

Article

Methodological Strategies of Faculty Members: Moving toward Inclusive Pedagogy in Higher Education

Almudena Cotán ¹, Arecia Aguirre ^{2,*} , Beatriz Morgado ³ and Noelia Melero ⁴

¹ Didactics Department, Area of School Organization, Universidad de Cádiz, 11003 Cadiz, Spain; almudena.cotan@uca.es

² Department of Pedagogy and Didactics of Social Sciences, Language and Literature, University of Jaume I, 12071 Castello de la Plana, Spain

³ Developmental and Educational Psychology, University of Seville, 41018 Sevilla, Spain; bmorgado@us.es

⁴ Department of Theory and History of Education and Social Pedagogy, University of Seville, 41013 Sevilla, Spain; nmelero@us.es

* Correspondence: aaguirre@uji.es

Abstract: This study presents findings that can pose an advancement in the development of inclusive teaching practices in the university scope. The aim of this work was to understand the methodological strategies that inclusive faculty members use in their classrooms and the difficulties that they find in the implementation of such strategies. A total of 119 faculty members from different fields of knowledge of 10 Spanish universities participated in this study. The data were gathered through semi-structured interviews and later analysed using an inductive system of categories and codes with computer software MaxQDA 12. The obtained data show the actions that these faculty members take to interact with their students, the methodologies they use to teach, the strategies they implement to promote their learning and the difficulties that hinder their inclusive practice in the classroom. This study concludes that there are faculty members who are committed to designing teaching projects based on the principles of Universal Design for Learning. They developing active methodologies in the classroom and attending to the diversity of the students through the necessary support and adjustments, from the approach of inclusive pedagogy.

Keywords: inclusive pedagogy; methodology; disability; higher education



Citation: Cotán, A.; Aguirre, A.; Morgado, B.; Melero, N. Methodological Strategies of Faculty Members: Moving toward Inclusive Pedagogy in Higher Education. *Sustainability* **2021**, *13*, 3031. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063031>

Academic Editor: Wayne Sailor

Received: 26 January 2021

Accepted: 5 March 2021

Published: 10 March 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In the last decades, the presence of non-traditional students, e.g., students with disabilities, has increased in university classrooms. The recognition of the needs of these students has favoured the development of international regulations and policies [1], such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities [2], the 2020 Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth [3] and the 2030 Incheon Declaration and Framework [4]. All these measures are based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [5] and have a key objective: To promote an inclusive, fair and equitable education, thus fostering learning opportunities for everyone [6]. Likewise, they have successfully contributed to ensuring the access of students with disabilities to the university and their continuation in it.

In Spain, in the academic year 2019/2020, students with disabilities represented 1.4% of all university students [7]. The presence of these students is progressively increasing, which has led a significant number of countries to implement actions in favour of inclusion and accessibility in their university institutions [8]. In this line, authors such as Thomas [9] and Wilson et al. [10] claim that guaranteeing access of students with disabilities to university is not enough, and that it is also important to guarantee their continuation.

Consequently, it is considered that universities must acquire commitments and responsibilities to attend to the needs of all their students [11,12]. In this way, it is proposed that Higher Education should promote the design of syllabi based on an inclusive approach [13].

Moreover, it is important to provide the necessary support and adjustments that guarantee the inclusion and continuation of these students in the university [14,15]. Approaches such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL) would allow attaining this goal. Accessible programmes, syllabi and materials could be design in a way that all students can access learning without the need for additional changes [16]. The design of educational practices based on UDL offers learning opportunities to all students, including students with disabilities, thus fostering, in addition, a more motivating and meaningful learning for every student [17]. Likewise, it has been demonstrated that the adjustments and implementations performed for students with disabilities not only benefit this group of students, but all students in general [18].

Therefore, academic success depends not only on the student [19], but also on teaching performance and the resources and materials that universities employ to respond to students with disabilities [6]. It is known that faculty members are an essential element in the experience of students with disabilities [20–22]. In this regard, different national and international studies have found that faculty members encounter difficulties when implementing inclusive pedagogy. Some of the main difficulties in dealing with diversity are due to their lack of information and training [1,15,21]. These two difficulties, together with a shortage of time and institutional support, are the reasons identified by faculty members for successfully addressing diversity in HE classrooms [1,16]. Therefore, for university institutions that aim to become more inclusive, it should be a priority to have faculty members who are informed, trained and sensitised in terms of disability [23]. Few studies have analysed the characteristics of inclusive faculty members and how they work in their classrooms to attend to diversity. The results found in the literature indicate that these are characterised by empathy, closeness, flexibility, accessibility and sensitivity toward the needs of their students [24,25]. With respect to their teaching practices, these stand out for their affective-emotional component [24]. Inclusive faculty members usually employ and carry out active pedagogies and methodologies with an emphasis on the learning and participation of the student. They are educators who use different methodologies and evaluation systems and make adjustments in the educational materials to respond to the needs of the students [6,26,27].

Pillay and Terlizzi [28] state that the use of inclusive pedagogy and support strategies that suit the needs of students is the most adequate way to achieve an inclusive education [29]. Through this, the exclusion of certain students is avoided, providing a wide range of learning and participation opportunities in an inclusive, fair and equitable social system. In this line, teaching methodologies play an important role in the academic success or failure experiences of students, especially in those of students with disabilities [26,30]. The traditional methods, such as the master class, that are not combined with other methods and by which the faculty member focuses only on transmitting contents, without interacting with the students, do not potentiate inclusive education in the classrooms [6]. On the contrary, these methods make it difficult for students with disabilities to follow the learning pace of the rest of their classmates [15]. This does not contribute to promoting motivation and meaningful learning of students [31].

Unlike the above mentioned, the instruction models based on the constructivist theory consider the faculty member as a guide and an adviser, whose main role is not to transmit knowledge, but to facilitate and foster the construction of new learnings in the students [32,33]. These models are focused on the needs of the students, thus potentiating inclusive pedagogies [34]. Similarly, these participatory, active and collaborative methods are preferred by students, since they increase their motivation and participation, and generate a meaningful, accessible and relevant learning [35,36]. Almarghani and Mijatovic [37] claim that, in addition to improving the learning of students, these strategies help them to develop their sense of commitment. Therefore, to achieve inclusive education, it is essential to adopt active pedagogies that promote meaningful and constructive learning [9] and generate interaction and participation among students, which have been identified as facilitators for students with disabilities [10]. In this way, active pedagogies are identified

as methodological strategies that promote the autonomy of the students and their active and participatory involvement in the construction of meaningful and reflective knowledge, always from their own experience. Some specific pedagogical strategies have been identified, such as problem-based learning, cooperative work, case studies, flipped classrooms, project-based learning and service-learning [38,39]. In this line, Miyazoe and Anderson [40] state that participation in the classroom and the use of group methodological strategies minimise anxiety in the students, as different social barriers and obstacles are temporarily disregarded, such as age, gender, social status and diverse capabilities. Therefore, participatory activities facilitate the development and attainment of an inclusive and democratic classroom [41]. In this sense, Vacarella [42] highlights that, in order to attend to diversity, it is important for faculty members to have a broad repertoire of methodological strategies.

Given the importance of adopting inclusive and participatory approaches in Higher Education, the aim of this study was to; (1) know the methodological strategies that inclusive faculty members use in their classrooms; and (2) analyse the main difficulties that they encounter in the classroom for the development of inclusive practices.

2. Materials and Methods

This study is part of a larger project funded the Ministry of Science and Innovation - State Research Agency (project EDU2016-76587-R), and co-financed by FEDER, entitled “Inclusive Pedagogy in the University: The Opinions of Faculty Members”. The aim of this project is to analyse the knowledge, beliefs, design and actions of faculty members who carried out an inclusive pedagogy. A biographic-narrative method was used in order to know the opinions of faculty members that had been previously identified by students with disabilities. Specifically, this article analyses their actions. The research questions that guided this analysis are the following: Which are the methodological strategies that inclusive faculty members use in the classrooms? What difficulties do these educators encounter in the development of an inclusive pedagogy in their classrooms?

2.1. Procedure and Contact with Participants

A total of 164 faculty members were contacted, of whom 6 did not participate in the study for personal and work-related reasons and 39 did not reply to the e-mail that was sent to them. Eventually, 119 faculty members of all fields of knowledge from 10 Spanish universities participated in the study. The sample was accessed in two different ways. Firstly, students with disabilities were contacted through the disability services of the participating universities. These were students with visible and non-visible disabilities. The technicians sent an e-mail in which students with disabilities were asked to identify the faculty members that had facilitated their social and educational inclusion in the university. Secondly, the snowball technique was employed [43]. This strategy was used with students with disabilities who had participated in previous projects, as well as with faculty members and colleagues of other universities who knew students with disabilities. Before they selected the inclusive faculty members, they were all given a list of criteria that these educators had to meet: They facilitate the learning processes; they use different teaching methodological strategies; they care for the learning of all their students; they are flexible, willing to help; they establish a close relationship with their students and favour the interactions among them; and they make their students feel important, as part of the class.

In relation to the participants' profile, 40 of them taught in the field of Education Science, 25 in Social and Legal Science, 24 in Arts and Humanities, 16 in Health Sciences and 12 in Science, Engineering and Mathematics. With respect to sex and age, there were 69 men and 50 women, mostly between 36 and 60 years, with seven of them under 35 years and four over 60 years. In regard to teaching experience, 89 had more than 10 years, 24 had between 5 and 10 years and only 6 had taught for less than 5 years in the university.

2.2. Instruments

This study was conducted from a qualitative perspective. Two semi-structured interviews were designed ad-hoc for the study, which were based on the analytical dimensions of inclusive pedagogy: Knowledge (on theoretical, policy and legislative issues), beliefs (the ability of the educator to support and believe in all students), design (designing a pedagogy that values difference and actions that work with students) and actions (implementation of teaching and learning strategies) [44,45]. These interviews were validated by 15 experts who did not belong to the study as part of the sample. All of them came from the different branches of knowledge considered in this study and had previous experience at teaching students with disabilities.

Two interviews were held with each participant, with an approximate duration of 90 min each. All the interviews were conducted and guided, individually, by the members of the research team, who were previously trained for that task. Most of the interviews (n = 89) were held face-to-face. The rest were carried out via Skype (n = 18) and phone call (n = 12). All interviews were recorded in audio and transcribed for later analysis.

2.3. Data Analysis

A progressive qualitative analysis of all the gathered information was performed, using an inductive system of categories and codes [46]. The data analysis was conducted using the MaxQDA 12 software. Specifically, the analysis allowed identifying different codes and the associations between them.

In the first stage of the analysis, the research team worked on a generic and comprehensive system of categories and codes. Each of these codes was analysed in order to break them down or merge them, if possible, with other codes. This allowed the data collected with the category system to be organised and interpreted. In the second stage of the analysis, two members of the team were responsible for analysing all the information simultaneously. Subsequently, those fragments of information where interpretation proved complex were analysed by the whole research team in different face-to-face meetings.

Table 1 shows the categories and codes used for the analysis of the data that are presented in this study.

Table 1. System of categories and codes for the analysis.

Categories	Codes
Teaching strategies for learning	Classroom climate
	Teaching attitude
	Student as the leader of his/her learning
	Active methodologies
	Meaningful learning
	Theoretical-practical contents
Teaching difficulties in the development of inclusive practices	Continuous feedback
	Faculty members training in attention to diversity
	Insecurity
	Lack of experience
	Lack of time to attend to the students
	Lack of knowledge about active methodological strategies
	Students' socio-cultural level
	Poorly motivated students
	Poorly sensitised students
	High ratios
	Architectural barriers
Quarterly subjects	
Lack of information, support and counselling	

2.4. Ethical Aspects

At the beginning of the interviews, each participant signed an informed consent form. This document informed about the project and the treatment of the data in compliance with Organic Law 3/2018 on Personal Data Protection [47]. The participants were free to modify any piece of information and leave the study whenever they wished, guaranteeing their confidentiality at all times. Based on the aim of guaranteeing the anonymity of the participants, all the information was anonymised at the beginning of the data analysis.

3. Results

3.1. Methodological Strategies Used by Inclusive Faculty Members to Promote Learning

The results obtained in this study allow describing how inclusive faculty members act in the classroom with their students, the methodologies they use to teach and the strategies they implement in their lectures to promote the learning of their students.

In relation to the actions of inclusive faculty members to promote the learning of their students, the results indicate that these educators were very eager in terms of teaching. Specifically, they promoted motivation and curiosity among the students and toward the use of humour to generate optimism and associate positive emotions with the learning contents. These faculty members were respectful, trusting, close and accessible toward their students. Moreover, they intended to be a reference to their students, by showing empathy and offering active communication and continuous feedback. Similarly, they cared for the environment and generated a good classroom climate.

I try to stimulate my students and make sure that the lectures are an inspiring and enriching environment where curiosity is encouraged. Moreover, I promote respect, ensuring that, in my lectures, everything is welcomed, except moral or ethical prejudices, so that people feel free, very accepted and very comfortable (Faculty member 53).

These inclusive faculty members understood that the students were the real protagonists of the teaching and learning process and, as such, they had to feel included and be free to make decisions.

It is important to make the students feel like they are the protagonists of their learning. I mean, if the students are given responsibility and shown that they can be top students and excellent professionals and that all this is up to them, then they feel that they lead and are in charge of their learning. Thus, they feel active in the learning process (Faculty member 42).

Consequently, the faculty members considered that their role consisted in mediating the teaching and learning processes, acting as guides for the students, making sense out learning and thus promoting learning in their students.

I try to show them that they are not only learning these contents, but that they are here to become excellent nurses, and that they have much to do for society. So, they are working for society and for themselves, for their life projects . . . They have to learn in order to be the best possible nurses, within their capabilities and personal possibilities (Faculty member 42).

The results of this study provide data about how inclusive faculty members work in their classrooms. Specifically, the data indicated that they used active pedagogies through different active teaching methodologies. Among these methodologies, they highlighted peer tutorials, collaborative learning, project-based learning, flipped classroom and gamification. Some participants reported that they used several teaching methodologies, and some of them even combined master classes with these active methodologies.

In learning and services, we begin with a specific need, a social need that can be detected by the students or the faculty member, and then the students try to find a solution through a service that favours the community, building networks and alliances. In this way, since they become involved, sometimes in associations and, in other cases, in educational centres, they experience meaningful learning. Additionally, cooperative learning is a

wonderful way of working on attention to diversity, since they help and support each other. When this is complemented with pedagogical pairs, maximum enrichment is attained (Faculty member 96).

I do many different things. I put them to work with problem-based learning, we hold debated and games. Sometimes, if the topic is delicate or more specific, then I teach a more traditional master class. In other cases, we do group assignments, that is, I propose them a problem and they have to solve it. I also give them an activity that they have to prepare and carry out, different things (Faculty member 89).

Therefore, the results showed that the inclusive faculty members pushed themselves to ensure that their lectures were very participatory. Moreover, these educators made use of different teaching strategies in the classroom to favour the learning processes of their students. Among these strategies, they pointed out the effort they made to work in the classroom on practical and applied contents, the constant exploration of the previous ideas of the students, recovering and synthesising the contents tackled at the beginning of each lecture, making a summary at the end of the lectures, using different types of materials, carrying out very different activities, encouraging reflection and adapting to the idiosyncrasy of each group.

I use examples or things that they see feasible in the real world, beyond the blackboard, I give them cases, examples, I put them in the situation, to make them think what they would do if they encountered certain circumstances ... I apply what we see in the classroom to real cases; I believe this is what motivates and encourages the student the most to understand the concept and put it into practice (Faculty member 68).

3.2. Difficulties That the Faculty Members Encounter When Implementing Inclusive Strategies in the Classroom

Despite the effort and the application of the different methodological strategies, the faculty members identified a series of difficulties that hindered their inclusive practice in the classroom.

On the one hand, they highlighted some difficulties related to faculty members themselves, such as the insecurity they sometimes felt regarding their teaching practice, the lack of experience, especially in the first years, and the scarce or lack of training in disability and educational inclusion. These aspects led them to go through situations of frustration and discouragement when they encountered these realities in the classroom.

Well, lack of knowledge on my part. I do not have any training in disability or functional diversity or anything in that matter. I do whatever I think is good, but I do not know if it is correct or not (Faculty member 32).

This insecurity, which was felt by some of the participants, were also reflected in their relationship with their students. The faculty members expressed some uncertainty about how to communicate and interact with them, especially when they encountered high ratios and did not know the needs of their students, which was an even bigger concern in the case of students with disabilities. Not knowing in advance the needs of the latter generated great concern and unrest in the participants. In some cases, they even mentioned the insecurity they felt when they thought they could be giving them a favourable treatment with respect to the rest of the students.

My problem was the fact that I did not know the limit to help her, but I also had to be fair with the rest of the students. So, she asked me to give an exam in advance in order to familiarise with it, and I told her that it was not fair for her classmates, and that I would give her more time and more explanations. But she never came back. That was the problem (Faculty member 2).

With respect to the teaching-learning process in the classroom, some of the faculty members identified certain limitations, such as the lack of knowledge about methodological strategies that could help them to make the lectures more dynamic and participatory. This

lack of resources and didactic strategies made them also reflect on the difficulties they encountered to motivate students and maintain their curiosity for learning.

I believe that I need pedagogical or teaching resources, whatever we call them. Sometimes, I think about whether this subject could be learned in a different way, taught in a different way and have the students learn it in a different way (Faculty member 43).

Regarding diversity, the participants mentioned the lack of time to attend to and adequately monitor all students according to their particular needs. The faculty members were aware of the need to make, in some cases, specific adaptations. Many of these adaptations took them more time than they could spend. In these cases, the lack of time did not allow them to know the learning paces of their students, thus they could not adapt to them.

The main difficulty is the lack of time, over the lack of training, knowledge or support; that is, the lack of time to analyse reality, observe it, monitor all students adequately, give them suitable feedback, keep up to date . . . (Faculty member 101).

The faculty members also identified some difficulties related to the students themselves. In this sense, they highlighted the low academic and cultural level of the students, especially in their first years of university, as well as their lack of motivation and their apathy for learning, along with their poor participation and involvement in the classroom sessions. According to some of the faculty members, this aspect was eventually reflected in the lack of attendance in the lectures. The faculty members were also concerned about the lack of receptivity and feedback from the students, and how this ultimately had a negative influence on their own motivation for teaching.

The students arrive at the university with some very important deficiencies related to expression, communication skills and even spelling, and I am very concern about this, since I do not really know how to tackle this, honestly (Faculty member 90).

The main difficulty is motivation. If I do not catch the attention of the students and fail to motivate them, then the lecture develops in a very different way (Faculty member 35).

The participants also stated that some students showed a lack of receptivity and sensitivity toward their classmates with disabilities, especially when working in groups.

I believe that the main difficulties appear when they have to work in groups, as sometimes they find it difficult to adapt to the group or they are not understood by their classmates. In many cases, people do not want to have in their group other people with these characteristics, so they are not accepted and they feel bad (Faculty member 11).

The faculty members identified a series of difficulties related to the university institutional policy. For example, they pointed out the high ratio of the classrooms, which made it difficult for them to monitor the students adequately. Furthermore, they recognised that there were still many obstacles and architectural barriers in university classrooms and buildings.

The overcrowding of the classrooms is not good at all; it does not benefit anybody. For instance, if I have three students with disabilities in the classroom, due to this overcrowding, I cannot adapt everything and I do not have time to plan the activities (Faculty member 29).

I cannot believe that we are in a faculty of Education, with the reflections and all the academic, professional and methodological background, and we still have the chairs fixed to the floor. I think that this makes learning difficult in diverse conditions (Faculty member 91).

Lastly, the participants highlighted the lack of information, support and institutional counselling to work with students with disabilities. Similarly, they could not understand why their universities did not inform them in advance about the students with special needs that were going to undertake their subjects. Moreover, considering the diversity of

the students, the absence of human and material resources made it difficult for them to properly attend to all the needs they encountered in the classroom.

The university does not inform the faculty members that they have students with disabilities, and we find out when we get to the classroom. We should know this in advance in order to plan ahead (Faculty member 82).

Well, it is always the same problem, that is, the lack of resources. When a faculty member detects that there are three or four students with disabilities in the class, it would be good to have additional credits to hold separate sessions, where we can help them (Faculty member 16).

4. Discussion

The number of students with disabilities in universities is increasing every year [48,49]. Due to this reality, universities are making efforts to offer more inclusive environments. Numerous studies [31,50] have focused on the development of inclusive practices from the perspective of students with disabilities. However, few studies have explored the characteristics of inclusive teaching practices in the university context from the perceptions of faculty members [16,51]. This study presents, from the view of the faculty members, findings that can pose an advancement in the knowledge of inclusive teaching practices in the university environment. This work shows that there are faculty members who are committed, concerned and sensitised regarding diversity, understanding it as an element of added value in the learning that takes place in their classrooms.

Firstly, it can be asserted that one of the main keys to carry out inclusive pedagogical practices in the classroom is the attitude of the faculty members. The participants of this study were concerned about protecting the climate of their classrooms. These inclusive faculty members were characterised for being enthusiastic, respectful, accessible and flexible in the learning process of the students, as well as for promoting the motivation and curiosity of the latter [8,9]. For these faculty members, attending to the affective and emotional component of the student was an essential element for the development of inclusive practices in the classroom [20]. According to students with disabilities, these are the traits and characteristics that the ideal educator should have [52]. In fact, several studies have valued, in a very positive manner, the human and personal characteristics of the faculty members, demonstrating their positive association with the academic success of the students [25].

In relation to the development of active pedagogies, the obtained results show that the inclusive faculty members act fundamentally as guides and counsellors in the knowledge-building process of the students, rather than as mere transmitters of contents. In fact, the results indicate that these educators support the development of pedagogies based on the principles of constructivism [32,33]. In this sense, they are faculty members who potentiate in their students an active and autonomous role, considering them as the true protagonists of the teaching-learning process [53]. Moreover, they do their best to make sense of the learnings, thus fostering the meaningful learning of their students. In this sense, authors such as Love et al. [54] have shown that, over master classes without interaction, students with disabilities prefer active and participatory methods, which is in line with the opinions of faculty members, who consider that these strategies help them to attend to the needs of these students [34].

All of the above mentioned demonstrates that the inclusive educational processes in university classrooms must be focused on the acquisition and construction of knowledge. This idea is strongly linked to the principles of inclusive pedagogy: Provide support for everyone, with differences for some [55,56]. According to Moriña [57], all students can learn under the proper conditions and circumstances and with the support and adjustments that each student may need. In turn, all this is related to the principles of UDL. In this sense, and in line with the findings of Lombardi et al. [16], the participants of the present study offered learning processes characterised by flexibility and accessibility for all students, without the need for major additional adjustments. From the three basic principles of UDL

and the methodological diversity they applied in their classrooms, these faculty members offered their students different alternatives of access, representation and participation, thus recognising the different ways of learning of the students [58,59]. The design of educational practices based on UDL allows providing learning opportunities to all students, including students with disabilities, thereby, also promoting a more motivating and meaningful learning for them [17]. To this end, the results corroborate the findings of previous studies: the educational processes must be based on the use of different methodologies that grant an active and participatory role to the students and allow the faculty members to respond to the different learning styles, motivations, interests and capabilities [50,59]. In fact, inclusive pedagogy is focused on guaranteeing the academic success of all students in the classroom through their participation in it, always recognising their individual differences [8,56].

In addition, and in line with Stefanich et al. [60], it is important that educators reflect on their own modeling, disposition in working with students and their expectations, since these aspects can have a great impact in the classroom, favouring the positive academic expectations of students and their empowerment.

In this line, and connecting with the “action” dimension of inclusive pedagogy, the participants of this study carried out active pedagogies in their classrooms. In agreement with findings reported in previous studies [38,39], the development of participatory teaching methodologies, such as the use of peer tutorials, collaborative, cooperative and project-based learning, flipped classroom, gamification and even participatory master classes, allowed the faculty members of this study to carry out participatory, active and collaborative learning processes. In fact, the literature shows that the use of these methods increases the motivation of the students, generating in these the scaffolding and knowledge-building proposed by the constructivist theories: The attainment of meaningful, active, participatory, accessible and relevant learning [35,36].

Finally, this study also shows the numerous difficulties that faculty members encounter when carrying out inclusive practices in their classrooms. In line with the findings of Moriña [15], the results of this work indicate that, according to the faculty members, one of the main difficulties to attend to diversity is the lack of information and training, which causes insecurity in their teaching performance with students with disabilities and in the design of methodological strategies that stimulate their participation and motivation. These results are in agreement with those reported in studies conducted in other countries [21,61]. The lack of training and knowledge about disability, along with the lack of time and institutional support and the university policies (such as high ratios and the lack of resources), are some of the elements that cause the difficulties encountered by inclusive faculty members when attending to diversity [16,51,62]. In this sense, several studies have identified faculty members’ information and training as a central element for the application of inclusive practices in the classroom [15,63].

From the perspective of inclusive pedagogy, this study demonstrates the importance of attending to the needs of the students, promoting their participation in the classroom. The obtained results show that there are faculty members who, despite the difficulties, do their best to carry out inclusive educational practices in their classrooms. These findings highlight the relevance and need of creating and developing policies and institutional agendas that ensure the training of faculty members to attend to diversity [54].

In conclusion, the results of this study allow highlighting that the academic success of students with disabilities depends on many factors [64]. Faculty members training in this topic would allow them to gain confidence, knowledge on how to tackle specific needs of the students, how to design inclusive teaching programmes and projects based on UDL, how to develop active pedagogies and methodologies, and most importantly, from the perspective of inclusive pedagogy, to believe that all students can learn in the same classroom, under the same conditions, with the necessary support and adjustments [56]. For this to be possible, it is necessary to urge universities to promote policies that consolidate an inclusive institutional culture, based on practices that promote diversity, encounter and dialogue from a constructive, equitable and humane approach [65].

5. Limitation of the Study

We cannot ignore the fact that the study has its own limitations, and describing them will help us put forward proposals for future research projects.

In this qualitative research process, using the biographical narrative approach, we wanted to give a concrete voice to the faculty members of Spanish universities as a whole. For this reason, we have not carried out an analysis by university, an aspect that can be seen as a limitation of the study. However, this was not the purpose of the research, and in general, we have not observed significant data that could show possible differences between universities.

The size of the sample could be another limitation, and it would be interesting to have a larger and more balanced sample in the different areas. This limitation could be extended in future studies.

Another limitation could be the lack of analysis of the differences between participants. In this sense, it would be interesting to develop studies that analyse the relationships between the dimensions of inclusive pedagogy based on the differences between participants, areas of knowledge and universities, which would allow exploring institutional contexts more broadly, thus delving into the cultural dimension of university institutions.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; data curation, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; formal analysis, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; funding acquisition, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; investigation, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; methodology, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; Project administration, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; resources, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; software, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; Supervision, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; Validation, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; visualization, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; writing—original draft, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M.; Writing—review and editing, A.C., A.A., B.M. and N.M. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation—State Research Agency (project EDU2016-76587-R), and co-financed by FEDER, entitled “Inclusive Pedagogy in the University: The Opinions of Faculty Members”.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Acknowledgments: Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation. Students with disabilities and faculty members who participate in the research.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Moriña, A.; Orozco, I. Spanish faculty members speak out: Barriers and aids for students with disabilities at university. *Disabil. Soc.* **2020**. [CrossRef]
2. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. 2006. Available online: <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html> (accessed on 9 December 2020).
3. European Commission. Europe 2020 Strategy for an Intelligent, Sustainable and Integrating Growth. Available online: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52010DC2020&from=en> (accessed on 12 January 2020).
4. UNESCO. Education 2030. Declaration of Incheon and Framework for Action. 2015. Available online: <https://iite.unesco.org/publications/education-2030-incheon-declaration-framework-action-towards-inclusive-equitable-quality-education-lifelong-learning/> (accessed on 12 January 2021).
5. United Nations. Universal Declaration of Human Rights. 1948. Available online: <https://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/> (accessed on 2 January 2021).
6. Lorenzo-Lledó, A.; Lorenzo, G.; Lledó, A.; Pérez-Vázquez, E. Inclusive methodologies from the teaching perspective for improving performance in university students with disabilities. *J. Technol. Sci. Educ.* **2020**, *10*, 127–141. [CrossRef]
7. Fundación Universia. *Guía Para la Atención al Alumnado con Discapacidad 2019/2020*; Fundación Universia-BancoSantander: Madrid, Spain, 2019; Available online: http://riberdis.cedd.net/bitstream/handle/11181/6119/Gu%C3%ada_atenci%C3%B3n_a_la_discapacidad_en_la_Universidad_19-20.pdf?sequence=1&rd=0031159692153011 (accessed on 12 January 2021).

8. Carballo, R.; Cotán, A.; Spínola, Y. An Inclusive Pedagogy in Arts and Humanities University Classrooms: What Faculty Members do. *Arts Humanit. High. Educ.* **2019**, *1*, 1–21. [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Thomas, L. Developing Inclusive Learning to Improve the Engagement, Belonging, Retention, and Success of Students from Diverse Groups. In *Widening Higher Education Participation*; Shah, M., Bennett, A., Southgate, E., Eds.; Elsevier: Oxford, UK, 2016; pp. 135–159.
10. Wilson, K.L.; Murphy, K.A.; Pearson, A.G.; Wallace, B.M.; Reher, V.G.S.; Buys, N. Understanding the Early Transition Needs of Diverse Commencing University Students in a Health Faculty: Informing Effective Intervention Practices. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2016**, *41*, 1023–1040. [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Gairín, J.; Suárez, C.I. Clarificar e Identificar a Los Grupos Vulnerables. In *Colectivos Vulnerables en la Universidad. Reflexiones Y Propuestas Para La Intervención*; Gair, J., Ed.; Wolters Kluwer España: Valencia, Spain, 2014; pp. 35–61.
12. Prowse, S. Institutional Construction of Disabled Students. *J. High. Educ. Policy Manag.* **2009**, *31*, 89–96. [[CrossRef](#)]
13. Everett, S.; Oswald, G. Engaging and training students in the development of inclusive learning materials for their peers. *Teach. High. Educ.* **2018**, *23*, 802–817. [[CrossRef](#)]
14. Kuper, H.; Davey, C.; Morgon, L.; Shakespeare, T. Trials and Tribulations of Collecting Evidence on Effectiveness in Disability-Inclusive Development: A Narrative Review. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 7823. [[CrossRef](#)]
15. Moriña, A. Inclusive education in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2017**, *32*, 3–17. [[CrossRef](#)]
16. Lombardi, A.; Murray, C.; Kowitt, J. Social Support and Academic Success for College Students with Disabilities: Do Relationship Types Matter? *J. Vocat. Rehabil.* **2016**, *44*, 1–13. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Scott, L.; Bruno, L.; Gokita, T.; Thoma, C.A. Teacher candidates' abilities to develop universal design for learning and universal design for transition lesson plans. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, 1–15. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Shaw, J. The Diversity Paradox: Does Student Diversity Enhance or Challenge Excellence? *J. Furth. High. Educ.* **2009**, *33*, 321–331. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Moriña, A. The keys to learning for university students with disabilities: Motivation, emotion and faculty-student relationships. *PLoS ONE* **2019**, *14*, e0215249. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Aguirre, A.; Carballo, R.; Lopez-Gavira, R. Improving the academic experience of students with disabilities in higher education: Faculty members of Social Sciences and Law speak out. *Innov. Eur. J. Soc. Sci. Res.* **2020**, 1–16. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Martins, M.E.; Morges, M.L.; Gonçalves, T. Attitudes Towards Inclusion in Education in a Portuguese University. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2018**, *22*, 527–542. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Veitch, S.; Strehlow, K.; Boyd, J. Supporting university students with socially challenging behaviours through professional development for teaching staff. *J. Acad. Lang. Learn.* **2018**, *12*, A156–A167. Available online: <http://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/article/viewArticle/526> (accessed on 24 January 2021).
23. Vickerman, P.; Blundell, M. Hearing the Voices of Disabled Students in Higher Education. *Disabil. Soc.* **2010**, *25*, 21–32. [[CrossRef](#)]
24. Sánchez, N.; Morgado, B. Docentes Universitarios Inclusivos: Qué les caracteriza y cómo conciben la discapacidad. *Siglo Cero* **2021**, in press.
25. Stein, K.F. Experiences of College Students with Psychological Disabilities: The Impact of Perceptions of Faculty Characteristics on Academic Achievement. *Int. J. Teach. Learn. High. Educ.* **2014**, *26*, 55–65. Available online: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1043011.pdf> (accessed on 24 January 2021).
26. Sandoval, M.; Morgado, B.; Doménech, A. University students with disabilities in Spain: Faculty beliefs, practices and support in providing reasonable adjustments. *Disabil. Soc.* **2020**, 1–20. [[CrossRef](#)]
27. Yvonne, L.; Tikhonova, J.; Gagnon, M.J.; Battalova, A.; Mayer, Y.; Krupa, T.; Lee, M.; Nimmon, L.; Jarus, T. Disabled healthcare professionals' diverse, embodied, and socially embedded experiences. *Adv. Health Sci. Educ.* **2020**, *25*, 111–129. [[CrossRef](#)]
28. Pillay, J.; Di Terlizzi, M. A case study of a learner's transition from mainstream schooling to a school for learners with special educational needs (LSEN): Lessons for mainstream education. *S. Afr. J. Educ.* **2009**, *29*, 491–509. [[CrossRef](#)]
29. Walton, E.; Rusznyak, L. Choices in the Design of Inclusive Education Courses for Pre-service Teachers: The Case of a South African University. *Int. J. Disabil. Dev. Educ.* **2017**, *64*, 231–248. [[CrossRef](#)]
30. Gale, T.; Mills, C.; Cross, R. Socially inclusive teaching: Belief, design, action as pedagogic work. *J. Teach. Educ.* **2017**, *68*, 345–356. [[CrossRef](#)]
31. Collins, A.; Azmat, F.; Rentschler, R. 'Bringing everyone on the same journey': Revisiting inclusion in higher education. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2018**, *44*, 1475–1487. [[CrossRef](#)]
32. Cubero, R. *Perspectivas Constructivistas. La Intersección Entre el Significado, la Interacción y el Discurso*; Grao: Barcelona, Spain, 2005.
33. Vygotsky, L.S. *Mind and Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*; Cole, M., John-Steiner, V., Scribner, S., Souberman, E., Eds.; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1978; pp. 79–91.
34. Stentiford, L.; Koutsouris, G. What are inclusive pedagogies in higher education? A systematic scoping review. *Stud. High. Educ.* **2020**, 1–17. [[CrossRef](#)]
35. Hitch, D.; Macfarlane, S.; Nihill, C. Inclusive pedagogy in Australian universities: A review of current policies and professional development activities. *Int. J. First Year High. Educ.* **2015**, *6*, 135–145. [[CrossRef](#)]
36. Huguet, C.; Pearse, J.; Noè, L.; Valencia, D.; Castillo, N.; Jiménez, A.; Patiño, M.A. Improving the motivation of students in a large introductory geoscience course through active learning. *J. Geosci. Educ.* **2020**, *68*, 20–32. [[CrossRef](#)]

37. Almarghani, E.M.; Mijatovic, I. Factors Affecting Student Engagement in HEIs—It is all About Good Teaching. *Teach. High. Educ.* **2017**, *22*, 940–956. [CrossRef]
38. Altemueller, L.; Lindquist, C. Flipped Classroom Instruction for Inclusive Learning. *Br. J. Spec. Educ.* **2017**, *44*, 341–358. [CrossRef]
39. Brewer, R.; Movahedazarhouli, S. Flipped learning in flipped classrooms: A new pathway to prepare future special educators. *J. Digit. Learn. Teach. Educ.* **2019**, *35*, 128–143. [CrossRef]
40. Miyazoe, T.; Anderson, T. Anonymity in blended learning: Who would you like to be? *J. Educ. Technol. Soc.* **2011**, *14*, 175–187. Available online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/jeductechsoci.14.2.175.pdf> (accessed on 24 January 2021).
41. Gibbs, J.; Hartviksen, J.; Lehtonen, A.; Spruce, E. Pedagogies of inclusion: A critical exploration of small-group teaching practice in higher education. *Teach. High. Educ.* **2019**. [CrossRef]
42. Vacarella, M. Unseen Disabilities and Inclusive Practices in Higher Education: The Case of Epilepsy. *High. Educ. Res. Netw. J.* **2015**, *9*, 49–63. Available online: <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/study/learningteaching/kli/Publications/Hern-J/Journals/hernjvol9.pdf> (accessed on 24 January 2021).
43. Dusek, G.A.; Yurova, Y.V.; Ruppel, C.P. Using social media and targeted snowball sampling to survey a hard-to-reach population: A case study. *Int. J. Dr. Stud.* **2015**, *10*, 279–299. [CrossRef]
44. Florian, L. What Counts as Evidence of Inclusive Education? *Eur. J. Spec. Needs Educ.* **2014**, *29*, 286–294. [CrossRef]
45. Gale, T.; Mills, C. Creating Spaces in Higher Education for Marginalised Australians: Principles for Socially Inclusive Pedagogies. *Enhancing Learn. Soc. Sci.* **2013**, *5*, 7–19. [CrossRef]
46. Miles, M.B.; Huberman, A.M. *Qualitative Data Analysis*; Sage Publications: Szcende Oaks, CA, USA, 1994.
47. Ley Orgánica 3/2018, de 5 de Diciembre, de Protección de Datos Personales y Garantía de los Derechos Digitales. Available online: <https://www.boe.es/eli/es/lo/2018/12/05/3/con> (accessed on 21 January 2021).
48. Khouri, M.; Lipka, O.; Shecter-Lerner, M. University faculty perceptions about accommodations for students with learning disabilities. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, 1–13. [CrossRef]
49. Sakız, H.; Sarıcal, M. Including students with visual difficulty within higher education: Necessary steps. *Exceptionality* **2017**, *26*, 266–282. [CrossRef]
50. Mullins, L.; Preyde, M. The lived experience of students with an invisible disability at a Canadian university. *Disabil. Soc.* **2013**, *28*, 147–160. [CrossRef]
51. Langørgen, E.; Kermit, P.; Magnus, E. Gatekeeping in professional higher education in Norway: Ambivalence among academic staff and placement supervisors towards students with disabilities. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2018**, 616–630. [CrossRef]
52. Moriña, A.; López-Gavira, R.; Morgado, B. How do Spanish disability support offices contribute to inclusive education in the university? *Disabil. Soc.* **2017**, *32*, 1608–1626. [CrossRef]
53. Huber, G.L. Aprendizaje activo y metodologías educativas. *Rev. Educ.* **2008**, 59–81. Available online: <http://www.educacionyfp.gob.es/revista-de-educacion/numeros-revista-educacion/numeros-anteriores/2008/re2008/re2008-04.html> (accessed on 24 January 2021). [CrossRef]
54. Love, T.S.; Kresier, N.; Camargo, E.; Grubbs, M.; Kin, E.J.; Burge, P.L.; Culver, S.M. STEM Faculty Experiences with Students with Disabilities at a Land Grant Institution. *J. Educ. Train. Stud.* **2015**, *3*, 27–38. [CrossRef]
55. Black-Hawkins, K.; Florian, L. Classroom teachers' craft knowledge of their inclusive practice. *Teach. Teach. Theory Pract.* **2012**, *18*, 567–584. [CrossRef]
56. Florian, L. Special education in the era of inclusion: The end of special education or a new beginning? *Psychol. Educ. Rev.* **2010**, *34*, 22–29.
57. Moriña, A. Faculty members who engage in inclusive pedagogy: Methodological and affective strategies for teaching. *Teach. High. Educ.* **2020**. [CrossRef]
58. CAST. *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines*; Version 2.2; Center for Applied Special Technology: Wakefield, MA, USA, 2018.
59. Kumar, K.L.; Wideman, M. Accessible by design: Applying UDL principles in a first-year undergraduate course. *Can. J. High. Educ.* **2014**, *44*, 125–147. Available online: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1028772.pdf> (accessed on 24 January 2021). [CrossRef]
60. Stefanich, G.; Davison, J.; Hadzigeorgiou, Y.; Keller, E.; Payne, C.; Paulson, J. *Science Teaching in Inclusive Classrooms: Models and Applications*; Woolverton: Cedar Falls, IA, USA, 2001.
61. Kendall, L. Supporting Students with Disabilities Within a UK University: Lecturer perspectives. *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.* **2017**, 694–703. [CrossRef]
62. Black, R.D.; Weinberg, L.A.; Brodwin, M.G. Universal Design for Instruction and Learning: A Pilot Study of Faculty Instructional Methods and Attitudes Related to Students with Disabilities in Higher Education. *Except. Educ. Int.* **2014**, *24*, 48–64. [CrossRef]
63. Langørgen, E.; Magnus, E. 'We are just ordinary people working hard to reach our goals!' Disabled students' participation in Norwegian higher education. *Disabil. Soc.* **2018**, *33*, 598–617. [CrossRef]
64. Márquez, M.; Melero, N. Advancing towards inclusion: Recommendations from faculty members of Spanish universities. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2020**. [CrossRef]
65. Slee, R. Belonging in an age of exclusion. *Int. J. Incl. Educ.* **2019**, *23*, 909–922. [CrossRef]