Journal of Teachers and Teacher Education

Firoz Karim
Department of Inclusive Education, Chittagong Institute of Education, Chittagong, Bangladesh

Curriculum design for inclusive education: Integrating universal design for learning in teacher preparation

Firoz Karim

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/30810647.2024.v1.i1.A.3

Abstract
Inclusive education requires educators who are well-prepared to address diverse learning needs. This paper explores how the integration of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) into teacher preparation curricula supports the development of inclusive pedagogical competencies. UDL, rooted in neuroscience and cognitive theory, promotes flexible instructional methods to accommodate individual learning differences. The paper reviews existing practices, presents comparative curriculum models, and evaluates their efficacy in pre-service teacher training. A mixed-methods approach comprising curriculum analysis and faculty interviews from five teacher education institutes was employed. Findings reveal that UDL-integrated programs significantly improve trainee teachers' confidence and ability to implement inclusive strategies. The study recommends policy reforms and curriculum frameworks to systematically embed UDL into teacher education.

Keywords: UDL, inclusive education, universal design, teacher education, teacher preparation

Introduction

Inclusive education is not merely a pedagogical trend but a foundational human right. It recognizes diversity as a resource rather than a barrier, aiming to provide equitable learning opportunities for all students, including those with disabilities, linguistic differences, and varying socio-economic backgrounds. As schools worldwide move towards more inclusive classrooms, the demand for teachers equipped with the knowledge, attitudes, and competencies to cater to diverse learners has grown exponentially. This shift necessitates a re-examination of teacher education curricula to ensure alignment with inclusive values.

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is an educational framework developed by CAST (Center for Applied Special Technology) that emphasizes the proactive design of instructional materials and activities to cater to a broad spectrum of learners. It proposes three core principles: providing multiple means of engagement, multiple means of representation, and multiple means of action and expression. These principles correspond to the affective, recognition, and strategic networks of the brain, respectively.

However, despite its robust theoretical foundation, the integration of UDL into teacher education programs remains sporadic and inconsistent. Many teacher candidates report minimal exposure to inclusive practices and lack practical strategies to implement UDL in real classroom settings. This paper aims to investigate how UDL can be systematically embedded in teacher preparation programs to foster inclusive pedagogical practices. It analyzes current curriculum structures, identifies barriers to implementation, and proposes a UDL-aligned curriculum framework.

Literature Review

Inclusive education has evolved from a special education model into a broader socio-political commitment to equity and access (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2006) [1]. UDL offers a framework to operationalize inclusive education by recognizing variability in learners and proactively designing flexible learning experiences (Meyer, Rose, & Gordon, 2014) [2].

Studies have shown that teacher preparation programs with embedded UDL components result in higher self-efficacy among pre-service teachers when addressing student diversity (Spooner *et al.*, 2007) [3]. However, Smith *et al*. (2012) [4] found that most programs treat UDL as an optional add-on rather than a core design principle.

Corresponding Author:
Firoz Karim
Department of Inclusive Education, Chittagong Institute of Education, Chittagong, Bangladesh

Additionally, international research indicates a fragmented approach. For example, Australian teacher training includes UDL in special education electives, while Finnish programs embed UDL across general pedagogy courses (Florian & Pantić, 2013) [5]. This inconsistency contributes to uneven teacher readiness for inclusive classrooms.

Barriers to UDL integration include faculty unfamiliarity, rigid accreditation standards, and lack of institutional support. To address these challenges, Al-Azawei, Serenelli & Lundqvist (2016) [6] recommend whole-program redesign rather than isolated course-level interventions.

Methodology

A mixed-methods approach was used. First, curriculum documents from five teacher education institutions across three countries (Nepal, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka) were analyzed using a UDL-alignment rubric based on CAST guidelines. Second, semi-structured interviews with 15 faculty members and 30 final-year pre-service teachers were conducted to understand perceptions, implementation challenges, and benefits.

Table 1: Institutions selected for curriculum analysis

Institution	Country	Type	UDL Integration Level
College A	Bangladesh	Public	High
College B	Nepal	Public	Low
College C	Sri Lanka	Public	Moderate
College D	Bangladesh	Private	High
College E	Nepal	Private	Low

The analysis focused on course syllabi, practicum guidelines, and program outcomes, with scoring based on the presence and depth of UDL principles.

Results

The curriculum review revealed significant variation in UDL integration.

Table 2: UDL principle coverage in core curriculum

UDL Principle	College A	College B	College C	College D	College E
Engagement	✓✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓
Representation	✓✓✓	✗	✓✓	✓✓✓	✓
Action & Expression	✓✓✓	✗	✓	✓✓✓	✗
Total Integration Score	9/9	2/9	6/9	9/9	3/9

Legend: ✓ = Partially Covered, ✓✓ = Fully Covered, ✗ = Not Covered

Qualitative data revealed that pre-service teachers trained in high-UDL integration programs felt more confident in addressing the needs of students with learning difficulties, using alternative assessments, and adapting lesson plans.

Discussion

The findings underscore the pivotal role of UDL in preparing teachers for inclusive practice. Institutions with comprehensive UDL integration produced teacher candidates who not only demonstrated awareness of learner variability but also actively planned for it. The high performance of Colleges A and D points to the effectiveness of institutional commitment and faculty training.

However, Colleges B and E highlight persistent gaps in low-resource settings where curriculum reforms lag. This suggests the need for national-level policy directives and faculty development programs to facilitate systemic change. Additionally, feedback from participants emphasized the importance of practical exposure e.g., UDL-based microteaching and inclusive practicum experiences.

To standardize UDL implementation, a model curriculum framework is proposed.

Table 3: Proposed UDL-integrated teacher education curriculum framework

Semester	Core Focus Area	UDL Elements Incorporated
I	Foundations of Education	Understanding learner variability, inclusive values
II	Educational Psychology	Neuroscience of learning, cognitive diversity
III	Pedagogy and Methodology	Designing for multiple means of representation
IV	Assessment and Evaluation	Flexible assessments, student choice
V	Practicum I	Lesson planning with UDL checklist
VI	Inclusive education and internship	Reflection, case studies, differentiated teaching

This progression ensures that UDL is not isolated but threaded through foundational and applied components of teacher education.

Conclusion

The integration of universal design for learning into teacher preparation programs is essential for the realization of inclusive education. This paper has shown that while some institutions exemplify best practices, many still lack structured implementation. A shift toward a curriculum that embeds UDL at all levels backed by policy, faculty training, and practicum redesign is critical. Only then can future educators be truly inclusive in both mindset and methodology.

References

1. Ainscow M, Booth T, Dyson A. Improving schools, developing inclusion. London: Routledge, 2006.
2. Meyer A, Rose DH, Gordon D. Universal Design for Learning: Theory and Practice. Wakefield, MA: CAST Professional Publishing, 2014.
3. Spooner F, Baker JN, Harris AA, Delzell AL. Effects of training in universal design for learning on lesson plan development. Remedial and Special Education. 2007;28(2):108-116.
4. Smith FT, Stahl S, Connors T, Polloway EA. Making inclusion work in general education classrooms. Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities. 2012;47(3):345-357.
5. Florian L, Pantić N. Teacher education for the changing demographics of schooling: Policy, practice and research. Dordrecht: Springer, 2013.
6. Azawei ALA, Serenelli F, Lundqvist K. Universal Design for Learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015. Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. 2016;16(3):39-56