

Culturally Responsive Practices (CRP):
Content development (product) & implementation (process)

Strategy	Strengths	Limitations
Community-driven design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process and as a product are autonomous by design, and reflect the concepts, views, and values of the community they are intended to serve • Social, cultural, and linguistic ties of the community are positioned at the center of the process and product • Expertise, knowledge, and “ways of knowing,” in many ways, extend beyond the confines of Western-dominant perspectives • Minimizes the dominant voice and power afforded to Western-based perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sourcing examples • Topic relevance may be specific to the target community • May be perceived as “counter” to the voices and interests of Western-dominant traditions for educational design and delivery
Co-construction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often represents a collaborative effort between stakeholder groups of different social positioning • Community-based perspectives mutually contribute to shaping content and delivery • Extends to include measures that are also linguistically appropriate • Dominant perspectives are examined, creating space for social, cultural, and linguistic ties of the community to be moved “toward the center” • Shared voice among stakeholders aims to balance power dynamics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite the balance of stakeholder perspectives, the process and product can [still] favor dominant perspectives • Content development is dependent on the experience, skills, and knowledge of stakeholder groups • Perspectives of community-based stakeholders can be misinterpreted as <i>the</i> voice of a community rather than a voice within the community
Adaptation / localization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contemplates the needs of the target community (e.g. geographical location, language, topic relevance, and others) • Offers flexibility in producing and delivering content that is both culturally responsive <i>and</i> linguistically appropriate for the community it is intended to serve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process and product favor the dominant group • “Retrofitting” the content and delivery methods can be problematic • Places authority for creation in the hands of those speaking <i>for</i> a community
Accommodation (e.g. translation & interpretation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridges an immediate gap that inhibits access to content • Intended to all provide all participants with “equal footing” despite differences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No flexibility for shaping the content • Added constraints to the delivery process • Only affords participants with partial access to content