Communication Center Journal
Vol. 11, No. 1, 2025

Flexible Agency: Advancing Inclusive Pedagogies through Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

Samantha Michelle Guajardo
University of Memphis

Alyssa Marie Radtke
University of Memphis

Introduction

Communication and writing centers (CWCs) sit at a rhetorical crossroads often seen as spaces of invention and collaboration yet steeped in higher education traditions that privilege able-bodied voices and literacies. As the number of disclosed and undisclosed disabilities in higher education increases (Curda, 2024), CWCs face a kairotic moment that calls us to reimagine how we understand and teach communication. Fluency has long since been equated with eloquence, eye contact with credibility, and physical presence with engagement. Yet, these assumptions reflect, as Dolmage (2017) puts it, a "steep steps history" (p. 124). Thus, perpetuating a legacy of exclusion. If CWCs are meant to be accessible pedagogical spaces, they must take up disability conscious frameworks, such as Universal Design for Learning (UDL), embodiment, and multiliteracies as rhetorical commitments.

CWCs must turn to disability studies as a way to resist reductive models of accommodation. As Browning and Cagle (2017) state, "The discipline of disability studies has emerged over the last few decades, following the growth of the Disability Rights Movement" (p. 443). This movement was created as a way for persons with disabilities to gain social equality and accessibility. Disability studies, as it has been shaped by scholars across disciplines throughout the years, has rejected the medical model of disability—framing disabled people as *curable* and keeping them from participation until that cure is achieved—and insisting that exclusion is a model of institutional design (p. 443). This model is now less common in its pure form; however, it still exists in academic spaces with the assumption that disabled students need "services specialized and standardized to their diagnosis, not their personal goals" (Hitt, 2021, pp. 67-84; Lang, 2017b, pp. 1-14). This has prompted scholars to interrogate how discourses of ability circulate and how communication competence is constructed and policed.

From the perspective of disability studies, pedagogy and praxis itself become a site of rhetorical struggle. Browning and Cagle (2017) warn educators against the "add and stir" model, in which disability is isolated to a single assignment or workshop (p. 444). To combat this cyclical model, disability studies invite educators to see how assumptions about bodies shape social structures and environments. Indeed, a (still flawed, but useful) social model of disability emerged out of the Disability Rights movement. This model assumes natural bodily variability and seeks to improve access for all—documented disability or not (Lang, 2017b, pp. 1-14). The

social model is in tension with the disability model that dominates education at large: the rehabilitation model. Recent scholarship highlights this rehabilitative slant and further situates access as justice oriented. Marom and Hardwick (2025) draw on Tanya Titchkosky by arguing that "people require access to a general feeling of participation, meaningfulness, and belonging" (p. 514). They argue that academic institutions are being organized around a "normate"—one that excludes disabled students or only admits them through narrow-based channels (p. 515). As they explain, higher education still encourages "valorize[d] perfection and stigmatize[s] anything that hints at intellectual (or physical) weakness" (p. 515).

These pressures place the mantle of adaptation on individual students, who must navigate the labyrinth of barriers while institutions maintain a semblance of inclusion. In practice, this navigation requires a great deal of rhetorical labor disclosing/documenting one's disability status, as well as advocating for and educating about individual needs. This leads to what Annika Konrad (2021) coined as "access fatigue" and means that accommodations most frequently appear *after* the people who need them enter and advocate (Lang, 2017b, pp. 1-14). The rhetorical challenge for CWCs, then, is to refuse complicity and instead cultivate access as belonging by taking up the social model's challenge to consider diverse needs and barriers to participation *before* an overt access need appears in these spaces. Doing so has us poised to reconfigure the norms of communicative success and help redesign rhetorical spaces, so disabled bodies and voices are valued as central to the circulation of knowledge. However, we must also remember that we, as communication and writing professionals, are not qualified to construct from our sessions a diagnosis for a client (even if we suspect an undisclosed disability), which means that cultivating a spirit of flexibility within our consulting styles is the best thing we can do for ourselves and all of our clients.

Other areas of higher education underscore the urgency of reorientation towards more inclusion, access, and agency. Sanchez-Rodriguez and LoGiudice (2018), write about library access and remind educators that libraries have not yet amassed extensive resources in accessible formats, as "libraries remain largely inaccessible to people with various disabilities" (p. 144). Their study adds that access is about cultivating infrastructures of engagement that connect users to resources in meaningful ways. This also applies to CWCs: access cannot be reduced to materials or technologies alone, but it requires relational and rhetorical labor. Thus, access must not remain static but continuously co-constructed with the agency of both the clients and consultants in mind.

Overview of UDL

UDL is a flexible pedagogical framework that began in 1983 when Dr. David Rose and Dr. Anne Meyer, two Harvard Graduate Education researchers co-founded The Center for Applied Specialized Technology (CAST). The guidelines for UDL were first released in 2004 and apply neuroscience principles to help address learner (client, for a CWC) variability and emphasize learner/client agency and choice in classroom assignments and assessment design. They are a learning-focused outgrowth of the slightly older (1960s/1970s) Universal Design (UD)

movement—itself a facet of the Disability Rights movement, a set of physical and digital guidelines—including considering the usefulness and intuitiveness of a design to diverse ability levels/preferences. These guidelines are exemplified by things like curb cuts (helpful for wheelchairs, yes, but also bikes and strollers) and lever door handles (requiring less hand strength than a knob, yet still easy to use) (Center for Applied Specialized Technology [CAST], 2025b; North Carolina State [NC State], 1 April 1997).

UDL takes the UD guidelines' social orientation and expands them into pedagogy. CAST's newest version of the UDL guidelines, 3.0, was released in 2024, with a particular focus on addressing "barriers rooted in bias" and systemic exclusion. It has three main pillars: 1) **Engagement** (*why* we are interested in learning), 2) **Representation** (*what* teachers are teaching), and 3) **Action and Expression** (*how* learning is demonstrated). The pillars are further subdivided into access, support, and executive function in the interactive guidelines on https://udlguidelines.cast.org/. Access is, of course, the first of these categories because it is important to ensure that clients can connect their identities to the topics they are learning about— in terms of seeing the relevance and value of each assignment—as well as seeing the choices they can make to answer a prompt. Access also encompasses all of the things a client might need to interact with a space or information about a topic. Support is the next category, and focuses on designing ways to help learners throughout the process of demonstrating their learning by ensuring that both the goals of an assignment and the meanings of terms are clear, there is collaborative community among classmates, "action-oriented feedback," multiple means of illustrating a concept (video, text, doodles, etc.) and "graduated supports" for practice and performance. This category is where the instructional design "meat" is, which makes it challenging in spaces like CWCs, where clients enter with full-fledged assignments we cannot change. While we are a support service for clients in the general sense of assisting a client at any stage of a writing/speaking project, the differentiation of the common usage comes down to the level of relationship we have with clients; "one-and-done" clients who come in for a single session do not let us have the iterative insight of multiple drafts and discussions needed to offer naturally graduated support, while "regulars" returning to us at multiple points throughout a project allows for us to be better integrated into their support scaffolding in the UDL sense of support. As a CWC likely has both kinds of clients, it can be helpful to acknowledge we will not always have the consistency UDL assumes in its discussion of something so close to the core of what we do.

The third category of UDL is executive function. Executive function, according to the Cleveland Clinic (2024), refers to a set of "cognitive skills that help people to manage their thoughts, emotions, and behaviors to achieve goals." It includes things like the cognitive flexibility needed to adapt to changes, plan, and organize, as well as the working memory needed to hold onto information as a person is using it for a task. Executive function also covers emotional inhibition—managing responses to distractions and "putting the brakes" on emotional triggers. These skills are not innate, but learned, and are common challenges faced by clients. As such, supporting it in UDL includes helping learners recognize assignment expectations and their

own motivations, organizing information and resources in such a way to help clients anticipate challenges and develop strategies to meet them, connecting new knowledge to prior learning, exploring patterns and connections within and between concepts, and giving space for reflection.

Literature Review

Rethinking Communicative Norms

CWCs often reproduce normative expectations of communicative competence, privileging fluency, eye contact, and expressiveness as indicators of rhetorical success. As Dolmage (2017) observes, higher education has adopted a "steep steps history" that links access to retrofitted, rehabilitative accommodations rather than proactive designs (p. 124). Thus, positioning able bodied and neurotypical performance as customary, leaving those who communicate differently at risk of being seen as *defective*. Price (2011) similarly states how "the 'universal' part of the UD/UDL monikers expresses [a lofty] aim rather than an accomplished fact," reaffirming the idea that Universal Design (UD) must be seen as adaptable (p. 87). In other words, communicative norms underscore markers of privilege and must be recognized as fluid rather than fixed, especially when considering practices in communication classrooms and CWCs.

Extending this critique, it is imperative to recognize that CWCs are uniquely situated to either reinforce or disrupt these norms. The very markers of "good communication," that are often present in CWC and communication course rubrics—steady vocalics and upright posture— are rooted in cultural assumptions that equate performance with ability. Such measures risk overlooking rhetorical effectiveness and how those emerge through different means: outline creation, annotated visual cues, or slideshow creation. Through privileging one mode of delivery over another, CWCs continue to risk perpetuating the "myth of normalcy" that Dolmage, Price, and Yergeau critique in their scholarship. Thus, a reimagining is integral to help CWCs move beyond a tolerance of difference.

Embodiment and Performativity

Embodiment and performativity highlight how rhetoric is consistently enacted through the body and shaped by the expectations placed upon it. Yergeau (2013) critiques the explication that people with autism are "mindblind," which excludes them from humanity itself (para. 15). This assumption that those with autism are "mindblind" creates the notion that these individuals lack the "quintessential abilities that make us human" (para. 15). Yergeau (2013) reminds us that "the body...brings visibility and materiality to the abstractions of theory" (para. 20). When autistic communication is viewed as *deficit* or *inhuman*, access then becomes a site of dehumanization. In a similar way, Price (2011) underscores the exclusionary relationship of "kairotic spaces," decisive classroom interactions where implicit social cues indicate participation. Price (2011) suggests that redesigning those moments by offering explicit expectations and creating nonphysical avenues for engagement, instead, honors students'

communicative differences. In CWC contexts, Hitt (2012) urges against treating students with disabilities as radically different than their counterparts, as it creates a narrative that these students are "beyond help" (para. 6). Such framings not only *other* students but also hide the fact that all learners benefit from multimodal and flexible approaches. By centering embodiment and performativity, CWCs can push back against exclusionary logics and affirm a broad range of communicative practices.

We have worked with disabled clients whose modes of embodiment invite us to adjust our consultation styles and reconsider how we define effective communication. For instance, I (Guajardo) have worked with a client who disclosed their hearing loss to me. They mentioned often relying on lip reading and visual cues to follow along with the conversation. Recognizing this, I adjusted my consultation style by maintaining eye contact and orienting my body toward them, so my facial expressions were clearly visible. In other sessions, we (Guajardo and Radtke) have worked with clients who disclosed that sensory stimulation helps them focus. In our Center, we keep a small collection of fidget toys on hand, and we often invite clients to use them. Clients are hesitant to grab one at first, but we find that taking one first helps to welcome sensory engagement. In doing so, we learn that effective communication is less about enforcing one correct style and more about remaining responsive to the embodied needs of the clients.

Yet, to center embodiment and performativity is not only to critique exclusion, but to reimagine the body as a site of rhetorical possibility. As Yergeau (2013) states, "the body brings visibility and materiality to the abstractions of theory" (para. 20), meaning CWC pedagogy should embrace the body as one of meaning-making. In this sense, CWC pedagogy should account for how bodies enact rhetoric differently (e.g., silence, gesture, affect, or assistive technology). Price's (2011) call to reshape kairotic spaces by naming implicit norms and opening nonphysical modes of participation creates a practical avenue forward: to demystify unspoken expectations CWCs may have of clients.

UDL as Justice-Oriented

UDL extends the critiques into a pedagogical model that resists uniformity. Dolmage (2017) describes UDL as "advocating the use of multiple and flexible strategies to address the needs of all students" (p. 124). The framework calls for a multiplicity of representations and ways to give learners varied ways of expression (p. 145). Dolmage continues to warn that UDL is often reduced to a list or appropriated as a neoliberal tool for marketing, and risks abandoning its commitment to equity (p. 140). Yet, emphasizes the reciprocal need between UDL and usability. The argument that UDL can be turned into a neoliberal tool is then saved by accounting for user centered feedback. Dolmage states that without iterative feedback, UDL risks abstraction, recounting how students "insist that teachers had to allow... multiple modes of anonymous course critique" for needs to be addressed (pp. 131-132). This insight shapes the importance of building feedback into consultations; therefore, allowing clients to co-construct pedagogical practices.

In practice, we have worked with clients who learn best by doing rather than listening. Students who prefer that we walk them through the process step by step instead of lecturing about technique. For them, embodiment is referenced in a literal sense. Similarly, we have collaborated with multilingual students who explicitly ask for clarity over comfort, as they prefer direct, unembellished feedback rather than comfort-oriented critique. With these students, we often pause and directly ask them, "Does this make sense?" or "Would you prefer I model an example for you?" Their responses shape the direction of our collaboration. These encounters remind us that accessibility must be rhetorically attuned to the communicative preferences each client brings to the session. Another way we often adjust sessions with clients is when we form a potential outline or revision plan aloud. Or when the client is looking overwhelmed/scrambling to take notes, we respond to this feedback by offering to write out the content on one of the pads of paper we keep around our tables. If the student agrees, we take over the note-taking, so the client has a more complete, take-home version of their conversation to use as a checklist for their continuing process. Additionally, if the session was done online, we may send a follow-up email to the client with a summary, next steps, and resources discussed.

Price (2011) frames UD as a process of ongoing revision, urging instructors to focus on feasibility while acknowledging that accessibility is never complete (p. 89). Price recommends that instructors include the following in their teaching style: naming participation norms, alternatives to physical embodiment, and providing "safe houses" for engagement (pp. 92-100). These recommendations align with Dolmage's (2017) insistence that UDL is not simply a static solution but is seen instead as socially-just acclimatization. Justice in this instance is material, as it emerges when a client who struggles to articulate ideas is validated by sketching out a visual description, when a neurodivergent client is invited to use asynchronous reflections as part of their session, or when multilingual clients are encouraged to draw on their linguistic repertoires rather than forced to adhere to English standards. Thus, these practices expand upon UDL as a reimagining of what counts as communication within institutional spaces. Through this, CWCs can embody Dolmage's call for a plan of "hybridity and transformation," rather than panic over difference (p. 131).

Multiliteracies and Multimodalities

Multiliteracy models reinforce UDL by underscoring how communication occurs across sensory, technological, and intercultural modalities. Michael and Trezek (2006) highlight the need to account for "all students' needs" throughout "curriculum development" (pp. 312-313). They continue to emphasize the three qualities of UDL—engagement, representation, and action and expression—reinforcing the belief that these are not to be simply viewed as accommodations but as strategies to level the academic field (p. 313). Michael and Trezek's work showcases how these practices can be both technological and nontechnological: moving between graphics to spoken word and reciprocal dialogue to experiential learning (pp. 314-315). Hitt (2012) continues to extend multiliteracy into writing center praxis, emphasizing how physical spaces can disable through the privileging of able bodies. By starting with

accommodative interventions—such as mobile furniture or multimodal session designs—centers can then start to expand accessibility. Hitt emphasizes that pedagogy cannot be separated from space nor embodiment: "Even if a center is physically accessible, students cannot benefit from inaccessible pedagogy" (para. 13). Through expanding upon multiliteracy to include visual, embodied, auditory, and tactile modes, CWCs can affirm a wider range of literacies.

As consultants, we have worked through a multitude of multiliteracy and multimodal strategies. We have worked with clients working on speeches who struggle to organize their ideas through a traditional outline format. Rather than working together on a sheet of paper or on a shared document, we found that sketching main points using boxes and arrows on a whiteboard helps them visualize the trajectory of their speeches. In other sessions, when clients are working on their public speaking skills, they have alternated between English and their native language while articulating their ideas. To understand the client, we have often asked about certain phrases and invited them to explain how words or expressions carried different nuances in each language. Additionally, we have also examined their nonverbal delivery (e.g., pacing, gestures, and tone) to help clarify meaning.

A multiliteracies orientation is not simply vital as a way to enhance access, but also to reframe what counts as rhetorical success. Too often, CWCs default to supporting clients in ways that uphold academic norms (e.g., linear outlines and essay formats). Yet, the reality of communication in contemporary contexts—civic, digital, or professional—is multimodal. Through training consultants to better see the value in clients drafting with images or composing non-linear ways of thinking, CWCs can then prep students for rhetorical situations outside of the academy. In addition, multimodality demands that we resist equating efficiency to equity, as the most conventional path is not always the most inclusive.

Flexible Agency in CWCs

The combination of embodiment, performativity, and multiliteracy can provide the theoretical foundation for advancing UDL in CWCs. Embodiment exposes that able-bodied assumptions corroborate communicative norms. Performativity, in a similar fashion, acknowledges the ways students are compelled to enact these norms in order to be recognized as competent. Multiliteracy, meanwhile, demonstrates how meaning-making should always be seen as multimodal, extending beyond speech and print. UDL summarizes these insights into a framework that creates flexibility, iterative design, and client agency.

As Dolmage (2017) reminds us, UDL is "finally a matter of social justice" (p. 132). Rather than merely being a pedagogical rubric, it functions as an ethical orientation that challenges CWCs to value inclusive, communicative futures. Through the resistance of retroactive practices, and instead, designing a praxis of disabled representation, CWCs can affirm difference as constitutive of rhetoric itself. In this way, UDL equips CWCs to become sites where access is the foundation of pedagogical praxis.

Communication Center Journal
Vol. 11, No. 1, 2025

UDL Tips and Tools

Physical and Digital Space

While Dolmage's (2017) critiques of space retrofits are forever relevant and valid, some awareness of a CWC's spatial barriers is nonetheless helpful in any attempt to prevent access fatigue. While CWCs, as academic units, are rarely granted the ground-up control of their physical and digital spaces implied by UD, as evidenced by Steven Garfunkel's 2020 Excellence in the Center discussion of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in this journal, it is still important to collaborate with our institutions' physical access committees/disability services to investigate accessibility improvements that can be made—and the possibilities for funding such things. After eight years of advocating, for example, our CWC secured an ADA fund grant from our institution to install battery-operated door buttons to make our heavy entrance easier to open. Knowing which UD/ADA retrofits and improvements apply to a given Center space can be daunting, but Sheryl Burgstahler's (2018) "Universal Design of Tutoring and Learning Centers" checklist offers a solid place to start, reminding us to keep clear pathways, wheelchair accessible sign-in desks, specialized computer programs to magnify text, and braille copies of Center resources. While these physical environment elements and technology might forever be on a "Nice to Have" list that is advocated for for years, the checklist is a good first step in considering barriers that might exist for a client entering a CWC and gives us some idea on how we might remove or lessen them.

From a UDL perspective, *having* an electronic means of accessing a CWC is an example of multimodal communication and support. However, UDL also calls for technology to be explicitly modelled for learners before it is used and UD-conscious software is designed with visual contrast, image description, accessible file types (*not* scans of book pages that screen reading technology cannot interpret), timing, and a load of other ease of use features in mind (Jewett, 2022; Microassist, 2023). As CWCs are working with established products, we do not have the same level of control we have over our physical spaces. As such, the best options may be patience and a willingness to use more accessible methods, like Google phone—for consultant privacy—and email, for when the digital platforms prove difficult for a client to use. **Pedagogy**
As Lang (2017a) points out, one common access challenge can emerge in how communication and writing center training guides often direct consultants to use non-directive language: like asking a client "Where do you think a pause should go?" instead of saying something more direct like "This is just a suggestion, but you should have a slight pause between topics." While the non-directive approach implicitly honors a client's ownership of their work, many clients (such as those with autism and ADHD) may struggle without explicit prompting, so this slight change of phrasing may help clients better recognize where an issue is occurring in a project and that they have options on how to address it. Clients may not be able to take notes in a session; consultants offering to take notes for the client in session can aid in session access, as can allowing the session to be recorded on a phone for client review (Lang, 2017a; Ryan et al., 2017, p. 273-274)

Another issue might be that clients are overwhelmed by how sources and notes appear on a screen—an access issue in terms of perception and interaction—and we can introduce them to (or remind them of) tools like Immersive Reader (which changes the spacing, background, and font of documents and text heavy webpages in Microsoft Online and the Edge browser) (Microsoft Education, 2019). While this tool does not work on every web page, or with every client, both Windows and Apple operating systems have accessibility features that may prove useful in altering the way text appears for editing, while not making permanent changes to the final document (Microsoft, 2025; Apple, 2025). Even the heart of what we do—asking careful questions—can highlight the rhetorical choices a client has within an assignment (even when it does not allow for videos and other options) and help draw out ways to connect a client's identities and interests to the work they are doing (CAST, 2024).

While the UDL category of support reflects what CWCs fundamentally do, it is important to remember that UDL's vision of the term stresses proactively designing things like clear goals, defined steps, and classroom community, as well as enabling multiple ways to communicate and demonstrate learning (videos, interviews, etc.). Since CWCs are not the designers of assignments, our options are limited; largely, we are the support. However, we can offer "action oriented feedback" when we—collaboratively— help clients create draft or revision plans and break down overwhelming goals (CAST, 2024). We can help create more approachable timelines at the ends of sessions either with our own estimations or with the help of tools like Goblin Tool's MagicToDo, which uses AI to help break down a task, the chili peppers allowing a user to choose how difficult the task feels (meaning the steps are smaller the more chilis chosen).

In terms of representation's support pillars for vocabulary and symbols, CWC consultants can help clarify the meaning of terms within assignments, or guide clients in how they might ask a more appropriate source for clarification (e.g., helping draft emails to instructors). We can also offer students new ways to revise their projects—even if the final version is a "traditional" front of-the-room speech. Such suggestions can include that both client and consultant "exaggerate expressions and bodily movements," standing if able, when discussing a topic or practicing a speech to potentially get at a client's "true" feeling about a topic, having a client draw a speech (or build it with blocks or dough), or using sticky notes and walls (space permitting) to physically move pieces of the outline (CAST, 2024; Ryan et al., 2017, pp. 273-275). Incorporating more movement into a typically more subdued process is one way to support expression and communication, as is trying to offer multiple ways to offer sessions—both in person and online. While many of the strategies suggested are difficult to implement digitally, alternative access to services allows clients a choice of how to communicate in a very UDL way.

Supporting executive function in CWCs includes helping clients develop strategies for common communication and writing challenges—like determining that a project has all of the needed components and that they flow well together. In such a case, it might be time to pull out the assignment sheet and make a list, color-coding elements in notes or outlines to see where they appear. Or a consultant might ask a client to explain a topic without looking at notes or

draw out their points without words (CAST, 2024; Ryan et al., 2017, pp. 273-275). Executive functioning support can also include using our knowledge as consultants to help clients connect their prior knowledge to their current work (though this can be tricky when we are helping someone from a different focus, level, or major than ourselves) and acknowledging that some assignments are emotionally difficult. We can support a client's emotional capacity by offering breathing exercises to help clients manage anxiety, as well as celebrating the progress and reflecting on the growth of recurring clients (CAST, 2024).

Now, of course, the strategies noted above are just some of the ones that a consultant might use to support a client. And they might feel like things our CWCs are already doing in sessions—particularly with clients who disclose a specific challenge or preference. UDL is applicable to all clients (which is why it can feel frustratingly vague); for consultants, hopefully, UDL's framework can empower us to be more flexible in sessions, addressing needs as they appear. If none of the strategies offered in this article and its sources seem to fit your CWC, think about the challenges that are common within your client population as a staff or small group. Grab a UDL guidelines chart and talk through how you might best address a challenge or embody a pillar within your space. By thinking through how you might direct sessions *before* they start, you are employing the pro-social, inclusive design of UDL. If, however, you are struggling—like we sometimes do— to think past the educator lens of the guidelines themselves, it may be helpful to prompt an AI for how a tutor or consultant might apply the guidelines with clients, which is very much in line with CAST's (2025) view of AI as assistive technology. In our experiments, we have found it most helpful to prompt specifically for each of the nine guidelines by the official names on the chart, so that the AI is less summative and more focused. ChatGPT is, of course, a ubiquitous model for this, though there is an AI tool by Poe called Ludia that is built to help educators find ways to meet design and task challenges with UDL. Of course, Centers and consultants have valid resistances to using AI, and there is nuance to the use of AI as an access aid versus a shortcut. We do not, for example, necessarily see AI-heavy grammar and paraphrasing tools like Grammarly and Ginger as appropriate UDL supports for writing and communication projects, while some UDL resources do—like those from Marshall University's UDL Community of Practice (2021). Ludia is a limited, UDL guidelines-only tool, though, so it *may* prove more helpful for our session prep than other AI tools.

Conclusion

UDL is far from perfect, but against the accommodation-dominated educational culture, it is a step in the right direction. At its best, UD/UDL is a framework and a prompt for ongoing conversations and work around access, both in CWCs and the wider field of communication. Access is an ever-evolving aim, not something that can be completed and forgotten (Price, 2011, p. 87). The hard truth remains that access will never be settled. It will remain contested and negotiated. However, therein lies its power, which is to keep things accessible; an ongoing

dialogue must continue alongside them. While this can be an overwhelming prospect, those who need access *will* notice when those needs are anticipated and are often quite aware of limitations—though they might not always know how to articulate them or who can best address these issues (Konrad, 2021). Forethought into the barriers we can reduce or eliminate helps our clients save their rhetorical energy for collaboratively refining the work of our Centers.

Future work in this area might include a follow-up client survey to offer an explicit venue for feedback and better gauge the effectiveness of UDL practices within our Center(s). Additionally, scholars might examine how UDL intersects with other pedagogical frameworks (e.g., feminist rhetorical praxis or decolonial pedagogy) to broaden what access can mean in communication spaces. Longitudinal studies could also examine how consultants' rhetorical awareness evolves when trained in UDL-informed strategies, or how clients' sense of agency and belonging shifts over time. These directions remind us that access is iterative, and often shaped by context and the embodied needs, identities, and relationships that add life to a Center.

Ultimately, to practice UDL within CWCs is to treat access as a rhetorical act: deliberative, ethical, and always unfinished. Our work is to listen and reimagine how communication might be made more accessible for all clients—with and without disabilities. In this sense, UDL works to keep us accountable for everyone who enters our Centers. We believe that CWCs can continue to model what equitable communication and writing standards look like, one that shares a commitment to revision, responsiveness, and the cultivation of belonging.

References

Apple. (2025). *Accessibility*. https://www.apple.com/accessibility/

Browning, E. R., & Cagle, L. E. (2017). Teaching a "critical accessibility case study": Developing disability studies curricula for the technical communication classroom. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 47*(4), 440–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616653491

Burgstahler, S. (2018). *Equal access: Universal design of tutoring and learning centers*. Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking, and Technology (DO-IT). https://doit.uw.edu/brief/equal-access-universal-design-of-tutoring-and-learning-centers/

Center for Applied Special Technology. (2024, July). *The UDL guidelines*. Universal Design for Learning. https://udlguidelines.cast.org

Center for Applied Special Technology. (2025). *Artificial Intelligence & UDL*. https://www.cast.org/what-we-do/artificial-intelligence/

Center for Applied Special Technology. (2025). *Board*. https://www.cast.org/about/board/

Cleveland Clinic. (2024, March 15). *Executive function: Skills for life*. https://my.clevelandclinic.org/health/articles/executive-function

Curda, E. H. (2024). *Higher education: Education could improve information on accommodations for students with disabilities* (Report to Congressional Addressees No. GAO-24-105614). United States Government Accountability Office.

Dolmage, J. T. (2017). *Academic ableism: Disability and higher education*. University of Michigan Press.

Hitt, A. H. (2012). Access for all: The role of dis/ability in multiliteracy centers. *Praxis: A Writing Center Journal, 9*(2). https://www.praxisuwc.com/hitt-92

Hitt, A. H. (2021). Resisting diagnosis and creating avenues for agency in the writing center. In *Rhetorics of overcoming: Rewriting narratives of disability and accessibility in writing studies* (pp. 61–84). National Council of Teachers of English.

Jewett, L. (2022, May). *How to plan online lessons with Universal Design for Learning (UDL)*. Understood. https://www.understood.org/en/articles/how-to-plan-online-lessons-with universal-design-for-learning-udl

Konrad, A. M. (2021). Access Fatigue: The Rhetorical Work of Disability in Everyday Life. In *College English* (Vol. 83, Issue 3, pp. 179–199). NCTE. https://doi.org/10.58680/ce202131093

Lang, H. (2017a). *Engaging disability & universal design in the writing center*. Disability in Florida State University's Reading and Writing Center. https://heatherlang7.wixsite.com/disabilityinrwc

Lang, H. (2017b). *Understanding, perception, and accommodation of disability in writing centers* (Doctoral dissertation). The Florida State University.

Marom, L., & Hardwick, J. (2025). From access to inclusion: A call for a cultural shift in higher education. *Higher Education, 89*(2), 513–534. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-024- 01032-4

Marshall University UDL Community of Practice. (2021). *Technology: Universal Design for Learning*. https://www.marshall.edu/udl/udl-and-technology/

Michael, M. G., & Trezek, B. J. (2006). Universal design and multiple literacies: Creating access and ownership for students with disabilities. *Theory into Practice, 45*(4), 311–318. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4504_7

Microassist. (2023, May 16). Digital Accessibility Checklist: 10 Critical Elements to Evaluate

for Website Accessibility. *Digital Accessibility Digest*. https://www.microassist.com/digital-accessibility/digital-accessibility-checklist/

Microsoft. (2025). *Windows 11 accessibility features*. Windows. https://www.microsoft.com/en us/windows/accessibility-features

Microsoft Education. (2019, September 24). *What is the immersive reader?* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wHJJCLV-DNg

Price, M. (2011). *Mad at school: Rhetorics of mental disability and academic life*. University of Michigan Press.

Ryan, H., Miller, G., & Steinhart, S. (2017). Informed practices: Destabilizing institutional barriers in the writing center. In *Writing centers and disability* (pp. 257–276). Fountainhead Press.

Sanchez-Rodriguez, N. A., & LoGiudice, J. (2018). Building bridges: Fostering dynamic partnerships between the library department and office of student disability services in higher education. *Journal of Access Services, 15*(4), 142–160. https://doi.org/10.1080/15367967.2018.1520640

The Center for Universal Design. (1997, April). *The principles of universal design*. North Carolina State College of Design. https://design.ncsu.edu/research/center-for-universal design/.

Yergeau, M. (2013). Clinically significant disturbance: On theorists who theorize theory of mind. *Disability Studies Quarterly, 33*(4). https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v33i4.3876