chapter of this dissertation, I examined the recent changes in the field of Disability Studies, demonstrating that BIPOC interventions shake the foundations of representing disability as desirable and challenge the liberal rights-based model that has shaped much disability activism and scholarship. I argued that adding BIPOC scholars to Disability Studies syllabi is not enough to change the pervasive whiteness of Disability Studies, but must be met with reflexivity. I continue this focus on education in this chapter to ask whether these critical race conceptualizations of disability in connection to colonialism, imperialism, and race are reflected on university websites and teaching resources.

Education for First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples in Canada has a fraught history. Indigenous peoples in Canada have been widely represented as mentally disordered, traumatized by the settler colonial oppression they have experienced. Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that in a move to settler innocence, settlers often represent Indigenous peoples as either “at risk” or “asterisk”:

> As “at risk” peoples, Indigenous students and families are described as on the verge of extinction, culturally and economically bereft, engaged or soon-to-be engaged in self-destructive behaviors which can interrupt their school careers and seamless absorption into the economy. (22)

Education is presented as a way of healing for Indigenous peoples (see Simpson 2017), or as a way of “asterisking” Indigenous people to be presented as small parts of datasets in groups of “non-white Others”. Education for Indigenous peoples therefore continues a legacy of colonialism, especially given the residential school system that created intergenerational trauma for thousands of Indigenous “students”. Similarly, white disabled settlers have experienced education in ways that encourages ableism. Those who exist at the intersections of these identities, Indigenous disabled peoples, feel the brunt of the ableist settler educational system, exacerbated perhaps by the representations of Indigeneity that equate all Indigenous peoples with mental incapability.

Recent legal cases and legislation have been enacted in Canada in order to change the ways these populations experience education in Canada, more specifically the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). However, there are limits to legal incentives and restrictions, as universities continue to operate as businesses looking to market themselves, rather than as liberating or progressive institutions that challenge the nation-state. Dean Spade (2015) argues that top-down decision making organizations like universities often “reflect capitalist business values rather than social justice values” (100). The racist and ableist past and present of Canada’s education system can be lacquered over with marketing terms that highlight Canadian institutions’ efforts to mitigate these historically damaging education models.

Indeed, the neoliberalization of universities continues the process of ableist colonial education through a new interest in appearing inclusive or diverse. Neoliberalism emphasizes individual achievement at the expense of structural change, spurred on by provincial divestment in education. Universities are forced to depend more on individual donations rather than government funds because of neoliberal policies, which translates to university programming shifting towards business and STEM and away from humanities and social sciences, despite increases in demand for this kind of education. Neoliberal policies also translate to larger class sizes, and a (re)investment in models of education that are easiest to implement on a large scale, including standardized testing, lecture-based pedagogy, and little room for individual difference, only individual responsibility. Diversity, inclusion, and equity become ways of marketing to students who are forced to individually fund their own university educations, rather than terms that help spur real change (see Henry et al. 2017).

This chapter looks to the ways that a selection of Canadian universities—all universities in Ontario— frame diversity, equity, and inclusion, accessibility, and Indigeneity on their Teaching and Learning support websites. Teaching and Learning Support Centres exist in most Canadian universities as support spaces for university educators, including full-time and adjunct professors, graduate students, and teaching assistants. The opening and growth of these centres has coincided with the increasing precarity of university teaching, as universities have begun hiring fewer full-time tenure-track professor positions, especially in the humanities and social sciences, replacing these teaching positions with graduate student and adjunct (part-time) professor work. Between 2005 and 2015, there was a 79% increase per year in part-time, part-year academic workers compared to a 14% percent increase for regular professors ("Shattering myths about contract staff" 2018). The opening and growth of Teaching and Learning centres has also coincided with the growing incentive for diversity, equity, and inclusion, as universities, who do not want the burden of course design, push professors to think through pedagogy more actively, rather than focussing only on research expertise (Forgie et al., 2018). While universities still incentivize their faculty to focus on research, teaching and learning centres function to arguably fix or ameliorate professors whose teaching suffers because of this emphasis on research. In the past, these centres were explicitly mandated to ameliorate individual teachers, but over time, they have expanded in scope, now aiming to "provide a figurative and literal hub where communities and integrated networks of practice can be built and nurtured" (Forgie et al., 2018, pp. 5).

Often located outside of education departments, Teaching and Learning centres also house the online platforms for online or blended courses, acting as training facilities for those who might not know how to use these platforms. Teaching and Learning centres provide the main teaching support for their associated university, thus functioning as an institutional home for a university's "official" pedagogy or vision of education. The websites of these centres are a useful resource in delineating how the university chooses to cultivate educational practices and market itself as an institution of higher learning. These websites are meant both for professors looking to improve their teaching and for (prospective) students to see how professors are improving their teaching, both enhancing the image of the university as a pedagogically rigorous environment. These websites are also built to find potential investors in an increasingly privatized university sector; teaching expertise, as represented by these websites, can encourage more students to enroll and finish their degrees, and potentially support more lucrative university investment. As both public facing declarations of a university's commitment to teaching and as resource hubs for educators, Teaching and Learning websites are potentially ripe for analyses, giving insights into the messages and intentions of the university as an institution. By examining websites, I can ask "what does website content and navigation say about the constitution of disability as an intersectional category—including Indigeneity and diversity, equity and inclusion—on Ontario Teaching and Learning websites?"

Before turning to the content of teaching and learning websites, I begin this chapter by examining the theoretical considerations underpinning higher education. While critical pedagogies represent education as liberating, disability scholars, and Indigenous scholars argue that universities are not necessarily as liberating as they are represented. Historically, Canadian education of disabled and Indigenous students, with residential schools and institutions for people with disabilities, has not instilled confidence in Canadian university education for those who live at the intersection of Indigeneity and disability (Daigle 2019). While new accessibility legislation, like the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act in Ontario (AODA) (2005), and new promises for the reconciliation of Indigenous peoples in Canada, as represented by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) (2015), provide mandates for Canadian universities to actively include students with disabilities and Indigenous students in their classrooms, I, along with many equity studies scholars, argue that inclusion is not adequate to make up for the devastating oppression that Canadian education has upheld (for some examples, see Henry et al. 2016; Nash 2020). In part, “inclusion” has become synonymous with other words like “diversity” and “equity” that have failed to provide liberation for BIPOC students or educators within Canadian universities. While inclusion, like diversity and equity, promises to unite disparate groups including BIPOC, disabled, trans, queer, and female people, scholars have shown how these terms fail to acknowledge the intersectional nature of these identities (see for example Ahmed 2013).

This chapter is broken down into a number of sections. The first section builds on the first chapter, and acknowledges the risks involved in connecting Indigeneity and Disability, demonstrating that many Indigenous people challenge the image of Indigenous intellectual, mental, and physical inferiority. In connecting Indigeneity with disability, I mean only to acknowledge that there are those that exist at the intersection of these identities, and that their experience is erased when we present these two identity categories as entirely separate. In the next section, I look to critical pedagogies, examining the critiques of education as liberatory. Given the fraught histories of residential schools and institutions, Indigenous peoples and disabled people have very often experienced education as disabling, rather than a force of liberation. I proceed in the next few sections to look at the recent legislative changes, both the AODA and the TRC, and how these changes impact university teaching. After briefly examining the AODA and the TRC, I turn to diversity, equity, and inclusion as three terms that have also widely impacted educational materials. Finally, I examine Teaching and Learning centre websites, exploring what themes emerge regarding identity. How do these websites relate the importance of addressing race, gender, disability, and sexuality in the classroom? How do these websites explore the intersectional nature of identity, if at all? Given these research questions, the following themes emerged: the framing of law on these websites to justify accessible or Indigenous pedagogy, Indigenous tokenism, International and Indigenous students standing in for race and racial issues, and Intersectionality. I end this chapter by exploring the benefits that teaching and learning websites provide, including the presentation of Universal Design materials and Indigenous pedagogical materials. I also highlight a couple of areas where these websites could improve, especially with regard to the support of non-tenure-track faculty, who are the most precarious educators at universities and who are more likely to be disproportionally disabled and/or BIPOC.

A Note on Connecting Indigeneity and Disability

As a white settler, there are risks in examining Indigeneity and disability together. As I begin to argue in the last chapter, Indigeneity is often framed as a disability in itself, where Indigeneity becomes synonymous with deficit. Dian Million (2013) argues that indigenous people are represented as “therapeutic subjects” according to the TRC, where Indigenous cultures are the therapeutic solutions to the traumatizing process of settler colonialism (84). This representation recenters settler colonialism as the main framing device of Indigenous lives, and necessitates settler colonial therapeutic models—like talk therapy, erasing the potential of Indigeneity as culture and process apart from settler manipulation. Pathologizing Indigenous people as traumatized or mentally ill erases the ways that diagnoses of mental illness are part of the settler colonial process. That is, the medical system erases Indigenous knowledge systems in its education of doctors, framing healing processes differently than Indigenous peoples would. Further, as scholars working in environmental justice have shown, settler colonialism also allows water and land pollution to be closer to Indigenous communities, leading to the creation of disability within many communities (for example, see Waldron 2018). Naming only the disability, or especially seeing disability as an identity category to be celebrated, erases the ways that these systems disproportionally affect Indigenous peoples.

Disability is not present in many Indigenous languages, in part because in some Indigenous cultures and communities, bodily difference was not understood as lack. Heather Norris (2014) argues that Eurocentric worldviews involving independence, mind/body dualism and body/environment dualism, and normativity have erased the pre-contact Indigenous value-systems that would not have interpreted disability as necessarily negative. Similarly, Nicole Ineese-Nash (2020) argues that the label of disability is a colonial construct that works to further oppress Indigenous peoples by presenting them as deficient. Ineese-Nash (Anishnaabe) argues that “many Indigenous languages of Turtle Island (North America) have no word describing the concept of disability” (29), in part because many of these languages are “verb-based,” and also because names are based “to reflect the gifts that they carry or the responsibilities they hold within community” (29-

30). Rivas Velarde (2018) interviewed 18 Indigenous peoples with disabilities from Australia, Mexico, and New Zealand, finding similarly that Western understandings of disability as lack were missing from Indigenous frameworks. Siobhan Senier (2013) also argues that “traditionally, disability was not seen as such” in Mohegan culture (213). Bringing disability together with Indigeneity thus potentially reinforces the colonial construct of disability onto Indigenous people, even as their own languages do not recognize this form of deficit.

However, even given this language difference, Indigenous peoples are more than twice as likely to experience disability in their lifetime, in part because of ongoing colonialism that leads to environmental and social discrimination. As Indigenous scholars have noted, more work needs to be done to explicitly look at the intersections between Indigeneity and disability in order to recognize these experiences without reinscribing understandings of Indigeneity as itself deficit. Tricia McGuire Adams (2018; 2020), for example, argues that stories of Indigenous strength are more difficult to find than stories of Indigenous inability. For McGuire Adams, and many other Indigenous scholars, the exploration of Indigenous resistance and resilience is necessary to counter the many settler representations of Indigenous intellectual, mental, and physical inferiority. Laura Jaffee and Kelsey John (2018) agree that these negative representations are pervasive, but formulate an alternative connection between Indigeneity and disability, highlighting the disablement of Indigenous peoples alongside their environment. Jaffee and John (2018) argue that Eurocentric (settler) Disability Studies has created a separation between body and land/environment. The social model of disability, for example, argues that people are not disabled by their bodies, but by the disabling society in which they exist. Instead, Indigenous disability theory, according to Jaffee and John (2018) emphasizes the connections between bodies and their environment, erasing divisions between disablement and impairment: "Land appropriation, resource extraction, forced removal, erasure, and devastation by settlers are all forms of land disablement that invariably wreak havoc on the land, spirit, livestock, and bodies of Indigenous people" (1408). Disability justice that takes seriously an Indigenous ontology, therefore, does not just examine the disabling environment, but also advocates for resistance to disabling/debilitating systems like settler colonialism, while not erasing the important contributions of disabled bodyminds. Jaffee and John (2018) advocate for three intersections between Indigenous theories and disability theories: the "logic of elimination," a focus on "sovereignty," and "theorizations of futurity" (1409). Both disability scholars and activists are familiar with theories that challenge their elimination, advocate for their sovereign bodies/lands, and imagine futures that go beyond "including" disability and Indigeneity, instead centring the perspectives of Indigenous and/or disabled people.

In this chapter, I examine the intersections of Indigeneity and disability, in part because Teaching and Learning websites fail to imagine Indigenous disabled people. I examine these intersections not to pathologize Indigenous peoples or to frame them as unable, but to challenge service providers to acknowledge those who fall into both categories and to examine what kinds of ideas, perspectives and experiences might be Made visible by looking at these intersections. Educational institutions are especially guilty of both assuming Indigenous or disabled inferiority, while at the same time failing to properly account for Indigenous and disability difference. Courses and programs that do not account for Indigenous teaching and learning processes coincide with an institutional history that actively encourages white settler success, often at the expense of Indigenous students. Similarly, disabled students are encouraged to manage their own accommodations in the classroom, through services like the University of Ottawa's "Student Success Academic Service" (SASS). These services often depend on medical diagnoses for students to receive accommodations, something that many students cannot find the time, money, or social clout to access. Further, even after potentially receiving a diagnosis, Indigenous disabled people could still experience a refusal of their accommodations because of racism. Advocating for a future of education with disabled Indigenous students means recognizing the past and continuing disabling structure of education.

I frame the intersection between Indigeneity and disability also because of the data that I collected for this chapter. Teaching and learning websites frame both Indigeneity and disability as two kinds of identities that must be addressed or acknowledged more so than other identity groups. However, these groups are rarely framed together. Instead, Indigenous teaching and teaching with accessibility in mind are represented as entirely separate teaching traditions. The specificity of settler colonialism and its effects on Indigenous students, faculty, and staff at universities must not be erased based on a focus on disability. However, Indigenous peoples at Ontario universities might still benefit from disability resources and vice versa. Presenting these groups as entirely separate erases potential coalitions and benefits that could be gained from beginning from the intersection, rather than imagining only one kind of oppression at a time.

Challenges to education as liberation

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1970) constructs a vehement critique of the banking model of education, arguing that teaching involves the transformation of both student and teacher. While teaching is often constructed as a hierarchical relationship between the powerful teacher giving the less powerful student knowledge, Freire argues that knowledge is not so much exchanged as it is created. Through a dialogical relationship, students and teachers both create new forms of understanding between them, a relationship that can liberate both parties from hierarchy, rather than reiterating power. Freire's critique advocates for pedagogy that aims to instil critical thinking and resistance in students, rather than depositing knowledge into the minds of these students. He argues that the banking model of education benefits the oppressors, as it encourages the passivity of the oppressed and the recreation of the same kind of oppressive circumstances.

Since the initial publication of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire's work has been translated into a field of study within education called "critical pedagogy" that aims to demonstrate the liberating potential of education for oppressed students. However, while dialogical education may foster critical thinking, it still upholds a particular kind of pedagogy involving discussion between two equal participants. Throughout Canada's history, First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples have rarely been constructed as equal participants with white settlers. Indigenous ways of knowing have long been erased or delegitimized not just in the university, but in Canadian education more generally. Residential schooling was a system that aimed to erase Indigenous knowledge systems, languages, and cultures, presenting Canadian education as an intentionally abusive, restrictive, and unloving place (Marker 2015). Until the 1968, Indigenous people who pursued post-secondary education were forcibly enfranchised, meaning that they lost their legal Indian status and privileges associated with it, including the ability to live on reserves (Kovach 2009). According to Margaret Kovach (2009): “as with the general education policy, the underlying assumption was that a post-secondary education could deliver the Indian person to an acceptable level of whiteness, deliver him from his Indian identity” (161). Indigenous peoples have also long been researched, rather than expected or encouraged to be researchers. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) argues that “‘Research’ is probably one of the dirtiest words in the Indigenous world’s vocabulary” (1), mainly because of the ways that Indigenous research often signifies Indigenous peoples as researched, rather than researcher. While Freire’s thinking intends to counter representations of Indigenous knowledge as inferior, it may not go far enough in addressing that schools themselves and pedagogical practice itself depends on hierarchy.

Margaret Price (2010) and Jay Dolmage (2018) argue that universities are also built to exclude people with disabilities, especially those who are framed as not smart enough or not smart in the correct (white) ways. Different ways of knowing, including ways of knowing through the disabled body have long been erased or delegitimized within the academy. Physical structures and requirements for in-person and embodied forms of knowing and learning have restricted the learning potential of disabled people, forcing ablebodied supremacy as well as white heteropatriarchal supremacy. Jay Dolmage’s book *Academic Ableism* argues that the North American university was built in relation to other institutions that existed around the same time. He argues that while residential schools were built to solve the “Indian Problem,” almshouses were constructed for disabled populations, asylums were built for the “feeble-minded,” and prisons were built for “criminals,” universities were built to house those with the most desirable characteristics, i.e. the least “Indian,” disabled, feeble-minded, or criminal: “Thus the subjects in one total institution, the college, are elevated. The inmates in the other spaces are confined. Importantly: one studies, the other is studied” (4). Dolmage argues that the university keeps people out in various ways, including by having a large staircase as the front of its main doors. Using Harvard’s staircase as an example, he also argues that there are rhetorical staircases that keep undesirable people from being admitted as well.

Margaret Price (2010) writes about academic ableism from a number of different lenses. While many critical pedagogies that have aimed to highlight the learning process as shared between teacher and student, Price’s book *Mad at School* challenges critical pedagogy for implying that both are equally powerful or responsible for learning. What happens, she asks, if learners are not beginning with the same capabilities for reasoning? What if the skills that we are trying to foster through critical pedagogies are better accomplished through other means? More specifically, Price is interested in supporting those with mental disabilities in her classroom, not through individual accommodations, but through a universal design outlook that advocates that all students can learn, but not all students learn in the same ways. Disabilities are not necessarily the exception in higher learning, as they have so often been framed, but are the rule.

Acknowledging that some students are not necessarily beginning from the same abilities is perhaps especially risky when discussing Indigenous students, who have often been represented and interpreted as mentally or physically disordered, inherently beginning from a less intelligent culture and body. However, it is also dangerous to assume that these students can compete with white settler students when settler colonialism is ongoing. Indigenous students are exposed to systemic racism within universities, experiencing racism from professors and peers in micro and macro ways. Knowledge systems still depend on Western understandings of what research is, how research takes place, and who is qualified to do this research. This translates to unconscious biases in the classroom that should be explored or considered, rather than assuming that all students are beginning from the same state of consciousness or lived experience. Similarly, Price challenges the idea that in order to be a strong educator, educators must be "enlightened" or somehow have a strong consciousness themselves. Instead, she wonders how educational institutions might change if they acknowledged mental disabilities, not just in their students, but also in their faculty.

As I demonstrated in the first chapter, health disparities do exist because of colonialism within Indigenous populations. The TRC highlights the ways that the Canadian education system has also fostered health disparities within Indigenous communities:

> The health of generations of Aboriginal children was undermined by inadequate diets, poor sanitation, overcrowded conditions, and a failure to address the tuberculosis crisis that was ravaging the country's Aboriginal community. There should be little wonder that Aboriginal health status remains far below that of the general population. The over-incarceration and over-victimization of Aboriginal people also have links to a system that subjected Aboriginal children to punitive discipline and exposed them to physical and sexual abuse. (132)

Indigenous students, faculty, and staff in the Canadian university could therefore stand at the intersection of discriminatory policies towards Indigenous peoples and towards people with disabilities. Indeed, diminishing the health of Indigenous peoples was arguably another process involved in keeping Indigenous peoples out of the university. People with disabilities and people with chronic health issues have also long been researched rather than researcher, placed outside of the university walls. The active disabling nature of the Canadian state has the double effect of limiting Indigenous resistance and keeping Indigenous peoples out of positions of power within knowledge-giving institutions. Ableism and settler colonial white supremacy intersect within the walls of the university, complicating the claims to indigenization that many Canadian universities now make because of the TRC's calls to action.

Representing education as a part of Indigenous healing is also potentially flawed. Dian Million (2013) argues that representing Indigenous peoples as traumatized by the settler colonial state justifies further state intervention in the name of therapy or reconciliation (11). Therefore, when pointing to education as potentially healing, we need to be careful not to re-justify colonial universities in the name of therapy. Similarly, Leanne Betamosake Simpson (2017) argues that Indigenous education systems have existed since time immemorial, and do not depend on large settler-colonial institutions like universities (163). Pedagogy that aims to appropriate Indigenous knowledge systems in the name of therapy or reconciliation is another form of colonialism. Indeed, in 'Decolonization is not a metaphor," Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012) argue that Freire's critical pedagogy erases the specificity of Indigenous knowledge systems by lumping all oppressed groups together:

> Freire’s theories of liberation resoundingly echo the allegory of Plato’s Cave, a continental philosophy of mental emancipation, whereby the thinking man individualistically emerges from the dark cave of ignorance into the light of critical consciousness. (20)

In contrast, Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that Black feminists ground their knowledge in the darkness of the cave, and decolonization is “not converting Indigenous politics to a Western doctrine of liberation; it is not a philanthropic process of ‘helping’ the at-risk and alleviating suffering; it is not a generic term for struggle against oppressive conditions and outcomes” (21). Using pedagogy as a kind of liberation from colonization erases the importance of repatriating Indigenous land and knowledges, a process that does not necessarily begin in education, especially not education within a settler colonial institution.

Legislative responses to oppressive education

Two legislated changes in Canada have aimed to address the violence of education for students with disabilities and Indigenous students. In 2005, the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA) was enacted to improve accessibility for all people with disabilities living in Ontario, Canada’s largest province. Meanwhile in 2008, after the largest class action in Canadian history, Prime Minister Stephen Harper issued an official apology for Canadian residential schools. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) that followed found Canada guilty of “cultural genocide,” against Indigenous peoples in Canada because of its attempts to “kill the Indian within,” and its intentional restrictions to Indigenous knowledge dissemination in Canadian education. The TRC Commission put forward a number of Calls to Action, including many that named universities explicitly. Because of these two different regulatory policies—the legal framework of AODA and policy recommendations of the TRC— many universities are beginning to implement accessibility measures and shifts to Indigenize their campuses and curriculum. In the following two sections, I examine these two documents more closely to highlight their significance to teaching and learning in Ontario.

The Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)

The AODA frames accessibility requirements as incentives to "remove barriers" from people with disabilities, so that they can access social and physical services as well as other (presumably non-disabled) people. The Act aims to "make Ontario accessible by 2025" (1), and not just in public buildings but all commercial and social services. The Act claims that accessibility is "just good business", pointing to an aging Ontario population, as by 2013, "40% of all income" will be for people living with a disability, or people 55 years of age and over (1). While the Act does not necessarily subscribe to the medical model of disability, representing social and physical barriers as a social phenomenon that can be ameliorated through social programming, it reinforces divisions between those who need accommodation as an extra measure of accessibility, and those who do not. The "huge demographic" of people with disabilities is one that can be mobilized for profit when barriers are addressed. Framing disability as a profitable demographic implicitly acknowledges that accessibility measures have a cost and that people with disabilities are often framed as burdens within the system.

The AODA gives two main requirements for educators in Ontario: training and alternative format training materials. First, all employees in Ontario must take a training on the act itself as well as the section of the Human Rights Code that also applies to people with disabilities. Educators must also take an accessibility awareness training that outlines:

- Different types of disabilities
- Needs often associated with different types of disabilities
- Barriers students with disabilities encounter in schools
- Techniques that improve the learning environment for students with disabilities. (61)

The regulation does not specifically delineate the content of the training or how the training takes place, only that educational institutions are required to have training and that the completion of the trainings must be recorded. Some examples are given regarding accessibility measures in the classroom, including providing closed captions when presenting video, and having a virtual discussion option for people with physical disabilities. These examples are very broad and give a lot of leeway to the institution to decide what accessibility looks like. In the process, accessibility trainings might vary widely. More work is needed to track the accessibility training in Ontario universities, as it would be useful to examine how each university defines necessary accessibility needs.

Educators are secondly required to provide educational training materials in alternative formats when these are requested. The burden of requesting alternative format documents still rests on the student, or the guardian of the student, who "can notify educational or training institutions of their need for information in accessible formats" (57). Limited information is also given regarding the definition of accessible format in this section of the regulation, meaning that universities could potentially deny a need if it is requested improperly or if the need is not interpreted as an accessibility need. Little is given in the regulation regarding the method of requests, with little protection for the privacy of a student or employee with a disability.

The AODA is the first of its kind in Canada, creating a precedent around accessibility legislation. However, this legislation gives very few specifics around what making Ontario accessible by 2025 would actually look like. For example, making all businesses wheelchair accessible alone would take millions of dollars in infrastructure, a reality that the regulation does not acknowledge. Further, placing the responsibility of requesting accessibility measures in the hands of people with disabilities does not necessarily help to remove barriers. Unconscious bias is a large part of disability barriers that are not necessarily ameliorated when the responsibility of managing or accommodating is placed in the hands of people with disabilities. While it is useful and helpful to have an accessibility legislation that recognizes that people with disabilities do experience social and physical barriers to participation, this Act alone will not necessarily encourage educators to acknowledge disability as a form of difference in their classroom.

The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC)

In 2006, Canada lost the largest class action settlement in Canadian history because of its residential school system. Courts found that Canada was at fault for the abusive “education” that took place in residential schools across the country, where thousands were separated from their cultures, families, and subjected to physical, emotional, sexual, and psychological abuse. In 2008, The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was mandated as part of the results of the class action settlement. The commission took place over a span of six years, collecting testimony from over 6,500 witnesses (Canada 2015). In 2015, the TRC released its summary of the final report, as well as its entire 6-volume final report. Within the report, which outlines the experiences of living in a residential school and the Canadian government's participation in the abusive practices that took place there, the TRC also provides 94 Calls to Action as recommendations for ways to reconcile Canada's abusive colonial past.

In 2008, then Prime Minister Stephen Harper issued a public apology for the residential school system. One year later, in the context of comparing Canada to the United States, Harper Made the statement that "We also have no history of colonialism" in Canada ("Really, Harper, Canada has no history of colonialism?", n.p.). As many Indigenous scholars have noted, this dissonance is at the heart of "official" reconciliation efforts, a process that does not go far enough to acknowledge and fix the problems exemplified in the residential school system (Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2016). For example, Glen Coulthard (2014) argues that reconciliation presents colonialism as located in the past, something that Canada has now grown out of. Following the Calls to Action in the TRC is the very minimum action that Canadian governments and non-Indigenous people can do. The main Calls to Action that can be implemented in the level of education are 6-17, 23, and 62-65. These Calls include developing strategies to eliminate educational and employment gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians (7), developing culturally appropriate curricula (10 and 12), language rights (13-17), providing cultural competency training for all health care professionals (23), creating curriculum about Indigenous peoples' history (62), giving funding for universities to train educators about Indigenous knowledge systems (62), building student capacity for intercultural understanding (63), and providing public funding for religious studies comparisons, including Indigenous spirituality (64-65). While the TRC is not a legally binding document, its Calls to Action point to the minimum requirements for "Indigenizing" the university. In response, many universities have begun developing strategies regarding Indigenous students and faculty, and many of them have created requirements around Indigenous issues, including mandatory training for health care workers and lawyers, for example.

As noted above, the model of reconciliation that the Canadian state has promoted has been widely critiqued by Indigenous scholars who view the state's attempts to apologize as inadequate and its commission process re-traumatizing. Dian Million (2013), for example, argues that this retraumatization of First Nations peoples is convenient for the Canadian state that also controls therapeutic processes, therefore continuing to control and colonize Indigenous subjects now under the banner of apologies and reconciliation (22). The more recent Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (IMMIWG), that released its final report in June 2019, has been likewise criticized for following the methods of the Canadian state, including a short timeline that was not extended despite a formal request. Both commissions (TRC and IMMIWG) found Canada guilty of genocide, with the TRC bracketing this claim with the use of "cultural genocide" instead of naming this process outright. Both commissions have also been critiqued for outlining and explaining what Indigenous peoples have known for decades: that the Canadian state has been deliberately colonizing the Indigenous peoples on this land, often in violent and coercive ways.

The AODA and the TRC both encourage universities to recognize that education has been a discriminatory space for many Indigenous peoples and people with disabilities. While critical pedagogies represent education as liberating, teaching and learning services must grapple with the ways that education has not always been liberating for most. Further, both of these documents, the AODA and the TRC were written, not by people with disabilities or Indigenous peoples, but by representatives of the state. While Disability Studies scholars and Indigenous scholars have been pointing to the discrimination that exists within education for decades (see for example Barman et al. 1995; Battiste 2000; and 2005; Skrtic 1995; Ferri and Connor 2005), it is these pieces of institutional documents that have arguably led to the most "official" and institutional change. As I will explore below, many Canadian universities seem to incorporate these documents into institutional systems and norms, rather than seeing them as documents that challenge this system.

Diversity, equity, and inclusion

While the AODA and the TRC aim to address the violence of education for disabled and Indigenous students, the language of diversity, equity, and inclusion aims to address race and gender disparities within the education system as well. In 2019, the Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC) surveyed almost 15,000 first year university students from across Canada, finding that 65% are women, 44% self-identify as a member of a visible minority, 3% self-identify as Aboriginal, 24% self-identify as having a disability, and 11% are first generation students. These statistics point to a dramatic increase in the categories of those belonging to a visible minority and having a disability when compared to a previous CUSC survey in 2013 (36% self-identify as a visible minority and only 9% as having a disability) (CUSC 2019; CUSC 2013). These numbers often allow Canadian universities to claim diversity without making real structural change. As the numbers of students who self-identify as disabled or as a member of a visible minority rise, diversity becomes something that universities already inherently have, rather than something that they need to encourage or take part in. Indeed, when not claiming to already be diverse, the Canadian university often declares that it is working towards equity and inclusion. These words, of diversity, equity, and inclusion, often stand in for more complicated or messy terms, like colonialism, racism, sexism, or ableism, allowing the university to highlight only the positive aspects of its community and policies. Equity has been used in the Canadian context to differentiate Canadian university policies from American affirmative action policies, after the concept was explained by Judge Rosalie Silberman Abella (1984) to differentiate between equality as sameness and the real interventions needed to create real social change (Henry et al. 2017, pp. 10). The first uses of this term coincided with the enactment of The Human Rights Act in 1985, which prohibited discrimination based on gender, race, and disability.

However, much has been written about the failure of university claims of diversity, equity, and inclusion. Sara Ahmed's *On Being Included* (2013), for example, explores the ways that the language of "diversity" acts as a method of glossing over the issues of racism and sexism within the university. Policies do not necessarily represent real action around diversity in the university, but rather can sometimes become self-congratulatory ways to avoid real diversity change. Policies that are written around diversity often act as the action itself, rather than doing more on the ground diversity work. The language of diversity also becomes "an aesthetic style or way of 'rebranding' an organization" (53), rather than a commitment to addressing racism and sexism within the university. Ahmed points to diversity as a replacement for "equity" because of its rejuvenating possibilities for a marketing and marketable university (61-63). It is possible that equity, diversity, and inclusion all function in rotations of marketability for the university, allowing the university to claim its progressiveness.

The disparity between marketing and structural reform is detailed at length by Frances Henry, Peter Li, Audrey Kobayashi, Malinda Smith, Howard Ramos, and Dua Enakshi (2017) in *the Equity Myth*. The authors demonstrate that Canadian universities still fail to hire, equally pay, and promote BIPOC professors in comparison to their white colleagues. Racism and sexism are absolutely a part of university life, according to the *Equity Myth*, especially for those who exist at the intersections of oppressed identities. While the language of diversity focuses on the positive aspects of the university, it is the barriers that need to be addressed, rather than the successes: “This finding [that racialized faculty published more than white faculty] suggests that researchers concerned with social justice and equity need to concentrate on points of blockage and reasons for failure rather than on the path to success” (82). Claiming that BIPOC researchers, educators, and professors need only to work harder to achieve success, replaces the impacts of discrimination back onto the individual, rather than recognizing the institution’s part in supporting discriminatory practices.

Neoliberal cultural and economic norms are partly at fault for the ongoing racism and sexism within universities, as identity categories are not addressed outside of their marketable characteristics, leading racism, sexism, and ableism to fester. Henry et al. (2017) finds that “The general consensus of our research participants is that with the ascendance of neoliberalism and audit culture, Canadian universities’ commitment to equity and diversity has decreased and diversity hiring has, at best, stalled” (85). Precarity is emphasized for racialized faculty members who find themselves overworked and underpaid, with little job security in non-tenured positions. While the number of racialized and Indigenous students is increasing, the same commitment is not found at the professorial level, where part-time and adjunct professors are increasingly replacing tenure-track positions. A CBC article published in 2014 (Basen 2014) argued that it was then estimated that more than half of all undergraduates are taught by contract faculty. These faculty are not paid living wages, do not have benefit packages as strong as their tenure-track colleagues, are not guaranteed courses each semester, and, for the most part, are not given stipends for travel or research. In short, they are the university's precarious faculty. Given race-based barriers for promotion, non-tenured faculty are more likely to be BIPOC, women, disabled, or some combination of the three (see Canadian Association of University Teachers September 2018).

Adam Gaudry and Danielle Lorenz (2018a) interviewed 3 Indigenous academics, finding that while Canadian universities often frame reconciliation as possible through Indigenizing the university, their definitions of Indigenization do not necessarily line up with the definitions of Indigenous faculty. While the TRC's calls to action include a call to support Indigenous communities and Indigenous knowledge systems, Canadian universities are struggling to ethically engage with these two forms of change, instead often hiring more Indigenous faculty without real cultural shifts. Gaudry and Lorenz isolate three distinct uses of "indigenization": "Indigenous inclusion, reconciliation indigenization, and decolonial indigenization" (218). The first is a more "add Indigenous curriculum, faculty, and students" and stir model of indigenous inclusion, including Indigenous materials but not necessarily changing the colonial structure of the university (218). The second, reconciliation indigenization, counters the long Canadian tradition of assimilationist universities and does not repeat the same genocidal processes of the past, but still fails to enact real structural challenges to the colonial university (219). Finally, the third, decolonial indigenization, shakes the core of the university structure, demanding a new outlook within the university that does not rely on Eurocentric, white knowledge systems (219). While the majority of Indigenous academics interviewed by Gaudry and Lorenz were invested in the third use of indigenization, it seems clear that many universities are unwilling to invest concretely in a new knowledge system so counter to neoliberal settler culture.

Despite the failures of diversity and equity measures in Canadian universities, and the insufficiency of surface-level indigenization, Canadian universities continue to use the language of diversity, equity, and inclusion. In order to explore the ways that diversity, equity, and inclusion is framed within the university, in the following sections, I examine the websites of Teaching and Learning centres within Ontario universities, asking how diversity, equity, and inclusion is conceptualized on their websites. Because of the AODA, I will be focussing specifically on Ontario universities. Ontario is not the only province with accessibility legislation—both Nova Scotia and Manitoba have accessibility acts—but it is the only province that specifically mentions education and therefore the only province that requires accessible teaching and learning supports. While Canada has also recently passed accessibility legislation (Accessible Canada Act, 2019), given that education is a provincial area, this act has little impact on educational facilities or how education is provided. I have chosen websites, rather than individual policies, because I am interested in both how universities are framing their Teaching and Learning practices to those beyond the university walls and in what kind of resources they offer to their faculty members. While policies affect the operational activities of individual universities, websites present an image for those not necessarily affected by such policies. Though not necessarily representing the ways that BIPOC disabled people experience the university, website material about diversity, equity, and inclusion can help demonstrate how the university wishes to be seen with respect to its educators and its pedagogy. Websites also change often, with a large capacity for change and amelioration. While critiquing policies is a useful exercise, especially around questions of discrimination in the university, critiquing websites might create quicker, simpler changes at a low cost, potentially impacting policy, a more lengthy process. Engaging with website materials help clarify why certain university policies are in place, as these spaces also potentially act as pedagogy in themselves.

In the following sections, I explore the websites of all 21 universities in Ontario, more specifically examining the 15 that have Teaching and Learning websites (Algoma, Brock, Carleton, Lakehead, McMaster, Queen's, Ryerson, Trent, Guelph, Ontario Institute of Technology, Ottawa, Toronto, Waterloo, Windsor, and Western). I looked for the keywords of: diversity, inclusion (or inclusive), equity, disability, accessibility (or accessible), Indigenous (or Indigenizing or Indigneity), and race (or racism). While other words, like Black, justice, crip, or queer might have been helpful, these words were entirely absent from any website at all. I map out the keyword terms and how many clicks it takes to arrive at these words, beginning from the main Teaching and Learning centre page. I examined these websites between September 1, 2019 and October 31, 2019, checking each website at least 5 times for consistency. Since then, the number of clicks may have changed, or the wording that I cite here may have changed, given the fluctuating nature of website materials.

I take this methodology from Gabel et al. (2015) who examine disability and diversity on California State University (CSU) websites. Gabel et al. (2015) maps out how many clicks it takes to access disability or accessibility on CSU websites to demonstrate how accessible accessibility information might be to prospective disabled students. Gabel e al. (2015) main research question was "what does website content and navigation say about the constitution of disability on CSU websites?" (68). Similarly, I ask: "what does website content and navigation say about the constitution of disability as an intersectional category—including Indigeneity and diversity, equity and inclusion—on Ontario Teaching and Learning websites?" I examine how accessible diversity information might be for prospective educators or students who might be looking for teaching and learning resources. Beyond mapping the accessibility of these terms, however, I also analyse how many of these terms occur in relation to one another, and in relation to the legislation that sparked diversity, equity, and inclusion work in universities. While some of these websites do not mention diversity, equity, inclusion, or Indigeneity, it is unsurprising that accessibility is a vital concern. Accessibility becomes a simple way, especially when framed as a class checklist, for university educators to claim inclusivity, while not doing the more difficult and challenging work of asking their students about their needs, or decentring whiteness from their analyses. The legislation around accessibility also makes it clear that disability in educational spaces in Ontario must be considered and accommodated. Many websites given this simple reason, that it is the law, to justify including accessibility information.

I continue this chapter by looking to the number of Ontario university teaching and learning sites that use each of my keywords—of accessibility, disability, Indigenous, race, diversity, equity, and inclusion—and how many clicks it takes to find them. I ask how these words are used in relation the legislation that governs accessibility, Indigeneity, and human rights in Ontario and Canada as well as the ways that this language might affect educators and students within each respective university. Through these websites, I ask how university diversity, equity, and inclusion methods might not consider identity categories as intersecting. Instead, are Diversity/Equity/Inclusion, Indigeneity, and Accessibility framed as different and conflicting initiatives, even when placed under similar umbrellas? In the final section, I ask how this language might be changed to represent the real ways that educators must interact with all three initiatives together, overlapping and intersecting solutions to discriminatory education.

An overview of Teaching and Learning websites

Table 1

University	**Teaching Service name**	**Teaching and Learning website URL**	**Number of clicks**
Algoma	The Learning Centre	https://www.algomau.ca/academics/home-of-dean/teaching-learning/	Accessibility: 1 Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: No Disability: 1 Race: No
Brock	Centre for Pedagogical Innovation	https://brocku.ca/teaching-learning/	Accessibility: 1* Diversity: 6 Inclusion: 3 Equity: 6

			Indigenous: No Disability: 2 Race: No
Carleton	Teaching and Learning Services (TLS)	https://carleton.ca/teachinglearning/	Accessibility: 2 Diversity: 2 Inclusion: 2 Equity: 2 Indigenous: 2* Disability: 2 Race: No
Institute of Technology	Teaching and Learning Centre	https://tlc.ontariotechu.ca/index.php	Accessibility: 1* Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: No Disability: No Race: No
Laurentian	no distinct website, but "teaching and learning days"	N/A	N/A
McMaster	MacPherson Institute	https://mi.mcmaster.ca/	Accessibility: 2* Diversity: 3 Inclusion: 3 Equity: 3 Indigenous: 4 Disability: 3 Race: 3
Nipissing	no distinct website	N/A	N/A
OCAD	no distinct website	N/A	N/A
Queen's	Centre for Teaching	https://www.queensu.ca/ctl/home	Accessibility: No

	and Learning		Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: 1 Disability: No Race: No
Ryerson	Learning & Teaching	https://www.ryerson.ca/learning-teaching/	Accessibility: No Diversity: No Inclusion: 2 Equity: 1 Indigenous: 2 Disability: No Race: No
Trent	Centre for Teaching & Learning	https://www.trentu.ca/teaching/	Accessibility: 1* Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: 2* Disability: 3 Race: No
Guelph	OpenEd: Open Learning and Educational Support	https://opened.uoguelph.ca/	Accessibility: 1* Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: 1 Disability: No Race: No
Hearst	no centre	N/A	N/A
Ottawa	Teaching and Learning Support Service (TLSS)	https://tlss.uottawa.ca/site/en/	Accessibility: 1 * Diversity: 3 Inclusion: 3 Equity: 3 Indigenous: 3 Disability: 3

			Race: No
Toronto	Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation	https://teaching.utoronto.ca/	Accessibility: 2* Diversity: 3 Inclusion: 2 Equity: 2 Indigenous: 3 Disability: 2 Race: 4
Waterloo	Centre for Teaching Excellence	https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/	Accessibility: 2* Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: No Disability: 2 Race: No
Windsor	Centre for Teaching and Learning	https://www.uwindsor.ca/ctl/	Accessibility: No Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: 1 Disability: No Race: No
Western	Centre for Teaching and Learning	https://teaching.uwo.ca/	Accessibility: 1 Diversity: No Inclusion: No Equity: No Indigenous: 1* Disability: 2 Race: No
Wilfred Laurier	no distinct website, but "teaching and	N/A	N/A

	learning" page		

Table 2

University	Accessibility	Diversity	Inclusion	Equity	Indigenous	Disability	Race
Algoma	1					1	
Brock	1	6	3	6		2	
Carleton	2	2	2	2	2	2	
Tech	1						
McMaster	2	3	3	3	4	3	3
Queen's					1		
Ryerson			2	1	2		
Trent	1				2	3	
Guelph	1				1		
Ottawa	1	3	3	3	3	3	
Toronto	2	3	2	2	3	2	4
Waterloo	2					2	
Windsor					1		
Western	1				1	2	
Average	1.36363636	3.4	2.5	2.83333333	2	2.22222222	3.5

These tables outline how many clicks it takes to come to any given term. For example, if “Accessibility” or “Indigenous” takes place on the main page, I have indicated that it took a single click to arrive to this term: “1”. If those terms link to another page where “disability” or “race” is used as a term, I have indicated “2” on those terms. These numbers give a good overview of how easy it is to navigate into these terms. When any given term is not easy to find on the website without using the search function, I have indicated “No” or filled in the table. Within Table 1, I have also indicated which universities do not have teaching and learning websites, perhaps because they do not have teaching and learning centres. I have put a star next to each website that references the AODA when mentioning accessibility (*) and a star next to each website that references the TRC when mentioning Indigenous (*).

These tables are not meant to measure the capabilities of any given university. For example, I am not saying that because the University of Toronto has a website with each of these terms, it is a superior university. Like all of these universities, the University of Toronto has its own fraught relationship with "equity" groups or with marginalized populations. Just using the term or having the term on the university website does not translate to more equity work. Indeed, as Sara Ahmed (2013) highlights, these terms can function as stand-ins for actual labour towards better and more inclusive universities. Instead of comparing these universities, I compare these terms and how likely they are to be used. Together, this analysis illuminates one aspect of how Ontario universities understand and wish to be represented around diversity, accessibility, and Indigeneity work.

Accessibility is clearly the term most used of those I am analysing in this chapter, with only three universities with teaching and learning sites not including accessibility: Queen's, Ryerson, and Windsor. Indigenous comes second as a term often used on teaching and learning websites, with four universities not using the term: Algoma, Brock, Institute of Technology, and Waterloo. Indigenous and Accessibility are not used in the same list very often. Race is the term least often used, with only two universities referencing race: McMaster and Toronto, both using these terms in reference to another service or organization available outside of the Teaching and Learning centre itself (McMaster references a grass-roots anti-racist group, while Toronto links to its Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Office.) Inclusion is used sooner and more often than diversity or equity to describe classroom practices.

"It's the Law"

Of the universities that use the term “accessibility,” (n=12), 9 of them explicitly mention the AODA, and of the universities that use the term “Indigenous” (n=11), 4 of them explicitly mention the TRC. I have indicated these universities using an asterisk. For example, York university’s Teaching and Learning website largely gives links to other parts of their own website and links to other websites. Rather than giving an overview of why Indigenous issues are relevant to teaching and learning, their website links directly to the executive summary of TRC final report, a document that is over 400 pages long. It is unlikely that an educator looking for Indigenous resources would spend the time to read 400 pages, unless they were already working on this document for their research. York similarly links to the AODA, a document that is also over 400 pages long. These documents, while absolutely useful to link to, would be better served as source material for summaries, rather than quick links.

Pointing the finger to the law—indeed Brock university has a section on their accessibility page that simply says “IT’S THE LAW” (Brock 2019)—becomes a way of placing the necessary changes on the educator visiting the website, rather than the university taking responsibility over the application of this law. Laws, like policies, may seem stable and static, but are in practice much more subjective that they may seem. By placing this directive within teaching and learning websites, universities have done their due diligence, even if they have not described what this law means for their educators. The University of Ottawa links directly to the Accessibility office, rather than having a specific subsection for accessibility and Teaching and Learning. The implication here is that accessibility is not necessarily for educators at all, but rather for students to request accommodation. With respect to the TRC, universities can appear as though they are addressing the TRC's Calls to Action by simply referencing the document itself, rather than more specifically referencing a particular Call to Action or to Indigenous scholars who might advocate for changes to educational spaces.

<u>Indigenous Tokenism</u>

In *The Equity Myth*, Frances Henry and Audrey Kobayashi argue that BIPOC faculty are often expected to provide alternative "perspectives," that are representative of their race and ethnic origin. BIPOC faculty take on the burden of diversifying their faculty through attending committees and mentoring BIPOC students at higher rates than their white colleagues. They are asked to have their photographs taken for university websites, and to give workshops on racism in the university. After examining the websites listed above, I argue that this tokenization translates onto teaching and learning websites as well. For example, with the University of Ottawa's diversity and learning series uses the term "Indigenous perspective" without contextualizing the many diverse Indigenous peoples that exist today (University of Ottawa 2019). The singular "perspective" implies that there is only one way of being Indigenous and having an Indigenous perspective. Similarly, the University of Guelph's annual conference on teaching and learning on their teaching and learning website: "Perspectives on experiential learning: Experiential learning through an Indigenous perspective" encourages the viewer to imagine an entire conference on Indigenous forms of experiential learning. In reality, the conference includes an Indigenous scholar (Jennifer Ward, Umpqua and Algonquin) as its keynote whose Indigenous perspective is placed at the forefront of the website (Guelph 2019).

While the University of Toronto teaching and learning website includes resources for accessibility, international students, and "inclusive teaching," the website fails to include any information on Indigeneity (University of Toronto 2019). In fact, the only instance when "Indigenous" is used includes this term without reference to an Indigenous person at all. In the syllabus design & course information" section, a professor outlines how he includes inclusive pedagogy in his syllabus by writing:

> The atmosphere of the class should be as conducive as possible to positive inquiry and the free exchange of ideas—an Indigenous "harmony ethic" that gives all members of the community the opportunity to share their knowledge with others. (n.p.)

This idea of "an Indigenous 'harmony ethic'" erases the potential for real Indigenous pedagogical intervention, instead representing all Indigenous peoples under the banner of "harmony," a pan-Indigenous conception of Indigenous value systems. This method is also placed in quotation marks, implying that the words come from another source, yet that source is not cited. Perhaps an Indigenous thinker here is not only Made to represent all Indigenous peoples, but is also not given the credit that they deserve for their work. The website does not reference the TRC or the ways that the university has an obligation to make education more accessible and useful for Indigenous faculty and students.

The tokenization of Indigenous faculty has a counterpart in the classroom: the "Native informant." Sheila Cote-Meek (2014) demonstrates that many Indigenous students find themselves asked to perform Indigeneity or explain Indigenous cultures for the benefit of the classroom. Representing the "Indigenous perspective" on teaching and learning websites could lead to expecting more from Indigenous students, who may not know much about their own cultures, given a long history of removing Indigenous children from their communities. Cote-Meek also highlights how learning about the residential school system can be a painful experience for many Indigenous students, some of whom may have even attended these schools themselves. Separating Indigenous issues from the issues of trauma, disability, or health may erase the potential harms that come from teaching about or erasing ongoing colonialism in Canada.

While Brock university does not have a particular Indigenous section of its teaching and learning website, it does include a land acknowledgement in its experiential education section on “The Brock University Labyrinth”:

> Brock acknowledges that it is on the traditional lands of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinabe peoples and traditional shared hunting and gathering grounds of many nations. We are grateful for the opportunity to build a labyrinth that can be inclusive of many cultures and ways of being. (Brock University, 2019, n.p.)

This moment, like the University of Toronto website’s reference to Indigenous culture, does not do justice to the ways that Brock profits from the land on which it stands. Especially with regard to its labyrinth series, that builds new structures into the land, referencing that the land is not Brock’s seems like a strange action. While they built the labyrinth to be accessible, it is still on Brock campus, a space that is inaccessible to many who have experienced educational spaces as traumatic. Carleton also acknowledges the territory on which it sits on its teaching and learning website in the welcome page from the Associate Vice-President of Teaching and Learning, David J. Hornsby: “I am excited to serve as Carleton’s Associate Vice-President, Teaching and Learning. Carleton is a dynamic institution, located on traditional and unceded Algonquin territory, that places students at the centre of our research and teaching practices" (Carleton 2019, n.p). This short excerpt glosses over the territorial claims of the Algonquin peoples, while highlighting the university's main mission statement. As I have demonstrated in the first chapter, Indigenous scholars and community members argue that land acknowledgements are only useful when they coincide with real institutional change (see Couture 2019; Robinson 2019; Ruffo 2019; Ravensbergen 2019; Hill 2019; Daigle 2019). By including land acknowledgements, without addressing or citing the work of Indigenous scholars, these institutions are taking on the performative aspects of land acknowledgements without addressing the real ways that education needs to be changed.

International and Indigenous Students standing in for race

Ahmed (2013) argues that race and racism are not referenced in university materials because these are not positive words that the university can use to market itself. These words can be contrasted with words like diversity, equity, and inclusion that the university uses more often in order to present itself as a progressive space. While diversity remains a very popular word for teaching and learning websites (appearing on 6 websites), inclusion (or inclusive) is even more popular (appearing on 7 websites) and is easier to access, with fewer clicks—diversity takes an average of 3.4 clicks while inclusion takes an average of 2.5 clicks. Ahmed (2012) argues that diversity took over for the language of equity as the term used most often in universities; however, it is possible that inclusion has since taken over for this word. On the one hand, inclusion becomes an action that an educator takes on by actively including—rather than just waiting for diversity to take place in the classroom as a passive circumstance. On the other hand, inclusion indicates that the educator is being kind or going above and beyond by including particular students that are deemed regularly unincluded. Without an analysis that involves race, inclusion can be a way of pointing out the BIPOC or disabled students in the classroom as anomalies that need “extra attention”. Thinking of BIPOC or disabled students as trouble or problem students reinforces ableist representations of BIPOC people as inherently unintelligent or disruptive.

With the exception of McMaster which links to an Anti-Racism initiative founded by BIPOC students (McMaster 2019), race is rarely mentioned on teaching and learning websites. Instead, a variety of terms are Made to stand in for race. For example, Waterloo university does not reference race on its teaching and learning website, but does have a section specifically about “Internationalizing your department” (Waterloo 2019). Similarly, Western university has a section devoted to “Working with Indigenous Students,” as well as a section on “International and New Resident Grad Students” (Western 2019). Naming these students without an analysis of race and racism highlights them as “problem cases” that university faculty might need to manage or address in special or particular ways. The University of Toronto likewise has a section about international students within their section on “Inclusive Teaching”. Website visitors are directed to the university’s Anti-Racism and Cultural Diversity Office and Sexual and Gender Diversity Office, rather than given resources on the teaching and learning website itself (University of Toronto 2019).

International students pay higher tuition fees than domestic students, making them important marketing points in any university space. These fees are similarly high no matter where these students come from, with international students coming from Global South or Global North locales. Replacing “international” with race is not entirely accurate, as some international students are white and Anglophone, while others have difficulties in English (or French) because this is their third or fourth language. Universities often use international students to stand in for conversations of diversity without acknowledging the other gains (fees) that they receive from these students.

For the most part, Indigeneity, disability, and Internationalism are represented on these websites as something that the students have/are, while faculty are assumed not to be Indigenous, disabled, or International. There is a distinct lack of resources on teaching with an “accent”, for example, or teaching without your cultural background represented in the universities’ values. There is similarly a lack of resources for teaching with a disability, as accessibility is referenced as something that educators must learn to integrate into their teaching for their students with disabilities. Disability, internationalism, and Indigeneity are therefore set up as points of inclusion, things that need to be added into the classroom because they are not already there, or expected to be there. Educators must perform extra activities to maintain inclusion, activities that are not necessarily mandated, but are included as encouraged teaching points. By emphasizing accessibility, indigenization, and internationalization, rather than offering analysis of discrimination based on disability or race, the university can claim its positive inclusive practices, rather than aiming to ameliorate its failings.

Inclusion has also been critiqued by Indigenous scholars, including Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill (2013) who argue in “Decolonizing Feminism,” that including Indigenous thinkers should not be the main goal of feminism:

> We argue that allying one’s self with feminism should not require consenting to inclusion within a larger agenda of whiteness; indeed, we believe that Native

> feminist theories demonstrate that feminisms, when allied with other key causes, hold a unique potential to decolonize the ascendancy of whiteness in many global contexts. (11)

Including Indigenous feminisms within more mainstream feminisms can be compared with including Indigenous students within a more mainstream—white settler—classroom. Such inclusion does not challenge the white supremacy of this classroom, but rather reinstates white settler knowledge as the default important knowledge base. Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill (2013) point to Indigenous feminist theories that can help challenge white mainstream feminism, by acknowledging the intersections of settler colonialism on BIPOC students and faculty. While heteropatriarchy and heteropaternalism solidified gender roles within a settler colonial Canada, ableism also impacts Indigenous peoples by equating alternative knowledge production with disordered minds. Accessibility is not just for white settler students with disabilities, but also for those whose culture does not align with white settler education systems. Accessibility needs to be taken from a more intersectional standpoint.

Intersectionality

Sirma Bilge (2013) argues that intersectionality has been institutionalized into the neoliberal university through women's studies and gender studies departments that still refuse to centralize race. While intersectionality is a theory and methodology that began with the work of Black feminists and other women of colour, Bilge argues, it has become diluted by institutions that mobilize intersectionality to legitimize the work of mostly white scholars. Erasing race, for example by using "international" or "Indigenous" as stand-ins for racism or race, is one example of how the misuse of intersectionality has allowed white supremacy to continue in universities. At no point is the university ready to admit that racism continues in its classrooms; instead, it can recommend inclusion, with the implication that Indigenous and International students just need to be better "included" in classrooms.

Beyond thinking through the implications of "inclusion," intersectionality also aims to emphasize the ways that categories of identity can intersect and co-exist. This means not only writing the words "race" and "gender" but acknowledging that processes of race and gender are inseparable, such that the ways that femininity, for example, is constructed depends on what kind of femininity we are imagining. Gender, race, disability, and sexuality exist in every individual, not as separate categories, but as categories that exist together and twist into how we see our colleagues and our students. Patricia Hill Collins (2000) argues that intersectionality is vital because of the "matrix of domination" that exists for oppressed groups. That is, intersecting oppressions create a matrix of domination that do not only hit on individual points of identity, but interact with the other identity categories as well. Collins gives the example of Black women's sexuality as impacted by the matrix of domination alongside religion, ethnicity, and language. We can see how the matrix of domination is also applied to Indigenous students who may also experience their gender, sexuality, ability, and culture as oppressed within a settler colonial state and white settler university space. Accessibility should arguably go beyond accommodation to recognition of the matrix of domination, addressing the many different ways that students experience disabling education systems.

Within teaching and learning websites, intersectionality is not integrated into how identity is represented. That is, when identity is referenced, it is through a single axis of oppression. Accessibility and Indigeneity in particular do not intersect in how these websites represented services or identities. Indigenizing the university, according to these websites, does not involve disabilities, despite work from the TRC and from Indigenous scholars emphasizing that Indigenous health is implicated in education. The one exception to this lack of intersectionality on teaching and learning websites is on McMaster University's Faculty Accessibility Resource Guide, that references a grassroots initiative started by BIPOC McMaster students. This Anti-Racism Initiative emphasized the intersectionality of disability:

> Intersectionality of Disability:
>
> ●More holistic sensitivity training, including de-escalation techniques for police with a focus on interacting with civilians who have visible or invisible disabilities, or undisclosed histories of mental illness
>
> ●More funding into educational institutions (Hamilton Wentworth District School Board, McMaster University, Mohawk College, Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board, etc.) for creating Critical Disability Studies curriculum and Mad Studies curriculum to address the stigma around mental health and disability
>
> ●City investment into increasing financial access to basic medical care and expanding the definition of basic medical care to include mental health services and counsellors (more access to psychiatrists, which can be costly). (2)

These recommended changes to the McMaster teaching community recognize the ways that racism is directly related to ableism, especially for BIPOC students. Teaching critical Disability Studies is here emphasized as one way to enact anti-racism in university classrooms.

Praise where it is due

Teaching and learning websites allow educators to quickly scan through teaching resources, as well as helping students manage their education. These centres are not necessarily heavily funded, usually with a relatively small staff in order to help the entirety of the university. This chapter is not meant to dismiss the difficult work of the few who are maintaining and supporting teaching and learning at their universities; rather it explores how these websites represent identities, and to see whether the language of diversity, inclusion, and equity allows for more accessible and Indigenized classrooms. While I have explored many of the ways that these websites reproduce institutional ableism, racism, and settler colonialism in their treatments of accessible, inclusive, and Indigenized classrooms, it is important to note the many resources that these spaces do include.

Universal Design

For example, Universal Design (UD) in classrooms was encouraged in a number of the websites that I examined, including Brock and Carleton. According to Roberta Null, a specialist in UD, UD is a term that “was first used in the 1970s by the staff at the Center for Accessible Housing at North Carolina State University. Its earliest and most important promoter was Ron Mace [...]. [Mace] said that one of the most important changes brought about by the use of universal design was the elimination of the special needs label” (Null 2014, pp. 2). Unlike accommodation models of disability, UD places the emphasis on the space, activity, or pedagogy to be universally designed for all users, regardless of mental or physical ability. Research has shown that UD can help students, regardless of whether they have a disability or not (see Vitelli 2015). UD is also a practical alternative to accommodation models because "using UD to redesign the project courses changed content delivery to meet student needs proactively rather than reactively, and as a result, in most of the project courses retrofit accommodations were no longer necessary" (Smith and Buchannan 2012, pg. 263). Universal design, especially when it considers race and colonialism, can be especially helpful for disabled students.

Guelph University provides a free module on UD through its teaching and learning website that gives a quick overview of what UD is and how it can be implemented into university teaching. As part of this module, UD is described as promoting "equity not sameness,":

> For the most part, we realize that we have a very diverse student population with different languages, cultures, genders and age groups. As instructors we try to ensure we use appropriate language that does not discriminate against one group, or incorporate examples into our courses that are more inclusive. (Brock University, n.d. n.p.)

UD is here represented as a way of integrating gender, culture (here standing in for race, religion, country of origin, and other differences associated with internationalism), disability, and age. While this moment considers the intersectional identities of students, it does not go into more detail as to how to implement an equity model through UD. The module on UD encourages multimodal materials when educating: providing information in multiple different formats for students and allowing students to express their learning in multiple different ways. While this is again a useful exercise and does help students learn, it does not necessarily address experiences of race or gender inequity in the classroom.

The University of Guelph also provides resources regarding UD on their teaching and learning website. They provide a checklist of considerations for course design according to the UD principles, including a checkmark relegated to “consider gender, culture, disabilities, learning preferences, language and experiences, prior learning” (Guelph 2019, 3). Again, while it is useful and promising to encourage educators to consider gender and culture (again, here standing in for race), exactly what it might mean to consider gender and culture in the design process is unclear if these were the only resources available. Within the UD resources given, culture becomes something outside of the professor, something to consider and address rather than something that exists in all classrooms already. Similarly, gender becomes code for women or for gender-diverse people as something that needs to be considered and integrated into classrooms, rather than something that already exists within the class. Rachel Gorman (2013) argues that Universal Design for Learning (UDL) does not adequately address differentials of racial inequality in the classroom, forcing BIPOC students to request additional accommodations within systems that do not represent BIPOC students as adequately disabled to receive these accommodations. Rather than imagining gender and race as something separate than disability, it is necessary to consider race and gender and their co-constitutive functions with disability, debility, and capacity. That is, how do cisgender or white settler students benefit from representations of the universal?

The University of Toronto teaching and learning website links to a document written by Sheryl Burgstahler, a director of accessibility services, that also advocates for UD in teaching. The first tenet of UD that she highlights is “Equitable use” that includes “formats accessible to people with a broad range of abilities, disabilities, ages, racial, and ethnic backgrounds" (1). This document again does not qualify what it might look like to make information accessible to people with disabilities, or of different ages, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, but does encourage adopting "practices that reflect high values with respect to both diversity and inclusiveness" (4). More information is needed from these websites regarding how to better integrate race, gender, and disability into UD.

Indigenous Resources

A number of teaching and learning websites also contain resources for thinking about Indigenous pedagogy that provide useful guidelines for teaching with Indigenous understandings. For example, Lakehead's teaching and learning website includes 59 different pages of Indigenous resources, including guides to teaching science, math, and other disciplines with an Indigenous perspective in mind (Lakehead 2019). One page links to a poster that lists the First Peoples Principles of Learning according to the First Nations Education Steering Committee:

- Learning ultimately supports the well-being of the self, the family, the community, the land, the spirits, and the ancestors.
- Learning is holistic, reflexive, reflective, experiential, and relational (focused on connectedness, on reciprocal relationships, and a sense of place).
- Learning involves recognizing the consequences of one's actions.
- Learning involves generational roles and responsibilities.
- Learning recognizes the role of indigenous knowledge.
- Learning is embedded in memory, history, and story.
- Learning involves patience and time.
- Learning requires exploration of one's identity.
- Learning involves recognizing that some knowledge is sacred and only shared with permission and/or in certain situations. (n.p.)

This resource is meant for the K-12 level, but can still easily apply to the university level. These guidelines were written in response to the TRC report and the acknowledgement that education and learning has often been a violent process for Indigenous peoples. This resource is also intersectional in its emphasis on wellbeing in connection to education and learning processes. While the TRC shows that Indigenous health was and is diminished by colonial practices within education, learning here is redefined not against this colonial violence, but with Indigenous resurgence in mind. Redefining learning as something that necessarily "supports the well-being of the self, the family, the land, the spirits and the ancestors" emphasizes the refusal of conditions that continue to harm. This resource also emphasizes that not all knowledge can be shared. For many Indigenous communities sacred knowledges cannot be shared without proper permission from Elders or other leaders. Similarly, as non-Indigenous settlers take up the labour of teaching Indigenous students, we must be aware of the limits of our own pedagogical practice and be prepared when Indigenous-lead education does not involve us.

It is unsurprising that Lakehead University takes Indigenous teaching and learning seriously, given that it was also the first university in Ontario to apply an Indigenous Content Requirement (ICR) for its undergraduate students. By the beginning of the 2016/2017 academic year, all undergraduate students have to complete a 0.5 Full Course Equivalent course in order to graduate. It is the only Ontario university to fully implement an Indigenous Content Requirement; however, York University, Queen's University, and Trent University have a content requirement for their respective Faculty of Education programs, and the Ontario Institute of Technology has committed to pursuing other measures of Indigenous education, like integrating Indigenous Knowledge into already required courses. Lakehead's commitment to an Indigenous Content Requirement means that Indigenous resources are vital for its teaching staff and students, who must fulfill this requirement regardless of their discipline of study. Thinking through Indigenous health and its connection to processes of colonialism in Canada might be a good way that this content requirement would highlight the intersectionality of disability.

ICRs have been criticized for potentially exacerbating an already overworked Indigenous faculty (Gaudry and Lorenz 2018b). Adam Gaudry and Danielle E. Lorenz (2018b) argue that while there is a lot of promise in ICRs, they could also stand in for other more substantial changes within the university. These courses are still situated within universities that uphold Western knowledge structures and support imperialist research, including neoliberal policies. Gaudry and Lorenz conducted surveys of 44 indigenous educators about how they feel about ICRs, concluding that while the vast majority are optimistic about the effects of ICRs, the main concern was regarding the audience of ICRs. While ICRs are often represented as being for everyone at the university, these courses are not necessarily helpful for Indigenous students and faculty. Indigenous students are still sometimes put on the spot as "Native Informants," while Indigenous faculty still have the burden of negative course evaluations, often because non-Indigenous students are unhappy with a requirement that they might feel is unnecessary. Gaudry and Lorenz (2018b) argue that universities need to go beyond ICRs in order to truly Indigenize the academy.

Going beyond inclusion to intersectionality

While inclusion has become the main word of choice for teaching and learning centres across Canada, inclusion is not an adequate classroom methodology according to intersectional disability perspectives. That is, inclusive practices still centre one kind of student—white settler ablebodied students—as the normal and natural subject in the classroom, while others must be actively “included”. In this final section, I propose changes to teaching and learning websites based on Indigenous and crip pedagogies. These changes cannot fully address the ways that teaching and learning needs to re-centre Indigeneity and disability. In fact, some have argued that the history of the university’s discrimination against people with disabilities, Indigenous peoples, Black peoples, and People of Colour cannot be reconciled or fixed (for example, see Grande 2018). The university system is arguably still based on a white supremacist ableist system that prioritizes the needs of white settler ablebodied students. Whether or not others are included does not and will not change this reality.

However, the university teaching and learning websites could still do a better job of addressing the necessary work of ameliorating ableist practices in the classroom. Acknowledging the precarious working environment of part-time and adjunct faculty, while also addressing the Indigenous students and educators with disabilities, is difficult but necessary. Part of this work may involve encouraging and extending website materials about universal design. Mitchell and Snyder (2014) argue that “cripistemologies”—ways of knowing that come from a disabled standpoint—can be fostered in the classroom through universal design. By beginning from a position of failure or of break, they argue we can queer education beyond neoliberal conceptions of inclusion. One way that this could be encouraged on teaching and learning websites is to push beyond “diversity, equity, and inclusion” language, instead using the words of identity itself. Encouraging students and educators to reimagine disabled, BIPOC, queer/trans, and female identity as a point of knowledge rather than of need or burden, can be something that all classrooms could aim to include. When it comes to the check-lists that many universities provide regarding Universal Design, it might also be helpful to have funds available for part-time and adjunct professors to create fully accessible materials, including training regarding particular pieces of technology. Asking non-tenured educators to "include" increases the burden of teaching large classrooms without adequate pay. Non-disabled, white contract faculty may also become embittered by the prospect of "including" these "other" identities, thus reinforcing prejudice rather than easing it. Unpaid training on accessibility can also be inaccessible for non-tenured professors, especially those who are BIPOC and/or disabled themselves, because of lower pay and fewer benefits.

Similarly, Indigenous pedagogies must be adequately funded and supported by Indigenous peoples themselves. Indigenous scholars and educators are already over-burdened by the tokenization of their cultures. One way to integrate Indigenous pedagogy into teaching and learning websites might be by thinking through the relationship that Canadian universities have with the land on which they sit. How does the University of Ottawa, for example, support colonialism or decolonization? Beyond just giving a land acknowledgement—which is also something that many websites lack—all universities can more honestly acknowledge their history of residential school involvement, land acquisition, and research funding that has had ties to discrimination against Indigenous peoples and people with disabilities. Tuck and Yang (2012) argue that decolonization cannot be only within the pedagogy or the mind, but must also be represented in the repatriation of land (7). How is each of these universities repatriating land to Indigenous peoples? Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017) points to land pedagogy as an Indigenous methodology for learning, arguing that the land on which we stand can help us learn and teach. Land pedagogy does not translate to more appropriation of land by white settlers, but instead emphasizes a deep connection to a history with land, climate, non-human animals and non-animal living things. Being careful to emphasize the particular Nation that rightfully inhabits the land on which each university exists is a small first step to repatriating this land.

A universally designed classroom would already recognize the Indigenous claims to land, and would also emphasize Indigenous knowledge systems and cripistemologies. To encourage such a classroom, websites could also include the history of intersectionality as a Black feminist concept. As Bilge (2013) argues, intersectionality has been widely co-opted by universities without acknowledging the important contribution of Black feminists. During this process, race has also been erased as a pedagogical concept in need of addressing. Bringing race, not just Indigeneity or Internationalism, back into the university teaching and learning website means also integrating critical race theory. For example, including a working guide on white privilege might be a helpful resource for white settlers who do not understand their own part in white supremacy. Similarly, including materials on gender-neutral language, proper disability terminology, and some nearby Indigenous Nations might be a helpful pedagogical tool for all educators and students. Creating spaces or workshops for BIPOC educators to come together without white settler input might also be a helpful resource specifically for BIPOC educators.

These proposed changes to university websites will not change the overall teaching culture in any given university, and will not necessarily Indigenize or crip the university. However, these changes may entice more educators to begin the process of self-reflecting around their pedagogy with respect to BIPOC and/or disabled students and with their own part in white supremacist ableist systems. In many ways, I expand upon these recommendations further in chapters four and five, giving more recommendations regarding Universal Design, including what happens when access needs conflict in the classroom.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, I outline how education can be disabling for Indigenous peoples and disabled peoples especially, despite university's claims to be accessible and "Indigenizing". While critical pedagogies frame all students as beginning from the same capabilities for learning, Indigenous and disabled theorists argue that structural inequities make it necessary to recognize that BIPOC and/or disabled students do not necessarily begin from the same capabilities. By demonstrating the inaccessibility of higher education both for BIPOC disabled students and faculty, I highlight how necessary alternative pedagogies are to higher education. Universities must be radically altered in order to properly "include" BIPOC disabled peoples, despite claims that this inclusion is already taking place.

As I outline, institutional responses to the AODA and the TRC have often allowed universities to claim that they are diverse and inclusive, despite a lack of structural changes. As many scholars argue, both the AODA and the TRC recommendations are the bare minimum in changes that Ontario universities need to make in order to make themselves more inclusive and accessible. While most Ontario universities reference the AODA and/or TRC on their teaching and learning websites, a lot of work is still needed before these centres can truly support their Indigenous and disabled students and faculty. I have outlined some major themes that teaching and learning centre websites include that demonstrate the work still needed to be done, including referencing the law without explaining or qualifying this law, tokenizing Indigenous people, International or Indigenous standing in for race, and a lack of Intersectionality. I have also pointed to some useful resources on these websites, including Universal Design and Indigenous resources. I have ended by pointing to some changes that can be immediately implemented on teaching and learning websites to better integrate Indigenous and disabled ways of knowing and learning.

This chapter primarily pointed towards Indigenous scholarship and Indigenous pedagogy in its examination of Teaching and Learning websites. The next chapter reflects instead on Black feminist scholarship and Black feminist pedagogy to examine the criminalization of Blackness on university campuses. While Chapter Two looked specifically to Teaching and Learning websites, Chapter Three examines university policies, specifically the University of Ottawa’s Policy 33, Policy 119, and Policy 67a in reference to an explicit moment of anti-Black racism on University of Ottawa campus. In focussing on anti-Black racism and its connections to ableism, Chapter Three more explicitly challenges the university as an institutionally violent space. However, like Chapter Two, Chapter Three offers changes to university structures to better ameliorate issues of inaccessibility and racism within the university space.

Chapter Three: Policing Education: the Criminalization of Blackness on University Campuses as an Accessibility Issue

Introduction

On June 14, 2019, Jamal Koulmiye-Boyce was detained while on the University of Ottawa campus, carded, handcuffed, and harassed by campus security. Koulmiye-Boyce, a Black student, had been skateboarding when campus security approached him; they demanded to see his student identification, and threatened to "arrest [him] right now" if he did not walk off campus (Koulmiye-Boyce 2019). When he informed them that he did not have his wallet with him, they followed him, making him feel increasingly uncomfortable, until they handcuffed him and put him under arrest. He was kept on campus, in handcuffs, for over an hour before being released. The campus security officers claimed that he should not have been doing tricks while skateboarding, but while he was in handcuffs, another white student skateboarded nearby.

This moment of blatant anti-Black racism on my own campus was followed by a media storm, a public apology from the university president, and a number of university policy changes. An independent investigator—Esi Codjoe— was hired to conduct an investigation for two purposes, first to examine:

> 1) the incident that took place on Wednesday June 12, 2019 involving a University of Ottawa student and the University of Ottawa Protection Services; and 2) make determinations of fact as to whether Policy 33-Security and Trespass to Property Act or any applicable other regulation were appropriately applied during this incident in accordance with the law, human rights and best practices in the sector. (Codjoe 2019, 5)

Codjoe published two reports, one on September 13, 2019 (Codjoe 2019) and another on January 28, 2020 (Codjoe 2020). Immediately after the incident took place, Policy 33, the policy in play during the incident, was amended, adding in a provisional clause that clarified that carding was to be conducted only in specific cases.[3] However, even after these minimal policy changes were implemented, more moments of anti-Black racism were confirmed, including Wiliston Mason, a Black Community Advisor (CA) being carded while trying to enter his residence building. As a CA, Mason has access to the list of building residents—the campus security personnel do not— yet he was asked to prove that he lived there. These two moments, that occurred within a four-month period, coincided with other moments beyond the University of Ottawa that highlight the University of Ottawa's understanding of Black men as threatening and unwelcome on university campuses. For example, on June 2, 2019, Shelby McPhee was falsely accused of stealing a laptop while attending The Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences 2019 at the University of British Columbia; the fellow conference-goers who accused him followed him harassed him, recorded his movements, and took photos of him. On October 17, 2019, Ebenezer Azamati was dragged by security out of an Oxford University Student Union debate. Azamati is Blind and had arrived early to make sure that he would have an accessible seat, concerned that accessible seats would not be readily available. He left and returned, only to be refused entry, and eventually, after he had help returning to his seat, was removed by security. The Oxford Union brought Azamati to a disciplinary hearing for refusing to leave the meeting without struggle (Hayes 2019). These moments of anti-Black racism on university campuses highlight the

---

[3] This amendment did not change any wording of the actual policy, instead linking one provision to a provisional clause clarifying the part of the policy in effect at the time of Koulmiye-Boyce's detainment.

inaccessibility of universities for Black students, within a system that is structurally disabling and debilitating for Black people, capacitating white scholarship and scholars on campus.

In the previous two chapters, I examined recent work in the fields of critical race informed Disability Studies (Chapter One), and materials created for University Teaching and Learning websites related to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI); accessibility; and “Indigenization” (Chapter Two). In the process, I outlined how education is not necessarily emancipatory, especially for those who do not fit the model of “normal” learner. In Chapter Two, I argued that while recent changes in legislation have encouraged an Indigenized and accessible university structure, these changes are not enough for those who exist at the intersection of Indigenous and disabled. Indigeneity and disability represent two forms of identity that have long been studied, rather than Indigenous and/or disabled people performing the act of study. In other words, education has been a dangerous place for Indigenous, disabled, and disabled Indigenous peoples. In this chapter, I turn my focus to the specificity of anti-Black racism and its intersection with disability as a socially constructed category. I examine anti-Black racism through the case study of the University of Ottawa to argue that ableism and white supremacy coexist within a matrix of domination as represented by the securitization of universities within the neoliberal era. Carding Black students on university campuses, and encouraging campus security to view themselves as police, is an accessibility issue, tightly connected to perceptions of Blackness not only as threatening but also as unintelligent or unworthy of university education. The legacy of eugenics still exists within the policing of Black lives on university campuses. Campus security acts as a barrier to participation for Black people who have been labeled and branded as unwelcome in locations of higher learning.

The scholarship examining disability and Blackness in education often focuses on Special Education in K-12 schools, where Black students are disproportionally diagnosed with learning disabilities and segregated into alternative schools or classrooms (see for some examples: Adjei 2018; Annamma 2016; Artiles 2013; Blanchett et al. 2009; Ferri and Connor 2005; Robson et al. 2018; and Vallas 2009). Black students are deemed to be unruly or dangerous in classrooms, even when they are five or six years old. The overlapping perceptions of Blackness as threatening and as unintelligent or otherwise incapable of learning, leads to criminalization after schooling. Scholarly work about the School to Prison Pipeline gives clear evidence that Black students are funnelled from special education into jails or prisons, especially within the United States (see for some examples Annamma 2016; 2015; Heitzeg 2016; Love 2014; and Wun 2016a and 2016b). Subini Ancy Annamma (2017) argues that this metaphor of “pipeline” does not adequately describe the ways that prisoners of colour experience being bounced between institutions, instead she argues that Erica Meiners (2007) has a better word to describe the complex relationship that BIPOC experience between school and prison: the “school-prison nexus” (6). Here in Canada, the relationship between school and prisons remain similar for BIPOC, as Black people are overrepresented in both Special Education and the prison system (Maynard 2017); in Canada, “while Black people account for just under 3 percent of the Canadian population, they accounted for 9.3 percent of the federal prison population in 2011/2012” (Balfour and Comack, 2014, 63) or “three times their rate of representation in general society” (Tetrault 2019). This chapter will explore work on anti-

Black racism as it appears in education, demonstrating the ways that Learning Disabilities are often used as justification for further restricting the education of Black people. The field of DisCrit (a field of the intersections of Disability, Critical Race, and Education studies) is especially relevant for this chapter, as I will explore the realities of campus police as a method of restricting access for Black students to university campuses and university events. I argue that the overdiagnosis of Learning Disabilities is connected to a carceral logic taking place on university campuses that presents Black people as inherently unwelcome. Anti-black racism thus functions as another way that the university is disabling and inaccessible.

At the same time as universities actively disallow Black students, employees, and educators from accessing a space free from racial violence, Black feminist theory is being actively institutionalized, and taught by white educators (Bilge 2013). This appropriation of Black knowledge, while at the same time continuing or encouraging perceptions of Black intellectual inferiority, works hand-in-hand with settler colonial expectations of land ownership. That is, universities can claim private ownership of campus land, and appropriate the knowledge systems of Black and Indigenous peoples—even while at the same time arguing that these people do not belong on their land. By using my own university as an example of some of these systemic issues, I want to acknowledge that this appropriation is taking place, refusing to shy away from the ways that I might also benefit from institutional appropriation. Intersectionality, for example, is a term that I have been using throughout this dissertation. Intersectional theory and praxis is a specifically Black feminist theory, but has at times been taken out of this context, especially in universities. Citational practice is an especially important part of Black feminist theory; it is therefore necessary to acknowledge the thoughtful and deep conceptual labour of Black students, educators, and scholars. As a white educator and scholar, I primarily centre the labour of Black thinkers throughout this chapter. I am indebted to Black feminist thought, activism, and labour, as well as to DisCrit, a growing field that also emphasizes the work of BIPOC scholars. I am also indebted to my Black students and the other Black students at University of Ottawa who have taken time to challenge white supremacy at the University of Ottawa over the past few years, and have taught me so much.

At the University of Ottawa, BIPOC students have been at the forefront of resisting the anti-Black racism that they experience. One example of this resistance is the Black Student Leaders' Association holding a press conference after the release of Esi Codjoe's report of the June 12 incident. Codjoe found that race was a factor in how the events took place, with Protection Services—the University of Ottawa campus security—acting on the assumption that Jamal Koulmiye-Boyce was a stranger on campus, rather than a student or employee. According to Codjoe's report, one of the two PSOs who arrested Koulmiye-Boyce said that, "in his experiences… it is not very often students who perform skateboarding tricks," implying that he was assumed not to be a student (Codjoe 2019, 32). This absurd statement was said even after another white student on a skateboard passed by the officers as they were detaining Koulmiye-Boyce. The Black Student Leaders' Association, alongside the University of Ottawa Student Union (UOSU), The Ontario Public Interest Research Group (OPIRG), CUPE 2626, Women in Sciences and Engineering (WISE) and 16 other recognized student groups on the University of Ottawa campus presented an open letter to the university on October 6, 2019, demanding an apology be given to both Mason and Koulmiye-Boyce; that the carding policies (specifically Policy 33) be reviewed and be implemented only in exceptional cases; that Protection Services be given anti-oppression and anti-racism training; that BIPOC students and faculty be consulted during the policy change process; that accountability and transparency be stressed, including a "permanent ban on officers who engage in racial discrimination on campus" (Gergyek 2019); that data collection about BIPOC students and faculty begin to be implemented; that BIPOC employees, and tenure-track professors be actively hired among all university staff; and that BIPOC have active representation within the *President's Committee for a Discrimination-Free Campus*. This letter pushed the university administration to hold an anti-Black racism Townhall where members of the university community were invited to discuss their experiences of anti-Black racism and to propose solutions. The Townhall took place on November 20, 2019 where Black students, faculty, and university staff outlined solutions to their experiences of anti-Black racism.

This chapter begins with a broad overview of anti-Blackness in education, including the school-to-prison pipeline, the school-prison nexus, and Special Education. I point to the legacy of eugenics within special education assessment to argue that white supremacy still exists within education, especially within universities. I then turn to police violence against Black people, linking Robyn Maynard's *Policing Black Lives* to the work of Anna Mollow and Nirmala Erevelles who argue that police violence disproportionally affects Black disabled people. In the next section, I return to the specific University of Ottawa case, examining policy changes and the report filed by independent investigator, Esi Codjoe. This report was followed by a Townhall on anti-

Black racism at the University of Ottawa. The participants at the Townhall asked for more Black professors, and asked that Black theory, history, and culture be taught more extensively in uOttawa courses (uOttawa, 2019). I therefore end this chapter by looking to Black pedagogy and intersectionality, asking how integrating Black theory better into Disability Studies can also impact how we teach. Black students have been at the forefront of resisting anti-Black racism, and of highlighting Black excellence and knowledge, even in the face of this racism. Advocating for a Black education free from police intervention also challenges the ableist (and sanist) notion that Black people do not hold intelligence and do not bring knowledge of their own.[4]

By analysing anti-Black racism through a Disability Studies lens, I do not mean to flatten difference or equate Blackness with disability. Black disabled people have emphasized that race and disability are different processes of socially constructed difference that are not properly addressed when giving analogies of "like race" (See Pickens 2019). Experiencing anti-Black racism does not always involve inaccessibility, nor does experiencing ableism always involve anti-Black racism. However, as I will argue, the specific case of the University of Ottawa's anti-Black racism did impact two students' access to campus space. I connect this inaccessibility to a legacy of eugenics practices that emphasize Black knowledge as inferior or unwelcome on university campuses. Thus, in this case, anti-Black racism is absolutely connected to ableist representations of Black intellect as inferior. Using a Disability Studies lens to examine this form of anti-Black racism helps clarify possible solidarity between different on-campus groups, as well as clarifying the need to continually connect studies of race with

---

[4] For an introduction to anti-Black sanism, see Meerai, Abdillahi, and Poole (2016).

studies of disability. University policies purporting to protect campus from intruders, to welcome students on-campus, and to protect campus community from harassment and assault are all working at once to exclude particular bodies from campus through structures of ableism, white supremacism, and colonialism.

The legacy of Eugenics in Special Education

There has been a considerable collection of scholarship exploring the over-diagnosis of Learning Disabilities (LDs) in Black youth, encouraging a segregation of Black students within Special Education classrooms. This work demonstrates the ways that Black students are seen or represented as incapable of achieving at the higher education level. For example, Rebecca Vallas (2009) notes that while the problem of Black students' overrepresentation in Special Education has been identified by scholars since Lloyd Dunn's work in 1968, this problem still exists within the American school system, with Black students representing 20% of those in Special Education, but only 15% of the American population (184). Part of the issue of these disproportional diagnoses is the way that students are diagnosed. Vallas (2009) argues that students diagnosed with LDs represent nearly three quarters of Special Education students, and that these diagnoses are often sparked by teacher referrals during early education rather than by medical professionals. The diagnoses are Made based on "less readily measured and more context-dependent criteria, such as behaviour, intelligence, social skills, and communication abilities" (183), a categorization process that she defines as through a "social model," giving teachers and school administrators a lot of power over the definition of "normal" and "disabled". In the process, racial biases impact how "normal" is defined, zeroing in on Blackness as itself a form of disability.

While research regarding the correlation between Blackness and Learning Disabilities in Canada is not as plentiful, Livingstone and Weinfeld (2017) argue that Black students are less likely to complete high school in Ontario schools, especially when considering special education. Robson et al. (2014) show that in Toronto schools, Black male students are overrepresented in special education, and Paul Banahene Adjei (2018) argues that Blackness is a form of disability in itself in the Toronto public school system, where Black men are more likely to be segregated from white students through special education and separate "gifted" schooling, where white students are overrepresented.

Adjei (2018) demonstrates that, on the basis of gifted (white) students, and special education (Black) students, assumptions around intelligence also impact how students experience school. The difference between Learning Disability and unintelligence is also slippery at best, with tests for LDs often based in models designed for eugenics policies. Peter Oakes (2012) explores the history of LD assessment, including the first assessment tests that were developed in the 1920s, at the time when Eugenics was a widely accepted scientific field. Oakes argues that even now, "in each case [of LD assessment], the aim is to establish a person's intellectual ability compared to the average ability of the general population" (15). When students are assessed by largely white educators, using a model that interprets Blackness as itself an indicator of unintelligence, Black students are held against a white norm. Shameka Standford and Bahiyyah MuhamMad (2018) argue that schools' definitions of "normal" and "disabled" can not only depend on behaviour and social systems, but also on language. Students whose parents do not speak English in the household are often also diagnosed with LDs or other disabilities because their intelligence assessments take place in English. International students and immigrant students are therefore also at risk of receiving a diagnosis of LD, within a system that already expects mastery of the English language as well.

LD assessments come from a eugenic history that has long implied that white intellectual superiority justifies the incarceration and sterilization of non-white people, including the ongoing involuntary sterilization of Indigenous women in Canada. Karen Stote (2017) has argued that sterilization—which occurred as recently as 2017— is part of a genocide against Indigenous peoples in Canada, while others, including Claudia Malacrida (2008) highlight the incarceration and sterilization of Intellectually disabled people in Canada as also genocidal. If Black students are disproportionally diagnosed with LDs, white intellectual superiority can be confirmed within a white supremacist educational system. White supremacy thus works in tandem with intellectual assessments, like Intelligence Quotient (IQ) tests—or even more widely used SAT or PSAT tests— that were initially developed to differentiate between “Idiots” and other “normal” students or people. Paul Banahene Adjei (2018) argues that racial disproportionality in Special Education classrooms in the United States and the United Kingdom is also prominent in Canada, with Black students placed in Special Education, in part to maintain a segregated classroom space for white students. While Canada presents itself as a multicultural foil to the more racist United States, ableism and racism also have a long history here, one that contributes to segregated Special Education classrooms.

The work on Special Education in the American and Canadian context is matched by scholarship showing how Black boys (and increasingly Black girls) are shuffled between school and prison through the School to Prison Pipeline.[5] Nancy Heitzeg (2016), for example, highlights the ways that Black youth are funnelled through the pipeline because “the intolerance of minor, typical misbehaviour starts as early as preschool, with these students subjected to expulsion and arrest early on” (90). Police are increasingly invited into elementary and secondary schools in the United States under the pretence of promoting safety for the children, but BIPOC students become the threat, rather than those in need of protection. The overrepresentation of Black students in underfunded schools that themselves resemble prisons is also a large part of this problem. Heitzeg details the ways that zero tolerance policies and practices encourage the school to prison pipeline, as well as the criminalization of Black culture and Black behaviour. Robyn Maynard (2017) argues that this same process is taking place in the Canadian school system, with different effects for Black boys, girls, and gender diverse people. While Black male students find themselves at the brunt of suspensions and expulsions, Black female students experience impacts of anti-Blackness in their education that are harder to quantify, like ongoing surveillance from their educators.

Anthony J. Nocella II and Kim Socha (2014) argue that the system that places Black students in Special Education and the system that funnels Black students into detention centres are one and the same system, one where whiteness is the norm and Blackness is represented as abnormal. They argue “the highest percentage of incarcerated youth includes those of color and those with supposed dis-abilities (which are often the same group of children)” (167), pointing the finger to educators for failing to notice and

---

[5] One example of the School-to-Prison Pipeline is the case surrounding #FreeGrace. In May 2020, a Black 15-year-old girl was incarcerated in juvenile detention for not completing online homework. Despite a ADHD diagnosis, she was only released on July 31, 2020 after intense public pressure on social media with the hashtag #FreeGrace (Cohen 2020; Pitofsky 2020).

address their internal biases against Blackness in the classroom, biases that are also maintained through standardized tests, like IQ and Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT), that fail to consider cultural difference (168). Nocella and Socha name this structure of placing students in Special Education and detention centres “the new Eugenics” (169) arguing that an out-dated conception of “ability” creates this hierarchy of race, with whiteness always on top of the intellectual hierarchy. Through these tests, Black people are justified as genetically inferior to White people, which also justifies their higher percentage in detention facilities and Special education.

Kathleen M. Collins (2016) argues that Black boys are framed as in need of Special Education in part because of a perception of Black masculinity as unruly and disruptive. The issues of Special Education and School to Prison Pipeline are intertwined in the case of Black students, she argues. Collins describes her own Black son’s reflection on his elementary school classroom experience of being segregated from other students: “Wade told me that his desk was separated ‘Because I’m not a good learner, Mom. It’s not her [the teacher’s] fault. I have to be separated from everyone else to learn’” (197). Collins’ son’s educators were convinced that her unruly child should be diagnosed with Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), so convinced that his teacher said so in front of him. Collins notes that part of the issue is the interlocking systems of racism and ableism within the classroom. D.L. Adams and Nirmala Erevelles (2016) also connect Special Education and the School to Prison Pipeline, arguing that:

> Thus, through the use of “zero-tolerance” policies, schools have created institutions that police students through the surveillance of behaviour and a hyper-vigilance directed toward students marked as both raced *and* disabled, resulting in

> their overrepresentation in office discipline referrals, suspensions, segregated classrooms, alternative schools, and ultimately incarceration. (137)

Both Collins (2016) and Adams and Erevelles (2016) argue that DisCrit is an important method of analysis for both the problem of Special Education and of the School to Prison Pipeline. These two issues, Special Education and the School to Prison Pipeline, constitute two different oppressive solutions to the "problem" of Blackness in Education that intertwine and are experienced as one system by Black students. These tactics also both remove or prevent Black students from entering in university, as Livingstone and Weinfeld (2017) demonstrate.

In 2013, Subini Ancy Annamma, David Connor, and Beth Ferri coined the term "DisCrit" to describe a new form of analysis at the intersection of Critical Race Studies, Disability Studies, and Education. Pointing specifically to the "disproportionate number of non-dominant racial, ethnic, and linguistic [that] continue to be referred, labeled, and placed in special education, particularly in the categories of Learning Disability, Intellectual Disability (formerly called Mental Retardation), and Emotional Disturbance or Behavior Disorders" (2), Annamma, Connor, and Ferri argued that disability is a social category defined in part with all the baggage around understandings of race, gender, and class. They note that Black students are three times more likely than white students to be diagnosed as "mentally retarded," two times more likely to be diagnosed as "emotionally disturbed" and 1.5 times more likely to be diagnosed with a LD (3). In their 2016 collection on DisCrit, Annamma, Connor, and Ferri continue the important work in exploring "why so many students labeled with a dis/ability, particularly students of colour, are either experiencing failure or being perceived as failing and on what grounds"

(6). Part of this work involves examining the intersections of carceral and disability school logics that label Black students as inherently unintellectual, unruly, and dangerous for their white colleagues, who are deemed more deserving of an education.

In her book The *Pedagogy of Pathologization*, Subini Ancy Annamma (2017) interviews young women of colour who have experienced what she refers to as the school-prison nexus, borrowing from Erica Meiners' argument that the school-to-prison pipeline does not adequately address the shuffle many young people experience between different institutions—prisons, schools, and back. Annamma (2017) argues that disability has largely been ignored in the conversations regarding this school-prison nexus:

> though much important work had laid the foundation, I was unable to locate a theory that was committed to untangling the ways race and ability were interdependent and co-constructed. That is, links between how a student is positioned racially and how that student is expected to perform have always been clear. Students of color experience lower graduation rates, test scores and higher rates of discipline and incarceration. (8)

In collaboration with David Connor and Beth Ferri, Annamma began the work of DisCrit to examine how categories of race bring with them understandings of mental and physical capacity. That is, as Puar might argue, state institutions capacitate certain students and debilitate others based on race.

Black students are thus regulated and controlled through a system that names them both intellectually inferior—or incapable, through disabilities that are diagnosed through perception—and criminal, threatening, or unsafe. Special education and the school to prison pipeline—or school-prison nexus—become dual systems of control. Part of this dual system of control is the material on which their academic performance is based; their school performance is often measured based on Eurocentric study materials, where Black theory and intelligence is not centred. At the K-12 level, students are more likely to be taught by white women than BIPOC instructors, with history, art, and culture materials that maintain white superiority. When this material does not resonate with Black students, they are measured against their white colleagues and found to be underperforming. For example, Karen Robson et al. (2018) found that in two sets of Toronto students, Black, Latino, and Southeast Asian grade 12 students "are less prepared for postsecondary education than White students" (39). These students had lower GPAs, higher representation in special education, and were less likely to be taking academic-stream courses. While this study also showed that Black men are now more likely to attend university than they were before 2006, Black men are also more like to have special education needs (SEN) (45). Measurements of university preparedness rarely consider course material or instructor representation, instead placing the "preparedness" in the individual student's lap. The combination of criminalization, disablement, and lack of relevant curriculum leave Black students less likely to succeed, in the process strengthening the white supremacist notion that Black people are less capable learners.

This notion of Black intellectual inferiority not only justifies the overrepresentation of Black people in detention centres and Special Education, it also justifies their underrepresentation in universities, both as students and as professors. In fact, by failing to hire Black professors and failing to fund Black Studies departments, universities can continue to represent Blackness as intellectually inferior. The University of Ottawa, for example, does not have an African or Black studies department, or any department that focuses specifically on Black theory, unlike Carleton University, University of Toronto, and York University who all have African Studies programs. Recently, the University of Ottawa has introduced an African Studies 12-course-unit option that received its first cohort on May 1, 2020. Within the University of Ottawa course catalogue, I was able to find seven courses that included the word "Africa"—Anthropology of Africa, Human Rights and Justice in Africa, International Development issues in Africa, the History of the Middle East and Africa, and Comparative Politics: Africa—and five courses with the word "African"—African Cinema, The African Past, African History South of the Sahara, African History, and Middle Eastern and North African History out of the hundreds of social science and humanities courses. These courses, with the exception of African cinema, emphasize an African past and African "development" issues, rather than positing African futures or contemporary African culture and expertise. No courses included the word "Black" or the abbreviation "Afro" in the title. Having courses only highlighting the past and the developmental issues of African countries upholds a conception of African students and Black students more generally as "developing" and as falling behind. In fact, there are only six universities in Canada that house full undergraduate or graduate programs in Black or African Studies: Carleton University, Trent University, York University, Simon Fraser University, University of Toronto, and McGill University.

Policing Black Lives in Canada

One of the major tactics white supremacy uses to erase resistance is through state actors hired to police the lives of Black people. Black people are overrepresented in

Canadian and American prisons in part because of policies that reflect the fear of Black intelligence and Black threat to white control. Michelle Alexander (2010) and Ruth Wilson Gilmore (2007) have argued convincingly that the overrepresentation of Black people in the American prison system is an extension of slavery. That is, prisons filled with Black people and guarded by white prison guards, put in jail by white police, and kept there by white legislators, have less to do with crimes committed by Black people, and more to do with ongoing white supremacy. The prison abolitionist movement takes its roots from slavery abolitionist movements, with aims that similarly argue for the freedom of Black people from imprisonment and forced work at the hands of white people. Prison abolition is linked to disability rights efforts for the end of institutionalized living, especially for those with intellectual disabilities. Prison abolition is also necessary for disability liberation because many prisoners have disabilities, some exacerbated by imprisonment. Black and disabled people, as well as Black disabled people disproportionally experience violence at the hands of police, prison guards, and legislators, the majority of whom are white and ablebodied (see for example Ben-Moshe et al. 2014; Ben-Moshe 2020). This experience is linked to eugenics practices of viewing whiteness as intellectually superior, and the eugenic desire to keep disability and Blackness out of public life.

The prison abolition movement coincides with a growing police abolition movement that aims not only to dismantle the prison system, but also agents of the state that maintain this system: the police. The Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, for example, started in the United States in 2013, after George Zimmerman was acquitted, even though he had shot and killed teenager Trayvon Martin in Florida one year previous.

BLM is the ongoing movement that challenges police violence against Black people, and the often eclipsed and erased deaths of Black Americans. BLM chapters outside of the United States also aim to show the ways that Black people more globally experience violence, death at the hands of police and other state officials; BLM Toronto—now a part of BLM Canada, for example, aims to "forge critical connections and to work in solidarity with black communities, black-centric networks, solidarity movements, and allies in order to dismantle all forms of state-sanctioned oppression, violence, and brutality committed against African, Caribbean, and Black cis, queer, trans, and disabled populations in Toronto" ("BLM-Canada – All Black Lives Matter: About Us"). Rather than supporting small incremental policy change that might temporarily ease the violence against some members of the Black community, BLM argues that police and prison abolition must begin with those most affected by oppression; if those that live at the intersections of multiple oppressed identities are not free from police violence, then we are all still affected by this violence.

Meghan G. McDowell and Luis A. Fernandez (2018) argue that police abolitionist movements, like prison abolitionist movements, point to the history of police as agents of slavery, returning Black people to the white people who claimed ownership over them. McDowell and Fernandez argue for

> Approaches to abolition that (1) aim directly at the police as an institution, (2) dismantle the racial capitalist order, (3) adopt uncompromising positions that resist liberal attempts at cooptation, incorporation, and/or reconciliation, and (4) create alternative democratic spaces that directly challenge the legitimacy of the police. (375)

In positioning their approaches to abolition outside of liberal solutions, McDowell and Fernandez emphasize that police reform or policy change will not solve the discrimination that takes place through the state. Like Angela Davis, who emphasizes that the prison system has not always existed and we can therefore imagine a society without such a system, radical police abolitionists emphasize that police presence has not always been a necessary part of a functioning society. Part of this abolitionist impetus is the argument that anti-Black racism is not only related to police violence, but a large part of it. Radial police abolitionists argue that "anti-Black violence [is] a constitutive, rather than aberrant, element of policing, and position the police as integral to the (re)production of the racial order" (McDowell and Fernandez 2018, 379). While much abolitionist scholarship focuses on the American context, Canadian scholarship also demonstrates that Canadian policing systems have their basis in racism as well.

In *Policing Black Lives*, Robyn Maynard traces the state-sanctioned violence against Black people in Canada through the histories of slavery and the current socio-political processes that support anti-Black racism in Canada. Maynard's work examines the myth of Canadian multicultural benevolence, arguing that Canadian policing is often compared favorably with American policing in order to justify the continuing violence of police officers within Canada, as not as bad in comparison. Instead, Maynard argues that any violence at the hands of the police against Black people should be taken just as seriously, regardless of its location. Moreover, framing Canada's state violence as "not as bad" justifies Canada's continuing racist and settler colonial violence against Black and Indigenous peoples. While many discussions of police violence against Black people frames it as an issue of Black men, Maynard argues that Black women face a particular kind of state enforced violence.

Maynard places this violence in a historical context, pointing to the construction of Black femininity as a longstanding justification for state control and violence. While white women were and are constructed as in need of protection, Black women have been constructed as either a “Mammy,” someone in constant servitude to white people, or a “Jezebel,” someone whose own sexual deviance and culpability obscures the guilt of white men. Both constructions are “held in place by the economic, social, political, and psychological violence of enslavement, and by the threat (whether implicit or explicit) of punishment in the form of physical or sexual violence for any deviation” (117). Maynard notes that while these representations are often connected to the Southern United States, these constructions also bled into Canadian society through “bellum blackface minstrel shows” that took place in Canada until the mid-twentieth century (117), for example.

These constructions of Black femininity help to frame Black women as “arrogant,” as in the case of Sandra Bland, who was called “arrogant from the beginning” by one of the police officers who held her (118). While she was found in her prison cell with a noose around her neck, Black activists and her family have contested that this was a death by suicide. Maynard argues that Bland is a good example of how Black women “who deviate from their ascribed role as deferent continue to be punished—sometimes by humiliation, physical abuse, sexual assault and neglect—for any deviance from their designated role as subservient, and for failing to perform the submissive, content role of the Mammy” (118). Black women are therefore not only represented as intellectually inferior, but also in need of severe punishment by the state to correct their inability to become white.

Settler colonial violence stands side-by-side with anti-Black racism and the legacy of slavery in North America as Indigenous femininity has also been framed in particular ways that justify police violence. Maynard gives two examples of reports that have found police violence against Indigenous people in Canada: Human Rights Watch 2013 that found violence in BC, and a CBC investigation in Val D'Or, Quebec in 2016. Indigenous women have also been framed as having deviant sexuality through settler colonial processes that uphold violence against them. The Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls (MMIWG) published in June 2019 highlights police violence as an integral part of Indigenous women's disappearances and murders. Police, especially Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) not only were perpetrators of murder and sexual abuse in some cases, they were also found to exacerbate disappearances by failing to initiate searches in good time, and failing to report these instances. Like Black women's involvement in BLM—the movement initially started by four Black women—Indigenous women have been at the forefront of the resistance to police violence, including the Idle No More movement and sex work activism that has challenged police violence against sex workers and indigenous peoples (see Hunt 2006 for example).

Maynard argues that gender and class cannot be separated from race when it comes to police violence. Black women, specifically, are often neglected when policies are created for Black people (as they are often for Black men) or for women (as they are often for white women.) Police violence is just one aspect of anti-Black racism that specifically happens to Black women. The term "misogynoir" (coined by Moya Bailey in

2010: see Bailey and Trudy 2018) is useful to describe the particular experiences of Black women and the intersection of misogyny and racism:

> Misogynoir extends across society, including and well beyond the state. This is not intended to erase the fact that state violence against cisgender Black men is also gendered, or to negate the fact that Black men are also highly sexualized due to long-standing, false associations between Black masculinity and rape. Still, highlighting gendered oppression makes visible the multiple and intersecting violences inflicted by patriarchy and white supremacy on those who do not receive any of the benefits from either system. (130)

While Black men experience police violence because their masculinity is represented as particularly threatening, Black women are more vulnerable to state-sanctioned processes that police their lives beyond law enforcement. Maynard gives the example of social assistance as a stereotype—the welfare queen—that has Made it more difficult for Black women to receive government assistance. The Ontario government has cracked down on "welfare fraud," expanding the Criminal Code prosecutions for actions like "providing false addresses, living common-law without declaring a 'spouse,' receiving undeclared income and tending lost/stolen cheques" (134). Maynard argues that the criminalization of welfare fraud "has been, in effect, the criminalization of poor women's survival strategies" (134). This is because while welfare payments are very low ($585 per month in Ontario, not even enough to cover the rent for a one-bedroom apartment), the very act of trying to make alternative income is criminalized (135). Black women also experience overrepresentation in the justice system, making up just roughly 3.1 percent of the Canadian population, but 6 percent of the federal prison population in 2016-2017

(Correctional Investigator Canada 2017). Their crimes are often related to the struggle against poverty (Balfour and Comack 2014).

Since Premier of Ontario Doug Ford's conservative provincial government was elected in 2018, Ontario has only reinforced its conservative and restrictive policies on welfare, as well as divesting from every other social service in the province. Education has been hit especially hard, with per-student funding shrinking in the 2019-2020 school year, 10,000 teacher jobs cut, university tuition cuts—without any increase in university subsidies, and Ontario student loan grants removed entirely (Andric 2019). These changes in education spending have direct effects on education processes, encouraging a representation of education as a profitable business—including holding as many students as possible in a K-12 classroom. While policy change cannot solve the problems of police violence against Black people, neoliberal and conservative policies have direct effects on Black students, parents, and employees, supporting a system that vilifies and criminalizes poverty because of a discourse of "fiscal responsibility". While poverty and Blackness are not synonymous—indeed the implication that they are is a stereotype central to anti-Blackness—policy reform that does not take into account the lives of poor Black people will not solve the overall issue of white supremacy (see Taylor 2016).

Wendy Chan and Dorothy Chunn (2014) argue that viewing all Canadians as equal under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms can exacerbate the problem of racialization in crime, as it encourages people to ignore the very real ways that race and gender impact criminalization (36-37). More specifically, they argue:

> Another consequence of equating equality with *formal* equality is that once formal equality is achieved, the focus becomes sameness and the identical

> treatment of everyone. But if inequalities related to gender, race, class, and sexuality remain, insisting that everyone must receive identical treatment actually entrenches and exacerbates the existing inequalities. (37)

While policy changes can have a significant impact on experiences of criminalization, policy change that aims to equalize racial, gender, disability differences often have the opposite effect of erasing the prominence that these factors had in the criminalization process. For example, the recent changes to Ontario Student Assistance Program (OSAP) have erased student grants and decreased the number of student loans available to students. Ford has justified this change by implementing a province-wide 10% decrease in tuition. This change, which focuses on equality for everyone, without regard for need, has severely impacted students' ability to access education. This policy is also linked to eugenic notions of poverty as linked with intellectual inferiority, representing the cost of education as an important measure of students' belonging on campus.

Policing Black Disabled Lives

Robyn Maynard argues that gender is a factor in the policing of Black people, however it is difficult to prove that Black women experience police violence disproportionally because “there exists virtually no systematic date collection on police violence that is based on gender and/or sexuality” (125). Similarly, disability is not often seen as a factor when police violence takes place, despite evidence that disabled Black people experience police violence at higher rates. For example, in 2016, Abdirahman Abdi, a Somali-Canadian man, was detained and beaten by Ottawa police and died while in police custody. According to his family, Abdi had mental health issues that contributed to the reasons behind his arrest. Indeed, many public mental health services are insufficient, leading to the criminalization of those in mental distress, with Black people at risk of this violence at the intersection of anti-Black racism and ableism. Carly Myers (2017) demonstrates that people with severe mental disabilities are at least sixteen times more likely to die when under police arrest in the American context. Chan and Chen (2014) demonstrate that people with mental health issues are more likely to experience excessive force at the hands of the police in the Canadian context (50). Because Black people are more likely to be placed under arrest, this statistic is likely to affect them in higher numbers.

Anna Mollow (2017) argues that ableism and anti-Black racism often intersect with respect to police violence, alongside fatphobia. Giving the example of Eric Garner, whose police killers argued that he was going to die anyway because he was fat, asthmatic, and had heart issues—"this guy would have died going up a flight of stairs. His diet killed him" (107)— Mollow (2017) argues that Black people often find themselves categorized as both "unvictimizable" and as already disabled. Fat Black people are deemed even more dangerous than Black people of a smaller size, and are seen as deserving any kind of force used against them:

> One side of this double bind renders violence against black people inconsequential by suggesting that fatness is the real cause of any injuries inflicted upon them, while its other side depicts violence as a necessary response to the excessive physical power that black people, especially those that are fat, are imagined to embody. (105)

Indeed, the perception that Black people cannot feel pain to the same extent as white people has been well documented, leading to Black disabled people being disbelieved when they are experiencing pain (see Moussa 2019). Mollow argues that while fatness is often pointed to as a cause of conditions like asthma, it is more likely that Garner experienced environmental racism, with exposure to nitrogen dioxide, "a chemical that has been identified as a potential causative agent in asthma and heart disease" (115) and a chemical that people of colour are disproportionally exposed to. Mollow argues that a "fat black Disability Studies" is necessary to understand the implications of intersecting identities of Blackness, fatness, and disability.

Jason Whitesel (2017) similarly argues that Eric Garner experienced police violence at the intersection of racism, classism, ableism, "fat hatred", ageism, and healthism. Whitesel also highlights the death of Eleanor Bumpurs in 1984, arguing that police interpreted her as a "Mad black woman," (427) leading to them using more force, and in the process shooting her in the hand and chest. Whitesel argues that "disability entangles with racialized notions of undesirable gendered subjectivities" leading to Bumpurs' experience of being "undeserving of humanity" because of her position as a schizophrenic fat Black woman. Especially given police violence is so normalized against Black bodies and Black people, social justice must take into consideration multiple forms of oppression and how they intermingle, intersect, and interlock.

Nirmala Erevelles and Andrea Minear (2010) use Patricia Williams' term "spirit murder" to describe the experiences of police brutality, imprisonment, and "educational negligence". Williams describes the "social structures centered around fear and hate" as a "cultural cancer" (qtd. on page 234). This use of a health term, cancer, to describe anti-Black racism in criminal justice and education systems might seemingly support healthism, where health is equated with moral values. Here "cultural cancer," as a representation of systems of racism, supports conceptions of cancer as morally wrong, potentially blurring lines between people with cancer and cancerous cells themselves. However, Erevelles and Minear emphasize that this “spirit murder” affects health as much as health affects the ableism of anti-Black systems. That is, ableism in an anti-Black racism context is not only experiencing police violence because of madness or asthma, but also experiencing these disabilities in part because of racism. For example, Bumpurs herself connected her schizophrenia and her failure to pay rent, the main reason that police arrived at her apartment, to “Reagan and his people” (Whitesel 2017, pg. 427). Black disabled people see how anti-Black racism both affects their ability to move safely without police intervention and how it directly affects their bodies and minds. Mollow (2017), Whitesel (2017), and Erevelles and Minear (2010) demonstrate that health, disability, and racism are intertwined within the lives of Black people, such that examining one form of identity is not enough.

There has been a similar push for a Black Disability Studies, even apart from fat studies. For example, Moya Bailey and Izetta Autumn Mobley (2018) argue that a Black feminist disability framework is necessary to understand the intersections between Blackness, gender, and disability. Bailey and Mobley (2018) point to state violence against Black women, looking in particular to the deaths of Tanisha Anderson and Michelle Cusseaux, “both Black women in the midst of mental health episodes that were used to justify their deaths” at the hands of the police (31). Bailey and Mobley argue that the conversation around Anderson and Cusseaux never emphasized or explored the ways that mental health and police violence overlap with respect to Black women especially. The trope of “Crazy Black woman” acts as another double-bind, framing mental health issues as the real cause for death, and justifying police force. Because "Black people experienced higher odds of disability across the adult lifespan compared with white people" (qtd. on page 31), they argue that Black feminist Disability Studies is necessary to also explore the way that anti-Black racism creates disabling environments and disabled bodies within Black populations.

While not explicitly taking up the work of naming a Black Disability Studies framework, Ellen Samuels (2014)'s work on the life of Ellen Craft is another useful representation of the intersection of Black Disability Studies. Ellen Craft was a Black woman who successfully "escaped from slavery in Georgia by traveling disguised as a 'white invalid gentleman'" (28). Samuels argues that the particular transformation of both gender and disability allowed Craft to hide in plain sight, even though she was unable to write or read, as a white man might be able to. Disability in this instance acted as an "enabling device" for Black slaves to maintain their false identity. In this instance, disability does not become a reason for violence, but a way of escaping that violence. Chris Bell's collection entitled *Blackness and Disability* likewise emphasizes that disability should not always be represented as undesirable or part of the reasons for police violence. Instead, the authors in his collection—especially Michelle Jarman—highlight the ways that Blackness and disability can represent new ways of understanding and experiencing the world, beyond just state violence.

Black Disability Studies therefore involves recognizing four interrelated parts of police violence: (1) People with disabilities are more likely to experience police violence, including Black disabled people; (2) Police violence is itself a disabling and debilitating structure, which can lead to traumatization, mental distress, or permanent physical injury (for example, Dafonte Miller in Toronto can no longer use one of his eyes); (3) Black disabled people can experience disability created by environmental racism that further justifies police violence against them; and (4) Black disability in itself is not violent, and can be a positive identity, even within structures of white supremacy, despite the negative reactions of police. The next section will demonstrate, through a close examination of a moment of anti-Black racism at the University of Ottawa, how campus police primarily erase the potential for Blackness to be a positive identity, instead creating disabling and debilitating environments for its students, faculty, and staff. This creation of disabling and debilitating environments reinforces the inaccessibility of university campuses. Campus police therefore create inaccessibility through anti-Black racism.

Anti-Black Racism at the University of Ottawa

On June 12, 2018, campus security on the University of Ottawa campus handcuffed and detained a Black student, Koumiye-Boyce, while Protections Services waited for police to arrive. Given the history of both eugenics policies that present Black intellectual inferiority as inherent, and policing policies that lead to Black people being disproportionally arrested, harassed, and killed by police, this University of Ottawa case demonstrates how anti-Black racism exists in the structure of the university. While Koumiye-Boyce was arguably assaulted—by Protection Service’s own definition of assault—the University of Ottawa’s policies permit this assault because of the responsibilities of Protection Services officers as police agents. There is therefore a hole that I will highlight between three of University of Ottawa’s policies: Policy 119 (approved May 2018), Policy 33 (approved April 1992), and Policy 67a (approved

December 2012). These policies are available to access through the University of Ottawa’s website.

The University of Ottawa’s Policy 119 outlines that the University of Ottawa “is committed to creating and maintaining an accessible barrier-free working, teaching and learning environment” (119.2). This policy’s purpose explicitly positions the “responsibilities related to accessibility at the University of Ottawa (the University) to ensure the University meets the requirements of accessibility legislation in Ontario” (119.1), and Ontario’s accessibility legislation is concerned most with employees and students with disabilities. However, this policy arguably goes beyond accessibility only for people with disabilities, especially with respect to article 30 “Facilities and service areas for public use” which ensures the University will “maintain meet [sic] the requirements of accessibility legislation in Ontario: outdoor public eating areas, exterior sidewalks or walkways constructed for functional, non-recreational pedestrian travel; off-street parking built by the University; service counters’ fixed queuing guides’ and waiting areas with seating fixed to the floor” (119.30). The investigation into the circumstances that took place on June 16, 2019 primarily concerned itself with Policy 33: Security, which allows Protection Services to “request proof of identity from persons on campus” (33.8). However, in this section I want to explore the possibility that this moment of anti-Black racism on the University of Ottawa campus is less an issue of security, and more an issue of accessibility, as the “outdoor public eating areas, exterior sidewalks or walkways constructed for functional, non-recreational pedestrian travel” (119.30) were Made inaccessible to a Black student because of his race.

Before I explore the inaccessibility of the University of Ottawa for Black students, faculty, and employees, I will first examine the case directly, through the investigative report completed by Esi Codjoe in September 2019. Codjoe highlights that racial discrimination did take place, and that there is reluctance among Protective Service workers to name race as a potential contributing factor in their work. Codjoe (2019) highlights four major concerns as outlined by Koumiye-Boyce’s Twitter feed: first, that he was carded and that this carding was primarily because of his race; second, that two Protection Service Officers followed and threatened him as he tried to leave the scene; third, that he was “grabbed by the arms and waist,” that his phone was knocked out of his hand, and that his handcuffs were applied too tightly; and four, that he was forced to sit for over two hours in front of a total of seven Protection Services Officers while he was in handcuffs (7). Codjoe (2019) found that Koumiye-Boyce was carded and detained because he is Black, but that the phone was not knocked out of his hand, and that the PSOs detained him for a little over an hour rather than two.

While policy 33 was altered slightly, adding an interim directive on the interpretation of 33.8, this carding policy still gives the PSOs authority to protect the University of Ottawa property, including the land that the University of Ottawa owns. The interim directive clarifies that 33.8 is primarily meant for PSOs to request identification in four cases: when following up on a phone call requesting assistance, when an individual requests access to parts of campus not normally open to the public, when following up on a witness, and when providing assistance to someone in a (mental) health crisis. While the University of Ottawa’s land is semi-public, located in the middle of Ottawa’s downtown core, including a major bus station at the time of the June 12, 2019 incident—and a major Light Rail station at the time of this writing—University of Ottawa continues to be concerned with protecting University of Ottawa property. As we have seen throughout this chapter, protection of property often does not involve protection of Black lives, instead involving the protection against the "threat" of Blackness. Within a University space, this threat is amplified because Black people are interpreted as unintellectual through a eugenic understanding of Black inferiority.

Indeed, the University of Ottawa's executive team includes a white male Chancellor, Calin Rovinescu, a white male President and Vice-Chancellor, Jacques Frémont, and five white vice-presidents, including Jill Scott, Sylvain Charbonneau, Jacline Nyman, Robert Bourgeois, and Annick Bergeron. The whiteness of the executive team is not necessarily surprising, given the whiteness of the faculty more generally. However, the whiteness of the faculty is difficult to substantiate because up-to-date racial data of professors or employees at the university of Ottawa is difficult, if not impossible, to find. While having a group of white people at the top tier of an organization does not in itself imply that white supremacist and eugenic policies and procedures take place within that organization, it does demonstrate the limits of commitment to "diversity and inclusion". In chapter Two, I examined the ways that language around "diversity and inclusion" is mobilized in Ontario university Teaching and Learning centres, including the Teaching and Learning Support Service (TLSS) at the University of Ottawa. While Indigeneity and Disability is explicitly mentioned on the TLSS website, race is absent. Similarly, the Sub-committees of the University of Ottawa Committee on Diversity and Inclusion have published a number of reports regarding diversity at the University, including Ageism, Disability, Gender, Disabilities, Mental Health, and Transgender

Issues, but have not published a report on race.[6] These reports also are not necessarily favourable to the University of Ottawa, with the Transgender Issues report in particular showing that the university needs a lot more support for trans students, staff, and facility.

This lack of reporting on race coincides with a focus in Policy 33 on university property, as "private property". As I discussed in chapter 2, the University of Ottawa is located on unceded and unsurrendered Algonquin Anishnaabe territory. Protection of the private property of the University of Ottawa is therefore protection of settler colonialism itself, where property ownership at the hands of a large institution aligns with institutional practices—like Eurocentric disciplines and a lack of representation at the professor level—that limit the education of Black and Indigenous students. Protecting the University property also justifies the detaining of Black students in the name of safety, as Black people are not interpreted as belonging within the halls of higher learning.

While Policy 33 singles out entry to the buildings that would otherwise be locked from the public as the main private property, it was not entrance to a building that lead to the detainment of a Black student on June 12, 2019. Policy 33's purpose is "to enhance the security of persons and their property, to ensure that their rights are protected and to safeguard University property" (Policy 33.1). Policy 119 specifies that the "University intends to maintain meet [sic] the requirements of accessibility legislation in Ontario" specifically in relation to "exterior sidewalks or walkways constructed for functional, non-recreational pedestrian travel" (Policy 110.30). As outlined in Chapter 2, the AODA,

---

[6] In June 2020, the 2019-2020 Equity Diversity and Inclusion Committee (EDIC) Report was published specifically regarding "Hiring and Retention of Black Faculty at the University of Ottawa". The Sub-committees of the Committee on Diversity and Inclusion have yet to publish a report about racism. The 2019-2020 EDIC Report is linked on the website under the name "Report of the APUO-Employer Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee 2019-2020" rather than including "Black Employees" in the website title ("Diversity and Inclusion" 2020).

the main accessibility legislation in Ontario, outlines that universities and other education institutions must accommodate students and employees with disabilities, as well as integrating accessibility measures into public spaces. Protection Services Officers (PSOs) argue that Koulmiye-Boyce was initially detained mainly because he was “doing tricks” on his skateboard, which might damage university property. Some might argue that these tricks could have damaged accessibility by cracking or damaging concrete that wheelchairs or mobility devices might need in order to move. This argument largely seems moot, given Esi Codjoe reviewed the surveillance of the area, showing that the one “trick” that Koulmiye-Boyce performed did not damage property in any way. In fact, skateboards are another transportation device like wheelchairs or mobility devices which benefit from clear and smooth walkways. It is unlikely that someone using a skateboard would intentionally make it more difficult to use a skateboard.

Further to the policies on accessibility on campus, that allow members of the University of Ottawa to access the public areas on the land owned by the University of Ottawa—unceded land—the University of Ottawa’s Policy 67a stipulates that:

> The University is committed to maintaining a learning and work environment that promotes the understanding and respect for dignity of the person as part of the University community and one that is free from harassment and discrimination… The University will take appropriate and corrective action where harassment and discrimination occurs (Policy 67a.7 and .9)

The University defines “harassment” as:

> engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome. A single incident, if it is sufficiently

> serious, may constitute harassment. Harassment includes comments or conduct that intimidates, humiliates, undermines or belittles the other person by belittling, embarrassing, or demeaning that person, or that involves the use of abusive or threatening language ("Harassment and discrimination")

Taking these three policies together, Policy 33 on security, Policy 119 on accessibility, and Policy 67a on harassment and discrimination, Koulmiye-Boyce's case demonstrates a contradiction between the responsibility of Protection Services Officers as police and the accessibility of Black members of the university community. Given the history of police violence specifically against Black people, Black people are rightfully intimidated and humiliated by the threat of arrest and detainment at the hands of the police. The potential for discrimination and harassment by Protection Services Officers, rather than being protected against discrimination and harassment, seems to be a flaw or hole within these policies.

The increased presence of campus police is often justified by neoliberal—white—feminist representations of sexual assault and sexual harassment on university campuses. For example, York University has been criticized for increasing campus police presence after two women were raped in their own dorm room. Naoko Ikeda and Emily Rosser (2009) argue that:

> policy implementation, such as tighter security measures, increased patrolling, and enforcement of self-vigilance on students, cannot be sufficient for combatting campus rape, as these 'law and order' methods lack an analysis of campus rape as a structural issue of oppression (37)

Despite this structural criticism of campus policing, that also recognizes the racial implications of increased campus policing, the University of Ottawa's Protection Services justifies itself through a nod to sexual harassment and assault. On the University of Ottawa website, the Protection Services page does not begin with an acknowledgement that PSOs can help you access office spaces when you get locked out—which has been my primary experience with them—instead beginning by emphasizing "Help for victims": "no one has the right to touch you without your permission" ("Protection"). This declaration is especially ironic, given the unwanted touching that Protection Services perpetrated against Koulmiye-Boyce.

Despite Policy 67a's promise to "appropriate and corrective action where harassment and discrimination occurs" (67a.9), the University of Ottawa has failed to discipline the PSOs involved in the Koulmiye-Boyce case. Koulmiye-Boyce clearly described his experience with PSOs as discriminatory and as harassment. Given the definition given of assault by Protection Services itself, Koulmiye-Boyce was also assaulted—or touched without his consent—by the PSOs. It is possible that disciplinary measures will take place in the future, as harassment tribunals are confidential and can take years from start to finish. At the time of the incident, Protection Services Officers were part of the University of Ottawa Support Staff Union and their disciplinary measures therefore followed the SSUO Collective Agreement. According to the Support Staff University of Ottawa Union's collective agreement, a Protection Services Officer who is called to a meeting "regarding a harassment complaint" will be informed of their right to Union representation, will be given time off of work to attend the meeting(s), and will be able to reschedule the meeting if they are not available on campus at the time of the meeting (Support Staff University of Ottawa Collective Agreement 2016-2019, 7.12).[7] In this very publicized case of harassment against a Black student, PSOs have the benefit of a union behind them, as well as a university policy that justifies their harassment.

After Esi Codjoe found that racial discrimination did take place on June 12, 2019, Policy 33 was maintained with an "interim directive on the interpretation and application of University of Ottawa Policy 33- Security Section 8" (Policy 33.8). This policy still says "members of the Protection Services are authorized to request proof of identity from persons on campus" (33.8), with the interim directive highlighting that "requesting identification must never be requested randomly and arbitrarily" (Interim Directive section 4). The directive further allows PSOs to request identification when they receive a phone call requesting help, when someone requests access to a university building or residence that they may not be allowed access to, when a witness is present at an incident, and when providing assistance in a health or mental health-related incident. This interim directive led to the carding of Wiliston Mason in September 2019 when he was trying to access his own residence building, as this building is "private property" and is not necessarily open to the public.

Especially considering that Mason was returning to his home when he experienced carding from a PSO, this moment represents how university institutions continue to frame Blackness as unwelcome. In claiming that Mason's case is also a case of inaccessibility, I am not trying to flatten important distinctions between race and

---

[7] On November 6, 2019, Protection Services workers joined a new union, Ontario Public Service Employees Union (OPSEU). The collective agreement is not publicly available on the University of Ottawa website.

disability. Anti-Black racism has a particular history in Canada and most other colonial nations, where Black people have long been presented as “a subhuman and bestial life form” (Maynard 2017, 8) in order to justify violence against them. Black studies has long emphasized how policing comes specifically from the colonial need to control or discipline Black people, resulting in harassment like that experienced by Koulmiye-Boyce and Mason. Critical Race Theory and Black Studies have their own field of studies that examine moments like these and moments of Black thriving in ways that do not necessarily mean that Disability Studies or theory is needed. For example, Délice Mugabo, in writing about her own experiences as a Black Muslim woman in Quebec argues that “blackness must be addressed in its specificity and singularity” (163). However, in examining these moments through and with Disability Studies—while still actively citing Black scholars and continuing to emphasize the specificity of antiblackness—we can see how university policies are structured to be anti-Black in part because of ableist/sanist constructions of Blackness as inferior. Later in the dissertation, in chapter five, I argue that by taking a universalizing understanding of disability, we can implement accessibility for those that may not be categorized as or understand themselves as disabled. If we begin at the intersection, we can begin to enact what Mia Mingus, Sandy Ho, and Alice Wong call “Access is Love,” where access needs are imagined in advance so that no one is left behind. In this case, abolishing Policy 33, rather than just qualifying it with a new interim directive, could have anticipated the needs of Black students who justifiably feel intimidated and harassed by the presence of police on campus. Access to his own home could have been a moment of access as love.

The University of Ottawa's policies are constructed to imagine students as victims of harassment, and PSOs as protectors. However, they are also constructed to gloss over the racial implications of PSOs having the authority to card, detain, and handcuff students. In this section, I specifically examined the University of Ottawa policies at play in the two cases of Koulmiye-Boyce and Mason. However, this analysis was also already Made in the hours and days after the June 12, 2019 case. Black students, including Tiyana Maharaj (2019), who wrote a letter to the editor within the school newspaper, asked "where was the respect for Jamal's rights?" arguing that Black students "do not feel welcomed, or respected" on the University of Ottawa campus ("Letter: Protection Services needs a complete overhaul"). Black students have also demonstrated what changes need to be Made in order to shift these feelings, pointing to a number of demands. These demands include the hiring of Black scholars and educators. Black students know that there is an underrepresentation of Black professors in comparison to the number of Black students. They know that African and Black theory and curriculum needs to be better taught—by Black professors. In the next section, I outline the many ways that the university both fails to take seriously Black theory, and co-opts this theory in order to continue the justification of its whiteness.

Intersectionality and Black theory in the classroom

In the introduction to *Black Women's Liberatory Pedagogy*, editors Olivia B. Perlow, Durene I. Wheeler, Sharon L. Bethea, and BarBara M. Scott (2018) argue that Black women have been educating and practicing radical pedagogy for millennia. They argue that "for Black people, pedagogy cannot be synonymous with the classroom or with schooling, because we have systematically been denied access to both, especially to higher education" (4). This problem of access makes Black pedagogy radical in the ways it demands attention and space within institutions of higher learning that systematically deny access to Black people. Pedagogy does not just exist within classrooms, but also within movements, making BLM, for example, a prime example of education on the ground.

White people represent and imagine Black people as incapable of intellectual and intelligent scholarly production, co-opting Black theory into the white mainstream in order to continue to justify white supremacy. Perlow et al. (2018) argue that this includes many of the pedagogical theories that were created and implemented by Black women within Black communities. Intersectionality is a good example of a theory that has been arguably integrated and erased from its Black roots. The term has become institutionalized and used within university materials in order to continue justifying not addressing race. Sirma Bilge (2013) argues that in the process of being increasingly disconnected from its Black roots, intersectionality has become depoliticized, synonymous with understandings of diversity. Part of this process, Bilge argues, is based on a new genealogy of the term intersectionality that claims itself as a "brainchild of feminism" (413), and focuses primarily on intersections of sexuality, gender, and disability, allowing feminists (that are white) and/or white feminists to neglect race. Bilge highlights that the appropriation of intersectionality to examine identity categories other than and apart from race can only be "countered by insistently emphasizing intersectionality's constitutive ties with critical race thinking and (re)claiming a non-negotiable status for race and the racializing processes in intersectional analysis and praxis" (413). Critical race theory is linked to Black feminist theory and Black theory more generally. By emphasizing CRT, Bilge is advocating for an emphasis on Blackness within intersectional analyses.

Jasbir Puar (2007) argues that intersectionality has become too diluted for critical race work, preferring instead to use assemblage theory in order to highlight the many overlapping ways that people experience identity. Puar (2007; 2017) uses assemblage methodology and terminology to explore her main consideration of the different capacity and debility structures that circle around disability. She argues that assemblage theory is useful in its articulation of affect and bodily experience as linked to not only human experience but also physical and animal processes. As well, Puar argues that assemblage is particularly necessary for identities that do not fit into Western conceptions of personhood. Ablebodied/ablemindedness is not so easy to distinguish from disability within processes that dictate particular affective connections as necessary and useful and others as not. Assemblage theory advocates for bodymind variation, including race variation, that are impure and cannot fit nicely into disciplinary boundaries. Affective registers beyond individual control mandate an understanding of identity beyond the individual.

In contrast, intersectionality, while also advocating for and with people who cannot fit nicely into disciplinary boundaries, still functions within these boundaries. That is, while assemblage represents people as being complicated collections of race, gender, sexuality, class, and disability that cannot be adequately studied through any given lens of race/gender/sexuality/class/disability but must be necessarily explained through an assemblage of all categories at once, intersectionality recognizes these categories both as separate and entangled. Thus, intersectional scholars can focus on gender, race, class, or disability while also implicating the other categories into their analysis. The two kinds of analysis, assemblage and intersectionality, accomplish similar goals, with both advocating that there are more complicated processes at play when analyzing identity formations, ones that cannot be adequately represented with separate points of analysis. Tiffany Lethabo King (2015) argues that intersectionality is critiqued for the ways it depends on identity categories, which allows intersectionality to be taken up by neoliberal institutions like universities or government agencies. While intersectionality has been at times criticized for not adequately addressing the messy realities of those who do not fit nicely into categories, assemblage theories have also been criticized for not adequately addressing the real pervasive power structures that are revealed when focusing on one particular lens of analysis. For example, assemblage risks recentering whiteness in its formulation that affect is unintentional or uncontrollable. As Lethabo King (2015) argues, “A tenacious and relentless embrace and redeployment of concepts like biopolitics and assemblage may actually be more of a sign of a wanton acceptance of a particular kind of speech (white male subject) than an actual sign of unending theoretical possibility and promise” (132). White people engaging in assemblage methodologies might find themselves recentering their own white understandings of racialized events or case studies because they fail to acknowledge how their affects are particularly centered.

So while assemblage might support white male theorizing, Black women founded intersectionality depending on Black feminist theory and critical race theory for its basis. Silma Bilge and Patricia Hill Collins (2018) argue that intersectionality takes its roots, not only from Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991; 1989) as is often cited, but also from Black women and women of colour in the 1970s and even before then. For example, they cite Toni Cade Bambara (1970), Frances Beal (1966), and Anna Julia Cooper (1892), pointing to the Combahee River Collective (CRC) and the National Black Feminist Organization (NBFO) as organizations that took seriously the intersecting identities of race, gender, sexuality, and class. While Therí Pickens (2019) acknowledges that assemblage theory can be useful, especially when examining the "folds" of difference that refuse to be contained in categories of race or disability, Pickens decides to explicitly turn away from Deleuzian frameworks, largely because of how important it is to support work created by and for Black women. She argues:

> Intersectionality is an epistemological intervention: it reorients how and from whom we understand the Enlightenment project. Redirecting that orientation back to Deleuze and Guattari (especially given that Hortense Spillers's work anticipates and expands Deleuze's ideas about the fold) reasserts the import of white European epistemologies over and against those of Black women and validates continental European intellectual traditions as standard. (18)

Turning away from Deleuze and focussing instead on the work of Black feminists might reiterate the importance of Critical Race and Black Feminist analyses, especially given the pervasive ableist desire to erase the intellectual capacity of Black people.

Intersectionality also theorizes structures of power, not just individual identity. In fact, Lethabo King (2015) clarifies that while intersectionality has been coopted into neoliberal institutions, its roots, specifically those of Kimberlé Crenshaw, Patricia Hill Collins, and the Combahee River Collective, emphasize "instability, back-and-forth oscillation, and double moves that deploy and collapse identity categories" (134) in ways that can be useful for poststructural and radical politics. For example, Crenshaw (1991) argues that it is not the process of construction of social categories that is at issue when it comes to those existing at the intersection, it is the ways that these social categories experience discrimination differently. That is:

> With particular regard to problems confronting women of color, when identity politics fail us, as they frequently do, it is not primarily because those politics take as natural certain categories that are socially constructed but rather because the descriptive content of those categories and the narratives on which they are based have privileged some experiences and excluded others. (1298)

Intersectionality allows us, then, to clarify or triangulate how identity categories fail us, just as it allows us to see the structures of power surrounding these categories.

Lethabo King "situates Crenshaw's work within a larger tradition of Black feminist thought that has had to contend with the discursive and epistemic limits of race, gender, sexuality, ability, class, and nation as categories that can claim to represent all lived experience" (129). However, Jennifer Nash (2018) cautions against equating Black feminism with intersectionality, arguing that through an emphasis between identity and theory, Black women are expected to continually protect and defend a particular vision of intersectionality, leaving innovation more difficult. Nash argues that intersectionality, like other terms, including diversity and equity, has been taken up and used in part because of the difficult work of Black feminists, who now must continue to defend their citational work. By letting go of attachments to citation and to original meanings of intersectional theory, Nash argues that Black women can begin imagining new forms of intersectional theory. What she calls "the intersectionality wars" involves many of the theorists I have outlined above, Crenshaw, Hill Collins, Puar, Lethabo King, and Bilge all take part in these wars, emphasizing that intersectionality has a particular history and should be interpreted in particular ways. While Nash convincingly demonstrates that feelings of defensiveness are expected of Black women and create a kind of bind for their scholarship, this defensiveness is also a political move that is useful in emphasizing Black intellectual production. In academic settings where universities do not support Black scholars or Black scholarship, defensiveness around citation and around scholarship is perhaps necessary, playing a crucial role against assumptions of Black intellectual inferiority. Further, white scholars like myself risk perpetuating stereotypes about Blackness if we present Black people as being defensive in their theoretical discussions of intersectionality. However, at the same time, we must be ready and willing to support our Black colleagues through and with critique as care, and to develop our own understandings and theoretical engagements with intersectionality. As Nash argues, it is possible to engage in intersectionality work—for example through the lens of Disability Studies—without co-opting or appropriating Black theory.

Teaching and highlighting the work of Black feminists and Black scholars is therefore not necessarily a sufficient solution to the perceptions of Black intellectual inferiority. It is also necessary to prioritize the hiring of Black professors, and engage Black pedagogy in the classroom. In November 2019, the Townhall about anti-Black racism at the University of Ottawa demonstrated that Black students and Black professors are already pushing for solutions to their experiences of anti-Black racism in universities. They advocate for hiring more Black professors, staff, and executives, also pushing for data collection to see how racism affects Black university community members. The final speaker of the event, Joanne St. Lewis, a Black law professor, argued that anti-Black racism would only be challenged through hiring and training professors who can lead intellectual change: "Who you hire and their willingness to take risks in the classroom—to actually challenge the orthodoxy—has to become a competency requirement if you want actual change" (Hemens 2019, n.p.). She also argued that this conversation needs to be ongoing, not just when examples of blatant anti-Black racism are publicized. The Scholar Strike Canada that took place in September 2020 likewise Made similar arguments, demanding the removal of campus police, hiring more BIPOC professors, the maintenance of mental health care at universities, and for affordable education.[8] These demands therefore transcend just the University of Ottawa, pointing to the need for "challeng[ing] the orthodoxy" at all Canadian universities.

Challenging the orthodoxy of white supremacy means listening carefully to the ways that anti-Black racism exist within all of us as educators, and how we need to challenge it inside ourselves as well as in our classrooms. St. Lewis also argued at the Townhall that "we consume the bodies of Black people and the spiritual energy of Black people to catalogue the conversation" (Hemens 2019, n.p.). Consuming Black intellectual production without hiring and promoting Black people, and while still maintaining myths of Black intellectual inferiority, is the major issue at the crux of this conversation. Framing "intersectional Disability Studies" without seriously considering race, reiterates the appropriation of Black theory.

Black Pedagogy and Intersectional Black Disabled Futures

---

[8] See www.scholarstrike.com for more information.

In the second chapter, I examined the ways certain words are mobilized on teaching and learning websites, demonstrating that “race” is often erased or replaced with more settled words. While I did not include “Black” in my written analysis, I did check to see whether this word was used in any of the websites that I examined; it was not. This lack of educational materials on the specificities of Black learning models once again highlights the pervasive whiteness of the university. In this final section, I examine some of these pedagogical priorities and positions to argue that Intersectional Black Disabled Futures are possible within our classrooms, if we are willing to continue challenging white supremacist institutions. While Black studies should remain in the hands of Black scholars, the dismantling of white supremacy should not be a task only completed by Black people. We, including those of us who are not Black, must continue to struggle for the benefit of our Black colleagues and Black students in order to struggle against the inaccessibility of universities. While part of this work involves representation—for example, demonstrating that Black disabled people exist and thrive in communities, including university communities—Black pedagogies also challenge us to reframe our classroom discussions.

First, there is no singular Black pedagogy. Black pedagogies in the plural often highlight the process of learning through and against oppressive structures. For example, the work of bell hooks (1989; 1994; 2003; 2000; 2009) often highlights the importance of critical thinking in the classroom, especially for Black students. Teaching through and with students’ understandings of their social identity positions, hooks argues that framing learning as transactional knowledge donation from teacher to student does not do justice to the ways that learning takes place in a classroom. Taking her inspiration from Paul

Freire’s *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, hooks argues that pedagogy needs to take place as an ongoing discussion and ongoing process of knowledge creation with students, who already have knowledge and understanding about their class, race, and gender positions. In *Teaching to Transgress,* hooks argues that learning as a classroom project should be “exciting, sometimes even ‘fun’” (7). She thinks of the classroom as a pleasurable place, which may be counter to the seriousness that we imagine a classroom to embody. However, the pleasure of learning, of gaining the tools to challenge the oppressive structures in which we live, is a necessary, crucial part of learning. Policing must therefore be removed from exciting, pleasurable learning spaces, in order to truly allow them to become accessible for Black students.

Audre Lorde (1984) similarly argues that “poetry is not a luxury” for Black students. Creating an environment where pleasure and the erotic can be welcome in a classroom means also recognizing how poetry, art, film, and other creative works can be life-saving, rather than just additional resources. Many Black pedagogies integrate song, and art into their classrooms to encourage students to learn creatively, rather than only through institutionally supported learning assessments (see for example DiAquoi 2014). An emphasis on creativity might also be a welcome addition to classrooms for disabled students of many kinds, as learning does not take place in the same way for every body or every student. Lorde’s challenging declaration that “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house” also encourages educators to create new tools, even outside of traditional classrooms. Indeed, looking to movements like BLM and Idle No More as educational tools in themselves might be part of how we can rebuild classrooms.

Adrienne Dixson (2018) argues that BLM, which primarily relies on social media as its method of bringing communities together, demonstrates a lack of positive educational models in institutional environments like schools. Dixson argues that while BLM integrates intersectionality and citational practices—consistently giving queer Black women credit for their leadership roles—schools instead use methods of cultural education that focus on food and other cultural practices, erasing oppressive structures that exist primarily for Black people. Vickie Cox Edmondson, Brandy Edmondson, and Tonya Perry (2018) argue that because of BLM's success as an intersectional movement, it can be used as an educational tool to teach critical thinking. They argue that "the movement represents a conscious-raising opportunity that prepares learners to consider multiple sides of an issue, conduct their own research, and use reflective thinking as they question what they read, see, hear, and so on" (289). Black led movements like BLM take the oppressive experiences of the policing of Black people and translate this oppression into active resistance.

Similarly, Courtney Cole (2017) argues that BLM encourages educators to imagine a new future where Black Lives and Black experience matters in the classroom. This future can be enacted now in the ways that educators choose to centre the experiences of Black students and the work of Black scholars, artists, and cultural icons. By using the work of Beyoncé and BLM specifically in the classroom, she has been able to "enact culturally sustaining pedagogy (CSP)" (737). Cole points to the work of Ladson-Billings (1995) to define CSP in three components: "academic success, cultural competence, and socio-political consciousness" (738). While "cultural competence" has been co-opted in many neoliberal corporate structures and de-politicized, teaching with cultural competence in mind alongside socio-political consciousness is useful, as it encourages educators and students to work together to define and outline culturally oppressive systems, as well as their solutions.

In emphasizing the connections between learning processes and political, social, and artistic processes, Black pedagogies encourage students and educators to imagine a future where Blackness is centred in our classrooms, rather than seen as threatening or unwelcome. Challenging the representation of Blackness as incapable of learning simultaneously challenges ableist understandings of learning as a specific and solitary function. That is, supporting Black pedagogies in the classroom also supports pluralistic learning and teaching methods. By imagining new tools to dismantle the master's house, and to potentially build new houses and new worlds, we can centre an Afrocentric educational methodology.

Conclusion

In December 2019, while I was in the process of writing this chapter, a University of Ottawa student had died by suicide, the fourth student this year. While I cannot confirm the race of any of these four students—and they could also all be white students, which would not diminish the severity of this mental health crisis—I think considering the connections between mental health policy and anti-racism policy is necessary. Anti-Black racism has been shown to affect mental health (see for example Thomspon-Miller and Feagin 2007); in fact, Koulmiye-Boyce referred to the experience of being handcuffed publicly as "humiliating" and "traumatizing" (Koulmiye-Boyce 2019). The inaccessibility of campus security also extends beyond Black people, as anti-Black racism also affects Indigenous peoples and People of Colour. When campus security is given enough power to encourage Black students to see themselves as unwelcome on "private property," while also given the responsibility to be the first responder in cases of mental distress, Black students are less likely to seek support during mental health crises.

This chapter has examined the ways that campus security act as police on university campuses, making these campuses perhaps intentionally inaccessible for Black students, scholars, educators, and employees. At the same time, universities are co-opting and using Black scholarship and pedagogy without giving these scholars credit, keeping out the scholars from the white university. Black members of the University of Ottawa community have highlighted the main issues inherent in anti-Black racism on campuses: a lack of Black scholarship being taught as Black work; a lack of Black professors teaching any courses; and a lack of anti-oppression or anti-racism training for all university personnel. Hiring and training policies are only the first step to the end of anti-Black racism on university campuses; a larger culture change is needed to dismantle the eugenic interpretations of Black intellectual inferiority. This includes changing the perception that there are universal methods for teaching and learning, or that everyone learns in similar ways.

The mental health crisis on university campuses is connected to the ways that the university is upheld as a neoliberal business that depends on learning assessments to dictate student performance. Eugenics therefore plays a hand in both mental health on campus, and in the anti-Black racism that Black students experience. Part of the change that is needed here at the University of Ottawa, and in other large universities, is an acknowledgement that this form of learning assessment—universal, heavy-handed, clunky—does not work for our students. In Chapter Five, I explore pedagogies of care as well as pedagogical tools that will help educators within the university system. These tools have the potential to create intellectually accessible spaces for students who have been Made to feel unwelcome on university campuses, including Black students diagnosed with LDs. In the Chapter Four, I explore mental health beyond institutional definitions. That is, I argue that Mad Studies and taking seriously our failures in the classroom can be helpful for BIPOC disability theory, as psychiatric systems often go hand-in-hand with carceral logics. In both Chapter Four and Chapter Five, I offer practical changes in the classroom in the struggle for less oppressive institutions. This chapter turn from theoretical to practical is also a turn to begin the process of enacting, rather than just imagining a university future that is no longer structurally anti-Black.

Part 2: Intersectional Disability Studies in Practice

Chapter Four: Learning through Failure: Mad/Crip Failure in the Classroom

Introduction

In the last week of January 2020, the University of Ottawa hosted an organization on campus that caused an uproar among students. The Citizens Commission on Human Rights (CCHR), a group affiliated with the Church of Scientology, rented a section of the student centre for its exhibit entitled *Psychiatry: an Industry of Death*. Students began a protest of the exhibit, arguing to reporters, other students, and university administration that this exhibit—which among other things claimed that psychiatry was the cause of the Holocaust—supported the stigma around mental health, specifically around taking medication for mental health diagnoses. In the first week of February, my Disability Studies class had been scheduled to discuss antipsychiatry, Mad Studies, and neurodiversity. Given the events of the previous week, I felt it was important to differentiate between the Church of Scientology's version of antipsychiatry and Mad Studies' criticisms of psychiatry, as well as the importance of remaining critical of psychiatric intervention and the psychiatric system more generally. While the Church of Scientology bases its criticisms of psychiatry in a conspiracy that positions psychiatric violence as the most egregious form of violence, Mad Studies understands psychiatry as potentially violent in part because of its connection to systems of oppression. I wanted to emphasize how Mad Studies has the potential to both criticize psychiatry and to criticize spiritual "cures" that erase how systems of racism, sexism, cissexism, and heterosexism connect to sanism. Instead, I was met with students who were unwilling to acknowledge psychiatry's flaws, discrepancies, and power. This class about antipsychiatry and Mad

Studies is probably one of my biggest failures in the classroom because I left feeling like my students would no longer trust me. During class I asked the question “how can I both support the mental health of my students while also teaching about antipsychiatry?” In this chapter, I continue to explore this question. In examining what I consider a large failure in the classroom, I also consider failure in general in higher education, where excellence is most often based in the lack of failure. Turning to affect theory, I consider how failure can “feel bad” in ways similar to the bad feelings that neoliberal universities connect to mental health. Failure, especially queer/crip failure, can therefore tell us a lot about the university’s relationship to mental wellness and mental health.

Part of the uproar regarding the CCHR exhibit was because of a mental health crisis on campus. Between March 2019 and March 2020, the University of Ottawa acknowledged 6 deaths by suicide within the university community (communications on March 14, 2020; February 10, 2020; December 6, 2019; October 31, 2019; May 21, 2019; April 26, 2019). These six deaths are representative of a larger issue within education where students do not feel connected to their peers, their educators, or to others outside of the institution. The neoliberalization of the university has emphasized individual success and a need for individual solutions to mental distress. The combination of racism, colonialism, sanism, and ableism on university campuses has Made universities a dangerous place for those who do not already have community and/or familial support. Like most professors and educators, I have had many students come to me with their mental or psychological distress, crying in my office hours, for example. I often direct these students to resources on and off campus, sharing the knowledge that other BIPOC students have complained about the quality of largely white on-campus services (some publicly, see Mason 2020). At times, I have also seen the discourse of mental health within a neoliberal framework erase the support of (often BIPOC) families and communities. When BIPOC communities refuse to be pathologized and named mentally ill because of the trauma of racism and white supremacy, they also risk being interpreted as unworthy of academic accommodation. Rachel Gorman (2013)'s analysis of her own students' access to institutional supports highlights that the words that certain communities use impacts who has access to institutional support:

> Racialized narratives of who is understood as having a diagnosable disorder, and who is understood as attempting to manipulate the system, are evident in the [accommodation] petition process and in parallel institutional processes that assist with emergency bursaries and housing. (278)

Because (mental) disability is imagined, within a white supremacist society, to be only a white condition, Mad or disabled BIPOC students are disadvantaged in multiple ways. First, they are interpreted as not disabled enough for academic accommodation, and second, they are told that their own communities are not supportive when these communities refuse and/or cannot access psychiatric intervention. Throughout this chapter, I will examine the ways that mental health has been co-opted under a white definition of "mental" and "health," a definition that erases non-medical forms of therapeutic healing and other forms of emotional or psychological well-being, in favour of psychiatric diagnoses that white students have access to, while BIPOC students may not.

On February 27, 2020, the University of Ottawa held a town hall, inviting its community to air its grievances and to propose solutions for the mental health crisis taking place on campus. Many students challenged the *Psychiatry: An Industry of Death* exhibit once again, while others recounted the mental health impacts of having no on-campus counsellors trained specifically in sexual assault or anti-Black racism. On June 24, 2020, the University of Ottawa announced the results of an ongoing investigation into solutions to the mental health crisis. The main recommendation was for counsellors, some trained in anti-racism, to be added, training required of every university student to know where these resources exist on campus, and to create partnerships with "community organizations," more specifically psychologists and psychiatrists. At the time of this writing, the University of Ottawa has not Made any recommendations regarding workload or financial precarity, instead investing resources in these partnerships.

That the University of Ottawa can establish psychologists and psychiatrists as "community organizations," without naming any other forms of community support, speaks to the power of the psychiatric system in overtaking other forms of community support. While I sincerely do not want to discourage students from attaining psychological help, in the form of psychiatry or any other service, I will continue to remain critical of a system that often erases and overshadows community resources. When it comes to mental health, the university is quick to solve the issue with small incremental reforms without acknowledging its own structural impacts on students' mental wellbeing. For example, austerity measures at the post-secondary level have erased the possibility of free tuition, or even in some cases, subsidized tuition. How many more students would feel able to perform well at university without the burden that tuition brings? Similarly, the pressure for academic success connects failure in academic settings to negative mental health. By emphasizing success, rather than allowing for failure, universities support a competitive and stressful environment. Thinking through the ways that antipsychiatry theory has challenged my students to recognize those with experiences different than their own has also brought up questions beyond antipsychiatry.

More specifically, social justice education often brings bad feelings with it. Students and educators must grapple with their own complicity in violent systemic processes, which can create confusion, frustration, anger, sadness, and exhaustion. If mental wellness means never feeling or living with these uncomfortable emotions, then social justice education is going to always be at odds with mental wellness. Sara Ahmed argues in the *Promise of Happiness* that happiness, good feelings, and good mental wellbeing can be set up as an excuse not to seriously consider racism, cissexism, sexism, and—though she does not mention it—ableism. The feminist killjoy kills the joy of a mental health system that erases or overlooks systemic oppression.

This chapter aims to ask how discourses of mental health at universities impact the teaching of Disability Studies. The first half of the chapter explores Mad Studies and antipsychiatry, as well as the particular moment of Scientologist antipsychiatry propaganda at the University of Ottawa. I examine the claims Made by the Church of Scientology's Citizen's Commission for Human Rights (CCHR) in relation to Mad Studies and explore why students were quick to defend psychiatry as a field. In this first section, I explore how antipsychiatry became a sticking point for students who were unwilling to be critical of scientific or medical knowledge. Part of the issue is an erasure of past generations' struggles against psychiatry; psych survivors, or the x/c/s movement has not been widely taught. While there are some exceptions to this—the History of Mad People course at Ryerson being one example—the erasure of a long history of resistance to psychiatry has left many students without the avenue to explore an option outside of psychiatry. I then connect Mad Studies to Disability Studies, emphasizing the violence of the medical system alongside that of the psychiatric system. Unsettling institutionally mandated knowledge is arguably a tenet of Disability Studies, one that is shared by Mad Studies. Together, Mad Studies and Disability Studies have the potential to encourage alternative kinds of futures for Mad or mentally ill people, ones that do not depend on the hegemony of psychiatry.

The second half of this chapter goes beyond looking to antipsychiatry or Mad Studies by exploring the ways that social justice education can be both good and bad for our students' mental health, and what we can do as educators to support them through such education. Here I grapple with what it looks like to be teaching outside of or against the knowledge bases of the majority of the students at most universities, who remain white, cisgender, straight, and ablebodied. By taking up examples from transformative justice and pedagogy of accountability, I imagine a classroom where accountability allows all of us to learn against systems of oppression. In contrast to neoliberal models of mental health, abolitionist, transformative justice, and accountability models emphasize conflict and failure as generative starting points, rather than as problems to be eliminated or "overcome". By emphasizing queer/crip failure as useful in classrooms, rather than as something in need of constant correction, I risk presenting failure as a step towards academic success. Instead, I think of failure as generative in the ways it highlights mental health as more complex than neoliberal models of mental health—which might present everyone as either in good or bad mental health. I conclude this chapter by considering some of my own failures in the classroom to demonstrate that although being called out and called in brings bad feelings, it can also bring the potential for community growth. While neoliberal models might teach us to turn away from or move past our failures, I wonder throughout this chapter how practical failures can be. This chapter represents a turn in the dissertation away from theory and into pragmatic experience; I therefore centre my own voice as an educator and as someone who has described themselves as Mad. While failures often exacerbate bad feelings and crises in my life, I argue that they are necessary moments of growth.

Mad Studies, Antipsychiatry, and CCHR

According to Gorman (2013), Mad Studies "takes social, relational, identity-based, and anti-oppression approaches to questions of mental/psychological/behavioural difference, and is articulated, in part, against an analytic of mental illness" (Gorman 2013, pp. 269). Mad Studies, a North American—and largely Canadian—field, is rooted in the resistance to psychiatry, with the psychiatric survivor movement and the asylum inmate movement before it, bringing up new nomenclature including ex-patient, consumer, and survivor (x/c/s) until the current Mad moment. Antipsychiatry is a part of that history, with Mad scholars and scholars in Mad Studies (who may not identify as Mad), also critiquing the power that psychiatrists have over their Mad people. The main difference between antipsychiatry and Mad Studies, according to Gorman and LeFrançois (2018), is that Mad Studies explicitly centres the experiences of Mad people:

> Although critiques of psychiatry have been around for decades, from radical and feminist therapists to antipsychiatry activists and critical psychiatrists (to name a few of the most prominent historic and current sources), none of these critiques have specifically centred the knowledges and theorising of those who have been

> deemed Mad. (107)

Mad Studies therefore takes a critical look at psychiatry, but more specifically acknowledges the work, theory, and understanding of those who have been named or name themselves Mad.

Mad Studies scholars have often been called Scientologists when they bring up critiques of psychiatry (see for example Gillis 2015). Indeed, CCHR began in 1969 with the help of one of the earliest antipsychiatry scholars, Thomas Sasz, and continues to speak against psychiatric violence. Its museum, located in Los Angeles but also sometimes brought to university campuses like the University of Ottawa's exhibit in late January 2020, uses emotional language and exaggeration to disqualify psychiatry as a medical field. The exhibit claims that psychiatry created the Holocaust and South African apartheid (Eastgate 2001). These claims, which refuse to acknowledge the place that ableism and racism took in both Nazi Germany and South African apartheid, discourage university students from making connections between power relations, instead blaming all ills on a single scholarly field, psychiatry. Indeed, Donald Westbrook (2017) argues that while CCHR claims to be a "watchdog" of psychiatry's harms, it was created "arguably in the service of a larger and quite grand theological objective, namely the eradication of the very practices of psychology and psychiatry at large and their eventual supplanting by Hubbard's 'technologies' of mental and spiritual health: Dianetics and Scientology" (40). According to Scientology (founded by Hubbard), psychiatry is a barrier to true mental harmony for all of humanity (42). CCHR simplifies the causes of oppression in part because it also depends on a very simple solution: belief in one particular religion, Scientology.

The main critique that University of Ottawa students brought against the *Psychiatry: an Industry of Death* exhibit was not its erasure/flattening of power relations, and its refusal to acknowledge racism, however. Rather, students argued that the exhibit would discourage others from seeking psychiatric help if they were experiencing mental distress. More specifically, the exhibit speaks against medication for people experiencing mental distress, arguing that it is part of a larger conspiracy for drug companies to make money. Student protestors were angry that the stigma against pharmaceutical drug use would be encouraged through a university-sponsored on-campus event. In response to the protesting students, the university president, Jacques Frémont said, "we support evidence-based science" ("U of O students denounce anti-psychiatry exhibit" 2020). This response distinguished another underwritten critique of the exhibit: the un-scientific nature of the emotional claims brought forward by CCHR.

In our conversation during class, students were especially angry to hear that I recognized antipsychiatry as a legitimate stance within the field of Disability Studies. Many of them actively defended psychiatry because of its services for Mad people, especially medication. As someone who has at various points in my life identified as mentally ill and Mad, I empathize with the desire to protect people who use medication. I also know that medication, like medical diagnosis, varies across bodies, cultures, and people. For example, many anti-psychotic drugs act as sedatives for those who are framed as dangerous; a study conducted by Correctional Services Canada found that psychotropic medications were prescribed to those in federal prisons at a rate almost four times the general population, with 30% of inmates prescribed these medications compared to 8% of the general population (Brown et al. 2017). Psychotropic drugs are, of course, different from anti-depressants, which are different from anti-anxiety medications. Presenting all of these medications as similarly stigmatized erases the structural differences of being diagnosed and prescribed these medications, not to mention their costs and side effects. As I repeated to my students, each Mad person must come to terms with their own relationship with medication, with diagnosis, and with psychiatric intervention. Emphasizing “evidence-based science” could potentially take away from a Mad person’s agency and autonomy in deciding that specific drugs do not work for them, even if recommended by scientific studies according to their diagnosis. For some people, the stigma of not taking medication drastically outweighs the stigma of taking it. That is, because of the need to cure or regulate madness, psychiatry has emphasized that medication is a necessity for certain Mad people, erasing alternatives, in part because alternatives might mean that psychiatry itself is unnecessary. Fighting against sanism involves both acknowledging that Mad people should have access to life-saving medication, and should be able to question their own prescription.

Gorman and LeFrançois argue that anti-stigma campaigns run by psychiatric hospitals and research facilities have co-opted Mad testimonies for their own ends, emphasizing “changed lives” (110). They argue that discourse of “stigma” emphasizes the “help” of violent systems, supporting psychiatry while not necessarily liberating or improving the lives of Mad people. Instead, they advocate for “sanism” as a term coined within Mad Studies that has the potential to describe both the discrimination for seeking or needing psychiatry services, and the discrimination and oppression within the psychiatric system:

> ‘Sanism’ has the potential to account for both discrimination against those

> perceived as Mad and for psychiatric violence, while ‘stigma’ only accounts for the former. Indeed, in contemporary mental health campaigns, the ‘problem’ with stigma is that it causes delays in ‘getting help’ from what are, ultimately, oppressive systems. (110)

Similarly, because Mad Studies has become more acceptable in universities as an academic discipline, Gorman and LeFrançois argue that radical antipsychiatry has been de-emphasized in favour of more neoliberal discussions of madness as difference. They argue that classrooms must not erase the violence of psychiatric systems by presenting madness as yet another disability, for example, where pharmaceutical drugs are presented uncritically as “just like” other lifesaving medications, erasing the structural impacts of these medications.

In the introduction to *Mad Matters: a critical reader in Canadian Mad Studies*, editors Brenda A. LeFrançois, Robert Menzies, and Geoffrey Reaume introduce Mad Studies as an academic field committed to social justice for those named Mad or for those who take up this name for themselves, as well as allies and those who are critical of systems that disproportionally oppress Mad people:

> Mad Studies in this sense incorporates all that is critical of psychiatry from a radical socially progressive foundation in which the medical model is dispensed with as biologically reductionist … As such, antipsychiatry is included within Mad Studies as contributing much to our understanding of the nature of psychiatric thought and practice by helping to reveal the inner workings of a profession that has dominated interpretations of madness but which, over the past

> 50 years, has had critics from within and without assail its presumptions, criticisms which continue today. (2)

Like the field's critique of psychiatry, alternative kinds of support outside of psychiatric models are likewise critiqued within Mad Studies when they reiterate sanist interpretations of Mad people as in need of help or in need of cure. However, critiquing spiritual "cures" of mental illness did not seem to be a challenge for my students. Instead, my students struggled with Mad Studies' emphasis on the oppression involved in psychiatric processes.

The idea of ending or abolishing psychiatry, something that many antipsychiatry scholars still advocate for (see for example Burstow 2014; 2015; 2016; 2017; 2019), was also a challenge for my students to imagine. Bonnie Burstow (2014) compares antipsychiatry to prison abolition, arguing that like a world without prisons, a world without psychiatry is hard to imagine because of how entrenched psychiatry is in the way we see the world and ourselves:

> The point is that we [those who want to abolish psychiatry] are up against a very complex system, with huge vested interests, with the complicity of the state, and with the blessings of a fearful general public. We are also up against thousands of years of prejudice against people whose ways of thinking and processing differ from those of folk deemed 'normal'—prejudice that, as theorists and members of the Mad movement such as Ester (2000) correctly point out, predates the medical model and predates psychiatry, but has been Made far more formidable by the veneer of science. Additionally, some who use psychiatric services are legitimately worried that without psychiatry, they will be out in the cold. (37)

This excerpt highlights the three major issues that the uOttawa CCHR exhibit brought to the fore: the erasure of Mad knowledge as knowledge, the justification of psychiatry as a scientific—and therefore reputable source, and finally, the fears of psychiatric service users who *can* imagine a world where their needs are ignored because those needs are often already ignored. Burstow argues that this resistance to the abolishment of psychiatry must be addressed with abolitionist methods, pointing to attrition as an important goal for antipsychiatry advocates. She gives three questions we can ask of a reformist policy to see whether it truly supports the abolishment of psychiatry: the first asks whether the action "moves us closer to the long-range goal of psychiatry abolition," the second asks whether the action gives legitimacy to the current psychiatric system, and the third asks whether the action would allow more people to be caught "in the web of psychiatry" (pp. 39). CCHR's exhibition is therefore not a very good antipsychiatry activity, as it gives legitimacy to the current system, and encourages the university to further justify psychiatric education, for example. Through an attrition model, CCHR's exhibit fails to enact antipsychiatry, even as it forcefully purports to support it.

Even if we do not agree with abolishing psychiatry outright, antipsychiatry can be useful in its insistence on a critical lens and its connection to other forms of abolition. Police and prison abolitionist traditions encourage models outside of police and/or carceral systems. These movements have also been led by Black and Indigenous peoples, with the emphasis that BIPOC experience incarceration at higher rates than white people and that these systems support white supremacy. Antipsychiatry can help us examine the ways that BIPOC are similarly over-psychiatrized and overepresented within mental health systems (see for example Gorman and LeFrançois 2018). Mad BIPOC folks also emphasize how psychiatry becomes an extension of carceral systems, locking up BIPOC outside of the justice system and also retraumatizing them in the name of therapy. Ejiogu and Marcus Ware (2018) analyze their own experiences with the psychiatric system as specifically gendered and racialized. Syrus Marcus Ware describes being pathologized for being gay, transsexual, and Black, at times explicitly by his doctor: “He [the doctor] told me repeatedly that if I wasn’t depressed about being gay, I should be” (125). His pathologization, he argues, is directly related to his identities, where a white psychiatric system pathologizes Blackness alongside transness and queerness.

Pathologization likewise takes place in the wake of academic failure. Students who experience psychological distress because of their inability to keep up with academic definitions of success are often encouraged to access mental health services on campus. Indeed, I myself have been encouraged by professors and other mentors to seek psychological and psychiatric help at different points in my academic career. The stress and burden of academic success has translated to more panic attacks than I’d like to admit, especially at the graduate student level, where success is no longer measured in concrete graded assignments, taking place in more uncertain terms. This academic stress has also taken place alongside the stress of social justice, where bad feelings are necessary for self-reflective social justice work. I have found myself in the throes of different kinds of failure, publicly and privately navigating the precarious and perilous academic definition of success alongside my own potential Mad experience.

Mad studies, which builds on antipsychiatry but more directly centres the experiences of Mad people, has the potential to recentre the experiences of Mad BIPOC, and to encourage alternatives to psychiatric intervention. Following Burstow (2014)’s lead as to the connection between abolitionist standpoints and critiques of psychiatric systems, the second half of this chapter is focussed on how we might encourage psychological wellbeing in our classrooms through community transformative justice models, rather than carceral models found in prison and psychiatry. Part of this work involves acknowledging that abolition is not only a social movement, it is also a personal movement. Dependence on police or other state representatives to take care of the violence in our lives, to lock it up and silence it, re-emphasizes the violence of these systems. Instead, we must be invested in our communities, our families, and what Mia Mingus calls “pods” to turn away from carceral punishment. Psychiatric intervention can often function as another way to continue ignoring structural oppression in our lives. BIPOC, women, trans, queer, and/or disabled people become Mad instead of being structurally oppressed. However, Louise Tam (2013) argues that the Mad movement has the potential to reinscribe racist systems by emphasizing sanism as the only major form of oppression and by appropriating BIPOC therapy as alternatives to psychiatry, without adequate recognition. Similarly, Gorman and LeFrançois (2018) caution Mad studies against taking up metaphors of psychiatry being “like being colonized” (110) as these metaphors erase BIPOC Mad folks. In positioning queer/crip failure as a useful part of our university classrooms, I highlight abolitionist work in our classrooms as a necessary challenge to academic models of success and academic representations of mental health, advocating for alternatives to psychiatry as a response to mental health crises on university campuses.

Fitting Madness into Critical Disability Studies

Mad Studies is sometimes described as a subsection of Disability Studies; however, there are some important distinguishing factors between the two fields. Disability activists have criticized the antipsychiatry movement for distancing itself from the term “disabled” (for example, see Withers, 2014). However, many Mad people argue that “disability” does not fit their real lived experience. While “disabled” fits as a term to describe a larger movement, many Mad people prefer the term “Mad” because it does not denote their experience with mental difference as exactly the same as physical disability. Jasna Russo and Debra Shulkes (2015), for example, look specifically to the term “disability” as it applies (or does not apply) to people with mental distress. They write that there are three ways that “disabled” is used: as a personal identifier, as a state classification that often comes with disability allowances, and finally, as an umbrella term useful for organizing very different kinds of people (31-32). For Russo and Shulkes (2015), the term “disabled” seems to be used by disability activists (as in the third usage) without necessarily listening to the personal identifications of people with mental distress (the first usage) (32). This can be problematic for those who have experienced diagnosis as a violent form of naming; that is, those who have had the psychiatric system classify them based on their behaviours or mental distress might feel especially wary of new classifications like “disabled”.

In contrast, Margaret Price (2010) explicitly uses “mentally disabled” to describe herself and those she writes about. She writes that there are many other terms that are also useful, including “neurodivergent” (Price, 2010, 16), “persons with impaired bodyminds,” (Price, 2010, 18) “psychosocial disability,” (Price, 2010, 18-19) and “Mad” (Price, 2010, pp. 10). Like “mentally ill” which has largely been challenged by Mad

Studies, but is still largely used by those interacting with the system in some way—for example Emily Martin (2007) uses this term—each of these terms has been taken up by some people with mental distress, but has been rejected by others. Price (2010) writes "as with *queer*, the broad scope of *Mad* carries the drawback of generality but also the power of mass" (pp. 10), while "mental illness" is reflective of a larger model of healthy/unhealthy bodymind:

> Mental illness introduces a discourse of wellness/unwellness into the notion of madness; its complement is mental health, the term of choice for the medical community as well as insurance companies and social support services. This well/unwell paradigm has many problems, particularly its implication that a Mad person needs to be 'cured' by some means. (pp. 12)

For Price, mental disability becomes a useful term because of its coalition building potential, bringing Mad people in conversation with other people with disabilities. The medical model does not necessarily have to take part in Mad experience, especially for those who are resistant to the intervention of psychiatry.

Like Price (2010) who refuses to use the term "mental illness," Philip Rosenbaum and Heather Liebert (2015) argue that the term "mental health" is problematic because mental can mean anything involving a person's consciousness including "a person's thoughts, feelings, affects, emotions, beliefs, expectations, hopes, dreams, judgments, and ideas of who and how they became that way (history)" (pp. 181). Connecting "mental" with "health," they argue is dangerous because of the binary of healthy/unhealthy. If the medical system can define what is or is not a healthy mind, they can also define what thoughts, feelings, affects, emotions, beliefs, expectations, hopes, dreams, judgments, and histories are healthy. This gives the medical system a very powerful ability to name, define, and categorize.

The power of the medical system to question sanity based on "a person's thoughts, feelings, affects, emotions, beliefs, expectations, hopes, dreams, judgments, and ideas of who and how they became that way (history)" is upheld and supported by education systems, like those of universities that delineate what knowledge is legitimate, and what knowledge is "crazy". Indigenous knowledges, for example, were erased from higher education and banned from education systems more generally, so much so that some Indigenous scholars doubt whether it is possible to ever reform education in a way that fosters Indigenous knowledges (for example, see Simpson 2017). As Dian Million argues, Indigenous peoples are often expected to be Mad because of the trauma of colonization. The discourse of traumatic colonialism justifies disregarding Indigenous knowledges once more, as Mad peoples' knowledge base is contestable.

When mental health is based on only positive feelings, affects, emotions, beliefs, etc, those who are critical and those who are negative are represented as inherently bad for mental health. In *The Promise of Happiness*, Sara Ahmed (2010) describes what she calls "a happiness script" as a proscriptive assumption of what social dynamics will lead to happiness (88). If we refuse these dynamics, or cannot adhere to their standards, we are imagined to cause unhappiness or to inevitably inherit unhappiness. Ahmed gives the example of the "unhappy queer" to illustrate the way that happiness scripts become normative: there is a discourse around the "happy couple" that is heterosexual, married, procreative, and stable. Two women are therefore imagined to be automatically outside of this equation, unable to accomplish happiness because of their sexual orientation.

Similarly, Ahmed describes the “melancholic migrant” as someone who cannot accomplish whiteness, and therefore must always be outside of the bounds of happiness. We can easily see how socio-economic class, disability, and other social markers can also be barriers to happiness, within a model that reiterates a white, middle-class, ablebodied, heterosexual person as normal and happy. When behavioral norms around happiness are refused, and bad affect follows, this bad affect is often pathologized as “mental illness.” The result is that mental health is not necessarily about “objective” health, but about affective normativity, or what we imagine to be normative affect.

Disabled people are also often expected to perform normative affects, especially positive ones. Ghaida Moussa (2019) delineates the ways that chronically ill Queer, Trans, Black, Indigenous, People of Colour (QTBIPOC) are encouraged by their health providers to think more positively in order to reduce the pain within their bodies. Looking specifically to fibromyalgia, Moussa demonstrates how if QTBIPOC refuse this mandated positivity, they are often given psychiatric diagnoses like depression or anxiety. For many QTBIPOC, psychiatry enacts a form of “institutional gaslighting” where their perceptions and experiences are put into doubt first, rather than acknowledged as embodied experiences (Moussa 2019). Indeed, taking critical race theory into account when considering mental health, Moodley, Mujtaba and Kleiman (2017) argue “Since the origins of mental health practice are replete with racial stereotypes, it becomes problematic for mental health practitioners to purport to be non-oppressive and a guarantor of social justice” (80). Mad Studies reminds us that Mad BIPOC experience racism within mental health systems as well as within health systems more generally because of the intersection of racism (often anti-Black racism), sanism, and ableism.

At the same time, Rachel Gorman (2017) argues that Mad Studies must be careful in taking up affect theory, as this theory could potentially essentialize Mad experience, removing the specificity of power relations. Some affect theorists argue that affect is an unconscious or “excess of consciousness” (Clough 2007) that some experience differently. Gorman argues:

> Mad theory and Mad movements risk similar reifications of essentialized ‘excess of consciousness’—specifically through adhering to ideologies of difference that emerge through disability rights claims and liberal identity politics in Western capitalist political formations and social movements. (310)

Gorman reminds us that in representing madness as a secondary or separate form of disability identity, rather than “an assemblage of an individual’s engagements with sedimented formations of social/cultural relations” (310), we risk reiterating conflicts of race and disability within Mad Studies. We risk framing madness as something that happens outside of other forms of identity, as an inherent part of a person’s brain or body, something that can be altered with medication, but not with structural changes. In other words, by essentializing Mad experience, we risk supporting psychiatric systems that medicalize social experience.

Gorman also connects queer of colour affect theory—an affect theory that challenges the idea of affect as unconscious—to madness, by arguing that those who are affected are Mad, according to the psychiatric system: “those who are sane have emotions, while those who are pathological have affects” (311). This is necessarily connected to experiences of white supremacy, where a white rational person "is initiated in its subjecthood through its capacity *to affect*, and *not to be affected*" (311, emphasis in original). White Mad people, she argues, have the capacity to be reintegrated into whiteness through antistigma campaigns that emphasize madness as emotional complexity. In the following few sections, I explore what this might mean for classroom dynamics where conflict and complex conversations must be encouraged in order for social justice learning to take place. What happens when we turn away from medicalized understandings of mental health as pathological, and instead support unpleasant and distressing self-exploration within our classrooms?

Classrooms being "good" or "bad" for mental health

The experience of discussing the CCHR exhibit with my students unsettled my relationship with my students in the classroom. During the discussion, I could see from their expressions that they were unwilling to take me seriously after I had defended antipsychiatry; for some this meant that the subject matter going forward in the class was less reputable. I call this moment a failure of teaching, because I did not fully outline the reasoning for my defence of antipsychiatry, instead repeating the question of how I might support my students' mental health while also teaching antipsychiatry. Framing the question in this way implies that students are correct in their assumptions that antipsychiatry is fundamentally "bad for mental health". While I think antipsychiatry is indeed "bad for mental health," this may not be true within the definitions of mental health that my students understand. I was trying to frame mental health as something inherently linked to psychiatry—that is, that the term "mental health" and the conception of mental wellness as a medical understanding is incompatible with antipsychiatry.

Instead, students perhaps interpreted this statement of mental health as a state of psychological wellbeing. Perhaps I should have reframed the question with: “How can I both support your psychological growth while also critiquing oppressive systems of psychiatry?” or even “how can we have difficult conversations while not actively harming each other?”

According to Gorman, it is white Mad subjects that are permitted back into whiteness through anti-stigma campaigns that redefine Mad affect as Mad emotion. It is perhaps unsurprising that those who most defended psychiatry in my classroom—some even writing final papers in defense of psychiatry—were largely white. bell hooks (2010), and others, have written about white tears in critical race classrooms and the risk of recentring whiteness by managing or confronting white discomfort in discussions about racial oppression. At the same time, I would argue that mental health campaigns, including those in universities, are built (in part) to encourage a management of discomfort in classrooms. Anti-racism education, or disability justice education is not a comfortable process; on the contrary, it depends on deep discomfort, especially for those who have not already acknowledged and begun the work of dismantling their own complicity in oppressive systems.

Conversations about discomfort and fostering good mental health in the classroom are connected to ongoing conversations of “safe spaces” in classrooms. Louise Tam (2013) reiterates bell hooks (1992)’s warning against mobilizing feelings (whether good or bad) when “forming radical subcultures” (284). Instead, she reminds us of bell hooks insistence that

> Rigorous critique and thoughtful reflection are a part of systemic resistance and need not be viewed as antithetical to our movements. In our struggles to relate race and racialization to madness, we might consider how hooks' demands for system resistance are substantively relevant to the organizing goals of Mad activists. It is not in our best interests to celebrate any work by a Mad-identified person at the risk of passive consumption because rigorous critique is a gesture of respect and love. (285)

Within the classroom, rigorous critique, especially in the face of conflicting or controversial subject matter, is also absolutely "a gesture of respect and love". This is perhaps even more true when this critique is uncomfortable, unpleasant, or difficult to hear. Sherene Razack (1998) argues that in her experience, white people do not give critique to BIPOC scholars or students, instead taking on a listening position. This lack of critique could be part of how white supremacy works within our university institutions. bell hooks (2010) argues that conflict within the classroom is inevitable and that it is

> often professors and not students who want to maintain the 'safe' classroom because it is simply easier to demand that students cultivate an atmosphere of seamless harmony in the classroom and harder to teach them how to engage in meaningful critical dialogue. (88)

As educators and for those of us teaching critical Disability Studies, it is often our responsibility to both encourage critique in the classroom, while also supporting our students' emotional and psychological growth.

Supporting our students' emotional and psychological growth involves encouraging complicated feelings of anger, frustration, and guilt. This works differently in different contexts, however; BIPOC students, queer students, and trans students, and those with multiple of these identities might feel discomfort from unintentionally or intentionally racist, heterosexist, or cissexist comments in the classroom. These feelings of discomfort are different from white straight cis students feeling discomfort in their newfound complicity in these systems of oppression. Throughout this dissertation, I have shown that teaching disability must also involve considering racial oppression and racism on a deeper level. For many students, discussing race and racism involves considering their own participation in structures of white supremacy. Such a process can be emotionally fraught, with unsettling and negative feelings brought to the fore. Chris Chapman (2013) argues that anti-racist work depends on a cultivation of "troubled consciousness" where anti-racist people are willing to grapple with their own complicity in structures of oppression, even if this grappling depends on negative and unsettling emotions. Chapman argues that unsettling emotional distress should be fostered and explored, rather than erased or overlooked, as negative feelings are necessary for racial liberation. Disavowing these feelings, Chapman argues, could come hand-in-hand with disavowing the responsibility for white people to be actively anti-racist.

Disability Studies classrooms can learn from anti-racist pedagogies by turning towards accountability in the classroom. Audre Lorde (1984) reminds us: "the true focus of revolutionary change is never merely the oppressive situations which we seek to escape, but that piece of the oppressor which is planted deep within each of us" (60). We therefore need to begin by doing the work to recognize how power influences the classroom space. Instead of thinking through how we might make it a "safe space"—a term that began in spaces specifically designed for particular oppressed groups, educators have turned to the phrase “brave space[s]” (Arao and Clemens 2013) to emphasize how taking accountability in pedagogy and course work is a brave action, depending on both educators and students to be brave, even in spaces that may not be able to be “safe”. This lack of safety in the classroom—spaces that have a legacy of being racist, colonial, and ableist that may be impossible to remove—can be compared to the ways that emotional or psychological wellbeing may not be stable in the classroom. That is, Disability Studies, like other social justice fields, depends on a willingness to acknowledge emotional upheaval within ourselves in favour of long-term growth.

Creating connections and communities depends on a recognition that we all have the capacity to learn and grow through and with each other. By taking accountability for the harms we could potentially (and do) perpetuate in the classroom, we have the potential to foster communities within our classrooms, communities that will inevitably contain Mad people, with behaviour and emotions we may not expect. In the next section, I outline some strategies for supporting brave spaces in the classroom and supporting student participation that might lead to feelings of being supported, heard, and recognized. The neoliberalization of university classrooms with its focus on maximizing paying “customers” has caused classroom sizes to grow at the detriment of human connection (Hill 2017, 174). Loneliness, rather than active critique, might be at the heart of university mental health crises (Stern 2017). Classroom accountability might have the dual effect of supporting the learning of our students and connecting with them on deeper levels, so that they know that someone cares about them and their wellbeing, beyond academic measures of success. At the same time, large class sizes limit the accountability measures that each educator can implement with their students. Better Disability Studies classes at the undergraduate level must go hand-in-hand with anti-austerity measures that challenge limits on full-time educators, challenge increased class sizes, and challenge precarious teaching labour.

Brave Spaces in Disability Studies Classrooms

Lynn Verduzco-Baker (2018) argues that just as there were limits to extending the idea of "safe spaces" beyond community spaces safeguarded for particular communities, there are limits to "brave spaces" beyond the workshop environment where they were originally cultivated. In university classes, the concept of the "brave space," she argues, often corresponds with students of colour—or openly disabled, trans, or queer students, for example—doing the work to educate the white (ablebodied, cis, straight) students, who are much more likely to perpetuate micro-aggressions. This work also differs for instructors who are themselves "women, people of colour, young, and/or queer, transgender or nonbinary gender" (586), as knowledge creation is still expected to be from the perspective of white straight men. Even when talking about issues of racism, white people are still given more authority in the classroom by virtue of this whiteness. Similarly, sharing experiences of madness, for example, or mental distress, can bring with it risks of being considered irrational or less knowledgeable, even when talking about madness.

In thinking through brave spaces, Verduzco-Baker develops some tools in the classroom for instructors to support better learning environments:

> Specifically, I suggest the following: (1) integrate first-person "virtual" accounts of personal experiences of oppression in the curriculum to eliminate dependence upon students to do this, (2) practice "calling in" rather than "calling out" to

challenge uninformed or biased beliefs, and (3) model being brave in their own response to being “called in.”

By integrating readings, videos, and other materials in our teaching that give first-person accounts of oppression—for example, giving disabled BIPOC a platform in our classrooms—we minimize the need for students to play the “informant” through their own traumatic narratives. Experiencing oppression in the classroom, just as in any other space, is inevitable. By inviting our students to “call in” each other and us as educators, we might be able to turn those oppressive moments into learning opportunities for all the students and challenge the oppressor within ourselves. The process of “calling in” comes from Loan Trån (2016) who describes it as a “process of pulling folks back in who have strayed from us. It means extending to ourselves the reality that we will and do fuck up, we stray, and there will always be a chance for us to return” (59). Calling in thus differs from “calling out” which might aim to shut down someone with power from being able to continue acting in an oppressive manner, instead encouraging us to reclaim the person who has caused harm back into our community. Verduzco-Baker outlines 5 steps to calling someone in:

1. repeat the problematic statement but revise it to be more appropriate;
2. restate the assumption the person meant no harm;
3. explain where the general misconception or myth originates, historically or as perpetuated by contemporary culture and social structure;
4. describe the harm caused by this kind of comment or usage of particular language; and
5. draw on class content to reveal the flawed assumptions underlying the comment. (589)

What this five-step process gives us is a clear way to challenge oppressive language and actions in our classrooms, especially if we are willing to also be challenged by our students. I have experienced being “called in” by my students in the last few years a number of times. Responding to being called in involves “resist[ing] defensiveness and embrac[ing] the moment instead as an opportunity to learn” (590). Learning alongside our students and demonstrating growth with them leads to better trust building between students and educators. While it would of course be best never to have to be called in in the first place, educators also exist within an oppressive world with oppressors living inside of us. The powerful position of the educator that we fulfill can sometimes feel precarious, especially when our jobs actually are precarious because of the neoliberalization of the university. However, choosing to acknowledge our mistakes and work to do better, rather than defensively ignoring or covering up criticism, leads to better classroom experiences. Acknowledging our failures thus creates opportunities for learning and building community.

Calling in is one form of classroom accountability that can be enacted in our classrooms to create a better community, better trust between students and between students and educator, and potentially support both the uncomfortable process of learning as well as the loving acknowledgement that listening provides. Ana Clarissa Rojas Durazo (2011) also describes some tools in the classroom to better support our students as a classroom community. In 2006, a student in one of Durazo’s classes admitted to raping someone who many of the students in the class knew. In the subsequent classes, Durazo cancelled the activities that had been planned and took the time with her class to create an accountability plan for the student who had committed the rape, as well as reaching out to the survivor. The class worked hard at breaking down the defensive barriers that the perpetrator had put up regarding his own actions. Following the steps outlined in an essay by Communities Against Rape and Abuse (CARA) entitled “Taking Risks: Implementing Grassroots Community Accountability Strategies,” the class went beyond the first principle that the perpetrator began by citing—“Recognize the humanity of everyone involved” (64) and “organize[d] collectively” (66) to “prepare to be engaged in the process for the long haul” (68). The perpetrator ended up dropping out of the class in which he had originally admitted his assault, but the class as a whole described the experience of following the CARA guidelines as liberating and satisfying, something that they would bring with them into their everyday lives.

There are a number of things that educators committed to social justice can learn from Durazo’s example, especially when teaching materials that challenge students’ perceptions of themselves and their communities. Especially if we are committed to police and prison abolition, finding ways to keep our communities accountable is vital. If we begin by viewing accountability not as a chore, but as an act of love, we can better support those within our communities, including our students. Similarly, while thinking of moments of being “called in” may feel like failures, we can use this failure to everyone’s benefit, rather than thinking of them as successes. Being accountable to our students means more than just showing up for class prepared, it means being straightforward when we cannot give our all, and owning up to our mistakes. Sometimes that might mean changing the syllabus at the last minute because of the events happening in the world that deserve immediate critical attention. Just as Durazo was willing to put their classes’ materials on hold, we must be willing to consider who our students are and how their realities are affecting their work. Similarly, we must allow the classroom to act as a community, even when the needs of the community sometimes might seem contradictory, we must be willing to grapple with those contradictions.

Mia Mingus (2018) has written about the importance of beginning accountability processes from our own perspectives first, rather than demanding accountability from others. What this means from an education standpoint is for educators to stop complaining about our students who have not done the work of adhering to our deadlines, expectations, or procedures, and ask how we might continue being accountable to them. For Mingus, access is love, critique is love, and accountability is love; by beginning with the question of how we can support accessibility, respectful critique and accountability beginning with ourselves, we have the potential to show our students that they are not alone. This accountability beginning from within has the potential to remind students of the care we are putting into our teaching practice. Students who feel isolated and alone experience mental distress in higher rates; showing them that critique is a form of respect and care by first taking on that accountability potentially gives them new forms of connections with their peers and with us. In the next section, I explore queer/crip failure as delineated by Jack Halberstam (2011), Jasbir Puar (2017), and David Mitchell, Sharon Snyder, and Laura Ware (2014).

Queer/Crip Failure

Halberstam (2011) argues that failure can tell us a lot about institutions of power through how it frames success and failure. While Halberstam primarily examines cultural texts, including films and television shows, his argument that failure can be generative beyond heteronormative models of success can also help us consider institutions like universities and which subjects they frame as successful. Throughout this chapter, I have been examining failure as something that might lend itself to Mad experience, as experiences of failure in the classroom translate to bad affective responses. Similarly, experiences of being called in can feel like personal or academic failures when they take place within academic institutions, meaning that good mental health is perhaps incompatible with social justice education.

Using Halberstam's consideration of queer failure, Stacey Waite (2014) describes a failure in their own pedagogy and how this failure has encouraged their classroom to change in ways that could better support learning through failure. One of Waite's students was very quiet in the classroom, and was encouraged by Waite to talk more in order to earn participation grades. This student's final paper examined exactly how being silent in the classroom is often pathologized or criticized, as silence is equated with unintelligence or the inability to learn. Waite realized through this student's work the ways that their own classroom politics—that depended largely on student discussion—were being called in as potentially discriminatory against alternative models of learning. Silence in the classroom can often present itself as failure, but this failure allowed their student to learn composition as demonstrated by an interesting and well-composed final assignment. Waite struggles against failure as something that is merely a stepping-stone towards success; instead, failure, they argue, tells us a lot about normativity and who embodied normality in the classroom.

Waite's exploration of failure emphasizes silence as a queer learning method, especially in classrooms that expect or demand discussion. All classrooms, like all community spaces, contain norms and expectations that certain people can and will never be able to live up to. Classrooms are especially fraught with failure, however, in the expectation that all students must be assessed, as success depends on particular learning objectives that all students must adhere to. Just as capitalist systems encourage certain kinds of success, depending on the failures of some, academic institutions measure success through bell curves and averages—the very definition of normal.

In tracing queer failure, Puar (2017) argues that the "It Gets Better" campaign erases the specificity of neoliberal success. "Better" for white gay men does not translate towards "better" experience for all, instead only support the normality of a single particular kind of queerness. Progress narratives that promise better classrooms, better universities, and better student/educator relationships often depend on some kind of exclusion. Classrooms without conflict or failure do not exist, and cannot exist, because of the ways that academic success depends on the failure of some. They also cannot exist because "better" is often defined in ways that already exclude alternative kinds of stories, epistemologies, or experiences. That is, in order to become better, queer experience must become more normal.

For example, Mitchell, Snyder, and Ware (2014) argue that disabled students must become more abled in order to succeed in academic institutions, hiding their disabilities. However, crip ways of living and understanding the world can be generative and expressive, creating new ways of learning and living in and beyond the classroom. They advocate for curricular cripistemologies that depend "upon the insights of human interdependency," where students are not encouraged to experience learning alone, but to think through learning as a collective experience, mediated by bodily and mental incapacities. For example, my own experiences with panic, anxiety, and overwhelm in the classroom might be experienced as a limitation—as something that prevents me from experiencing the classroom space—or as a form of embodied knowledge in itself. Just as Halberstam encourages us to imagine queer failure not as something in need of eventual correction, but as a generative process that helps clarify what norms exist, crip failure in the classroom can be helpful in delineating the limits of university success and knowledge.

Thinking through embodied knowledge and affective knowledge means recognizing that bad feelings are necessary points of failure within academic spaces that present objectivity as success. Mad Studies, including antipsychiatry, can help us support students who are destined to fail within spaces that will not get better. Rather than working towards more success, we might work with and explore failure with our students, especially exploring who is framed as embodying and expressing affective success. While psychiatric interventions might aim to alleviate mental distress, supporting failure might involve living with and living in mental discomfort, learning from and with those who are framed as failing.

The limits of failure

In this section, I trace the limits of failure through an anecdote about a teaching institution removed from the university and a story that from first glance also may not be about disability at all. This story has helped me imagine potential coalitions between identity groups, and reminded me that, within all classrooms, identity does matter. In the final pages of this chapter, I connect this anecdote and my own experience as a white settler straight-passing cis-passing feminine-presenting woman feeling unsafe in a "classroom," to the ways in which university institutions must dramatically shift their educator demographic. More specifically, this story highlights how highlighting accessibility has the potential to benefit those who may identify as disabled at all, and how all educators do not fail in the same way. Rather, it is sometimes necessary to remove people from power when they fail, showing the limits of failure as pedagogy.

This story begins when I was learning to drive in my mid-twenties. My driving instructor was a white settler man twice my age. As I had the wheel of a car for the second time in my life, we were talking about things other than driving. At one point he was telling me about his girlfriend who was only a couple of years older than me. He told me not to worry though, he wouldn’t hit on me because I was too young for him. At the end of the lesson, he was driving me home and drove right past my apartment building. I felt my whole body clench as he cheerfully told me that he wanted to show me how to switch lanes, something I had done very poorly earlier in the session. I did not pay any attention to the lane switch, instead checking the outfit I had chosen to wear that day. It was a sweltering day in July, and I was wearing the shortest, smallest strapless dress I owned. Suddenly I was not comfortable with an outfit I had chosen for comfort.

I was already thinking of how I might address the inappropriate comments and actions of my driving instructor days later, when I ran into him while I was walking home alone from dinner. He was standing beside his car with the driving school logo secured on top. I smiled politely, saying I was not expecting to see him so soon, as our next class was scheduled for the following week. He joked, “I’m stalking you”. I laughed nervously, quickly walking away from his car and towards my apartment. This man had my phone number, my address, my occupation, and a copy of my driver’s license, and he was joking (I hoped) about stalking me. It was clear that I would never feel safe in a car with this person.

I emailed the driving school, making it clear that I wanted an apology from my instructor or to be assigned a female driving instructor. I was told that no female instructor existed. Instead, I was given an explanation for my instructor’s actions, and a half-hearted apology from the administrative staff. Later, after I requested another instructor a second time, I was assigned a new instructor, another man twice my age. In my first class with this new instructor, he told me that he was an expert in teaching “nervous drivers,” and was normally assigned neurodivergent and physically disabled drivers, as well as drivers that were learning to drive again after traffic collisions and other traumatic events. By requesting a driving instructor who would not sexually harass me, I was placed with an instructor who specialized in driving with a disability.

While I cannot understand the experiences of racism as a white settler, as a young straight-passing cis-passing woman, I do understand how impossible it was for me to learn in a sexist environment. I felt strongly after finishing that first driving lesson that I would not be comfortable taking my lessons with a man. In fact, it took me weeks to trust my new instructor enough to give him my phone number, instead corresponding regarding our schedule entirely over email. I learned to drive well because of this instructor. He was extremely good at his job. In many ways, I was lucky that being a feminist killjoy was equated with being disabled. In standing up for myself, I received the best possible instruction within an institution that continues to be inherently sexist and ableist. In this experience, sexism Made me into a “nervous driver,” both disabling me and eventually capacitating me when sexism was translated into disability. Because I knew, through my Disability Studies background, that disability is not something that has to be shameful or negative, the form of accommodation given to me by my driving school was the best they could do given their resources.

This story of failure highlights three things: first, that failure is not experienced the same way by all educators. My first instructor was never penalized for his actions. Educators with identities that hold power do not lose this power when they fail. For those of us that are white settler educators, we must consider how we use this power and what we do when we are not penalized for failures that do merit our removal from power. Second, disability is never just disability. Rather, the social construction of disability depends on power relations and who is imagined to be normal. I later had a long conversation with my second instructor about why the company did not have any female instructors; even after hearing why he had been assigned my case, he could not believe that a sexist culture existed there. This collective disbelief that was probably shared by others at the driving school translated my actions into nervousness, even though I actually find driving a very calm activity. Finally, third, this story highlights how accountability must begin from centering the needs of those calling out or calling in. If I had received an apology from my first instructor, my experiences would have differed dramatically.

Conclusion: More teaching failures

Practicing accountability in the classroom means recognizing when you are wrong, when you need to shut up and listen, and when you should have spoken up. This chapter features a number of different moments of failure in the classroom in order to help us imagine spaces where accountability is possible. All of us, as educators, will fail. These failures have the potential to bring processes of accountability with them, processes that are invaluable to our learning. Within carceral models, failure is the end of an experience; failing a class indicates that you are personally responsible for not doing enough to pass. In carceral models, failure is something that can lead to mental distress, as it implies a personal failing. In transformative justice models, failure is a starting point from which our communities and classrooms can begin to work better for us, even as we work through and with mental distress. Fostering cripistemologies does not necessarily mean correcting or fixing mental distress; rather, we might learn from and with our experiences of mental instability and mental distress.

To end this chapter, I want to consider one last moment of teaching failure, one that arguably began this dissertation. In the summer of 2019, I was looking over my course evaluations for the first Disability Studies class that I had taught in Winter 2019, a second year course with 150 students in the Institute of Feminist and Gender Studies. At that time, I was writing a very different dissertation, and had imagined this class to be something separate from my scholarly work. Two comments from two different students emphasized to me that this separation between research and teaching needed to drastically change. First, a comment forcefully told me that I should have taught Jasbir Puar and the fact that I had chosen not to cover her in a Disability Studies class was unforgivable. Second, a comment argued that the way that I had framed my relationship to race was inadequate. These comments, alongside other small critiques, had me reflecting on what I might do to make my course better. I realized, through these two comments that I had failed in this first course to properly integrate race in my Disability Studies class. This failure was one that I knew had roots in Disability Studies itself. That is, I am not the first white person to make this mistake. However, through reflecting on this issue, I realized that just adding more BIPOC folks to the syllabus would not be enough to truly consider race in the study of disability. In the process, these comments forced me to start redefining my dissertation project. I am grateful to my students who challenge me to work on and with my failures, and who teach me that I am worthy of criticism. I only hope that I can help them to access that same process.

While considering teaching failures can be disorienting, unsettling, and frustrating—and not necessarily "good for my mental health"—it is these failures that have led me to transform my classroom. Similarly, we can transform our communities and ourselves through accountability and critique. This chapter has represented a turn away from the theoretical into moments of my own teaching failure. In the fifth and last chapter, I take these themes even further by asking about pedagogical care and accessibility in times of crisis. By specifically exploring the university's changes to accessibility in the time of the COVID-19 pandemic, I show that pedagogical care, accountability, and access is love.

Chapter Five: Caring Classrooms in Crisis: Creating more Accessible University Classrooms

Introduction

On March 13, 2020, the University of Ottawa announced that classes would be cancelled on Monday, March 16 and Tuesday, March 17 and that the rest of the Winter semester would take place online. This unprecedented announcement was the result of a rapidly spreading contagious virus caused by COVID-19; a few cases of coronavirus had appeared in Ottawa and the surrounding areas. Ottawa citizens were being encouraged to stay indoors and engage in social distancing. Universities and other educational services were being suspended across the country, with students being sent home, and educators at a loss for how they would alter or suspend their classes. In this moment of crisis, pedagogical care was of the utmost importance.

When this news was announced, I had already been spending the day starting the process of moving my own class online. Weeks leading up to this moment had been making it more and more clear that people with chronic conditions and older people would be most hard hit by the spread of the virus. As I was teaching a Disability Studies course, I was very aware of the ways that my students might be experiencing this virus first hand. Because of this crisis, I had also been reflecting on my own classroom set up. Had I been attuned to the needs of my students throughout the class, not just after hearing information regarding this unprecedented pandemic? The transition to online classes was also fraught in my mind: it has been clear to me, despite my training in online, distance, and blended classrooms, that technology often causes accessibility issues, especially for those who do not already have access to a strong wifi connection, a working computer, and enough space/time to complete online work. I had initially planned to write this chapter about classroom accessibility as an intersectional issue, but thinking through accessibility during a time of social distancing brought up new questions and queries.

The Coronavirus pandemic brought up questions that pushed the concept of accessibility even further. For example, was it ethical to expect the same from my students during a collective traumatic event as severe and all-consuming as this particular crisis was turning into? When students' friends and family could potentially be dying, when BIPOC people are more likely to contract the virus, when students are potentially working overtime in hospitals and in grocery stores, when students are potentially isolated from their families, friends, and support networks, when students are already being bombarded by a very pessimistic news cycle, how can educators expect learning to take place? What does pedagogical care look like in the time of a pandemic? Is learning possible, even while trauma is taking place?

This chapter explores accessibility in a classroom context and the connections between pedagogy and care. Like the previous chapters, I will be emphasizing the intersectional nature of accessibility concerns. That is, rather than imagining disability separately from gender, race, class and sexuality, I will point to the ways that accessibility concerns should also encapsulate cultural, racial, gender, and class difference in the classroom. If Access is Love, as Alice Wong, Mia Mingus, and Sandy Ho argue through their campaign (Access is Love), pedagogical care and accessibility are inherently linked. I argue that Universal Design for Learning (UDL), a method that often coincides with conversations about accessibility, must be connected to Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP) to adequately address difference in the classroom. These two pedagogical perspectives must also be paired with an ethical orientation that recognizes both the universality of bodymind differences, and the specificity of disability and the possibility that conditions fluctuate. A universalizing impulse, as I discuss below, does not see disability as an exception, instead considering disability as something that affects all students in different ways.

Finally, I also examine the limits of individual educators; post-secondary institutions often leave accessibility concerns in the hands of their professors, many of whom are not permanent faculty. Placing the accessibility decisions, education and labour in the hands of professors who are given very little—or in most cases, no—accessibility training places the project of access onto the precarious worker, rather than the institution. While flexibility is absolutely necessary in educational processes, as accessibility needs are often fluctuating and unknowable, this flexibility must not be downloaded onto already overworked and underpaid precarious faculty.

This chapter examines the announcements that the University of Ottawa sent to its students and to its faculty, alongside its regular accommodation procedure. The new flexibility of the University of Ottawa, a flexibility that was arguably thrust on its precarious and permanent faculty without adequate or paid training, demonstrates a pedagogical care for students within a time of pandemic that was not present for students with disabilities before this crisis took place. This care that was only extended to all students when the majority of students were affected is reflective of a concept within Critical Race Theory: “interest convergence” (Bell 1993). Derrick Bell (1993) argues that Black students are only integrated into white schools when this process benefits white supremacy. Jay Dolmage also used this theory to comment on disability in 2005 and again in 2015 (Dolmage 2005; 2015). More recently, he has directly applied this concept to the ways that universities have changed their policies because of COVID-19 (Dolmage 2020). Using this concept also emphasizes the ways that disability is seen and treated as an exception or how the university depends on a minoritizing view of disability, something reflected in the University of Ottawa's accessibility policy.

I start this chapter by exploring what pedagogical care consists of in an educational setting. I then turn to UDL and CSP, exploring how these two teaching methods interact with pedagogical care. I then examine accessibility policies at the University of Ottawa, first before COVID-19, and then during. By attending to the work of Critical Race theorists who explore the possibilities of interest convergence, I argue we can better apply CSP and UDL in our classrooms. I end this chapter by examining some of the ways that we might design our courses in advance with disability in mind. By also extending the concept of disability beyond bodily difference and into racial, gender, class, and sexuality difference, I imagine a classroom that also emphasizes care from an intersectional perspective. Pedagogical care depends on a willingness to be flexible and understanding in times of crisis. However, pedagogical care also means ongoing critique and boundaries on the part of the educator. Knowing our limits, our capabilities, and our needs is also an important part of pedagogical care. I have therefore proposed an assignment for educators to complete and/or assign in their classrooms to better inform pedagogical care in an accessible format. This proposed assignment encourages a reformulation of what accessibility is, so that we can better uncover whose learning is centered in our classrooms.

Pedagogical care

Yusef Waghid (2019), an educational philosopher, has compiled feminist understandings of care, arguing that a philosophy of any kind of caring depends on seeing care as dependent on three aspects: caring “is a form of human attachment,” a “relational act,” and is “open to enacting one’s responsibility towards oneself and others” (Waghid 2019, pp. 4; pp. 6; pp.7). In other words, caring depends on forming attachments between two or more people, while also acknowledging the responsibilities involved when forming relationships with others. Waghid proceeds by arguing that this relational care attachment must be formed in a particular way in education; “democratic inclusion makes possible the enactment of speaking and listening (deliberation), disagreement (that could also lead to dissensus), and responsibility towards others” (9). Unlike other forms of caring relationships, perhaps, care in education depends on recognizing that disagreement can and should take place. Conflict, therefore, is at the heart of educational care, where conflicting understandings, constructions, or arguments can come into respectful conversation. Through this respectful conversation, all disagreeing parties come into new understandings, and potentially new construction of selves (22). While Waghid (2019) is leaning on feminist philosophies of care in exploring the philosophy of care in education, he fails to consider the ways that respectful conversation could be Made impossible depending on the structures of power in the classroom. What happens if the “responsibility towards… others” is not reciprocal?

Sherene Razack (1998) argues that classrooms always hold power imbalances, even when they are lacking people from dominant groups. For example, she describes the impact of a white disabled female student asking a Black female student for their story or opinion in a setting where this student did not want to speak. In this moment, the white disabled woman demands the Black woman's work after her own in a moment of power. Razack describes her own experience as a woman of colour after watching this Black student leave the room in tears; she was also impacted by the power of whiteness in this moment, despite her many years of experience working in classrooms, because of the pattern of white people demanding the stories of BIPOC (47-48). This moment of disproportionate power is representative of many classroom encounters where power and care cannot be reciprocal because of power in different identities. Disproportionate power also translates into care, through who is given critique and who is given encouragement, time, and understanding.[9] As well, who performs the care work plays into this arrangement; care work is a feminized form of labour.

Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha argues in *Care Work* that femmes of colour are often at the heart of care work, often without recognition: "But I remain, with many other femme and feminine people, harmed by misogyny—where endless free care work and emotional labor is simply the role my community and the world has for us. We are supposed to wipe the asses of the world without ceasing" (138). When this care work also coincides with chronic illness or chronic health issues, femme people often take on additional care work caring for themselves in a world that does not work for them. They are rarely paid, or sometimes not even thanked for their care labour. Piepzna-Samarasinha argues that:

> providing care is work. By work, I mean it's just that: work. I mean that the care work we give is essential to building movements that are accessible and sustainable. We are building and maintaining movements when we're texting to

---

[9] Razack (1998) describes how white women do not often give critique to BIPOC, instead engaging in "passive listening" (50).

> make sure someone is okay, talk on the phone for hours, talk shit on the couch, drop off a little care. Those things are not a sideline or an afterthought to our movements. They are our movements. And I have seen some of the most femme movements and communities—disabled ones, sex-working ones—organize very differently because they are fully centered around feminized, sick survivor care labor. (141)

We can also extend this work into the university setting, pointing to the care work that educators provide as work. When we listen and support during office hours where students come to cry and discuss aspects of their lives, or when we receive emails from students in crisis, we are providing care. This care is work. However, the care work that Piepzna-Samarasinha advocates for is a care work that is recognized and reciprocal.

In a university setting, how can care be truly reciprocal? The hierarchy of university work, with undergraduates, master's students, and PhD candidates coming below assistant, associate, and full Professors, makes truly reciprocal care difficult if not impossible. Those who do not have tenure often teach larger classes, having more students to care for. Precarious workers are more likely to be racialized workers as well (Canadian Association of University Teachers April 2018, 2). Finally, students are likewise not at an equal standing. If, as Waghid argues, care within the university setting depends on critique, criticism, and disagreement, how can educators both foster disagreement in their classroom when students are already beginning with difference, with power imbalances inherent in racial, gender, sexual, and disability difference? This is not to say that care cannot also involve fostering respectful disagreement. The issue is that the definition of "respectful" must always be critiqued and troubled.

Sara Ahmed argues that when the definition of respect is not troubled, the trouble is inscribed onto the body of the person representative of difference in the room. The affect alien, the person bringing up the disagreement, the odd one out, must do the work of justification. Often this affect alien is already outside of the structures of power that exist in the university institution: the woman of colour, the queer person with a disability, the trans or gender-nonconforming person. Katherine McKittrick (2014) argues that classrooms can never be safe spaces and that inevitable moments of violence will occur:

> I try very hard to create classroom conversations that work out how knowledge is linked to ongoing struggle to end violence and that, while racist or homophobic practices are certainly not encouraged or welcome, when they do emerge (because they always do!) we need to situate these practices within the wider context of colonialism and anti-blackness. (n.p.)

Taking the time to name anti-Blackness and to name ableism while it is taking place removes some of the power from the moments of violence. When these moments do take place, Cote-Meek argues that Indigenous students are often Made to perform the work of naming violence, without regard for their wellbeing. What we call care in the classroom, for example fostering disagreement about colonialism in the classroom, an Indigenous student might experience as a debate regarding their existence. Cote-Meek argues that content warnings are useful to help Indigenous students know when these conversations are taking place so that they can disengage if they need to. Content warnings can be useful accessibility measures in a classroom that supports pedagogical care and respectful disagreement.

When considering what care entails in a university setting, each educator needs to carefully examine their own position within the classroom: what are your needs in the classroom and what are the needs of your students? Who are you prepared to teach? For example, is your material meant to primarily cater to the majority of students, or to those most impacted by oppression? Rather than marginalizing those who are already Made marginal by systems of oppression—including white supremacy, compulsory heterosexuality, imperialism, colonialism, and cissexism—we need to be teaching with those very people in mind. Intersectionality reminds us that by teaching to and for the most marginal in our classrooms, everyone has the potential to learn. This way of thinking—focusing on teaching those impacted by oppression first—is put into practice within Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and in Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP), where disabled students and/or BIPOC students are centralized in teaching, rather than Made marginal by majority-focussed teaching.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

As outlined in Chapter 2, UDL is a classroom strategy that anticipates accessibility needs in advance and integrates them into the class before the class begins, rather than adding or accommodating disability retroactively or reactively. Universal Design claims to build in access for the highest number of people possible, creating technologies that would work for the majority (through a focus on minority needs), rather than adding in accommodations into the building or technology. By considering difference in advance, additional work to change the building, technology, or service is minimized, benefiting not just those accessing but also those in charge of maintaining or allowing access. We might compare this to caring in the classroom: the experience of being cared for is maximized and the work of care is minimized when those most marginal in the classroom are centred.

In *Building Access: Universal Design and the Politics of Disability,* Aimi Hamraie (2017) argues that Universal Design, though once focussed on making buildings more accessible specifically for disabled people, has since been more interested in the majority. The "universal" in Universal Design has, over time, erased the specificity of disability needs, instead pushing for design that would fit the most people. More often "most people" translates to what Rosemarie Garland-Thomson has named the "normate" or the corporeal representation of unmarked physical characteristics. Further, Hamraie argues that conceptions of disability often ignore or gloss over considerations of race, even though eugenics policies and conceptions of normal bodies are always racialized. The result is glossy new accessible buildings being constructed in neighbourhoods where gentrification is pushing out BIPOC and poor people, making these buildings ironically inaccessible to those most affected by oppressive structures.

In the same way, we might consider the ways that UDL does not integrate cultural or racial difference. What happens when BIPOC students are bombarded by racism in their classrooms by white students learning about their own racial privilege? Can we conceive of these moments as problems of access—where BIPOC students need access to classroom spaces where they will not experience violence? Thinking through access as not just an issue of embodiment, where spaces are Made inaccessible to disabled bodied, but also an issue of violence and oppression bridges gaps between students and encourages moments of solidarity between those experiencing inaccessibility in different ways. Similarly, what happens when Queer/Trans BIPOC students (or QTBIPOC) experience a combination of racism, transmisogyny, cissexism, and heterosexism in the classroom—or when this is embedded in the curriculum? Is it possible to differentiate between productive disagreement and oppressive communication?

Often, UDL appears on Teaching and Learning sites in the form of a checklist. In fact, I explored this reality in chapter two. These checklists often ask how cultural difference has been addressed in course design. However, they fail to explain what it might look like to address cultural difference. Intersectionality might be a helpful framework for imagining difference in the classroom, as it encourages us to design based on those most affected by oppression. This is similar to the origins of Universal Design which aimed to design based on those who were most unable to use any given space. Tabitha Grier-Reed and Anne Williams-Wengerd (2018) argue that Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy must be integrated with Universal Design for Learning in order for race to be prioritized alongside disability. Likewise, Waitoller and Thorius (2016) argue that in order to be done properly, UDL must integrate CSP, as race is inseparable from disability given contexts of eugenics, white supremacy, and settler colonialism. However, race is often represented in education, like disability, as a deficit in need of adjustment.

In most university settings, students with disabilities are asked to apply for accommodations that will erase or solve the deficit that their disability creates. Similarly, students who are not the default race, gender, class and sexuality in the classroom—in institutions that are often white supremacist, heterosexist, cissexist institutions—are expected to act and address their gender/race/sexuality/class difference in order to make up for this deficit. Disabled students are thus responsibilized for their own needs, including needing access to doctor’s notes and health assessments that might not be covered by health insurance. Similarly, students outside of racial and class norms—or students of colour and/or poor students—are responsibilized for their racial/class difference in the classroom, adjusting schedules for non-Christian holidays, for example, challenging racist remarks in classrooms, or justifying late assignments when work schedules conflict with assignment deadlines. Educators are not taught to consider how their student's lives and experiences outside of their classrooms impact their experiences in the classroom. Even when teaching feminist subjects, educators are taught to expect "academic rigour" in their classrooms, without regard for how that rigour might involve class or race privilege.

Troubling the understanding of class/race/disability difference in the classroom as deficit in need of correction must coincide with a troubling of who might be making these corrections. If difference in the classroom is presented as deficit, as it often is, students are responsibilized for solving the issue of their difference. However, replacing the responsibility of addressing difference in the classroom onto the educator is not a solution. In fact, we must challenge the idea of difference as deficit in order for our classrooms to truly "solve" the issue; true care would involve reconfiguring the classroom in order to interpret difference not as deficit, but as "disagreement" perhaps, something that is necessary for pedagogical care. If all classrooms will have some kind of disagreement, we can use the conflict created by accessibility needs in our classroom as a form of learning aid. In fact, Mitchell, Snyder, and Ware (2014) argue that Crip failure can lead to crip epistemologies; that is, difference in the form of disability, race or class difference, can help the whole class learn if we are centring the needs of those at the margins.

Crip success, Mitchell, Snyder and Ware (2014) argue, is the failure to become the normate. If we aim to represent learning as a process of knowledge creation, rather than as a result of knowledge distribution, disability has the potential to also be actively invited into classrooms. Disability can act as a new way of learning rather than a limitation or deficit to be overcome. If every process of knowledge creation depends on boundaries sent around goals, timelines, and activities, disability in the classroom creates new unforeseen boundaries, and new opportunities for alternative knowledges to be fostered in the classroom. Similarly to how CSP emphasizes the knowledge creation possible when we foster racial and cultural difference in the classroom, UDL can emphasize the possibilities for new crip knowledges.

Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy (CSP)

CSP examines and troubles the understanding of cultural difference as deficit, instead arguing that pedagogy should be culturally sustaining, rather than replacing or fixing cultural difference. By addressing cultural difference head on, and by considering the standpoint of the educator alongside the standpoint of their students, CSP challenges the representation or understanding of racial difference as part of classroom dynamics that often reiterate and strengthen power relations. Challenging power structures regarding race and class entails not just recognizing that class and race difference exists, but that power around those identities also exists. That is, the educator—many of whom are white and female—must not claim to know cultural experiences better than their students. Instead, they must grapple with whose knowledge they are choosing to emphasize in the class and whose experience is represented as “normal” or abnormal, and therefore in need of study or understanding. CSP recognizes that disability and race can both be useful forms of knowledge, rather than undesirable aspects.

In 1995, Gloria Ladson-Billings argued for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) because standard class curriculum was upholding white supremacy by making cultural difference seem abnormal or irrelevant. Ladson-Billings (1995) focussed on three areas that make up CRP: academic success, cultural competence, and socio-political consciousness (Ladson-Billings 2014, pp. 1). By academic success, she described the "intellectual growth" of the students; by cultural competence, she described the ability of the student to find knowledge in their own and at least one other culture; and finally, by socio-political consciousness, she described the ability of the student to apply their learning to real world problems beyond the classroom (1-2). Together, these three aspects make up CRP, a teaching style and methodology that emphasizes learning through and with cultural difference in mind.

More recently, Django Paris (2012) argues that Culturally Responsive Pedagogy is not enough. Being "responsive" to cultural difference in the classroom still centers and normalizes one kind of student at the expense of others. Instead, Paris argues that we must advocate for Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy, a rhetorical move beyond "response" and into "sustaining". Ladson-Billings (2014) also pushes beyond ideas of relevant teaching and into CSP, calling it "Culturally relevant pedagogy 2.0" (1). CSP argues that certain students are often set up to fail because their cultural differences are marked as deficient. Ladson-Billings (2014) argues that African-American students are specifically termed "at-risk" and "disadvantaged" without attempts given to understand how disadvantaged learning takes place. However, teachers that were successfully teaching African American students were applying similar kinds of tools in their classroom:

> By focusing on student learning and academic achievement versus classroom and behavior management, cultural competence versus cultural assimilation or eradication, and sociopolitical consciousness rather than school-based tasks that have no beyond-school application, I was able to see students take both responsibility for and deep interest in their education. (3)

CSP brings in the same tools as CRP: academic excellence, cultural competence, and socio-political consciousness, but does not stop at being “relevant” or “competent”. Ladson-Billings argues that the concept of cultural relevance has become static over time, erasing the ever-changing reality of culture and erasing the need for continued struggle against white supremacist teaching.

Similarly, conversations around “inclusion” are not necessarily helping us teach our most marginalized students. We do not need to “include” Blackness or International students, trans students, disabled students, or those who live at the intersections of these identities. We do not need to “include” them because they are already showing up in our classrooms. By using the word “include” or “inclusion,” we are not going far enough to actively center their learning. As Henry and Kobayashi (2017) argue “Inclusion” does not solve the issues of whiteness or other forms of identity dominance in the classroom (143). By advocating for UDL to also refer to differences around race, gender, and sexuality, and for CSP to also include disability, I want to emphasize that we need to completely change our classroom structures, rather than incrementally “include”. We need to build in change and difference into the way we perceive and interact with power in the classroom.

In many ways, the difference between CRP and CSP, or “relevance” and “sustaining,” is the difference between viewing cultural difference as an ingrained and unchanging minority identity and seeing cultural difference as something that applies differently to different people in changing and shifting ways. This difference is one that Eve Sedgwick arguably points to regarding queer identity, naming the former “minoritizing” and the latter “universalizing”. In the next section, I outline these two ways of viewing queerness, and apply them to disability and other identities that fall within the CRP and CSP frameworks.

Minoritizing and Universalizing views of disability

In *Epistemology of the Closet*, Eve Sedgwick (2008) differentiates between the minoritizing and universalizing views of homosexuality. In the minoritizing view, homosexuality is something innate and fixed in the person who loves people of the same sex. This view represents homosexuality as a minority identity that has its own perspective and its own culturally different experience, again built into the human body. The universalizing view posits that homosexuality is not innately built into human beings, but a social category that potentially impacts everyone. Sedgwick intentionally uses the term “homosexuality” to highlight the medical and legal definition at the time she was writing, highlighting that this term was a clinical and institutional term that was defining specific bodies based on specific behaviour. In pointing to these two views of this specific behaviour—the minoritizing saying that this behaviour was fixed in a specific minority, while the universalizing saying that this behaviour was a continuation of behaviours that everyone has experienced—Sedgwick is not necessarily arguing that one is right or the other is wrong. Rather, Sedgwick intentionally examines these views to emphasize how both are dependent on social understandings of behaviour.

The minoritizing/universalizing viewpoints have been also applied to disability (Garland-Thomson 2002; Kelly 2011), where certain people have described disability as a fixed and unmoving (or at least an agreed-upon) identity category, one that defines a specific way of seeing the world and a specific set of behaviours—the minoritizing view—or as a category that affects everyone to a certain degree, with behaviours and worldviews fluctuating with time, social circumstance and other kinds of identity—the universalizing view. Again, both viewpoints are useful; for example, the minoritizing view encourages a disability community, one that collectively fights against ableism. Calling disability a social identity is useful for disabled people who are socially and physically isolated by ableist structures. However, like queerness, disability is both a specific identity and a universal experience; all of us experience limitations in our bodies that limit our participation in society in some way. For example, we cannot be in two places at once, or able to read a book in a couple of minutes, as much as society sometimes expects us to be able to do both of those things. We have also all experienced some form of sickness or exhaustion, as limitations to our health. It is therefore possible to study disability as both a specific group of people or community, and as a social category that sometimes and often affects all of us.

As Aimi Hamraie (2017) argues, the danger with talking about disability as something that affects everyone is that we erase disability altogether, instead representing accessibility as something “for everyone” (7). For many, disability is not an abstract characteristic that affects everyone in various degrees, it is something in their own body and environment, something that they experience on a daily basis. However, one issue with minoritizing disability is that it potentially erases the possibility that disability could change. For example, for many with chronic conditions, bodily conditions—like pain for example—could improve or worsen with time and/or because of environmental factors. The minoritizing view also supports a representation of disability that should be individually accommodated or addressed, rather than giving a more general change that could help those who may not qualify for the individual fixed definition of disability. Finally, the minoritizing viewpoint could encourage a rights-based understanding of disability as difference and social identity, therefore not necessarily recognizing the intersectional nature of the disability category, potentially flattening very different experiences of disabled identity. As I discuss in chapter one and two, many communities do not define themselves as disabled, even though they also experience the labeling and limitations in embodied ways. For many Indigenous peoples, the category of disability brings with it a history of colonial state intervention, rather than community (see Ineese-Nash 2020 for example). An indigenous disability theory is still a contentious idea for many, because white settler disability communities still largely support military and settler colonial invasions in the name of better disabled lives (see Hutcheon and Lashewicz 2019). However, by applying the universalizing view of disability, we can open up the potential for sustaining Indigenous understandings and knowledge systems, as disability is not an isolated experience of the few, but something that appears and is experienced in all cultures in different ways.

The University of Ottawa largely supports the minoritizing view of disability through its Student Academic Success Service (SASS), the main way that disabled students receive accommodation for their accessibility needs. SASS communicates with professors of every class, giving them a list of modifications that they need to make for particular students. The students must bring medical notes to SASS in order to apply for accommodations. While SASS does not need to know the diagnosis of the student, they do require a list from a doctor or other specialist regarding “functional limitations” and what measures might address these functional limitations. If any of the student’s needs change, they must once again consult with a doctor or other specialist and go through this process again in order to receive different accommodations. Professors are instructed to refer “all accommodation requests related to a disability to Student Academic Success Service (SASS)—Academic Accommodations” (“Academic Regulation I-16 Academic Accommodations”) and to comply with all SASS decisions regarding academic accommodations. This includes uploading a copy of all exams to a system (VENTUS) so that those with academic accommodations can write their exams in an alternative location to the rest of the students.

At the same time as educators are expected to work within the accommodations given to them through the SASS service, they also “share the University’s legal responsibility for providing academic accommodation of students with disabilities” and are therefore expected to work “in collaboration with the Teaching and Learning Support Service, [and] consider universal design elements of their course that could minimize the need for accommodations” (“Academic Regulation I-16 Academic Accommodations”). The policy links to the TLSS website, which gives a checklist of what kinds of design tools an educator can use to minimize accommodation requests from their students. None of these tools are Made mandatory for teaching, apart from listing this requirement in the policy. This is an example of what Sara Ahmed describes in *On Being Included* as writing change into policy so that the university does not have to change. The accommodation policy includes UDL, rather than incentivizing or paying university professors to be trained in UDL.

SASS both purports to take care of the accommodation process for University of Ottawa professors, and expects the participation of professors. In the process, students and professors are responsibilized for the care of accommodations, while the university acts as a mediator between the two. The process encourages university professors—who may not be trained on universal design at all—to interpret their students who are in need of accommodations as needing *extra care*. Even though SASS runs a separate system for exams, segregating those who need differently formatted or more time on exams, university professors must pick up these exams at a different time, giving them a separate pile of exams for those who have gone through the disability system. This segregated system emphasizes those in need of accessibility measures, making it difficult for these students not to experience unconscious ableist biases.

Many studies have demonstrated that there are a number of issues with accommodations processes in universities across North America. Christopher Toutain (2019) reviewed 23 empirical studies, finding three major themes in issues with accommodations services at universities: lack of student awareness of available services, inability to access documentation proving needs, and stigma around receiving or needing accommodations. The accommodation process also leaves little room for fluctuating conditions or conditions not institutionally recognized. Students are forced to interact with multiple different institutional bodies, medical and educational, in order to be recognized as sufficiently disabled for disability accommodations, and even when they have received this accommodation, they are often interpreted as inferior because of their disability. Toutain demonstrates that university professors and students both had unconscious biases against those signed up through disability services.

In *The Question of Access*, Tanya Titchkosky (2011) argues that disability policies in the university are a bureaucratic function of the university that erase cultural or racial difference in the name of sameness:

> Ruled by person-first linguistic expressions, all disabled people are regarded as the same sort of people who happen to come along with a condition of impairment; embodied differences along with race, gender, and sexuality are thus Made to disappear. The process of bureaucratizing embodiment suggests that it is fair, or morally correct, legally efficacious, or even tacitly neutral to regard disability as a condition attached to some people while disregarding the ways disability is differentially conceptualized around the world. (95)

Titchkosky highlights the importance of reinterpreting accessibility to also represent other forms of identity, perhaps outside of university policies. Accommodations models reinforce understandings of disability as deficit, while at the same time emphasizing a “level playing field” (Price 2011, 59). People with disabilities—people that are removed from their gendered, racial, and sexual specificities—are represented as similarly unfit to complete university work without university help. This unfitness is measured on an equal basis, representing disability experience as an innate minoritizing difference without acknowledging the ways that this minoritization erases important differences in how people both experience impairment and the cultural identity of disability.

Disability accommodation policies therefore emphasize disability as a deficit to be corrected through accommodations given by the university educator, and erase difference in and through disability as a minoritized identity. At the University of Ottawa, SASS accommodations often also segregate disabled students while they are taking exams or other evaluations. Students with extra time on their final exams or alternative formats on these exams are placed in a separate room in a separate building, often far away from their professors. When I taught my first class, I went to each room that my students were assigned to answer questions and distribute stickers (a thank you that I was giving to all my students). I had to visit three different buildings and six different rooms. The students were surprised by my visit, saying that they had never had any other professor visit them while they were writing exams. More often, SASS is given the phone number of the professor so that if students have questions, they can call. Students have often complained that professors do not answer the phone when SASS calls them during an exam. Finally, professors have to pick up the SASS exams on another day than the exams the rest of their students have written, emphasizing which evaluations are written by disabled students. The limitations of university space makes it so that disabled students experience their disability as a deficit to be corrected, and as a difference that is emphasized through university procedure.

Finally, the accommodation policy is a rigid policy that does not incentivize its educators to apply UDL. If all accommodations go through SASS, educators are not encouraged to care for their students, even as this care might provide more support than an outside service can provide. For example, if a student cannot afford to be medically assessed for Autism, a process that can often take thousands of dollars if a student has not been diagnosed as a child, care from a professor might be the only accommodation they can access. When SASS evaluations are not enough for students to receive what they need, educators are left to pick and choose what boundaries they are willing to loosen for their students. Meanwhile, the university often claims that changing accommodation processes would take too much administrative labour, or would be too costly for the university as a whole. However, this accommodation process was completely altered in March 2020 because of Coronavirus, and students were allowed to take classes online and access other accommodations without any medical documentation. This process is detailed in the next section through an analysis of University of Ottawa emails.

University of Ottawa and COVID-19 policy changes

The University of Ottawa defines me as an Employee, a union member, an alumna, and a student. As such, I receive a variety of emails from the university on a regular basis, with different reference points. The first email that I received from the University of Ottawa regarding coronavirus was on January 27. In this email, the first few cases in Ontario were announced, and students were encouraged to wash their hands and take proper precautions. On January 31, 2020, the University suspended all travel to China based on the World Health Organization (WHO)'s declaration of a global health emergency. International students were encouraged at this time to ask the International office any questions they may have had. The first mention of COVID-19 was on March 4, 2020. In this email, addressed to the university community as a whole, the University of Ottawa wrote that it had created a working group in case of emergency measures, and that travel to Iran, Hong Kong, Northern Italy, Singapore, China, and South Korea were suspended. A travel registry was also created at this time for students and staff to register their university travel. Faculty were also encouraged to apply.

On March 10, 2020, a new procedure for attaining a medical certificate was announced by the University of Ottawa. Students who needed to be excused from exams on the basis of short-term illness no longer had to receive a letter from a doctor, instead requesting a form from “reception staff” at the university clinic. This new procedure was communicated to me in two separate emails, one directing me as a student and the other directing me as a university employee. According to the email sent to me as a student:

> Reception staff will print the attached medical certificate to be completed by you. Once you have completed it, reception will stamp it to validate and scan a copy for your chart. (institutional communication from University of Ottawa March 10)

When I received this email, I was initially shocked that the university would consider believing its students when they say that they are sick. This new procedure was frustrating, though, because it still forced sick students, possibly contagious students, to enter into medical service areas in order to receive proof of their inability to complete course work. While this protected doctors from possibly contracting COVID-19, it downloaded this risk onto reception workers, a form of work that is often feminized.

A copy of the medical certificate was attached to the email describing this new procedure. In this certificate, students must sign a line that reads:

> I understand that using this form to provide false or misleading information to delay or avoid fulfilling academic requirements constitutes a departure from the

> University of Ottawa academic integrity policy. (“Student Medical Certificate” institutional communication from University of Ottawa March 10)

This form tells us a lot about how the university views its students. First, there seems to be an ongoing fear that students are trying to cheat their way through university. Second, it seems that the university, even when it is trying to lessen the outbreak of a pandemic (in this case Coronavirus) will still make their students come to a health office in order to have a letter stamped proving that they are sick. In both cases, I wonder how much more would get done if we assume that are students are trying desperately or enthusiastically to learn, and that this desperation/enthusiasm is not completely separate from the bodies that they inhabit, bodies that sometimes get sick. Accepting late submissions at any time, not just in the moment of global crisis, is a matter of disability justice.

On March 11, one person in Ottawa had tested positive for COVID-19. The university reminded its community that a working group had been created including some of its senior administrators regarding a contingency plan in an emergency situation. On March 12, the travel advisory changed again, this time banning all university-related travel. The university also announced the following:

> Based on recommendations by public health officials that ‘social distancing’ is an effective means of protecting students, staff and faculty members from infection, the administration is exploring the possibility of moving the remainder of the academic semester to distance learning (online, etc.) as early as next week. (institutional communication from the University of Ottawa March 12)

This declaration was once again shocking. In three days, the university had transitioned from requesting that sick students still access a medical service in order to prove that they were sick, to announcing that distance learning procedures might be applied. On March 13, the University announced that it would be closed on March 16 and 17, with the rest of classes transitioned to distance learning. Final exams would no longer take place in person, with more announcements regarding exams to come. Educators were encouraged to take a number of different distance learning trainings from TLSS during the two days of university closures. Later, after weeks of negotiations, the union for part-time professors (APTPUO) announced that this additional training and time to complete online classes translated to $250 for part-time professors and $71.43 per hour for each hour of training. For those of us already trained in online instruction, $250 was a very small amount for transforming 3 weeks of classes to online instruction.

On March 14, the University announced that a student had died in residence. This was the fifth student in twelve months who had died by suicide within the University of Ottawa community. The president, Jacques Frémont, confirmed that this death was unrelated to coronavirus, but wrote:

> Apart from following the steps that have been recommended to reduce the risk of Coronavirus infection, please don’t forget to tend to your emotional wellness. Eat well. Sleep well. Practice Mindfulness. Meditate. Take a walk in the fresh air. (institutional communication from University of Ottawa March 14)

Here the university connected the coronavirus global pandemic to the mental health crisis unfolding within the University of Ottawa community. Encouraging students to “tend to your emotional wellness,” replaces the burden of action once again onto the student. On March 15, the university confirmed that all campus events would be cancelled for the week of March 16. The university also wrote that “it is deeply disappointing to learn that some members of our International student community have experienced harassment and discrimination in recent weeks" (institutional communication from University of Ottawa March 15). This "unacceptable" behaviour was likely racism, specifically against those from COVID-19 infected areas, probably Chinese students specifically. Without naming racism outright, racist behaviour can be denied.

On March 17, it was announced that all students in residences would need to move out by March 22 at 4pm. This eviction of students in residences came at a particularly vulnerable time for them, three weeks before exam period, around when final papers and assignments would be due. While the announcement allowed space for students who could not leave residence because of "exceptional circumstances," it gave the majority of students less than a week notice before asking them to leave.

Finally, Faculties were given flexibility regarding methods of evaluation. On March 23, the Faculty of Social Sciences and on March 24, the Faculty of Arts decided to change their policies such that students would not be penalized for failing to take the final exam, and that the students would not be able to defer exams. According to the Faculty of Social Sciences:

> It is therefore up to each student to decide which final exams they will complete. Students do not have to inform their professors of their choice. At the end of the semester, FSS professors have been asked to submit the best of the following two final grades, for each student: 1) the final grade which includes all the assessments (re-weighted to 100%) other than the final exam, OR 2) the final grade which includes all assessments, including the final exam.

> (Institutional communication from Victoria Barham, University of Ottawa, March 23; emphasis in original)

Students would also be allowed to change their final grades to S/NS (Satisfied/Not Satisfied), making classes now pass/fail courses. Finally, professors were “highly encouraged” to extend all deadlines on assignments due before the final exam by at least one week. These measures once again create a much greater flexibility for students struggling through their semester than they might have been able to access otherwise. For disabled students or students struggling for other reasons related to equity, these changes would have been extremely useful. However, in the context of COVID-19, the work was being once again downloaded onto the professors to work out the math around grades, and to construct an exam that would still assess the work of students, without testing the whole class. These changes also conflict with earlier messages of “academic rigour,” demonstrating that the university was prioritizing students’ health and well-being over academic rigour during this exceptional time period, rather than admitting that “academic rigour” is often at odds with student well-being.

These major changes to university policy came during a global pandemic and a traumatic experience for many students. The University Made difficult decisions regarding its services and campus, eventually closing campus completely—except for essential workers—on April 8. The decision to evict students from residence buildings and to close university campus were decisions that were needed given how contagious coronavirus has been demonstrated to be. The university administration acted quickly to safeguard the health of its community. In doing so, many of the accommodations long needed by disabled or otherwise marginalized students were suddenly Made available to everyone. The COVID-19 crisis should remind us that these needs are not marginal or unique, but pervasive, even outside of crises. University institutions have the power to allow their students to learn in safer and kinder circumstances, but do not deem this necessary outside of extenuating and unprecedented circumstances.

Interest Convergence

The changes announced by the University of Ottawa were a relief for many students with disabilities. In fact, one of my students commented that online learning would allow them to participate much more in class as their mobility disability Made it difficult to walk across campus to access my classroom. Jay Dolmage spoke about this newfound freedom for many people with disabilities on Twitter on March 30:

> There is a concept in critical race theory called "Interest Convergence" (access: Derek [sic] Bell). Basically, it means conditions for the minority will only improve if the changes can be framed as helping the majority. We have a perfect example of how this is happening now (n.p.).

He continues by writing that "universities are using the language of accommodation, starting to think of students as economically vulnerable, as people who have needs for housing and food, as people who have dependents" (n.p.). This new conversation and these new policies, around late assignments, final exams, and online classes were completely impossible until they were seen as helpful to the majority, not the disabled minority. Throughout the emails sent by the university, the idea that "the health of community is our highest priority" was repeated (correspondence University of Ottawa, March 17, for example).

In Derrick Bell’s initial article that coins the term “interest convergence,” he is describing the legal decision of *Brown vs. the Board of Education* and the ways that racial integration was inevitable because of the needs of the majority: “the interest of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interest of whites” (523). Bell argues that at issue in the *Brown* case was not the oppression of Black students in the form of segregated schools, but the needs of both white and Black students. He argues that judges involved in the case pointed to how desegregation would make Americans look good abroad, as a representation of equality through democracy, in contrast to communist nations. As well, the *Brown* decision also helped Black veterans see progress after coming home from the War, making them less likely to challenge white supremacy at home. Finally, desegregation was seen as an important step in order to further the industrialization of the South (524-525). In these ways, *Brown* was not necessarily about helping Black students, but of representing the American school system as a democratic one.

Jay Dolmage connects this display of nationalism to the accommodation process for disabled students in universities. Instead of viewing accessibility as an investment in alternative kinds of knowledge production, and therefore better schools, educational institutions use accessibility as a marketing ploy, while still claiming an academic rigour that disqualifies disabled participation in many cases. However, when a traumatic event like COVID-19 makes accommodations necessary for the abebodied majority, academic “rigour” is de-prioritized in order to allow everything to have different kinds of access.

A number of people on Twitter and other forms of social media have argued that interest convergence has been extremely apparent throughout the COVID-19 crisis. For example, Twitter user autistictic (@autistictic) wrote on March 7:

> Please REALLY take in how EASILY amid the Coronavirus pandemic
>
> - places go back to single use plastic
> - businesses switch in-person meetings to online
> - schools and universities switch to online lessons
>
> Yet these have always been "impossible" accommodations for disabled people. (n.p.)

In reply, Cait S. Kirby (@caitskirby) wrote that they would begin to document the different institutions that were making accommodations during the pandemic that they would have otherwise deemed impossible. Kirby created a "Digital paper trail" in the form of a google excel sheet, including different tabs for university, technology, food service, retail, transportation, and utility (Kirby 2020).

These comments and this paper trail emphasize how institutions do not take seriously the needs of those they understand to be in the minority. In an ableist white supremacist heteropatriarchal world, this often translates to women, people of colour, disabled, trans, and/or queer people being left out from the initial policies of the institution. It is not until the cisgender, male, white, ablebodied, and/or straight people are directly affected that policies regarding the well being of everyone are considered necessary. In the case of the University of Ottawa, accommodations around taking final exams, around online classes, and around pass/fail grades were only considered necessary when the ablebodied majority was implicated. This process was also accomplished without regard to how online courses might not be best for all students, and for university professors who had not been given training in online teaching. Indeed, online course work is not best for everyone. It also emphasizes an understanding of learning as knowledge accumulation rather than knowledge creation. Creating an online course that encourages online participation, rather than passive accumulation and regurgitation is a challenge that can often take years to accomplish. In the case of March 2020, professors were instead given two days and a handful of webinars that they were encouraged but not mandated to take.

Problems with Access and Online Learning

Online classrooms have been emphasized as accessible spaces, especially for students with disabilities. Indeed, online classes allow for students with reduced mobility, chemical sensitivities, agoraphobia, and other disabilities to access classroom spaces. However, online learning environments often depend on narratives of flexibility that encourage a neoliberal learning subject, one that is autonomous and independent.[10] In order to successfully take an online course, students need a capable computer, a strong internet connection, time to complete the work alone, and the ability to work independently and keep yourself on track; these necessities are linked to neoliberalism, depending on a learning style that is individualistic. This learning style is not shared by everyone, including for students with disabilities. Shandell Houlden and George Veletsianos (2019) argue that narratives of flexibility around online learning—flexibility

---

[10] Robert McRuer (2006) argues that narratives of flexibility “again works both ways: heterosexual, able-bodied characters in such texts work with queer and disabled minorities, flexibly contracting and expanding, while queer, dis- abled minorities flexibly comply” (18). In similar ways, we can see how online learning environments may encourage similar movement for those already able to fit into conventional classrooms, while depending on the compliance of disabled BIPOC students.

on the side of the student to take the course when and where they prefer—actually erase the power differentials between those with time and space to complete work. This space for choice is only accessible to some, those with the cultural and material capital to access time and space for focussed learning. In emphasizing individual learning practices, online learning environments also erase race, gender, and sexuality differences that still impact learning processes, even in the seemingly democratic and equal environment of the online space.

In *Restricted Access*, Elizabeth Ellcessor (2016) argues that accessibility, especially when considering access to online spaces, is often referred to as an inherently positive thing—that someone might have access to a space or an activity is seen as primarily a good thing. Access is also represented as something someone either has or does not have, erasing all the complexity involved in allowing someone to access learning processes. For example, giving a student access to information in the form of an excel sheet is very different from giving them access to an executive summary. It is also very different to giving them access to a video explaining data found in the excel sheet. While all three might include the same information, the video might give the greatest chance for understanding, depending on the student. Similarly, when thinking about accessibility for students with disabilities, alternative formats might be a helpful accessibility need, but may not necessarily provide equal access. A Blind student with a screen-reader, for example, might be able to have a machine “read” all the same materials a sighted student might be able to read, but will probably take longer to process this “reading,” as the machine reads HTML code, making images without image descriptions impossible to read, and annoying to gloss over. Image descriptions are also not the same as seeing images; in fact, many of the accessibility fixes that we have in online spaces create a different kind of access, not necessarily an equal access.

Ellcessor (2016) argues that accessibility is a fluctuating process of negotiation: conversations about accessibility need to be constantly asking accessible for whom? Ellcessor points to the idea of "cultural accessibility," where race, gender, and sexuality is interpreted alongside disability when creating or addressing access:

> Considerations of access as an experience entails attention not just to forms, regulations, or content, but also to the embodied and affective dimensions of those involved and their choices regarding use. It requires conceiving of the user—whether the producer or beneficiary of access—in terms of an intersectional identity that forms a standpoint from which the means and goals of access may (or may not) be understood, produced, or achieved. (162)

So often when accessibility is enacted in online classroom settings, it is tagged on as an extra resource or alternative format in order to correct a deficit. However, by reimagining accessibility as a process, we can reintegrate our learning with and through accessibility instead of against it. Who, how, and when are important questions for accessibility of any kind: who has access? How do they have access? When are they having this access? Changing, adding, or addressing access issues is a process of figuring out the default user of any space, and those that might be left behind in making access.

In an online environment, process is often erased from the conversation in service of content. How students are accessing content is not necessarily emphasized as much as the content itself is accessible in some way. However, pedagogical care means acknowledging that both accessibility and learning are processes, rather than results.

Access is a process, often involving pedagogical care to consider multiple, potentially conflicting users/learners. Learning as well is a process that requires and depends on respectful conversation, disagreement, and reflection. In an online space, this means providing multiple opportunities and formats of learning similar material, guiding respectful conversation between students, and expecting varying assessment results.

Blending UDL and CSP beyond Interest Convergence

Considering access and learning as *processes* means distancing our teaching methods from banking models of education. This also means recognizing that teaching itself is a process, one that cannot be accomplished with a single method. Lilia I. Bartolomé (1994) argues that there is not a singular method for teaching well; rather students exist within the social framework of oppressive systems, and must always learn from their own standpoint. Often this is in contradiction to university methods of assuming students are all equally equipped to begin autonomously learning.

> By understanding the historical specificities of marginalized students, these teachers and prospective teachers come to realize that an uncritical focus on methods makes invisible the historical role that schools and their personnel have played (and continue to play), not only in discriminating against many culturally different groups, but also in denying their humanity. By robbing students of their culture, language, history, and values, schools often reduce these students to the status of subhumans who need to be rescued from their "savage" selves. (127)

Instead of imagining that students must learn in spite of their cultural specificity, we might begin by acknowledging that this cultural specificity is where all of us begin. That is, difference is already baked into the classroom through all of the different perspectives of the students and educators. A really important first step to properly addressing this difference is to find out more about your students. Who are they? How did they arrive in this classroom? What assumptions do they bring with them regarding race, gender, sexuality, class, or disability? Finally, how does their experience challenge the educator's biases around race, gender, sexuality, class, or disability?

In order to begin "creating democratic learning environments where students become accustomed to being treated as competent and able individuals" (130), educators should aim to bridge gaps between UDL and CSP. Designing classrooms with the most impacted by oppression in mind also implies actively understanding who your students are and what they are expecting from a classroom space. Something I have often struggled with is the expectation or entitlement of some students to my extra time and care. Many students find receiving critique or criticism difficult and experience feedback as an attack. Many of these students are white, ablebodied, cisgender students who are trained to expect extra resources to be given to them. At times, these students are unwilling to consider how their standpoint might make critical theory classes more difficult for them, or how they might need to work harder in order to unlearn the knowledge systems that they have grown up with. These are the students that many of us spend time trying to teach, struggling to get through to students who have never had to exercise critical thinking skills. In many ways, crip failure can help both the students who experience oppression in classrooms, and students struggling with their own complicity in these systems. Fostering crip failure in the classroom can hopefully teach the ablebodied students why and how they have experienced success: through privilege, while also allowing disabled students to understand that their failures have often been through the privileged success of others.

In a response to Waitoller and Thorius (2016)'s article advocating for "cross-pollination" between UDL and CSP, a number of scholars (Alim, Baglieri, Ladson-Billings, Paris, Rose, and Valente 2019) came together to discuss why UDL and CSP need to be better implemented together, discussing the importance of viewing disability in an intersectional way. Alim, Baglieri, Ladson-Billings, Paris, Rose, and Valente (2019) argue that one of the major issues with UDL is that "UDL had… been creating better access to boredom, better access to oppression, better access to other bad things" (23). David Rose emphasizes that expert learners, not the same kind of learner, was the main goal of UDL (23).Accessibility alone does not erase the oppressive power of education, especially for those that do not fit into the expected "default user". This idea of accessibility connects to conceptions of inclusion as not necessarily positive: "rhetorically, if it's read as neutral, as including people into an already oppressive system as opposed to a radical transformation of that system, then that's problematic" (19). Inclusion or accessibility to oppressive education, to white supremacist education, for example, is not radical or revolutionary, but merely continues the problems of exclusionary education. Part of this begins by turning away from students as forms of difference and acknowledging systems as oppressive:

> So, again, culturally sustaining pedagogy depends on a critical emancipatory vision of schooling that redirects the object of critique away from our children—there's nothing wrong with our children—to oppressive systems, which, by their very definition, are flawed. (16).

UDL must be integrated with CSP in order to radically transform exclusionary education systems into culturally sustaining ones. This process needs to be taken outside of abstraction, however, and applied practically: “to think about ways in which we can ensure that when we talk about pedagogy, we’re talking about things that are actually happening, real-life things that are happening in the classroom” (9).

In order to be more practical in the application of UDL and CSP, the final section of this chapter explores some practical exercises, assignments, and considerations that I have applied in my classroom. My classes were between 140 and 170 students, so these practical applications could work in larger classes, not just smaller seminars or experiences. Given the size of my class, it was difficult to get to know the context of each and every student. I relied on UDL to help me set up my classroom in advance, so that fewer students would have to be addressed individually. Universalizing disability in my classroom and recognizing difference as a helpful knowledge base were also two other ways that I managed a class of this size, alongside TAs that were equally willing to extend empathy and care to the students.

Combining UDL and CSP in Your Classroom: An Assignment

This section presents two assignments: one for educators and one for students. If you are in the process of designing or conceptualizing an undergraduate course, I recommend that you first complete both, before assigning them to your students. The questions that I ask in these assignments are meant to help guide methods within the spectrum of UDL and CSP, while also helping you know your students a little more. I’ve included some questions that involve assessment methods, identity, and accessibility. I hope by answering these questions, you will have a better idea of what you can do to make your physical classroom and classroom methods more useful, accessible, and productive. If there are some questions that you cannot answer, or that you are having difficulty answering, discuss the questions with friends, community members, or faculty members. What makes these questions difficult?

Assignment 1: For Educators

Self-directed CSP and UDL introspective for educators

This assignment asks educators to answer a series of questions to begin thinking through how they are organizing their course and how CSP and UDL might be integrated into this teaching.

Remember, CSP and UDL can both be enacted through different teaching methods and with very different communities. There is no one right way to teach!

Where are you teaching? Whose traditional lands are located in the country/province/city you are teaching in? What is your relationship to this land? (Indigenous person, settler, immigrant, etc.) How does this relationship impact your teaching?

What are the physical limitations in your classroom? Is there an elevator nearby? Stairs? How are the seats in the classroom space; are they large and comfortable enough to seat larger bodies? Are there gender-neutral wheel-chair accessible washrooms nearby? Water fountains? How can you make your physical classroom more accessible?

How many people are you teaching? What level is the class (1st year? 4th year?)?

What supports have you been given by your faculty, department, etc. regarding your class? How many TAs do you have (if any)? Is your position associated with a union, if so, what privileges does the Collective Agreement give you as an educator? (If you're not sure, ask!)

What supports do you have outside of the educational institution? What family, friends, mental health services, and/or community do you turn to when you are stressed, overwhelmed, or frustrated? (If you're not sure, seek out support!)

What parts of your identity make your students take you seriously? (i.e. masculinity, gender-conformity, tallness, ablebodiedness, age, experience in education, whiteness, nationality, etc.)… how do these forms of difference make it more difficult for you to teach?

What parts of your identity make your students doubt your teaching? (i.e. femininity, gender-non-conformity, shortness, disability (be specific), inexperience in education, age, race or racial identity, nationality, etc.)… how do these forms of difference help you teach?

What kinds of limitations do you have in your class? Do you need accommodations to physically enter into your classroom space? Do you need accommodations to read, distribute materials, or interact with your students?

What boundaries have you set in your classroom for your own emotional and mental well-being? (i.e. not answering classroom correspondence on weekends, not accepting late assignments after a certain date, not having your work email on your phone, limiting hours spent per week on planning or enacting classroom activities, etc.)

How will students have access to course materials? (i.e. they will need to purchase a textbook, access materials online, or refer to materials you hand out in class) What other ways can students access materials (i.e. if they can't afford to buy the textbook, don't have a strong internet connection, etc.)? What other formats do you have on hand in case a student requests it?

What kinds of support do your students have within the institution regarding disability, race, gender, and sexuality difference? (i.e. student disability support centre, mental health centres, women's resource centre, emergency food bank(s), pride/LGBTQ centre, BIPOC centres, etc… if you're not sure, ask your department!)

What kinds of community supports do your students have outside of the institution? (i.e. community groups, religious support groups, crisis centres, etc… if you're not sure, ask around!)

How are you sharing these resources with your students?

How will your course be assessing your students? What kinds of skills do these assessments also assess outside of or above content? (i.e. essay writing, argumentation, following verbal and/or written instructions, research skills, etc.) How are you supporting these skills in your class?

If your course includes a participation assignment, how will this work for students unable to come to class for reasons relating to gender, race, class, sexuality or disability differences? What alternative methods of assessment are your prepared to offer your students? (extra credit? Etc.)

When are the deadlines for your course assignments? How flexible is your late assignment policy? How do you assign extensions? How can you make it easier for students without access to institutional proof of lateness to still submit their assignments?

What are some ways that your students might learn that will not be assessed? How are you giving them credit for their work outside of assessments?

What are your main methods of teaching (lectures, guest lectures, written and/or verbal activities, quizzes, videos, songs, stories, demonstrations, labs, etc.)? Why are you using these methods? What alternatives do you have for students who might not connect well with these methods? (i.e. posting lecture slides and/or lecture recordings, giving video or audio feedback on assignments, etc.)

What do you expect of your students regarding your teaching methods? (i.e. participation, silence, communication skills, writing skills, etc.)

What will your students be expecting of you regarding your teaching methods (i.e. powerpoints, study aids, answering questions etc.)?

What tools are you using in the classroom to help your students learn? (i.e. powerpoint, Brightspace (or some other online teaching platform), textbooks/readings, video-conferencing software, whiteboard/blackboard, videos, google docs, etc.) Do your students know how to use these tools? If something goes wrong with these tools, are there alternatives you can use? If you are not sure what tools are available to you, can you reach out to your institution’s teaching and learning resources for training?

What are your policies regarding sexism, racism, heterosexism, ableism, cissexism, and other forms of discrimination in your classroom? How have you Made these policies clear to your students?

What content warnings have you given your students regarding difficult materials?

The assignment for educators encourages educators to be introspective about their teaching and to invest in multiple formats, multiple avenues, and multiple teaching methods. At the same time, the early questions about faculty and community supports acknowledge the limitations that might already be in place. Coming up with multiple methods, avenues, and formats is especially difficult when you do not have support. UDL and CSP need to be practical in their addition to teaching. The assignment for students, that follows, allows students to discuss their accessibility needs, their hopes for the course as whole, and their strengths in learning. This assignment should be assigned in the first few weeks of class, so that you have a better idea of how to change your classroom to adhere to the myriad of difference that is represented in your classroom.

Assignment 2: For Students

Accessibility and support check-in for students

This assignment asks students to answer a series of questions to begin thinking through how they might have difficult accessing course material and/or how they might already have the tools to succeed! All answers should be anonymous and/or voluntary. For confidentiality reasons, you may choose to omit certain questions or make these questions explicitly optional.

What is your relationship to this land (settler, Indigenous person—what Nation do you belong to? Immigrant) How does this relationship affect your learning?

What are your needs regarding the classroom space? (i.e. do you need more light, bigger seats, more space, wheelchair accessibility, gender-neutral wheelchair accessible bathrooms nearby, etc.)

How do you access readings for this class?

How do you access assignments for this class? What are their deadlines? What are some practical steps you can take to make sure you complete them on time? What is the late assignment policy for this course? Do you know how to request an extension?

What are some things in your life that might impact your ability to hand in assignments on time? (i.e. religious holidays, working hours, children and/or other dependents, etc.)

In the past when you have taken courses similar to this one, what have been your main challenges?

In the past when you have taken courses similar to this one, what have been the main ways you have succeeded?

How do you prefer to communicate with your professor (emails, discussion forums, in class questions, after/before class conversations, office hours, etc.)?

What supports have you been given by your faculty, department, etc. regarding this class? (i.e. writing help centres, mental health support, peer mentoring programs etc.) If you're not sure, check the syllabus for support!

What supports do you have outside of the educational institution? What family, friends, mental health services, and/or community do you turn to when you are stressed, overwhelmed, or frustrated? (If you're not sure, seek out support—the syllabus has a few options!)

What parts of your identity make it easier for you to receive support in university? (for example masculinity, gender-conformity, tallness, ablebodiedness, age, experience in education, whiteness, nationality, etc.)… how do these forms of difference make it more difficult for you to learn?

What parts of your identity make it more difficult for you to receive support in university? (i.e. femininity, gender-non-conformity, shortness, disability (be specific), inexperience in education, age, racial features, nationality, etc.)… how do these forms of difference help you learn?

In a perfect world, what teaching methods would this class enact to make it best for you to learn (lectures, videos, quizzes, games, group in-class conversations etc.) ?

In a perfect world, what tools would this class use to make it best for you to learn? (powerpoint, Brightspace (or some other online teaching platform), textbooks/readings, video-conferencing software, whiteboard/blackboard, videos, google docs, etc.) I love hearing about new tools, feel free to recommend them!

How do you take notes in class? Have you considered writing your notes in a physical notebook rather than a laptop or other device? Why not?

Do you use a screen reader when accessing course material?

Do you use captions when watching videos?

Do you have any serious allergies and/or substance sensitivities that would make it difficult for you to learn in the classroom if someone were to bring it into the class?

In a perfect world, how could the professor/educator best support your learning in this class?

Think back to your favourite teacher or educator: what Made them memorable to you?

What are you expecting to learn in this class? What would you like to learn?

Do you have anything else you'd like to share with your professor/educator, especially regarding accessibility needs?

These assignments have been developed in part through a survey that I asked my students to complete at the beginning of their course in Winter 2019 and Winter 2020, in order to see how I could better prepare my classroom for their needs. In doing this accessibility survey, I found that many students—more than I had expected—used screen readers, needed closed captions on videos, and had other accessibility needs that I could easily help with. I also developed an alternative to assigning a participation grade in the form of a “social media participation” grade that encouraged students to seek out course material in their own social media circles, as well as posting class notes in a shared google document, so that I would not have to worry about assigning note-takers. Many students posted their notes because of this assignment, such that by the end of the course, each class had at least one person’s notes in the shared google doc, and many classes had multiple notes from different students, allowing students to see how learning is subjective and that we are all learning differently together. Posting notes was not mandatory, as students could choose to instead post on social media or share articles on the shared discussion forum. Assigning this survey also taught me to take away my late penalties on assignments, as it was clear there were many racialized and classed reasons for late submissions. Instead of these late penalties, I now have a note that late submissions will be accepted, as long as I receive a proposed alternative timeline.

Creating a classroom space that acknowledges and encourages difference begins with introspection, both on the part of the educator and the student. I hope these assignments will encourage us to continue caring for our students within our capacity for care.

Contradicting Needs

Upon instituting an accessibility survey, or an assignment similar to the one outlined above, it is possible that you will find that some students have needs that contradict the needs of other students. At Laurentian University in Fall 2019, two students enrolled in a mandatory course for their degree in social work. One of these students, Tyler George, has an allergy to dogs that can trigger severe asthma attacks, the other student, Guy Carriére, is legally Blind and has used the help of his guide dog, Dixon for over four years. In the first class, George had a severe asthma attack that involved a hospital visit, sparking a conversation about accessibility that was unprecedented for Laurentian university. A solution proposed by the students, to divide the class into two so that both would still be able to enjoy the “interactive nature” of the social work class, was not one that Laurentian University seemed willing to invest in. For the university, this would mean hiring another instructor or another room where half the class would watch from a live video of the other room’s instructor (see Siren and Stranges 2019).

Before this solution was proposed, both students were asked to accommodate to the class. The class was moved to a bigger room with an air purifier installed, but this was still affecting George’s asthma, even as he sat on the other side of the room. Carrière was asked to keep Dixon out of the room, or in a room next door, and then was asked to watch a zoom stream of the class in another room separate from the rest of class. In short, the two students were asked to make accommodations for the class rather than the other way around. In situations like these, listening to the wishes of the students is essential, because both students wanted to make sure the other would have access to the classroom space.

While this final example is unlikely to take place in your classroom to the same extent, accessibility needs may contradict or be counter to “best practices”. Doing our best to support the needs of our students means our classrooms might look different every single time we teach. While it may not necessarily be possible to cater completely to the learning styles and needs of each individual student every time we teach, we can centre the needs of those most marginal by investing in UDL and CSP. We can ask our students what they need, and how we can improve, trusting them to help us learn and teach.

Conclusion

This chapter was written in April 2020, while the COVID-19 crisis was still underway. In this chapter, I examined what pedagogical care might look like both in times of crises, and on a normal basis. For many "normal basis" is also fraught with circumstances that make it difficult to learn and to apply learning. Pedagogical care recognizes that difficult conversations are necessary, but not equal within a classroom context. The accommodation process for students with disabilities at the University of Ottawa fits into a minoritizing view of disability, where disability is imagined as an exception to the academic rigour of non-disabled students. According to the institution's understanding of disability, it is not fluctuating, and does not connect or intersect with other forms of identity. Instead, disability is seen as a medically definable deficit existing in the body that limits learning and/or assessments. By integrating UDL with CSP, we can better imagine disability as a condition built into academic processes and expected in university classrooms, as well as other learning environments. For example, online/distance learning creates conditions that make access different for those with disabilities. Screen-readers create different ways of accessing information, potentially creating new kinds of knowledge processes in classes.

Both UDL and CSP advocate for teaching to augment the learning and knowledge creation of those most affected by oppressive systems first. What this means is that we need to be attuned to who we are as educators and how our standpoints impact our teaching. When the University of Ottawa changed its final grade policies and its accommodation structure because of COVID-19, it was enacting interest convergence, where the ablebodied majority’s needs were finally affected enough to create change that disabled students had been requesting before this crisis. As educators, we need to be careful not to do the same in our classrooms, only swayed to change our accessibility measures when the majority is affected. Instead, we should be implementing these measures in advance, with the knowledge that what helps the most impacted by oppression also helped the other students learn. Because learning is collective and fluctuating, a process not unlike disability itself, we need to be ready to change our classrooms in order to make them more encouraging for learning based on the differences in our classrooms.

This chapter ended with a number of recommendations to better implement CSP and UDL into university classes. For example, content warnings, accessibility surveys, and alternative kinds of assessments create new opportunities for students to learn within and beyond classroom spaces. These changes are imperfect methods of integrating UDL and CSP, imperfect because they are only as successful as their contextual application. No one method of teaching is necessarily more productive or helpful. It is rather an educator who is willing to take the time to understand their students and to be willing to unlearn alongside these students who will best implement CSP and UDL. Expecting difference in our classrooms, rather than imagining that expert knowledge comes from the powerful professor, has the radical potential to change a white supremacist, ableist structure, like a university, into a place of change. In the first few classes of any course I teach, I make sure to emphasize that I am expecting to be wrong, I am expecting to learn from my students, and I am expecting to experience the classroom as a learning space, just as much as my students are. Pedagogical care can take place in the form of critique, criticism, and encouragement through negative feedback. However, this negative feedback must also come with understanding and encouragement that learning fluctuates, changes, and acts as a process rather than as a stagnant knowledge.

Conclusion: Mad, Disabled, BIPOC Futures Beyond the University

Throughout this dissertation, I have been arguing that Disability Studies educators—and indeed, all educators—should be thinking through and addressing the connections between disability and race. However, educators are not interchangeable. While we must consider and struggle against the structural oppression inherent in educational spaces, not just "identity politics," this struggle is also necessarily about identity, because structures work through identity. Change comes not only from educators who are reflexive about their teaching methods, who cite BIPOC scholars widely, and address the complexities of their own failures in the classroom; it also comes from advocating for more BIPOC and disabled educators. In order to challenge the whiteness of university faculties, white ablebodied educators changing their methods, their citations, and their classrooms will only do so much to help BIPOC disabled students. Trust is already lost if we stop there.

I end by considering the events that took place at the University of Ottawa in Fall 2020. These events emphasize the ways that the university space has been and continues to be a racist place, unsafe for BIPOC students, faculty, and staff. In ignoring the needs and demands of BIPOC student representatives, the University of Ottawa has acted as a disabling and debilitating place for BIPOC people. This story also highlights how not all failure is equal. For white settler educators, failure is pardoned more quickly and more quietly, allowing institutions to maintain systemic oppression. By allowing white settlers to continue to fail in the classroom, universities potentially also uphold and encourage harm against disabled and/or BIPOC and/or queer and/or trans students, making it impossible for some students to learn. What happens, I wonder, when we support BIPOC and/or disabled and/or queer and/or trans educators through their failures, within spaces that depend on this failure to uphold white supremacy? What happens when we embrace critique as love in our institutions, beginning by advocating that our BIPOC peers have access to this critique? Perhaps we can reimagine the disabled QTBIPOC futures through the failures of educators, if we take seriously the power imbalances involved in identity.

It is very possible, perhaps probable, that the university will never be a fully accessible place and will continue to work within debilitating and capacitating structures that uphold white supremacist and settler colonial ableism. Indeed, Sandy Grande (2018) argues just this point, pointing to universities as settler colonial spaces incapable of radical change. Grande argues that "politics of recognition" do not go far enough into critiquing the settler colonial university, instead advocating "against the neoliberal capitalist or settler logics that situate women in asymmetric relations of power in the first place" (57). In many ways, the events that took place in Fall 2020 at the University of Ottawa highlight how university institutions can use recognition as diversity work that does not challenge these settler colonial or white supremacist power relations, only supporting the image of the university as a progressive space.

Mobilizing "academic freedom" to perpetuate racism

In Fall 2020, a white settler part-time professor at the University of Ottawa used the N-word (the full word with a hard r) during an online class. After being called out (or perhaps called in) by a student of colour taking this class, the course instructor proceeded to force BIPOC students to explain to the class where she had gone wrong. The University of Ottawa did not give this part-time professor any discipline for her actions, but the moment of blatant anti-Black racism did cause a media storm and protest from Black students, faculty members, and staff across the University of Ottawa community and beyond. An alternative story was told about this event through the lens of some white faculty members, who wrote a letter defending the instructor's actions because of "academic freedom" (Lindquist 2020). The part-time professor union likewise protected the part-time professor, writing multiple letters to the public shaming the University of Ottawa for siding with the students. By using this language in class, the professor was making her power clear, her power over and above Black students. Institutional justification of her action in the form of "academic freedom" reinscribes her power and the power of other white settler academics to use words without regards to the harm they can and do commit.

On October 21, 2020, the University of Ottawa sent the last in a series of statements regarding the incident. This statement summarized what had taken place in the weeks previous, clarifying that the University of Ottawa "condemns racism in all its forms, full stop" (institutional communication Jacques Frémont). However, this statement was entitled "An appeal for calm and reflection" and asked explicitly that students and faculty stop talking about what had happened and start a process of "reflection and calm" (institutional communication Jacques Frémont). This affective request for calm is not politically neutral. Sara Ahmed is clear that diversity work is often interpreted as disruptive, in need of the calming potential of normativity. Groups that experience and resist oppression are often told to "calm down" when they call out power dynamics that oppress them. The appeal for calm in this email could therefore be interpreted as contradicting statements against racism, instead repeating the needs of the white institution.

Action Committee Rejected

On November 23 2020, the University of Ottawa announced a new “Action Committee on Antiracism and Inclusion,” in part to address the actions of the part-time professor. BIPOC students were upset by the creation of this committee, because the demands from a previous advisory committee were still not implemented. More specifically, the Black Student Leaders Association held a day of action publicly announcing that they would not take part in the newly announced action committee. The BIPOC Caucus of the Association of Professors of the University of Ottawa (APUO) announced that it would likewise not take part in the new action committee, listing seven demands for the institution to immediately implement instead of the action committee, including creating a university-wide anti-racism policy, hiring a BIPOC Anti-Racism Officer at the executive level with its own budget, placing BIPOC people at the centre of anti-racist work, committing to hire a cluster of 15 Black professors, committing to deliver annual reports on progress, developing mandatory anti-racism education for all faculties, and disbanding Protection Services.

This day of action was followed by a 6-day sit-in where BIPOC student representatives remained on campus during a global pandemic, demanding for a meeting with the president, Jacques Frémont, and vice-president academic, Jill Scott. A meeting was promised to them on December 9, 2020 at 1pm, which would mark 120 hours of the sit-in. However, Jill Scott contacted sit-in organizers shortly before 1pm to ask for more time to prepare, requesting to meet on December 10th instead and that the meeting be confidential. The organizers refused, giving vice-president and president until 3pm on December 9 to meet with them, before ending their sit-in. They never met with Jill Scott, but at 1:17pm on December 9, Jill Scott posted the following on Twitter:

> My gratitude to our @uOttawaGeeGees athletes for a very constructive meeting this morning. I'm inspired by your willingness to act as leaders on our campus about anti-racism and inclusion. I'm so very proud of you! @uottawa (Scott, n.p.)

Jill Scott was meeting with GeeGees (student athletes) to ask them about anti-racism on campus, rather than meeting with BIPOC student leaders.

On December 9 at 8:30pm, after the student representatives had announced the conclusion to their sit-in, the University of Ottawa emailed a statement to the university community, inviting "the students who took part in the sit-in to respect this process [of the new Action committee] on behalf of other students, faculty and staff on campus who deserve to have their voices heard as well" (Personal correspondence with the University of Ottawa). While this statement also once again emphasized that the University of Ottawa was committed to anti-racism, this encouragement to "respect the process" is extremely condescending. Respecting the university process translates to allowing racism to continue to fester in university spaces. Just as requesting "calm" is perhaps contradictory when making a statement against racism, requesting "respect" for the "process" of the white supremacist settler colonial university is not compatible with anti-racist action. In fact, these moments could be part of what Ghaida Moussa has called "institutional gaslighting," a process that resignifies the experience of BIPOC people within an institution for the benefit of those in power (Moussa 2019). This abusive tactic allows power to remain unchecked and unbalanced, creating debilitating effects on BIPOC students, faculty, and staff.

I know that my work throughout this dissertation has emphasized the ways that pure identity is impossible—disability, I have argued, is something that we must address through a universalizing impulse, rather than imagining it as something individual, fixed, or essential. I have also emphasized critique as a form of love and care such that supporting BIPOC scholarship uncritically is potentially harmful. However, we must also recognize that Crip knowledge, and Black knowledge, and Indigenous knowledge, and all other forms of knowledge that are rooted in identity experience are particular. For this reason, the research that I have done throughout this dissertation is limited by my own experiences as a white settler. In advocating for a future for BIPOC disabled, crip, and/or Mad people, I must accept the limits to my academic freedom and my academic reach. I am hopeful that the cracks in my theorizing can be filled by future work that engages with the particular, the specific, and the minority.

The Post-COVID University

I am finalizing this dissertation in March 2021, one year after the initial COVID-19 lockdown occurred. On February 23, 2021, I received an email from the administration regarding a return to campus in Fall 2021:

> Our ambitious plan is to provide a full, enriching on-campus experience at uOttawa for the Fall 2021 term, with 30-50% of our campus delivered in person or using hybrid formats and the remainder offered online. (Institutional communications, Jill Scott, February 23, 2021)

This “ambitious” declaration is potentially dangerous for immunocompromised students and faculty, as well as complicating the teaching process with unnecessary technological change. In this email, the university outlines that all classrooms will be set up with technology allowing “simultaneous in-person and videoconference teaching” and that “every effort will be Made to accommodate students who cannot attend in person due to personal circumstances” (Institutional communication, Jill Scott, February 23, 2021). Nearly a year after the university first shut its doors, the university is here attempting to step back into the prioritization of students and faculty most closely aligned with the normate, at the expense of those with “personal circumstances” or those who refuse to put themselves at risk of contracting a highly contagious disease while at work/school. This change tells us how little UDL and CSP are integrated into the University of Ottawa’s teaching.

In Ontario, COVID-19 vaccines are still in the process of being rolled out. It is very possible that the general population of Ontario will not receive their vaccines until August 2021 at the very earliest. Given that the Fall semester begins in September, it is unlikely that students or faculty will be returning to a fully vaccinated university population. Given the poor ventilation in many university classrooms, and the new strains of the coronavirus that spread at higher, quicker rates that earlier strains of COVID-19, it is surprising that the university is willing to take on the risk of in-person instruction. This risk is perhaps outweighed by the financial benefits gained by having students stay in residence and eat on campus, where food services are largely owned by the university. As premier Doug Ford still has not increased funding for universities, or indeed any other education, the university as a business is willing to put its workers and its students at risk in order to continue making a profit. Neoliberalism and COVID-19 policies have always been at odds with one another, as saving people's lives means little to capitalism.

I could potentially write another whole chapter about this rush to go back to "normal" and how this normal is at the expense of specific kinds of university workers—those working in service positions, who are largely precarious—as well as specific kinds of university students and faculty—specifically sick and disabled and/or BIPOC and/or women who are most at risk of contracting COVID-19 and most at risk of experiencing its social effects. While Ontario's COVID-19 numbers remain in the thousands, and over 22,000 people in Canada have died of COVID-19 in the last year, it is clear what risks the university will take in order to bring back the supremacy of normal.

At the beginning of the pandemic, the interest convergence and increased protest against anti-Black racism brought with it some hope of a future where Black disabled lives would be recognized within the public as worthy. However, what the pandemic has demonstrated is that as long as those affected are the most marginal, "normal" life for white ablebodied people can continue. Over half a million people have died in USA alone, with 2.75 million worldwide deaths. As we look to the future after COVID-19, it is imperative that we do not forget that the majority of those deaths were older folks with disabilities, people in prisons or Long-Term Care (LTC) institutions, and those whose lives were already precariously employed. As educators, we must refuse a reality where "back to normal" means going back to systems of oppression, including the intersecting and interdependent processes of ableism and racism.

Conclusion

In this dissertation, I have outlined a shift in disability theory because of disabled BIPOC theorizations. I have examined the limits in “diversity, equity, and inclusion,” organizing, especially for Indigenous disabled people. I have critiqued the carceral logics on university campuses that result in anti-Black racism, disabling Black faculty, students, and staff. I have advocated for crip/Mad failure in university classrooms. I have challenged minoritizing teaching methods. Here, I end by advocating for the change that BIPOC faculty, students, and staff have Made clear is needed in my institution. Hire Black professors now.

I end this dissertation with an encouragement to imagine classroom spaces beyond the university and beyond institutions of power. Throughout this dissertation, I have explored Indigenous, Black, People of Colour, and crip pedagogies to point to futures that challenge the whiteness and ableism of university institutions. As the university continues to shift given global pandemics and global political upheaval, educators can use abolitionist methods to begin from ourselves and our own experiences with power imbalance. While I may not be optimistic about the state of the university, I remain optimistic about radical change, where we must continue to imagine new worlds and new futures beyond institutions where settler colonial white supremacist ableism remains entrenched. It is Mad Disabled BIPOC students who will continue to shift educational practices, challenging educators to move beyond small incremental change.

References

"A Guide to the Integrated Accessibility Standards Regulation," (N.d.) Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act. 406.

Academic Regulation I-16- Academic Accommodations. (N.d.). uOttawa. Accessed August 27, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/administration-and-governance/academic-regulation-i-16-academic-accommodations

Adams, D. L., and Nirmala Erevelles. (2017). "Unexpected Spaces of Confinement: Aversive Technologies, Intellectual Disability, and 'Bare Life.'" *Punishment & Society* 19 (3): 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474517705147.

Administration and Governance - University of Ottawa. (N.d.). "Policy 33 - Security." Accessed November 27, 2019. https://www.uottawa.ca/administration-and-governance/policy-33-security.

Adjei, Paul Banahene. (2018). "The (Em)Bodiment of Blackness in a Visceral Anti-Black Racism and Ableism Context." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 21 (3): 275–87. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248821.

Afolayan, Gbenga Emmanuel. (2015). "Contemporary Representations of Disability and Interpersonal Relationships of Disabled Women in South-Western Nigeria." *Agenda* 29 (2): 54–65. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2015.1061780.

Agosto, Vonzell1, Ashley1 White, and Maria Migueliz1 Valcarlos. (2019). Deficit-Laden Use of Constructs in Anti-Oppressive Curriculum. *JCT: Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 34(1): 36–49.

Ahmed, Sara. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham ; London: Duke University Press.

———. (2013). Making Feminist Points. Feministkilljoys. Accessed November 23, 2019. http://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/

———. (2018). "Rocking the Boat: Women of Colour as Diversity Workers." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 331–48. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_19.

Aho, Tanja, Liat Ben-Moshe, and Leon J. Hilton. (2017). "Mad Futures: Affect/Theory/Violence." *American Quarterly* 69 (2): 291–302.

Aho, T. N. (2018). *A Mad Critique of Anti-neoliberalism: Sanism in Contemporary Left Thinking on Political Economy* [Ph.D., State University of New York at Buffalo].

Alexander, P. E. (2020). Radical Togetherness: African-American Literature and Abolition Pedagogy at Parchman and Beyond. *Humanities*, *9*(2), 49. https://doi.org/10.3390/h9020049

Alexander, Michelle. (2010). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New Press.

Algoma University Teaching and Learning. (N.d.). *Algoma University* Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://www.algomau.ca/academics/home-of-dean/teaching-learning/

Alim, H., Susan Baglieri, Gloria Ladson-Billings, Django Paris, David Rose, and Joseph Valente. (2017). Responding to 'Cross-Pollinating Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy and Universal Design for Learning: Toward an Inclusive Pedagogy

That Accounts for Dis/Ability.' *Harvard Educational Review* 87(1): 4–25,155-157. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.1.4.

Allen, Andrea, and Scott Jacques. (2018). 'He Did That Because I Was Black': Black College Students Perceive Municipal Police, Not Campus Police, as Discriminating. *Deviant Behavior* 0(0): 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2018.1519133.

Anderson, Kim. (2000). *A Recognition of Being: Reconstructing Native Womanhood*. Sumach Press.

Anderson, Kim. (2010). *Aboriginal Women, Water and Health: Reflections from Eleven First Nations, Inuit, and Métis Grandmothers*. Prairie Women's Health Centre of Excellence.

Andric, Anastasian. (October 23, 2019). 'I live in constant fear of having to drop out': Students stuggling with OSAP cuts. *CBC news.* Accessed January 14, 2021. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/osap-students-protest-ford-cuts-1.5330716

Annamma, Subini. (2016). "Disrupting the Carceral State through Education Journey Mapping." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 29(9):1210–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2016.1214297.

———. 2015. "Whiteness as Property: Innocence and Ability in Teacher Education." *The Urban Review* 47 (2): 293–316. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-014-0293-6.

Annamma, Subini Ancy, Beth A. Ferri, and David J. Connor. (2018). "Disability Critical Race Theory: Exploring the Intersectional Lineage, Emergence, and Potential Futures of DisCrit in Education." *Review of Research in Education* 42 (1): 46–71. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18759041.

Annamma, Subini Ancy. (2017). *The Pedagogy of Pathologization : Dis/Abled Girls of Color in the School-Prison Nexus*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315523057.

Annamma, Subini Ancy, David Connor, and Beth Ferri. (2013). "Dis/Ability Critical Race Studies (DisCrit): Theorizing at the Intersections of Race and Dis/Ability." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 16(1): 1–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2012.730511

Annamma, Subini Ancy, Beth A. Ferri, and David J. Connor. (2018). "Disability Critical Race Theory: Exploring the Intersectional Lineage, Emergence, and Potential Futures of DisCrit in Education." *Review of Research in Education* 42 (1): 46–71. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18759041.

Annamma, Subini, and Deb Morrison. (2018). "DisCrit Classroom Ecology: Using Praxis to Dismantle Dysfunctional Education Ecologies." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 73 (Complete): 70–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.03.008.

———. (October 4, 2018). Identifying Dysfunctional Education Ecologies: A DisCrit Analysis of Bias in the Classroom. *Equity & Excellence in Education* Online first. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2018.1496047.

Apple, Michael W., Wayne Au, and Luis Armando Gandin. (2009). *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Education*. Routledge International Handbook Series. New York, NY: Routledge.

Arao, Brian, Clemens, Kristi. (2013). From Safe Spaces to Brave Spaces: A New Way to Frame Dialogue Around Diversity and Social Justice. In Landreman, Lisa M. Sterling, eds. *The Art of Effective Facilitation*, VA: Stylus Publishing. 135–50.

Arday, Jason. (2018). "Being Black, Male and Academic: Navigating the White Academy." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 161–74. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_9.

Arday, Jason, and Heidi Safia editor Mirza. (2018). *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Arrigo, B. A., & Bersot, H. Y. (2016). Revolutionizing Academic Activism: Transpraxis, Critical Pedagogy, and Justice for a People Yet to Be. *Critical Criminology*, *24*(4): 549–564. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-016-9328-5

Artiles, Alfredo J. (2013). Untangling the Racialization of Disabilities: An Intersectionality Critique Across Disability Models 1. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 10 (2): 329–47. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000271.

Arvin, Maile, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill. (2013). Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy." *Feminist Formations 25(*1): 8–34. https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2013.0006.

Atterbury, K. (2020). *Far from Just: Neoliberalism and the (Re)Production of America's Mental Health "Crisis"* [Ph.D., New York University].

[autistictic]. (March 7, 2020). *Tweets*. Retrieved August 25, 2020 from https://twitter.com/autistictic/status/1236193538603397121?lang=en

Baglieri, Susan, and Priya Lalvani. (2020). Guidelines for Teaching Critical Inquiries on Disability and Ableism. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351002868-4.

Bailey, Moya, and Izetta Autumn Mobley. (2019). "Work in the Intersections: A Black Feminist Disability Framework." *Gender & Society* 33 (1): 19–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243218801523.

Bailey, Moya & Trudy. (2018). On misogynoir: Citation, erasure, and plagiarism. *Feminist Media Studies*, *18*(4), 762–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2018.1447395

Balfour, G., & Comack, E. (2014). *Criminalizing women: Gender and (in)justice in neo-liberal times* (2nd edition.). Fernwood Publishing.

Bambara, Toni Cade. (1970). *The Black woman: An anthology*. New York : New American Library.

Barker, Clare, and Stuart Murray. (2010). "Disabling Postcolonialism: Global Disability Cultures and Democratic Criticism." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 4 (3): 219–36. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2010.20.

Baril, A. (2015a). 'How dare you pretend to be disabled?' The discounting of transabled people and their claims in disability movements and studies. *Disability & Society*, *30*(5), 689–703. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2015.1050088

———. (2015b). transness as debility: Rethinking intersections between trans and disabled embodiments. *Feminist Review*, *111*(1), 59–74. https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2015.21

———. (2016). “Doctor, am I an Anglophone trapped in a Francophone body?”: An Intersectional Analysis of “Trans-crip-t Time” in Ableist, Cisnormative, Anglonormative Societies. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, *10*(2), 155–172. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2016.14

———. (2018). Confessing Society, Confessing Cis-tem: Rethinking Consent through Intimate Images of Trans People in the Media. *Frontiers (Boulder)*, *39*(2), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.5250/fronjwomestud.39.2.0001

Baril, Alexandre, Annie Pullen Sansfaçon, and Morgane A. Gelly. (2020). Digging Beneath the Surface: When Disability Meets Gender Identity. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, *9*(4): 1-23.

Bartlett, Katherine. (2018). *Feminist Legal Theory: Readings In Law And Gender*. First edition. London: Taylor and Francis.

Bartolomé, Lilia. (1994). Beyond the Methods Fetish: Toward a Humanizing Pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, *64*(2), 173–195. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.64.2.58q5m5744t325730

Barman, Jean, Marie Battiste, and Canadian Electronic Library. (1995). *First Nations Education in Canada the Circle Unfolds*. DesLibris. Books Collection. Vancouver [B.C.], Vancouver: UBC Press.

Basen, I. (2014, September 09). “Dirty Little Secret”: Poorly paid part-timers now teach most undergrads. CBC News. Accessed September 10, 2019. Retrieved from https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/most-university-undergrads-now-taught-by-poorly-paid-part-timers-1.2756024.

Battiste, Marie. (2000). *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. DesLibris. Books Collection. Vancouver, Vancouver [B.C.]: UBC Press.

———. (2005). *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge*. Purich’s Aboriginal Issues Series. Saskatoon: Purich Pub.

———. (2016). *Visioning a Mi’kmaw Humanities: Indigenizing the Academy*. Sydney: Cape Breton University Press.

———. (2017). *Decolonizing Education: Nourishing the Learning Spirit*. Saskatoon, Sk: Purich Publishing Limited.

Beal, Frances. (1966). *Double Jeopardy: To Be Black & Female*. Radical Education Project.

Beckett, Angharad E. (2015). Anti-Oppressive Pedagogy and Disability: Possibilities and Challenges. *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research* 17(1): 76–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/15017419.2013.835278.

Bell, Chris. (2010). “Is Disability Studies Actually White Disability Studies.” In *The Disability Studies Reader*, edited by Lennard J. Davis, 3:374–82. New York ; London: Routledge.

Bell, Christopher M. (2011). *Blackness and Disability: Critical Examinations and Cultural Interventions*. 21. East Lansing, MI : Münster, Germany: Michigan State University Press; Lit.

Bell, Derrick A. (1980). Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma. *Harvard Law Review* 93(3): 518–33. https://doi.org/10.2307/1340546.

Bell, Derrick. (1980). *Shades of Brown: New Perspectives on School Desegregation*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

———. (1992). *Faces At The Bottom Of The Well*. New York: Basic Books.

———. (2004). *Silent Covenants: Brown V. Board of Education and the Unfulfilled Hopes for Racial Reform*. New York, Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, USA, Oxford University Press.

Ben-Moshe, Liat. (2018). "Dis-Epistemologies of Abolition." *Critical Criminology* 26(3): 341–55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-018-9403-1.

———. (2020). *Decarcerating Disability: Deinstitutionalization and Prison Abolition*.

Ben-Moshe, Liat, Chris Chapman, and Allison C. Carey. (2014). *Disability Incarcerated: Imprisonment and Disability in the United States and Canada*. First edition. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bilge, Sirma. (2013). INTERSECTIONALITY UNDONE *DuBois Review: Social Science Research* 10(2): 405–424. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000283.

Blackburn, L. (2019). *Toward a Trauma-Informed Pedagogy* [Ph.D., Michigan State University].

Blackmore, Jill. (2013). "Within/Against: Feminist Theory as Praxis in Higher Education Research." In *International Perspectives on Higher Education Research*, edited by Jeroen Huisman and Malcolm Tight, 9:175–98. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3628(2013)0000009013.

Blanchett, Wanda J., Janette K. Klingner, and Beth Harry. (2009). The Intersection of Race, Culture, Language, and Disability: Implications for Urban Education. *Urban Education* 44(4): 389–409. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085909338686.

Blanck, Peter. (2017). Disability in Prison.(Beating Mental Illness: A Dialogue on Race, Gender, and Disability Stereotypes in Police Use of Force Cases). *Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal* 26(2): 309–322.

Block, Pamela, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard. (2016). Occupying Disability: An Introduction. In *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*, edited by Pamela Block, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard, 3–14. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_1.

BLM – Canada – All Black Lives Matter: About Us. (n.d.). Retrieved August 21, 2020, from https://blacklivesmatter.ca/

Bois, W. E. B. D. (1998). *Black Reconstruction in America 1860-1880*. Simon and Schuster.

Bowden, Olivia. (May 2, 2020). Canada's Lack of race-based COVID-19 data hurting Black Canadians: experts. *Global News.* Accessed August 26, 2020. https://globalnews.ca/news/6892178/black-canadians-coronavirus-risk/

Brock University. (n.d.). Accessible Instruction: UDL in Teaching and Learning. Accessed August 26, 2020 from https://cpi.brocku.ca/accessible_instruction/ains/Introduction_print.html

Brock University Centre for Pedagogical Innovation. (N.d.). *Brock University*. Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://brocku.ca/teaching-learning/

Brown, Gregory, Terry Rabinowitz, Harold G. Boudreau, and Angela J. Wright. (May 2017). Approved and 'Off-Label' Use of Prescribed Psychotropic Medications among Federal Offenders. Correctional Service Canada Research Report. Accessed January 14, 2021. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/scc-csc/PS83-3-387-eng.pdf

Brown, L. X. Z. (2017). Ableist Shame and Disruptive Bodies: Survivorship at the Intersection of Queer, Trans, and Disabled Existence. In A. J. Johnson, J. R. Nelson, & E. M. Lund (Eds.), *Religion, Disability, and Interpersonal Violence* (pp. 163–178). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56901-7_10

Burch, Susan. (2021). *Committed: Remembering Native Kinship in and beyond Institutions*. UNC Press Books.

Burke, Penny Jane. (2018). “Trans/Forming Pedagogical Spaces: Race, Belonging and Recognition in Higher Education.” In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 365–82. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_21.

Burstow, Bonnie. (2014). The Withering Away of Psychiatry: An Attrition Model for Antipsychiatry. In Shaindl Diamond, Brenda A. LeFrançois and Bonnie Burstow, eds. *Psychiatry Disrupted* (pp. 32–51). Montreal: MQUP.

———. (2015). *Psychiatry and the business of Madness: An ethical and epistemological accounting*. Palgrave Macmillan.

———. (2016). *Psychiatry Interrogated: An Institutional Ethnography Anthology*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41174-3

———. (2017). “Mental Health” praxis- not the answer: A constructive antipsychiatry position. In B. Cohen (Ed.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Mental Health* (pp. 31–38). Routledge Handbooks Online. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315399584.ch12

———. (2019). *REVOLT AGAINST PSYCHIATRY a counterhegemonic dialogue.* SPRINGER NATURE.

Cammarota, Julio, and Michelle Fine. (2008). *Revolutionizing Education: Youth Participatory Action Research in Motion*. Critical Youth Studies. New York: Routledge.

Canada, G. of C. I. and N. A. (2015, December 14). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* [Administrative page]. https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1450124405592/1529106060525

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (September 2018). Out of the Shadows: Experiences of Contract Academic Staff. Accessed August 26, 2020 from https://www.caut.ca/sites/default/files/cas_report.pdf

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (April 2018). Underrepresented & Underpaid: Diversity & Equity Among Canada’s Post-Secondary Education Teachers. Accessed August 26, 2020 from https://www.caut.ca/sites/default/files/caut_equity_report_2018-04final.pdf

Canadian University Survey Consortium 2019 First-Year University Student Survey Master Report (Rep.). (2019). Winnipeg, Ottawa, Edmonton, Regina: Prairie Research Associates.

Canadian University Survey Consortium 2013 First-Year University Student Survey Master Report (Rep.). (2013). Winnipeg, Ottawa, Edmonton, Regina: Prairie Research Associates.

Carleton University Teaching and Learning Services (TLS). (N.d.). *Carleton University*. Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://carleton.ca/teachinglearning/

Carmody, T. (2015). “In Spite of Handicaps: The Disability History of Racial Uplift.” *American Literary History* 27 (1): 56–78. https://doi.org/10.1093/alh/aju075.

Carolissen, R., Bozalek, V., Nicholls, L., Leibowitz, B., Rohleder, P., & Swartz, L. (2011). Bell Hooks and the Enactment of Emotion in Teaching and Learning across Boundaries: A Pedagogy of Hope? *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *25*(1), 157–167.

Chan, Wendy and Dorothy Chunn. (2014). *Racialization, crime and criminal justice in Canada*. University of Toronto Press.

Chapman, C. (2013). “Cultivating a Troubled Consciousness: Compulsory Sound-Mindedness and Complicity in Oppression.” *Health, Culture and Society* 5 (1): 182–98. https://doi.org/10.5195/hcs.2013.140.

Chartrand, V., & Piché, J. (2019). Abolition and pedagogy: Reflections on teaching a course on alternatives to punishment, state repression and social control. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *22*(1): 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2019.1576129

Chatterjee, Piya, and Sunaina Maira. (2014). *The Imperial University: Academic Repression and Scholarly Dissent*. University of Minnesota Press. http://muse.jhu.edu/book/31207.

Chaudhry, Vandana. (2018). “Capacity, Debility and Differential Inclusion: The Politics of Microfinance in South India.” *Disability Studies Quarterly* 38 (1). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v38i1.5995.

Chen, Jun Mian. (2017). “The Contentious Field of Whiteness Studies.” *Journal for Social Thought* 2 (December). http://ojs.lib.uwo.ca/index.php/jst/article/view/507.

Chen, Mel Y. (2012). *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822395447.

———. (2015). “Unpacking Intoxication, Racialising Disability.” *Critical Medical Humanities* 41: 25–29. https://doi.org/10.1136/medhum-2014-010648.

Cheng, An-Chih, Michelle E. Jordan, and Diane L. Schallert. (2013). “Reconsidering Assessment in Online/Hybrid Courses: Knowing versus Learning.(Report)(Author Abstract).” *Computers & Education* 68: 51.

Childers, Sara M., Jeong-eun Rhee, and Stephanie L. Daza. (2013). “Promiscuous (Use of) Feminist Methodologies: The Dirty Theory and Messy Practice of Educational Research beyond Gender.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 26 (5): 507–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2013.786849.

Chinn, Sarah E. (2014). “Teaching Crip; or, What We Talk about When We Talk about Disability Pedagogy.” *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy* 25 (2): 15–19. https://doi.org/10.1353/tnf.2014.0017.

Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie Mccall. (2013). “Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis.” *Signs* 38 (4): 785–810. https://doi.org/10.1086/669608.

Church, K. (2015). ‘It’s complicated’: Blending disability and Mad studies in the corporatising university. In *Madness, distress and the politics of disablement*. Policy Press.

Church, Kathryn, Landry Danielle, Frazee Catherine, Ignagni Esther, Mitchell Cindy, Panitch Melanie, Patterson Jennifer, et al. (2016). “Exhibiting Activist Disability History in Canada: Out from under as a Case Study of Social Movement Learning.” *Studies in the Education of Adults* 48 (2): 194–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2016.1219479.

Clare, E. (2015). *Exile and pride: Disability, queerness, and liberation*. Duke University Press.

———. (2017). *Brilliant Imperfection Grappling with Cure*. Duke University Press.

Clark, Lauren B. (2018). Critical Pedagogy in the University: Can a Lecture Be Critical Pedagogy? *Policy Futures in Education* 16(8): 985–999. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210318787053.

Clough, Patricia. (2007). Introduction. In Clough, P. T., & Halley, J. O., eds. *The affective turn theorizing the social*. Durham: Duke University Press. 1-33.

Codjoe, Esi. (September 13, 2020) Independent Review, University of Ottawa. Accessed August 26, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/president/sites/www.uottawa.ca.president/files/2019-09-30_-_final_english_a.pdf

Codjoe, Esi. (January 28, 2020) Independent Review, University of Ottawa. Accessed August 26, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/president/sites/www.uottawa.ca.president/files/universityottawa_phase2_final_report_eng.pdf

Cohen, B. M. Z. (2018). *Routledge International Handbook of Critical Mental Health* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315399584

Cohen, J. S. (July 16, 2020). Thousands demand release of teenager incarcerated for not doing her schoolwork. *ProPublica Illinois*. Retrieved August 21, 2020, from https://www.freep.com/in-depth/news/local/michigan/oakland/2020/07/15/freegrace-birmingham-groves-mary-ellen-brennan-juvenile-detention/5448520002/

Cole, Courtney. E. (2017). Culturally sustaining pedagogy in higher education: Teaching so that Black Lives Matter. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal; Birmingham*, *36*(8), 736–750. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1108/EDI-01-2017-0005

Coleborne, C. (2020). Talking About Mental Health and the Politics of Madness. In C. Coleborne (Ed.), *Why Talk About Madness? Bringing History into the Conversation* (pp. 53–63). Springer International Publishing.

Collins, K. (2016). *A DisCrit perspective on The State of Florida v. George Zimmerman: Racism, ableism, and youth out of place in community and school.* In David Connor, Beth Ferri and Subinni Annamma (Eds.) DisCrit--Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education (Disability, Culture, and Equity. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connell, Raewyn. (2014). “Southern Bodies and Disability: Re-Thinking Concepts.” In *The Global Politics of Impairment and Disability: Processes and Embodiments*, 1–14. London: Routledge.

Connell, Raewyn. (2016). Southern Bodies and Disability: re-thinking concepts. In Meekosha, H., & Soldatic, K, eds. *The Global Politics of Impairment and Disability: Processes and Embodiments*. New York: Routledge. Pp. 1-16.

Connor, David J. editor, Beth A. editor Ferri, and Subini A. Annamma. (2016). *DisCrit: Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education*. Disability, Culture, and Equity Series. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connor, David J., and Susan L. Gabel. (2013). "'Cripping' the Curriculum Through Academic Activism: Working Toward Increasing Global Exchanges to Reframe (Dis)Ability and Education." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 46 (1): 100–118. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.750186.

Conway, Megan A. (2017). "What about Disability and Social Justice?" *Review of Disability Studies: An International Journal* 13 (1): 1–3.

Cooper, A. J. (1892). *A Voice from the South*. Aldine Printing House.

Cote-Meek, Sheila. (2014). *Colonized Classrooms: Racism, Trauma and Resistance in Post-Secondary Education*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Fernwood Publishing.

Cote-Meek, Sheila, Taima Moeke-Pickering, eds. (2020). *Decolonizing and Indigenizing Education in Canada.* Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Coulthard, G. S. (2014). *Red skin, white masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition*. University of Minnesota Press.

Couture, S. (2019). Selena Couture: Rethinking the Practice and Performance of Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. *Canadian Theatre Review*, *177*, 27–29.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. (1989). Foreword: Toward a Race-Conscious Pedagogy in Legal Education. *National Black Law Journal*, *11*(1), 1–1.

———. (1991). "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241–99. https://doi.org/10.2307/1229039.

———. (1995). *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*. New York: New Press : Distributed by WWNorton & Co.

———. (2012). "From Private Violence to Mass Incarceration: Thinking Intersectionally About Women, Race, and Social Control." *UCLA Law Review* 59 (6): 1418–72.

———. (2010). "Close Encounters of Three Kinds: On Teaching Dominance Feminism and Intersectionality.(Symposium: Catharine MacKinnon)." *Tulsa Law Review* 46 (1): 151–189.

Crosby, Andrew C. (2018). *Policing Indigenous Movements: Dissent and the Security State*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Da Silva Gorman, Rachel. (2018). "Dialectics of Race and Disability: On the Unintelligibility of Revolutionary Desire." *A/b: Auto/Biography Studies* 33 (2): 453–458. https://doi.org/10.1080/08989575.2018.1445597.

D'Arcy, Kate, and Lisa Galloway. (2018). "Access and Inclusion for Gypsy and Traveller Students in Higher Education." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 215–32. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_12.

Daggett, Lynn M. (2013). Book 'em?: Navigating Student Privacy, Disability, and Civil Rights and School Safety in the Context of School-Police Cooperation. *Urban Lawyer* 45(1): 203–33.

Daigle, M. (2019). The spectacle of reconciliation: On (the) unsettling responsibilities to Indigenous peoples in the academy. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, *37*(4), 703–721. https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775818824342

Dancy, T. Elon, Kirsten T. Edwards, and James Earl Davis. (2018). Historically White Universities and Plantation Politics: Anti-Blackness and Higher Education in the Black Lives Matter Era. *Urban Education* 53(2): 176–95. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918754328.

Davidson, Michael. (2016). Cripping Consensus: Disability Studies at the Intersection. *American Literary History* 28 (2): 433–53. https://doi.org/10.1093/alh/ajw008.

Davis, Lennard J. (1995). *Enforcing Normalcy: Disability, Deafness, and the Body*. ACLS Humanities E-Book. Verso.

---------. (2013). *The Disability Studies Reader*. Florence, UNITED STATES: Taylor & Francis Group.

Davis, Lennard J. editor, Jay Dolmage, Nirmala editor Erevelles, Sarah Parker Harris, Alexander Luft, Susan M. (Susan Marie) editor Schweik, and Linda P. Ware. (2018). *Beginning with Disability: A Primer*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic. (1997). *Critical White Studies: Looking behind the Mirror*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

———. (2013). *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*. Third edition. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Deliovsky, Katerina. (2010). *White Femininity: Race, Gender and Power*. DesLibris. Books Collection. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, Fernwood.

Diamond, Shaindl, & Ambrose Kirby. (2014). Trans Jeopardy / Trans Resistance: Shaindl Diamond (SD) Interviews Ambrose Kirby (AK). In BONNIE BURSTOW & BRENDA A. LeFRANÇOIS (Eds.), *Psychiatry Disrupted* (pp. 163–175). McGill-Queen's University Press.

Diamond, Shaindl. (2013). What Makes Us a Community?: Reflections on Building Solidarity in Anti-Sanist Praxis. In Brenda Lefrançois, Robert Menzies, and Geoffrey Reaume. (Eds.) *Mad Matters: A Critical reader in Canadian Mad Studies.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc. 64-83.

DiAquoi, Raygine Coutard. (2014). Separate and connected: A portrait of perspectives and pedagogy at an African-centered shule. (2): 105-130.

Dillon, Stephen. (2018). *Fugitive Life: The Queer Politics of the Prison State*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822371892.

Diversity and Inclusion. (August 20, 2020). uOttawa. Accessed on August 26, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/president/strategic-areas/diversity-and-inclusion

Dixson, Adrienne. (2018). "What's Going On?": A Critical Race Theory Perspective on Black Lives Matter and Activism in Education. *Urban Education*, *53*(2): 231-247.

Dixson, Adrienne D., and Celia K. Rousseau. (2006). *Critical Race Theory in Education: All God's Children Got a Song*. New York: Routledge.

Dolmage, Jay. (September 15, 2005). "Disability Studies Pedagogy, Usability and Universal Design." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 25(4): n.p. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v25i4.627.

———. (May 19, 2015). Universal Design: Places to Start." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 35(2): n.p. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v35i2.4632

———. (2018). *Academic Ableism: Disability and Higher Education*. Corporealities. Baltimore, Maryland, Ann Arbor [Michigan]: Project Muse, University of Michigan Press.

———. [@JayDolmage] (March 30, 2020). *Tweets*. Retrieved August 25, 2020 from https://twitter.com/JayDolmage/status/1244665664985608194

Donnor, Jamel K., Adrienne D. Dixson, Celia Rousseau Anderson, and Lori D. Patton. (2016). "Disrupting Postsecondary Prose: Toward a Critical Race Theory of Higher Education." *Urban Education* 51 (3): 315–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602542.

Donnovan, Kathleen Francis. (2018). The Social Architectures of Access and Inclusivity for Adults with Learning Disabilities in Indigenous Cultural Contexts. [Master's, York University].

Driver, Justin. (2011). Rethinking the Interest-Convergence Thesis. *Northwestern University Law Review* 105 (1): 149–97.

Dunhamn, Jane, Jerome Harris, Shancia Jarrett, Leroy Moore, Akemi Nishida, Margaret Price, Britney Robinson, and Sami Schalk. (2015). Developing and Reflecting on a Black Disability Studies Pedagogy: Work from the National Black Disability Coalition. *Disability Studies Quarterly* 35(2): n.p. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v35i2.4637.

Durazo, A. (2011). In Our Hands: Community Accountability as Pedagogical Strategy. *Social Justice*, *37*(4): 76–100.

Eastgate, Jan. (2001). *Creating Racism: Psychiatry's Betrayal*. Citizens Commission on Human Rights, CCHR — Nonprofit Mental Health Watchdog. Accessed August 28, 2020 from https://www.cchr.org/cchr-reports/creating-racism/introduction.html

Edmondson, Vickie Cox, Brandy S. Edmondson, and Tonya B. Perry. (2019). Stay Woke: The Black Lives Matter Movement as a Practical Tool to Develop Critical Voice. *Communication Teacher* 33(4): 298–303. https://doi.org/10.1080/17404622.2019.1575433.

Ejiogu, Nwadiogo. (2009). "A Clinic for the World": Race, Biomedical Citizenship, and Gendered National Subject Formation in Canada. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Ejiogu, Nwadiogo, and Syrus Marcus Ware. (2018).Calling a Shrimp a Shrimp: A Black Queer Intervention in Disability Studies." In *Queering Urban Justice: Queer of Colour Formations in Toronto*, edited by Jinthana Haritaworn, 138–47. Toronto Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Ellcessor, Elizabeth. (2016). *Restricted Access: Media, Disability, and the Politics of Participation*. NYU Press.

Erevelles, Nirmala. (2011a). "Crippin' Curriculum at the Intersections." *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy* 8 (1): 31–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/15505170.2011.572518.

———. (2011b). *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. (2011c). "Disability as 'Becoming': Notes on the Political Economy of the Flesh," 25–63.

———. (2014). “Thinking With Disability Studies.” *Disability Studies Quarterly* 34 (2). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v34i2.4248.

———. (2018). Disability and Race. In *Beginning with Disability: A Primer*, edited by Lennard J. Davis. New York ; London: Routledge. 115–22.

Ettorre, E. (2016). *Autoethnography as Feminist Method: Sensitising the feminist “I.”* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315626819

Fairclough, Norman author. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis the Critical Study of Language*. Second edition. Longman Applied Linguistics. Harlow, England ; New York: Longman.

Farrell, M. (2017). *Psychosis Under Discussion: How We Talk About Madness*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315268262

Fellows, Mary Louise, and Sherene Razack. (1994). “Seeking Relations: Law and Feminism Roundtables.” *Signs* 19 (4): 1048–83.

———. (1997). “The Race to Innocence: Confronting Hierarchical Relations among Women.” *Journal of Gender, Race and Justice*, no. 2 (1998): 335–52.

Fenton, Z. (2016). Disability Does Not Discriminate: Toward a Theory of Multiple Identity Through Coalition. In S. A. Annamma, D. Connor, & B. Ferri (Eds.), *DisCrit—Disability Studies and Critical Race Theory in Education*. https://repository.law.miami.edu/fac_books/134

Ferri, Beth A., and David J. Connor. (2005). In the Shadow of Brown: Special Education and Overrepresentation of Students of Color. *Remedial and Special Education* 26(2): 93–100. https://doi.org/10.1177/07419325050260020401.

Ferri, Beth A., and David J. Connor. (2005). Tools of Exclusion: Race, Disability, and (Re)Segregated Education. *Teachers College Record 107(*3): 453–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2005.00483.x.

Fernando, Mayanthi. (2019). Critique as Care. *Critical Times* 2(1): 13–22. https://doi.org/10.1215/26410478-7769726.

Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd, Publishers.

Final Report of the Task Force on Campus Racism. (2010). Toronto, Ont.: Canadian Federation of Students, Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario = Fédération canadienne des étudiantes et étudiants-Ontario.

Fisher, Bonnie, and John J. Sloan. (2013). *Campus Crime: Legal, Social, and Policy Perspectives*. 3rd ed. Springfield, Ill.: Charles CThomas.

Forgie, Sarah E., Olive Yonge, and Robert Luth. (2018). “Centres for Teaching and Learning Across Canada: What’s Going On?” *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* 9,1: 0-18. https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2018.1.9.

Foucault, Michel. (2012). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Fox, Ann M.1. (2010). “How to Crip the Undergraduate Classroom: Lessons from Performance, Pedagogy, and Possibility.” *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability* 23 (1): 38–47.

Flaugh, Christian. (2010). Of Colonized Mind and Matter: The Dis/Abilities of Negritude in Aime Cesaire’s Cahier d’un Retour Au Pays Natal.(Critical Essay). *Journal of*

Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 4(3): 291-308,339. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2010.24.

Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. A Continuum Book. New York: Seabury Press, Herder and Herder, Herder & Herder.

———. (2013). *Pédagogie de l'autonomie*. ERES. https://doi.org/10.3917/eres.freir.2013.01.

Fritsch, Kelly. (2015). "Gradations of Debility and Capacity: Biocapitalism and the Neoliberalization of Disability Relations." *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies* 4 (2): 12–48. https://doi.org/10.15353/cjds.v4i2.208.

Gabel, Susan, David Connor, and David Connor. (2013). *Disability and Teaching*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796832.

Gabel, S., Reid, D., Pearson, H., Ruiz, L., & Hume-Dawson, R. (2016). Disability and Diversity on CSU Websites: A Critical Discourse Study. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, *9*(1), 64–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039256

Galvan, Dennis B., and Jeremy L. Brunson. (2012). Culture and Disability in the Classroom. In *Handbook of College and University Teaching: A Global Perspective*2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States: SAGE Publications, Inc. 91–106. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412996891.n7.

Garland-Thomson, R. (1997). *Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature*. Columbia University Press.

———. (2002). Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory. *NWSA Journal*, *14*(3), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1353/nwsa.2003.0005

———. (2013). Disability Studies: A Field Emerged. *American Quarterly* 65 (January): 915–26. https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2013.0052.

Gaudry, Adam, and Danielle Lorenz. (2018a). Indigenization as Inclusion, Reconciliation, and Decolonization: Navigating the Different Visions for Indigenizing the Canadian Academy. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples 14*(3): 218–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1177180118785382.

Gaudry, Adam, and Danielle Lorenz. (2018b). "Decolonization for the masses?: Grappling with Indigenous Content Requirements in the Changing Canadian Post-Secondary Environment" in Smith, Linda Tuhiwai editor, Eve Tuck, K. Wayne Yang, and Taylor and Francis. *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. First edition. Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education. Boca Raton, FL: Routledge, an imprint of Taylor and Francis. 159-174.

Gehl, Lynn. (October 9, 2018). Algonquin Anishinaabe Land Acknowledgment. Black Face Blogging. Accessed October 13, 2019. http://www.lynngehl.com/2/post/2018/10/algonquin-anishinaabe-land-acknowledgement.html.

Gergyek. (2019, October 7). *Open Letter to the President of the University of Ottawa*. Accessed November 22, 2019. https://cdn.fbsbx.com/v/t59.2708-21/71051592_2737929566230823_8908159379069468672_n.docx/961401de.docx?_nc_cat=109&_nc_oc=AQkGhQ1W6xEikG7PtLPsNI4oQcCBU33NulraMQRfng90K1AQ89ysBkOyn_2OVExCoJ0&_nc_ht=cdn.fbsbx.com&oh=4be395f557be62f0e5f0392a4f56114f&oe=5D9E02E6&dl=1&fbclid=IwAR1cmN3CoiUaaZlZ7mUajCxgIvtE2Pmj8oBj8tSnQerZpMXclkElyOiO3gI

Ghai, Anita. (2012). Engaging with Disability with Postcolonial Thoery. In Dan Goodley, Bill Hughes, and Lennard Davids, eds. *Disability and Social Theory: New Developments and Directions.* New York: Palgrave Macmillian. Pp. 270-286.

Gill, Michael, and Nirmala Erevelles. (2017). "The Absent Presence of Elsie Lacks: Hauntings at the Intersection of Race, Class, Gender, and Disability." *African American Review* 50 (2): 123–37. https://doi.org/10.1353/afa.2017.0017.

Gillis, Alex. (November 3, 2015). The rise of Mad Studies. *University Affairs*. Retrieved June 29, 2020, from https://www.universityaffairs.ca/features/feature-article/Mad-studies/

Gillborn, David. (2015). "Intersectionality, Critical Race Theory, and the Primacy of Racism: Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Education." *Qualitative Inquiry* 21 (3): 277–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414557827.

———. (2016). "Softly, Softly: Genetics, Intelligence and the Hidden Racism of the New Geneism." *Journal of Education Policy* 31 (4): 365–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2016.1139189.

Gilman, S. L. (2014). Madness as disability. *History of Psychiatry*, *25*(4), 441–449. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957154X14545846

Gilmore, R. W. (2007). *Golden gulag: Prisons, surplus, crisis, and opposition in globalizing California*. University of California Press.

Ginsburg, R. (2019). *Critical Perspectives on Teaching in Prison: Students and Instructors on Pedagogy Behind the Wall*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351215862

Goodley, Dan. (2013). "Dis/Entangling Critical Disability Studies." *Disability & Society* 28 (5): 631–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2012.717884.

———. (2016). *DISABILITY AND SOCIAL THEORY.* Place of publication not identified: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.

———. (2017). *Disability Studies: An Interdisciplinary Introduction*. 2nd edition. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Gorman, Rachel. (2013). Mad Nation? Thinking Through Race, Class, and Mad Identity Politics. In Brenda Lefrançois, Robert Menzies, and Geoffrey Reaume. (Eds.) *Mad Matters: A Critical reader in Canadian Mad Studies.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc. 269-280.

———. (2016). Disablement In and For Itself: Toward a 'Global' Idea of Disability. *Somatechnics* 6 (2): 249–61. https://doi.org/10.3366/soma.2016.0194.

———. (2017). Quagmires of Affect: Madness, Labor, Whiteness, and Ideological Disavowal. *American Quarterly* 69 (2): 309–13. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1353/aq.2017.0025.

Gorman, Rachel, and Onyinyechukwu Udegbe. (2010). "Disabled Woman/Nation: Re-Narrating the Erasure of (Neo)Colonial Violence in Ondjaki's Good Morning Comrades and Tsitsi Dangarembga's Nervous Conditions.(Critical Essay)." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 4 (3): 309-325,339-341. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2010.25.

Gorman, R., & LeFrançois, B. A. (2017). Mad Studies. In B. Cohen (Ed.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Mental Health*. Routledge Handbooks Online. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315399584.ch12

Gornitsky, Marcelle. (2011). Distance Education: Accessibility for Students With Disabilities. *Distance Learning* 8(3): 47–53.

Government of Canada, Public Services and Procurement Canada. (2015). “Honouring the Truth, Reconciling for the Future : Summary of the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada.: IR4-7/2015E-PDF - Government of Canada Publications - Canada.Ca.”.

Grande, Sandy. (2004). *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Grande, Sandra. (2018). “Refusing the University” in Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. *Toward What Justice?: Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education*. First edition. London: Taylor and Francis. Pp. 47-66.

Grande, Sandy, and Lauren Anderson. (2017). “Un-Settling Multicultural Erasures.” *Multicultural Perspectives* 19 (3): 139–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/15210960.2017.1331742.

Grande, Sandy, and Teresa L. Mccarty. (2018). “Indigenous Elsewheres: Refusal and Re-Membering in Education Research, Policy, and Praxis.” *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 31 (3): 165–167. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1401144.

Grech, Shaun. (2011). Recolonising Debates or Perpetuated Coloniality? Decentring the Spaces of Disability, Development and Community in the Global South. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 15 (1): 87–100.

———. (2015a.). “Decolonising Eurocentric Disability Studies: Why Colonialism Matters in the Disability and Global South Debate.” *Social Identities* 21 (1): 6–21.

———. (2015b). *Disability and Poverty in the Global South: Renegotiating Development in Guatemala*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grech, Shaun, and Karen Soldatic. (2016). *Disability in the Global South: The Critical Handbook*. International Perspectives on Social Policy, Administration, and Practice. Cham: Springer.

Grech, S., & Soldatic, K. (2015). Disability and colonialism: (Dis)encounters and anxious intersectionalities. *Social Identities*, *21*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2014.995394

Grier-Reed, Tabitha, and Anne Williams-Wengerd. (2018). Integrating Universal Design, Culturally Sustaining Practices, and Constructivism to Advance Inclusive Pedagogy in the Undergraduate Classroom. *Education Sciences* 8(4): 167. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8040167.

Gronseth, Susie L., Elizabeth M. Dalton, and Elizabeth M. Dalton. (2019). *Universal Access Through Inclusive Instructional Design : International Perspectives on UDL*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429435515.

Gunn, Vicky, and Chris McAllister. 2013. “Methods on the Margins? Queer Theory as Method in Higher Education Research.” In *International Perspectives on Higher Education Research*, edited by Jeroen Huisman and Malcolm Tight, 9:155–74. Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3628(2013)0000009012.

Hall, Kim Q. (2013). Philosophy, Religion, Race, and Queerness: A Question of Accommodation or Access. *Philosophical Topics* 41 (2): 157-171.

Hamraie, Aimi. (2017). *Building Access: Universal Design and the Politics of Disability*. Book Collections on Project MUSE. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hande, Mary. (2019). “Disability Consciousness on the Frontlines of Urban Struggle.” *Antipode* 51 (2): 558–78. https://doi.org/10.1111.

Haritaworn, Jinthana. (2018). *Queering Urban Justice: Queer of Colour Formations in Toronto*. Toronto Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

Harris, Cheryl. I. (1993). Whiteness as Property. *Harvard Law Review*, *106*(8), 1707–1791. https://doi.org/10.2307/1341787

Harris, Duchess. (2019). Introduction: The Departure of Michelle Obama from the White House and the Need for Black Feminism. In *Black Feminist Politics from Kennedy to Trump*, edited by Duchess Harris, 1–12. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-95456-1_1.

Harris, Jessica C. (2019). Multiracial Campus Professionals’ Experiences with Racial Authenticity. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 52(1): 93–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2019.1631232.

Haye, Stephanie de la. (2016). Beyond Policy—A Real Life Journey of Engagement and Involvement. In *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*, edited by Pamela Block, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. 235–45. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_16.

Hayes, Georgina. (November 7, 2019). Blind Student ‘Dragged from Oxford Union Chamber by His Ankles.’ *The Guardian*, Accessed November 17, 2019, sec. Education. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2019/nov/17/blind-student-dragged-from-oxford-union-chamber-by-his-ankles.

Heitzeg, Nancy A. (2016). *The School-to-Prison Pipeline: Education, Discipline, and Racialized Double Standards*. Racism in American Institutions. Santa Barbara, California: Praeger, an imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC.

Hemens, Aaron. (November 23, 2019). Students Push for More Black Profs at U of O’s Anti-Racism Town Hall. *Fulcrum.* Accessed November 29, 2019. https://thefulcrum.ca/news/students-push-for-more-black-profs-at-u-of-os-anti-racism-town-hall/.

Henriques, Anuradha, and Lina Abushouk. (2018). “Decolonising Oxford: The Student Movement from Stuart Hall to Skin Deep.” In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 297–309. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_17.

Henry, Frances et al. Ed. (2017) *The Equity Myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian Universities*. Vancouver British Columbia ; Toronto Ontario: UBC Press.

Hester, Scarlett L., and Catherine R. Squires. (2018). “Who Are We Working for? Recentering Black Feminism.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 15(4): 343–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/14791420.2018.1533987.

Hill, K. J. C. (2019). Kanonhsyonne Janice C. Hill: Rethinking the Practice and Performance of Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. *Canadian Theatre Review*, *177*, 22–24.

Hill, Yvonne. (2017). Loneliness as an occupational hazard. In Olivia Sagan and Eric Miller, eds. *Narratives of Loneliness: Multidisciplinary Perspectives from the 21st century*. London: Routledge. 173-184.

Hill Collins, Patricia. (2000). *Black Feminist Thought*. London: Routledge.

Hobson, Janell. (2018). *Venus in the Dark: Blackness and Beauty in Popular Culture*. Second edition. New York, New York ; London, England: Routledge,

Hobson, Michael, and Stuart Whigham. (2018). White Privilege, Empathy and Alterity in Higher Education—Teaching About Race and Racism in the Sociology of PE and Sport. In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_11. 195–213.

Hook, Derek. (2001). Discourse, Knowledge, Materiality, History: Foucault and Discourse Analysis. *Theory & Psychology*, *11*(4), 521–547. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354301114006

———. (2005). Genealogy, discourse, 'effective history': Foucault and the work of critique. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *2*(1), 3–31. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088705qp025oa

hooks, B. (1997). Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination. In *Displacing Whiteness* (pp. 165–169). Duke University Press. https://read.dukeupress.edu/books/book/619/chapter/127939/Representing-Whiteness-in-the-Black-Imagination

———. (2000). *All about Love: New Visions*. 1st ed. New York: William Morrow.

———. (2010). *Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom*. New York: Routledge.

———. (2013). *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope*. First edition. Boca Raton, FL: Routledge, an imprint of Taylor and Francis, ©2004.

———. (2014a). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Routledge.

———. (2014b). *Teaching To Transgress*. Routledge.

———. (2014c). *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black.* Routledge.

Houlden, Shandell, and George Veletsianos. (2019). A Posthumanist Critique of Flexible Online Learning and Its 'Anytime Anyplace' Claims. *British Journal of Educational Technology* 50(3): 1005. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12779.

Howell, Alison. (2018). Forget 'Militarization': Race, Disability and the 'Martial Politics' of the Police and of the University. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 20(2): 117–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2018.1447310.

Hutcheon, Emily J. and Bonnie Lashewicz. (2019). Tracing and Troubling Continuities between ableism and colonialism in Canada. *Disability & Society*, *35*(5): 695-714.

Hum, Peter. (August 6, 2020). Why a group of Ottawa businesses is leading the charge to help workers learn to de-escalate encounters with distressed people. *Ottawa Citizen.* Accessed August 20, 2020. https://ottawacitizen.com/business/local-business/why-a-group-of-ottawa-businesses-are-leading-the-charge-to-help-workers-learn-to-de-escalate-encounters-with-distressed-people

Hunt, Sarah. (2006). *Violence in the lives of sexually exploited youth and adult sex workers in BC provincial research: Final report, 2006*. Justice Institute of British Columbia, Centre for Leadership and Community Learning.

———. (2011). *Restoring the Honouring Circle: Taking a Stand against Youth Sexual Exploitation*. Justice Institute of British Columbia.

———. (2016). *Introduction to the Health of Two-Spirit People*. National Collaborating Centre for Aboriginal Health.

Ineese-Nash, N. (2020). Disability as a Colonial Construct: The Missing Discourse of Culture in Conceptualizations of Disabled Indigenous Children. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies*, *9*(3), 28–51.

Inckle, Kay. (2015). Debilitating Times: Compulsory Ablebodiedness and White Privilege in Theory and Practice. *Feminist Review*, 111: 42–58. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1057/fr.2015.38.

Ikeda, Naoko, and Emily Rosser. (2009). 'You Be Vigilant! Don't Rape!': Reclaiming Space and Security at York University. *Canadian Woman Studies* 28 (1): 37–43.

Jaffee, Laura Jordan. (2016). "The Materiality of Virtual War: Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder and the Disabling Effects of Imperialism." *Policy Futures in Education* 14 (4): 484–96. https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210316637971.

———. (2018). "Rethinking School Safety in the Age of Empire: Militarization, Mental Health, and State Violence." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 38 (1). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v38i1.5230.

Jaffee, Laura Jordan, and Kelsey John. (2018). "Disrupting Global Disability Frameworks: Settler-Colonialism and the Geopolitics of Disability in Palestine/Israel." *Disability & Society 31*, 1: 1–15.

Jarman, Michelle. (2005). Resisting 'Good Imperialism': Reading Disability as Radical Vulnerability. *Atenea* 25 (1): 107–16.

Jeyasingham, Dharman. (2012). "White Noise: A Critical Evaluation of Social Work Education's Engagement with Whiteness Studies." *British Journal of Social Work* 42 (4): 669–86. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcr110.

Johnson, Merri Lisa, and Robert McRuer. (2014). Cripistemologies. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 8(2): 127–47. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2014.12.

Jones, N., & Brown, R. (2012a). The Absence of Psychiatric C/S/X Perspectives in Academic Discourse: Consequences and Implications. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *33*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v33i1.3433

Jones, Ryan Patrick. (August 4, 2020). Physical distancing, mask-wearing could be in place for 2-3 years even with vaccine, Tam warns. CBC News. Accessed August 26, 2020. https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/covid-19-vaccine-tam-1.5673729

Kafer, Alison. (2003). COMPULSORY BODIES: Reflections on Heterosexuality and Able-Bodiedness. *Journal of Women's History* 15 (3): 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1353/jowh.2003.0071.

———. (2013). *Feminist, Queer, Crip*. Indiana University Press.

———. (2016). "Un/Safe Disclosures Scenes of Disability and Trauma" 10 (1): 1-20,127. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2016.1.

———. (2019). "Crip Kin, Manifesting." *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience* 5 (1): 1–37. https://doi.org/10.28968/cftt.v5i1.29618.

Kanter, A.S., and Beth A. Ferri. (2013). *Righting Educational Wrongs: Disability Studies in Law and Education*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Kayiatos, Anastasia Ioanna, and Joan Ostrove. (2015). "Minding the Body." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 35 (2). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v35i2.4644.

Kelly, Christine. (2011). Making 'Care' Accessible: Personal Assistance for Disabled People and the Politics of Language. *Critical Social Policy* 31(4): 562–582. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261018311410529.

Kelly, Diann Cameron, and Rani Varghese. (2018). Four Contexts of Institutional Oppression: Examining the Experiences of Blacks in Education, Criminal Justice and Child Welfare. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* 28(7): 874–88. https://doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2018.1466751.

Kelsey, Penelope. (2013). "Disability and Native North American Boarding School Narratives: Madonna Swan and Sioux Sanitorium." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 7 (2): 195–212. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2013.14.

Kieran, Laura, and Christine Anderson. (2019). Connecting Universal Design for Learning With Culturally Responsive Teaching. *Education and Urban Society* 51(9): 1202–1216. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124518785012.

Kim, Eunjung. (2017). *Curative Violence: Rehabilitating Disability, Gender, and Sexuality in Modern Korea*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kirby, Cait S. (2020). "Digital Paper Trail: Covid19 Accommodations." Google Docs. Accessed April 15, 2020. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1QhSE4o-AW--3agNyS2kwG50R56EqUSH7aR5QX8lk7eI/edit?usp=sharing&usp=embed_facebook.

———. [caitskirby]. (March 7, 2020). Tweet. Retrieved August 25, 2020 from https://twitter.com/caitskirby/status/1236310800136110080

Knadler, Stephen. (2019). *Vitality Politics*: *Health, Debility, and the Limits of Black Emancipation*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.

Kohli, Rita, Marcos Pizarro, and Arturo Nevárez. (2017). The 'New Racism' of K–12 Schools: Centering Critical Research on Racism. *Review of Research in Education* 41(1): 182–202. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X16686949.

Kolářová, Kateřina, and M. Katharina Wiedlack. (2016). "Crip Notes on the Idea of Development." *Somatechnics* 6 (2): 125–41. https://doi.org/10.3366/soma.2016.0187.

Koulmiya-Boyce, Jamal. [Jamal-KB]. (June 13, 2019). *Tweets*. Accessed August 20, 2020 from https://twitter.com/Jamal_KB/status/1139281101359386628?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1139281306771238912%7Ctwgr%5E&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fottawacitizen.com%2Fnews%2Flocal-news%2Fhumiliating-black-uottawa-student-cuffed-in-campus-carding-incident

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies characteristics, conversations and contexts*. University of Toronto Press.

Krebs, Emily. (August 30, 2019). Baccalaureates or Burdens? Complicating 'Reasonable Accommodations' for American College Students with Disabilities. *Disability Studies Quarterly* 39(3): n.p. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v39i3.6557.

Kress, Margaret. (2017). Reclaiming Disability Through Pimatisiwin: Indigenous Ethics, Spatial Justice, and Gentle Teaching. *Ethics, Equity, and Inclusive Education, 9*: 23-57.

Kumar, Kari, and Maureen Wideman. (2014). "Accessible by Design: Applying UDL Principles in a First Year Undergraduate Course." *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 44 (1): 125–147.

Kunzel, R. (2017). Queer History, Mad History, and the Politics of Health. *American Quarterly*, *69*(2), 315–319. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1353/aq.2017.0026

Kuppers, Petra. (2013). "Decolonizing Disability, Indigeneity, and Poetic Methods." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 7 (2): 175–93. https://doi.org/10.3828/jlcds.2013.13.

———. (2016). "Landings: Decolonizing Disability, Indigeneity and Poetic Methods." In *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*, edited by Pamela Block, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard, 63–82. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_5.

Kyrola, K. (2015). Toward a Contextual Pedagogy of Pain: Trigger Warnings and the Value of Sometimes Feeling Really, Really Bad. *Lambda Nordica*. https://www.academia.edu/14336918/Toward_a_Contextual_Pedagogy_of_Pain_Trigger_Warnings_and_the_Value_of_Sometimes_Feeling_Really_Really_Bad

Ladson-Billings, Gloria, and William F. Tate. (1995). "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education." *Teachers College Record* 97 (1): 47–68.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. (2014). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the Remix. *Harvard Educational Review* 84(1): 74–84. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751.

Lakehead University Teaching Commons. (N.d.). Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://teachingcommons.lakeheadu.ca/

Lalvani, Priya, Alicia A Broderick, Michelle Fine, Tina Jacobowitz, and Nicholas Michelli. (2015). Teacher Education, In Exclusion, and the Implicit Ideology of Separate but Equal: An Invitation to a Dialogue. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice* 10(2): 168–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/1746197915583935.

Lalvani, Priya, and Alicia A. Broderick. (2013). Institutionalized Ableism and the Misguided 'Disability Awareness Day': Transformative Pedagogies for Teacher Education. *Equity & Excellence in Education* 46(4): 468–83. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2013.838484.

Lambert, David C., and Rachel Dryer. (2018). Quality of Life of Higher Education Students with Learning Disability Studying Online. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education* 65(4): 393–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2017.1410876.lamot

Larock, Timothy, Timothy Sakharov, Sahely Bhadra, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. (2020). Understanding the Limitations of Network Online Learning. *ArXiv.Org*, 2020.

Lazar, Michelle M. (2007). "Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Articulating a Feminist Discourse Praxis 1." *Critical Discourse Studies* 4 (2): 141–164. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405900701464816.

Legassic, Cory. (2009). "Reasonable Accommodation as a Settling Concept." *Canadian Woman Studies* 27 (2/3): 46–52.

Leonardo, Zeus, and Alicia A. Broderick. (2011). "Smartness as Property: A Critical Exploration of Intersections Between Whiteness and Disability Studies." *Teachers College Record* 113 (10): 2206–32. https://doi.org/0161-4681.

Leeuw, Sarah, Margo Greenwood, and Emilie Cameron. (2010). Deviant Constructions: How Governments Preserve Colonial Narratives of Addictions and Poor Mental Health to Intervene in the Lives of Indigenous Children and Families in Canada. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, *8*, pp. 282-295.

Lefrançois, Brenda, Robert Menzies, and Geoffrey Reaume. (2013). Introducing Mad Studies. In Brenda Lefrançois, Robert Menzies, and Geoffrey Reaume. (Eds.) *Mad Matters: A Critical reader in Canadian Mad Studies.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc. 1-22.

Liasidou, Anastasia. (2014). The Cross-Fertilization of Critical Race Theory and Disability Studies: Points of Convergence/ Divergence and Some Education Policy Implications. *Disability & Society* 29(5): 724–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2013.844104.

Liasidou, Anastasia. (2014). Critical Disability Studies and Socially Just Change in Higher Education. *British Journal of Special Education* 41(2): 120–35. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8578.12063.

Light, Tracy Penny, Jane Nicholas, and Reneé Bondy. (2015). *Feminist Pedagogy in Higher Education: Critical Theory and Practice*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Lindquist, E. (2020, November 10). U of O students outraged by professor's use of the N-word. *The Charlatan, Carleton's Independent Newspaper*. https://charlatan.ca/2020/11/u-of-o-students-outraged-by-professors-use-of-the-n-word/

Livingstone, A., & Weinfeld, M. (2017). Black Students and High School Completion in Quebec and Ontario: A Multivariate Analysis. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, *54*, 174–197. https://doi.org/10.1111/cars.12144

Louie, Dustin William, Yvonne Poitras Pratt, Aubrey Jean Hanson, and Jacqueline Ottmann. (2017a). Applying Indigenizing Principles of Decolonizing Methodologies in University Classrooms. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education* 47 (3): 16–33.

Loutzenheiser, Lisa W., and Nirmala Erevelles. (2019). 'What's Disability Got To Do With It?': Crippin' Educational Studies at the Intersections. *Educational Studies* 55(4): 375–86. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2019.1630131.

Love, Bettina. (2014).'I See Trayvon Martin': What Teachers Can Learn from the Tragic Death of a Young Black Male. *The Urban Review* 46(2): 292–306. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-013-0260-7.

Lovern, Lavonna L. and Carol Locust. Eds. (2013). *Native American Communities on Health and Disability: A Borderland Dialogue.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Lucchesi, Andrew J. (2016). Accessing Academe, Disabling the Curriculum: Institutional Locations of Dis/Ability in American Higher Education. Ph.D., City University of New York, 2016.

Lund, Darren E., and Paul R. Carr. (2015). *Revisiting the Great White North?: Reframing Whiteness, Privilege, and Identity in Education*. Second edition. Vol. 106. Transgressions (Rotterdam, Netherlands) ; v. 106. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Luu, Linda. (2019). "Toward Interdisciplinary Coalitions: Eunjung Kim's Curative Violence and Jasbir K. Puar's The Right to Maim." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 13 (1): 111–115.

Lynn, Marvin, and Adrienne D. Dixson. (2013). *Critical Race Theory in Education | All God's Children Got a Song*. New York: Routledge.

Lyons, Kim. (July 31, 2020). YouTube is ending its community captions features and deaf creators aren't happy about it. *The Verge.* Accessed August 27, 2020. https://www.theverge.com/2020/7/31/21349401/youtube-community-captions-deaf-creators-accessibility-google

Maharaj, T. (2019, June 15). Letter: Protection services needs a complete overhaul. *The Fulcrum*. https://thefulcrum.ca/opinions/letters/letter-protection-services-needs-a-complete-overhaul/

Malacrida, Claudia. (2008). Discipline and Dehumanization in a Total Institution: Institutional Survivors' Descriptions of Time-Out Rooms. In *Sociology of the Body: A Reader* (Second Edition). Claudia Malacrida and Jacqueline Low, eds. 71-79.

Malott, Curry, Pierre W. Orelus, and Romina Pacheco. (2014). *Colonized Schooling Exposed: Progressive Voices for Transformative Educational and Social Change*. Vol. 6. Routledge Studies in Education and Neoliberalism 6. New York ; London: Routledge.

Manuel, Jeffrey T., and Matthew P. Schunke. (2016). Meeting Students Where They Are Online, But Leading Them Somewhere More Interesting: Reflections on Teaching the Facebook Class. *College Teaching* 64(3): 112–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2015.1099094.

March for racial justice fills downtown Ottawa. (2020, June 5). *CBC News*. Accessed August 26, 2020. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/ottawa-no-peace-until-justice-1.5600508

Marker, M. (2015). Borders and the borderless Coast Salish: Decolonising historiographies of Indigenous schooling. *History of Education (Tavistock)*, *44*(4), 480–502. https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760X.2015.1015626

Mason, Zoë. (January 31, 2020). 'You're swimming upstream': Students highlight gaps in U of O's mental health system. *Fulcrum.* Accessed January 15, 2021. https://thefulcrum.ca/features/youre-swimming-upstream-students-highlight-gaps-in-u-of-os-mental-health-system/

Matias, Cheryl E. (2016). *Feeling White: Whiteness, Emotionality, and Education*. Vol. volume 2. Cultural Pluralism Democracy, Socio-Environmental Justice & Education ; Volume 2. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Matsuda, Mari J. (1996). *Where Is Your Body?: And Other Essays on Race, Gender, and the Law*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Maylor, Uvanney. (2018). "Leadership for Race and Social Justice in Higher Education." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 349–64. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_20.

Maynard, Robyn. (2017). *Policing Black lives: State violence in Canada from slavery to the present*. Fernwood Publishing.

Metzl, J. M. (2010). *The Protest Psychosis: How Schizophrenia Became a Black Disease*. Beacon Press.

———. (2019). *Dying of Whiteness: How the Politics of Racial Resentment Is Killing America's Heartland*. Basic Books.

Meyer, J., Land, R., & Land, R. (2006). *Overcoming Barriers to Student Understanding: Threshold Concepts and Troublesome Knowledge*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203966273

Myers, E. (2019). Beyond the Psychological Wage: Du Bois on White Dominion. *Political Theory*, *47*(1), 6–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591718791744

McGuire-Adams, Tricia. (2018). “Anishinaabeg Women’s Wellbeing: Decolonization through Physical Activity.” Dissertation: Université d’Ottawa / University of Ottawa.

McCusker, Geraldine. (2017). A Feminist Teacher’s Account of Her Attempts to Achieve the Goals of Feminist Pedagogy. *Gender & Education* 29(4): 445–60. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540253.2017.1290220.

McDowell, M. G., & Fernandez, L. A. (2018). ‘Disband, Disempower, and Disarm’: Amplifying the Theory and Practice of Police Abolition. *Critical Criminology (Richmond, B.C.)*, *26*(3), 373–391. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10612-018-9400-4

McGibbon, E. A. (2012). *Oppression: A social determinant of health*. Halifax: Fernwood.

McGuire-Adams, Tricia. (2018). *Anishinaabeg Women’s Wellbeing: Decolonization through Physical Activity*. Université d’Ottawa / University of Ottawa.

———. (2020). *Indigenous Feminist Gikendaasowin (Knowledge): Decolonization through Physical Activity*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56806-1

McKinney, Claire. (2014). “Cripping the Classroom: Disability as a Teaching Method in the Humanities.” *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy* 25 (2): 114–27. https://doi.org/10.1353/tnf.2014.0024.

McKittrick, K. (2014, December 17). *Katherine McKittrick, author of Demonic Grounds, on Trigger Warnings – Bully Bloggers* [Blog]. Bully Bloggers. https://bullybloggers.wordpress.com/2014/12/17/katherine-mckittrick-author-of-demonic-grounds-on-trigger-warnings/

Mcmanus, Dean, Rachel Dryer, and Marcus Henning. (2017). Barriers to Learning Online Experienced by Students with a Mental Health Disability. *Distance Education* 38(3): 336–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2017.1369348.

McMaster MacPherson Institute. (N.d.) Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://mi.mcmaster.ca/

Mcmillen, Rebecca, and Frances Alter. (2017). “Social Media, Social Inclusion, and Museum Disability Access.” *Museums & Social Issues* 12 (2): 115–125. https://doi.org/10.1080/15596893.2017.1361689.

McRuer, R. (2006). *Crip theory: Cultural signs of queerness and disability*. University Press.

———. (2010). “Disability Nationalism in Crip Times.” *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 4 (2): 163–178.

———. (2018). *Crip Times: Disability, Globalization, and Resistance*. New York: New York University Press.

McWhorter, John. (July 15, 2020). The Dehumanizing Condescension of White Fragility: the popular book aims to combat racism but talks down to Black people. *The Atlantic.* Accessed August 26, 2020. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/dehumanizing-condescension-white-fragility/614146/

Meekosha, Helen. (2010). The Complex Balancing Act of Choice, Autonomy, Valued Life, and Rights: Bringing a Feminist Disability Perspective to Bioethics. *IJFAB: International Journal of Feminist Approaches to Bioethics* 3 (2): 1–8.

———. (2011). Decolonising Disability: Thinking and Acting Globally. *Disability & Society* 26 (6): 667–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2011.602860.

Meekosha, H., & Shuttleworth, R. (2009). What's so 'critical' about critical Disability Studies? *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, *15*(1), 47–75. https://doi.org/10.1080/1323238X.2009.11910861

Meekosha, Helen, and Karen Soldatic. (2011). Human Rights and the Global South: The Case of Disability. *Third World Quarterly* 32 (8): 1383–1397. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2011.614800.

Meekosha, H., & Soldatic, K. (2016). *The Global Politics of Impairment and Disability: Processes and Embodiments*. New York: Routledge.

Meerai, S., Abdillahi, I., & Poole, J. (2016). An Introduction to Anti-Black Sanism. *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice*, *5*(3), 18–35.

Merkwae, Amanda. (2015). SCHOOLING THE POLICE: RACE, DISABILITY, AND THE CONDUCT OF SCHOOL RESOURCE OFFICERS. *Michigan Journal of Race & Law* 21(1): 147–181.

Mills, Stu. (August 12, 2020). Carleton Criminology department cuts ties with police, prisons. *CBC News*. Accessed August 26, 2020. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/carleton-criminology-police-ottawa-1.5683717

Mingus, Mia. (2018a). 'Disability Justice' Is Simply Another Term for Love. Leaving Evidence. November 3, 2018. https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2018/11/03/disability-justice-is-simply-another-term-for-love/.

———. (2018b). Moving Toward the Ugly: A Politic Beyond Desirability. In *Beginning with Disability: A Primer*, edited by Lennard J. Davis, 137–41. New York: Routledge.

———. (2019, December 18). The Four Parts of Accountability: How To Give A Genuine Apology Part 1. *Leaving Evidence*. https://leavingevidence.wordpress.com/2019/12/18/how-to-give-a-good-apology-part-1-the-four-parts-of-accountability/

Mirza, Heidi Safia. (2018). "Black Bodies 'Out of Place' in Academic Spaces: Gender, Race, Faith and Culture in Post-Race Times." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 175–93. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_10.

Mitchell, David T. and Sharon L. Snyder. (2000). *Narrative prosthesis: Disability and the dependencies of discourse*. University of Michigan Press.

———. (2010). "Disability as Multitude: Re-Working Non-Productive Labor Power." *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies* 4 (2): 179–193.

———. (2014). '[Every] Child Left Behind': Curricular Cripistemologies and the Crip/Queer Art of Failure. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies 8,* 3: 295–313.

Mollow, Anna. (2006). "'When Black Women Start Going on Prozac': Race, Gender, and Mental Illness in Meri Nana-Ama Danquah's 'Willow Weep for Me.'" *MELUS* 31 (3): 67–99.

———. (2015). *The Biopolitics of Disability: Neoliberalism, Ablenationalism, and Peripheral Embodiment*. Corporealities. Baltimore, Maryland, Ann Arbor [Michigan]: Project Muse, University of Michigan Press.

———. (2017). Unvictimizable: Toward a Fat Black Disability Studies. *African American Review 50*(1): 105–121. https://doi.org/10.1353/afa.2017.0016.

Mitchell, Don. (June 23, 2020). Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board terminates Hamilton police school liason program. *Global News*. Accessed August 26, 2020. https://globalnews.ca/news/7094973/hwdsb-terminates-hamilton-police-school-liaison-program/

Million, Dian. (2013). *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*. Critical Issues in Indigenous Studies. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.

Mollow, Anna. (2006). "When Black Women Start Going on Prozac": Race, Gender, and Mental Illness in Meri Nana-Ama Danquah's "Willow Weep for Me." *MELUS*, *31*(3), 67–99. JSTOR.

Mollow, Anna. (2014). Criphystemologies: What Disability Theory Needs to Know about Hysteria. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, *8*(2), 185–201.

Mollow, A. (2017). Unvictimizable: Toward a fat black Disability Studies. *African American Review*, *50*(2), 105–121. https://doi.org/10.1353/afa.2017.0016

Monaghan, Jeffrey, and Andrew Crosby. (2018). *Policing Indigenous Movements: Dissent and the Security State*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Montoya, T. M. (2020). Unlearning racism: The classroom as a space for social transformation through borderlands pedagogy. *Contemporary Justice Review*, *23*(2): 148–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2020.1755844

Moodley, R., Mujtaba, F., & Kleiman, S. (2017). Critical race theory and mental health. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Critical Mental Health* (pp. 79–88). Routledge Handbooks Online. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315399584.ch9

Moussa, Ghaida. (2019). *QTBIPOC Interventions in Fibromyalgic Presents: Critically Exploring Gendered, Racial and Neoliberal Regimes of Knowledge in Medical Understandings of Fibromyalgia*. 1-253.

Mugabo, D. (2016). On Rocks and Hard Places: A Reflection on Antiblackness in Organizing against Islamophobia. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, *2*, 159. https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.2.2.0159

Murphy, Ann, Derek Malenczak, and Mina Ghajar. (2019). "Identifying Challenges and Benefits of Online Education for Students with a Psychiatric Disability." *Journal of Postsecondary Education & Disability* 32(4): 395–409.

Mustaffa, Jalil Bishop. (2017). Mapping Violence, Naming Life: A History of Anti-Black Oppression in the Higher Education System. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 30(8): 711–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2017.1350299.

Mwangi, Chrystal A. George, Barbara Thelamour, Ijeoma Ezeofor, and Ashley Carpenter. (2018). 'Black Elephant in the Room': Black Students Contextualizing

Campus Racial Climate Within US Racial Climate. *Journal of College Student Development* 59(4): 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2018.0042.

Myers, C. A. (2017). Police violence against people with mental disabilities: The immutable duty under the ADA to reasonably accommodate during arrest. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, *70*(4), 1393-.

Nail, T. (2017). What is an Assemblage? *SubStance*, *46*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.3368/ss.46.1.21

Nash, Jennifer C. (2019). *Black Feminism Reimagined: After Intersectionality*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478002253.

Nelson, Camille A. (2011). Racializing Disability, Disabling Race: Policing Race and Mental Status. *Legal Studies Research Paper Series* 15(1): 1–64.

Newnes, C., & Golding, L. (2017). *Teaching Critical Psychology: International Perspectives*. Taylor & Francis Group. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/ottawa/detail.action?docID=5143965

Nguyen, Xuan Thuy. (2018). “Critical Disability Studies at the Edge of Global Development: Why Do We Need to Engage with Southern Theory?” *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies* 7 (1): 1–25. https://doi.org/10.15353/cjds.v7i1.400.

Nicholson, Katie and Jacques Marcoux. (April 4, 2018). Most Canadians killed in police encounters since 2000 had mental health or substance abuse issues. *CBC Investigates*. Accessed August 20, 2020. https://www.cbc.ca/news/investigates/most-canadians-killed-in-police-encounters-since-2000-had-mental-health-or-substance-abuse-issues-1.4602916

Nishida, Akemi. (2016). “Neoliberal Academia and a Critique from Disability Studies.” In *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*, edited by Pamela Block, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard, 145–57. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_10.

Nocella, A. J. (2011). *A dis-ability perspective on the stigmatization of dissent: Critical pedagogy, critical criminology, and critical animal studies* [Ph.D., Syracuse University].

Nocella, A. J., & Socha, K. (2014). CHAPTER TEN: The New Eugenics: Challenging Urban Education and Special Education and the Promise of Hip Hop Pedagogy. *Counterpoints*, *453*, 165–182.

Norris, Heather. (2014). “Colonialism and the Rupturing of Indigenous Worldviews of Impairment and Relational Interdependence: A Beginning Dialogue towards Reclamation and Social Transformation.” *Critical Disability Discourses/Discours Critiques Dans Le Champ Du Handicap* 6 (0). https://cdd.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/cdd/article/view/39665.

Null, Roberta L. (2014). *Universal Design: Principles and Models*. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Press.

Oakes, Peter. (2012). Assessment of Learning Disability: A History: Peter Oakes Provides an Analysis of Learning Disability to Show That the Essential Relationship of Service Providers and Users Remains Unchanged.(Feature). *Learning Disability Practice* 15(1): 12–16.

Oba, Olufunke. (2019). *Youth and Elders in Solidarity: An Afrocentric Dialogic Approach to Research*. 1 Oliver's Yard, 55 City Road, London EC1Y 1SP United Kingdom: SAGE Publications Ltd. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526484215.

Oliver, Mike. (2013). The social model of disability: Thirty years on. *Disability & Society*, *28*(7), 1024–1026. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2013.818773

———. (1990). The Individual and Social Models of Disability. *People with Established Locomotor Disabilities in Hospitals*, *Reader in Disability Studies*, 1–7. https://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/40/library/Oliver-in-soc-dis.pdf

———. (1983) Social Work with Disabled People. London: Basingstoke Macmillan.

Ontario Institute of Technology Teaching and Learning Centre. (N.d.) Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://tlc.ontariotechu.ca/index.php

Opini, Bathseba. (2016). "Walking the Talk: Towards a More Inclusive Field of Disability Studies." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 20 (1): 67–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2015.1073800.

Orr, C. E. (2018). *Exorcising Intersex and Cripping Compulsory Dyadism* [Thesis, Université d'Ottawa / University of Ottawa]. https://doi.org/10.20381/ruor-21864

Ore, Ersula. (2017). Pushback: A Pedagogy of Care. *Pedagogy* 17(1): 9–33. https://doi.org/10.1215/15314200-3658366.

Osborne, Tanya. (2019). "Not Lazy, Not Faking: Teaching and Learning Experiences of University Students with Disabilities." *Disability & Society* 34 (2): 228–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1515724.

Palfrey, J. (2017). *Safe Spaces, Brave Spaces: Diversity and Free Expression in Education.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Palmater, Pamela D. (2011). *Beyond Blood: Rethinking Indigenous Identity*. Saskatoon, SK: Purich Publishing.

Palmater, Pamela D. (Pamela Doris) (2015). *Indigenous Nationhood: Empowering Grassroots Citizens*. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Fernwood Publishing.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, *41*(3), 93–97.

Parker, R. (August 10, 2020). *New OHRC report confirms Black people disproportionately arrested, charged, subjected to use of force by Toronto police*. Ontario Human Rights Commission. Retrieved August 27, 2020, from http://www3.ohrc.on.ca/en/news_centre/new-ohrc-report-confirms-black-people-disproportionately-arrested-charged-subjected-use-force

Patton, Lori D. (2016). "Disrupting Postsecondary Prose: Toward a Critical Race Theory of Higher Education." Edited by Jamel K. Donnor, Adrienne D. Dixson, and Celia Rousseau Anderson. *Urban Education* 51 (3): 315–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085915602542.

Peters, Michael Adrian. (2018). "Why Is My Curriculum White? A Brief Genealogy of Resistance." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 253–70. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_14.

Pickens, Therí. (2019). *Black Madness: : Mad Blackness*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Piepzna-Samarasinha, Leah Lakshmi. (2018). *Care Work: Dreaming Disability Justice*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press.

Pilkington, E. (2020, May 20). Black Americans dying of Covid-19 at three times the rate of white people. *The Guardian*. Accessed August 26, 2020. https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/20/black-americans-death-rate-covid-19-coronavirus

Pitofsky, M. (2020, August 11). Black Michigan teen jailed for missing schoolwork released from probation. *TheHill*. https://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/511523-black-michigan-teen-jailed-for-missing-schoolwork-released-from

Pittman, Candice and April Heiselt. (2014). "Increasing Accessibility: Using Universal Design Principles to Address Disability Impairments in the Online Learning Environment." *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration* 17(3): 1–9.

Policy 33- Security. (n.d.). *uOttawa*. Accessed August 27, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/administration-and-governance/policy-33-security

Policy 67a- Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination. (n.d.). *uOttawa*. Accessed August 27, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/administration-and-governance/policy-67a-prevention-of-harassment-and-discrimination

Policy 119- Accessibility. (n.d.). *uOttawa*. Accessed August 27, 2020 from https://www.uottawa.ca/administration-and-governance/policy-119-accessibility

Price, Margaret. (2011). *Mad at School: Rhetorics of Mental Disability and Academic Life*. Corporealities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Preston, Susan, and Jordan Aslett. (2014). Resisting Neoliberalism from within the Academy: Subversion through an Activist Pedagogy. *Social Work Education* 33(4): 502–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2013.848270.

Procter, Jenna-Lee. (2018). "Rethinking Disability: The Need to Rethink Representation." *African Journal of Disability* 7 (1): N.PAG-N.PAG. https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v7i0.498.

Puar, Jasbir. (2009). "Prognosis Time: Towards a Geopolitics of Affect, Debility and Capacity." *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 19 (2): 161–72. https://doi.org/10.1080/07407700903034147.

———. (2010). *Terrorist Assemblages*. Duke University Press Books.

———. (2015). "Inhumanist Occupation: Palestine and the 'Right to Maim.'" *GLQ* 21 (2–3): 218–221.

———. (2017). *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. ANIMA (Duke University Press). Durham: Duke University Press.

Queen's University Centre for Teaching and Learning. (N.d.) Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://www.queensu.ca/ctl/home

Quinlan, L. (2018). *Accessibility and Disability for Indigenous Women, Girls, and Gender Diverse People*. Native Women's Association. 1-17.

"Ramp Your Voice!" (May 5, 2016). "Black Disabled Woman Syllabus: A Compilation," Accessed November 29, 2019. http://rampyourvoice.com/2016/05/05/black-disabled-woman-syllabus-compilation/.

Ravensbergen, L. C. (2019). Lisa Cooke Ravensbergen: Rethinking the Practice and Performance of Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. *Canadian Theatre Review*, *177*, 29–30.

Razack, S. (1998). *Looking white people in the eye: Gender, race, and culture in courtrooms and classrooms*. University of Toronto Press.

Reading, Jeffrey Lawrence. (2011). Consensus Conference on Small Water Systems Management for the Promotion of Indigenous Health Victoria. *Crisis on Tap Seeking Solutions for Safe Water for Indigenous Peoples*. DesLibris. Documents Collection. Victoria, B.C.: University of Victoria Centre for Aboriginal Health Research.

"Really Harper, Canada Has No History of Colonialism?" (September 8, 2009). Vancouver Sun. Accessed October 30, 2019. https://vancouversun.com/news/community-blogs/really-harper-canada-has-no-history-of-colonialism

"Reclaiming Power and Place: The Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls" (2019). https://www.mmiwg-ffada.ca/final-report/

Ricks, Shawn Arango. (2018). Normalized Chaos: Black Feminism, Womanism, and the (Re)Definition of Trauma and Healing. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 16: 343–50. https://doi.org/10.2979/meridians.16.2.15.

Rivas Velarde, M. (2018). Indigenous Perspectives of Disability. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *38*(4). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v38i4.6114

Roberts, Dorothy E. (1997). *Killing the Black Body Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. 1st ed. Black Women Writers. New York: Pantheon Books.

———. (2011). *Fatal Invention: How Science, Politics, and Big Business Re-Create Race in the Twenty-First Century*. The New Press.

Robinson, D. (2019). Dylan Robinson: Rethinking the Practice and Performance of Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. *Canadian Theatre Review*, *177*, 21-22.

Robinson, Dylan, Kanonhsyonne Janice C. Hill, Armand Garnet Ruffo, Selena Couture, and Lisa Cooke Ravensbergen. (2019). Rethinking the Practice and Performance of Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. *Canadian Theatre Review* 177(1): 20–30.

Robson, Karen, Paul Anisef, Robert S. Brown, and R. C. George. (2018). Under-Represented Students and the Transition to Post-Secondary Education: Comparing Two Toronto Cohorts. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education; Toronto* 48(1): 39–59.

Rohrer, Judy. (2005). Toward a Full-Inclusion Feminism: A Feminist Deployment of Disability Analysis. *Feminist Studies* 31(1): 34–63. https://doi.org/10.2307/20459006.

Rollock, Nicola. (2018). "The Heart of Whiteness: Racial Gesture Politics, Equity and Higher Education." In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 313–30. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_18.

Rosenbaum, Philip J. and Heather Liebert. (2015). Reframing the Conversation on College Student Mental Health. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy* 29(3): 179-196.

Ruffo, A. G. (2019). Armand Garnet Ruffo: Rethinking the Practice and Performance of Indigenous Land Acknowledgement. *Canadian Theatre Review, 177*, 24–27.

Russo, Jasna and Debra Shulkes. (2015). What we talk about when we talk about disability: Making sense of debates in the European the user/survivor movement. In Helen Spandler, Jill Anderson, and Bob Sapey. (Eds.). *Madness, distress, and the politics of disablement.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 27-42.

Ryerson University Learning and Teaching. (N.d.). accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://www.ryerson.ca/learning-teaching/

Ryujin, T., Collett, E., & Mulitalo, E. (2016). From Safe to Brave Spaces: A Component of Social Justice Curriculum in Physician Assistant Education. *The Journal of Physician Assistant Education*, *27*(2), 86–88. https://doi.org/10.1097/JPA.0000000000000073

Saeed, Tania. (2018). "Islamophobia in Higher Education: Muslim Students and the 'Duty of Care.'" In *Dismantling Race in Higher Education: Racism, Whiteness and Decolonising the Academy*, edited by Jason Arday and Heidi Safia Mirza, 233–50. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60261-5_13.

Samuels, Ellen. (2014). *Fantasies of Identification: Disability, Gender, Race*. Cultural Front (Series). New York: NYU Press, New York University Press.

Schalk, Sami. (2016). Happily Ever After for Whom? Blackness and Disability in Romance Narratives. *Journal of Popular Culture* 49 (6): 1241–1260. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpcu.12491.

Schalk, Samantha Dawn. (2018). *Bodyminds Reimagined: (Dis)Ability, Race, and Gender in Black Women's Speculative Fiction*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Schalk, Sami and Jina B. Kim. (2020). Integrating Race, Transforming Feminist Disability Studies. *Signs, 46*(1): 31-55.

Scully, Jackie Leach. (2008). *Disability Bioethics: Moral Bodies, Moral Difference*. Feminist Constructions. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sedgwick, Eve. (2008). *Epistemology of the Closet: Updated with a New Preface*. University of California Press.

Senier, Siobhan. (2013). "Traditionally, disability was not seen as such": Writing and Healing in the Work of Mohegan Medicine People. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies, 7*(2): 213-229.

Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (2001). The social model of disability: An outdated ideology? In S. N. Barnartt & B. M. Altman (Eds.), *Exploring Theories and Expanding Methodologies: Where we are and where we need to go* (Vol. 2, pp. 9–28). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3547(01)80018-X

Shallish, Lauren, Shridevi Rao, and Nadya Pancsofar. (2020). Teaching Toward Justice: Reflections on Collaboration, Engagement, and Social Action in Uncertain Times. *The Educational Forum* 84(1): 18–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2020.1674437.

Shapira, S., & Granek, L. (2019). Negotiating psychiatric cisgenderism-ableism in the transgender- autism nexus. *Feminism & Psychology, 29*(4), 494–513. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353519850843

Shattering myths about contract academic staff. (September 2018). CAUT. Retrieved August 27, 2020, from https://www.caut.ca/bulletin/2018/09/shattering-myths-about-contract-academic-staff

Sheridan, Lynnaire, and Suzanne Kotevski. (2014). "University Teaching with a Disability: Student Learnings beyond the Curriculum." *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 18 (11): 1162–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2014.881567.

Shifrer, Dara, Rebecca M. Callahan, and Chandra Muller. (2013). "Equity or Marginalization?: The High School Course-Taking of Students Labeled With a Learning Disability." *American Educational Research Journal* 50 (4): 656–682. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831213479439.

Siebers, Tobin. (2008). *Disability Theory*. Corporealities. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Simpson, Audra. (2011). Settlement's Secret. *Cultural Anthropology* 26 (2): 205–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1360.2011.01095.x.

———. (2014). *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States*. Duke University Press: Durham ; London.

———. (2016). "Whither Settler Colonialism?" *Settler Colonial Studies* 6 (4): 438–445. https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1124427.

Simpson, Audra, and Andrea Smith. (2014). *Theorizing Native Studies*. Durham ; London: Duke University Press.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. (2017). *This Accident of Being Lost: Songs and Stories*. Toronto: Astoria.

———. (2016). "Indigenous Resurgence and Co-Resistance.(Discussion)." *Journal of the Critical Ethnic Studies Association* 2 (2): 19–34. https://doi.org/10.5749/jcritethnstud.2.2.0019.

———. (2017). *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. Indigenous Americas. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Siren, Sandra and Casey Stranges. (December 2019). Blind student says Laurentian University suggested he 'leave the guide dog at home'. *CBC News*. Accessed January 14, 2021. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/laurentian-guide-dog-dilemma-1.5394398

Sjölander, Annika Egan. (2009). "Lazar, Michelle. M. (Ed.) Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: Gender, Power and Ideology in Discourse." *Journal of Language & Politics* 8 (1): 159–62.

Skrtic, Thomas M. (1995). *Disability and Democracy: Reconstructing (Special) Education for Postmodernity*. Special Education Series (New York, N.Y.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Smith, D. E. (2005). *Institutional ethnography :a sociology for people* . Walnut Creek, CA : http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.49015003167492

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London ; New York : Dunedin, N.Z. : New York: Zed Books ; University of Otago Press ; Distributed in the USA exclusively by StMartin's Press.

———. (2015). "Imagining Our Own Approaches." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 53 (5–6): 473–474. https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2015.1027982.

———. (2012). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Second edition. London, England ; New York, New York: Zed Books.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, Eve Tuck, K. Wayne Yang, and Taylor and Francis, eds. (2018). *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. First edition. Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education. Boca Raton, FL: Routledge, an imprint of Taylor and Francis.

Smith, Phil. (2004). Whiteness, Normal Theory, and Disability Studies. *Disability Studies Quarterly* 24 (2): n.p. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v24i2.491.

Smith, Rachel E., and Tara Buchannan. (2012). "Community Collaboration, Use of Universal Design in the Classroom." *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability* 25(3): 259–65.

Smith, S. (2018). *De)pathologizing Discourse: The Problematization of Trans and Gender-Nonconforming Mental Health in Ontario*. Université d'Ottawa / University of Ottawa.

Snow, Kathy. (2018). "What Does Being a Settler Ally in Research Mean? A Graduate Students Experience Learning From and Working Within Indigenous Research Paradigms." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 17 (1): 160940691877048. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406918770485.

Snyder, S. N., Pitt, K.-A., Shanouda, F., Voronka, J., Reid, J., & Landry, D. (2019). Unlearning through Mad Studies: Disruptive pedagogical praxis. *Curriculum Inquiry: Disability as Meta Curriculum: Epistemologies, Ontologies, and Transformative Praxis*, *49*(4): 485–502. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2019.1664254

Soldatic, Karen. (2015). "Postcolonial Reproductions: Disability, Indigeneity and the Formation of the White Masculine Settler State of Australia." *Social Identities* 21 (1): 53–68.

Soldatic, Karen, and Shaun Grech. (2014). "Transnationalising Disability Studies: Rights, Justice and Impairment." *Disability Studies Quarterly* 34 (2). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v34i2.4249.

Soldatic, Karen, and Helen Meekosha. (2014). *The Global Politics of Impairment and Disability: Processes and Embodiments*. Third World Quarterly (Series). London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Soule, B., & Soule, J. (2003). Death at the Hiawatha Asylum for Insane Indians. *South Dakota Journal of Medicine*, *56*(1), 15–18.

Spade, D. (2015). *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv123x7qx

Stanford, Shameka, and Bahiyyah MuhamMad. (2018). "THE CONFLUENCE OF LANGUAGE AND LEARNING DISORDERS AND THE SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE AMONG MINORITY STUDENTS OF COLOR: A CRITICAL RACE THEORY." *American University Journal of Gender, Social Policy, and the Law* 26(2): 691–718.

Stern, Julia. (2017). Loneliness in education. In Olivia Sagan and Eric Miller, eds. *Narratives of Loneliness: Multidisciplinary Perspectives from the 21st century.* London: Routledge. 113-123.

Sterritt, A. (2007). *Racialization of poverty indigenous women, the Indian Act and systemic oppression: Reasons for resistance*. Vancouver Status of Women.

Stote, Karen. (Fall 2017). Birthright Denied: Sterilization of Indigenous Women. *Herizons*. 16-18.

Subblefield, Anna. (2007). "'Beyond the Pale': Tainted Whiteness, Cognitive Disability, and Eugenic Sterilization." *Hypatia* 22 (2): 162–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2007.tb00987.x.

Support Staff University of Ottawa: Collective Agreement. (2016-2019). uOttawa. Accessed August 27, 2020 from https://hrdocrh.uottawa.ca/info/en-ca/ssuo/policies.html

TallBear, Kim. (2013). *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. (2018). "Making Love and Relations Beyond Settler Sex and Family" In Adele E. Clare and Donna Haraway. (Eds.) *Making Kin Not Population.* (Pp. 145-164.) Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press.

Tam, Louise. (2013). Whither Indigenizing the Mad Movement? Theorizing the Social Relations of Race and Madness through Conviviality. In Brenda Lefrançois, Robert Menzies, and Geoffrey Reaume. (Eds.) *Mad Matters: A Critical reader in Canadian Mad Studies*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc. 281-297.

Tanner, S. J. (2018). *Whiteness, Pedagogy, and Youth in America: Critical Whiteness Studies in the Classroom* (First edition.). Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203702437

Taylor, Ashley. (2015). "The Discourse of Pathology: Reproducing the Able Mind through Bodies of Color." *Hypatia* 30 (1): 181–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12123.

———. (2017). "When Fact Conceals Privilege: Teaching the (Shared?) Reality of Disability." *Educational Theory* 67 (2): 131–51. https://doi.org/10.1111/edth.12239.

"The Act (AODA)." (n.d.) *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA)* (blog). Accessed October 30, 2019. https://www.aoda.ca/the-act/.

Thompson, Vilissa. (May 5, 2016). Black Disabled Woman Syllabus: A Compilation." 2016. *Ramp Your Voice!* (blog). Accessed September 3, 2019. http://rampyourvoice.com/2016/05/05/black-disabled-woman-syllabus-compilation/.

Thompson-Miller, Ruth, and Joe R. Feagin. (2007). Continuing Injuries of Racism: Counseling in a Racist Context. *The Counseling Psychologist* 36(1):106–115. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006294664.

Thorius, Kathleen A. King, and Federico R. Waitoller. (2017). Strategic Coalitions against Exclusion at the Intersection of Race and Disability--A Rejoinder. *Harvard Educational Review* 87(2): 251–57. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-87.2.251.

Titchkosky, Tanya. (2011). *The Question of Access Disability, Space, Meaning*. Toronto [Ont: University of Toronto Press.

Todhunter, Barrie. (2013). LOL - Limitations of Online Learning - Are We Selling the Open and Distance Education Message Short? *Distance Education: Education Across Space and Time: Meeting the Diverse Needs of the Distance Learner* 34(2): 232–252. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2013.802402.

Toutain, Christopher. (2019). Barriers to Accommodations for Students with Disability in Higher Education: A Literature Review. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*, *32*(3): 297-310.

Trần, Ngọc Loan. (2016). Calling IN: A Less Disposable Way of Holding Each Other Accountable. In McKenzie, M. (ed). *The Solidarity Struggle: How People of Color Succeed and Fail at Showing Up for Each Other in the Fight for Freedom*, edited by Oakland, CA: BGD Press. 59–63

Trent University Centre for Teaching and Learning. (N.d.) Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://www.trentu.ca/teaching/

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. (2012). "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor | Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society." https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630.

———. (2018). *Toward What Justice?: Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education*. First edition. London: Taylor and Francis.

University of Guelph OpenEd: Open Learning and Educational Support. (N.d.). *University of Guelph.* Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://opened.uoguelph.ca/

University of Ottawa Teaching and Learning Support Service (TLSS). (N.d.). *uOttawa.* Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://tlss.uottawa.ca/site/en/

University of Ottawa Media. (September 4, 2019). UOttawa Implements Four Measures to Promote a Racism and Discrimination-Free Campus. Accessed November 27, 2019. https://media.uottawa.ca/news/uottawa-implements-four-measures-promote-racism-and-discrimination-free-campus.

"U of O students denounce anti-psychiatry exhibit" (2020, January 29). *CBC News*. https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/uottawa-phychiatry-protest-1.5443534

University of Toronto Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation. (N.d.). *University of Toronto*. Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://teaching.utoronto.ca/

University of Waterloo Centre for Teaching Excellence. (N.d.). *University of Waterloo*. Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/

University of Windsor Centre for Teaching and Learning. (N.d.). *University of Windsor*. Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://www.uwindsor.ca/ctl/

University of Western Ontario Centre for Teaching and Learning. (N.d.). *University of Western Ontario*. Accessed many times between September 2019 and November 2019 from https://teaching.uwo.ca/

uOttawa. (2019, November 20). *Séance de discussion ouverte | Town hall discussion*. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F2FliWGzjrY&ab_channel=uOttawa

Utt, Jamie. (2018). A Case for Decentering Whiteness in Education: How Eurocentric Social Studies Curriculum Acts as a Form of White/Western Studies. *Ethnic Studies Review* 41 (1–2): 19–34. https://doi.org/10.1525/esr.2018.411205.

Vallas, Rebecca. (2009). The Disproportionality Problem: The Overrepresentation of Black Students in Special Education and Recommendations for Reform. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law* 17(1): 181–208.

Varvarezou, Dimitra Mari. (2020). Interactions in Healthcare: Social Perceptions and Experiences of Physical Disabilities Among Diné Individuals With Physical Disabilities, Family Members, and Diné/Non-Diné Indigenous Service Providers and Health Care Workers. [PhD, Arizona State University].

Vega-Castaneda, Lillian, and Mario Castaneda. (2019). *Teaching and Learning about Difference through Social Media : Reflection, Engagement, and Self-Assessment*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351238212.

Verduzco-Baker, Lynn. (2018). Modified Brave Spaces: Calling in Brave Instructors. *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity (Thousand Oaks, Calif.)*, *4*(4), 585–592. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649218763696

Verlinden, J. J. (2017). On Affect Theory's Hidden Histories: Toward a Technological Genealogy. *American Quarterly*, *69*(2), 321–326. http://dx.doi.org.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/10.1353/aq.2017.0027

Villenas, S. A. (2019). Pedagogies of being with: Witnessing, testimonio, and critical love in everyday social movement. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *32*(2), 151–166. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2018.1533148

Vitelli, Edward M. (2015). Universal Design for Learning: Are We Teaching It to Preservice General Education Teachers?" *Journal of Special Education Technology* 30(3): 166–178. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162643415618931.

Wadhwa, Rashim. (2018). "From Planning to Realization: Who Goes? Who Stops? What Matters?" In *Perspectives on Diverse Student Identities in Higher Education: International Perspectives on Equity and Inclusion*, edited by Jaimie Hoffman, Patrick Blessinger, and Mandla Makhanya, 14:147–64. Innovations in Higher Education Teaching and Learning. Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-364120180000014011.

Waghid, Yusef. (2019). *Towards a Philosophy of Caring in Higher Education Pedagogy and Nuances of Care*. 1st ed. 2019. Cham: Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03961-5.

Waite, Stacey. (2017). *Teaching Queer: Radical Possibilities for Writing and Knowing.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Waitoller, Federico, and Kathleen Thorius. (2016). Cross-Pollinating Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy and Universal Design for Learning: Toward an Inclusive Pedagogy That Accounts for Dis/Ability. *Harvard Educational Review* 86(3): 366–389,473-474. https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-86.3.366.

Waldron, Ingrid. (2018). *There's Something in the Water: Environmental Racism in Indigenous and Black Communities*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Wane, Njoki Nathani, and Kimberly L. Todd. (2018). *Decolonial Pedagogy: Examining Sites of Resistance, Resurgence, and Renewal*. Palgrave Pivot. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave MacMillan.

Waterfield, Bea, Brenda B. Beagan, and Merlinda Weinberg. (2018). "Disabled Academics: A Case Study in Canadian Universities." *Disability & Society* 33 (3): 327–348. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2017.1411251.

Watermeyer, Brian. (2017). 'I Don't Have Time for an Emotional Life': Marginalization, Dependency and Melancholic Suspension in Disability. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry* 41 (1): 142–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11013-016-9503-x.

Watts, Ivan Eugene, and Nirmala Erevelles. (2004). “These Deadly Times: Reconceptualizing School Violence by Using Critical Race Theory and Disability Studies.” *American Educational Research Journal* 41 (2): 271–299. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312041002271.

Webb, Mark, and Caroline Ukoumunne. (2018). “Breaking the Silence: Critical Race Theory in Pedagogy and Practice.” In *Teaching with Sociological Imagination in Higher and Further Education: Contexts, Pedagogies, Reflections*, edited by Christopher R. Matthews, Ursula Edgington, and Alex Channon, 55–73. Singapore: Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6725-9_4.

Weinbaum, Alys Eve. (2019). *The Afterlife of Reproductive Slavery: Biocapitalism and Black Feminism’s Philosophy of History*. Duke University Press. https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478003281.

Wendell, S. (2001). Unhealthy Disabled: Treating Chronic Illnesses as Disabilities. *Hypatia*, *16*(4), 17–33. https://doi.org/10.1353/hyp.2001.0062

Westbrook, D. A. (2017). “The Enemy of My Enemy Is My Friend”: Thomas Szasz, the Citizens Commission on Human Rights, and Scientology’s Anti-Psychiatric Theology. *Nova Religio*, *20*(4), 37–61. https://doi.org/10.1525/nr.2017.20.4.37

White, Khadijah. (2016). Black Lives on Campuses Matter: The Rise of the New Black Student Movement. *Soundings 13*(86): 86–97. https://doi.org/10.3898/136266216819377002.

Whitesel, Jason. (2017). Intersections of Multiple Oppressions: Racism, Sizeism, Ableism, and the ‘Illimitable Etceteras’ in Encounters With Law Enforcement. *Sociological Forum* 32 https://doi.org/10.1111/socf.12337.

Whitney, Kelly A. (2017). Making Space to Engage Difference in the Classroom.” *Writing Program Administration* 40(3): 117-133.

Williams, Cristan. (2020). The ontological woman: A history of deauthentication, dehumanization, and violence. *The Sociological Review, 68*(4): 718-734.

Williams, Patricia. (1991). *The Alchemy of Race.* Harvard University Press.

———. (1997). *Seeing a Color-Blind Future: The Paradox of Race.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Withers, A. J. (2012). *Disability politics and theory*. Fernwood Pub.

Wolframe, P. M. (2012). The Madwoman in the Academy, or, Revealing the Invisible Straightjacket: Theorizing and Teaching Saneism and Sane Privilege. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, *33*(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v33i1.3425

Wong, Alice. (n.d.). “Alice Wong.” Disability Visibility Project. Accessed August 5, 2019. https://disabilityvisibilityproject.com/author/alwong199/.

Wortley, Scot, and Akwasi Owusu-Bempah. (2011). The Usual Suspects: Police Stop and Search Practices in Canada. *Policing and Society* 21(4): 395–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2011.610198.

Wun, Connie. (2016a). Against Captivity: Black Girls and School Discipline Policies in the Afterlife of Slavery. *Educational Policy* 30(1): 171–96. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815615439.

———. (2016b). Unaccounted Foundations: Black Girls, Anti-Black Racism, and Punishment in Schools. *Critical Sociology* 42(4-5): 737–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920514560444.

Yee, June Ying, and Anne E. Wagner. (2013). Is Anti-Oppression Teaching in Canadian Social Work Classrooms a Form of Neo-Liberalism? *Social Work Education* 32(3): 331–48. https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.672557.

Yergeau, Melanie. (2016). "Occupying Autism: Rhetoric, Involuntarity, and the Meaning of Autistic Lives." In *Occupying Disability: Critical Approaches to Community, Justice, and Decolonizing Disability*, edited by Pamela Block, Devva Kasnitz, Akemi Nishida, and Nick Pollard, 83–95. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9984-3_6.

Yull, Ashley. (2015). "The impact of Race and Socioeconomic Status on Access to Accommodations in Post-Secondary Education" *The American University Journal of Gender*, *Social Policy & the Law* 23 (2): 353–392.

Yull, Denise, and Marguerite Wilson. (2018). "Keeping Black Children Pushed Into, Not Pushed Out of, Classrooms: Developing a Race-Conscious Parent Engagement Project." *Journal of Black Psychology* 44 (2): 162–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798417753519.

Yunliang Meng. (2017). Profiling Minorities: Police Stop and Search Practices in Toronto, Canada. *Human Geographies: Journal of Studies and Research in Human Geography* 11(1): 5–23. https://doi.org/10.5719/hgeo.2017.111.1