The Project Team ran a roundtable discussion at the ACEN National Conference (October, 2014).

23 participants were involved in the 1.5 hour discussion forum. The focus of this symposium was a verification and triangulation of feedback around the emerging principles and guidelines that were developed as part of this project.

All participants provided consent for any collected data to be included as part of the project. As with the previous symposium the session commenced with a brief overview of the project and key themes from the literature, as well as some insights of emerging themes from the pilot sites.

Participants were then divided into groups of 3 to 4, accompanied by one of the project team members, to discuss the draft principles and guidelines, developed from the literature, conversations within pilot sites and consultation. Participants were provided with a principle and associated explanation, and the discussion was shaped by the following questions:

1. We are seeking your feedback on the intent and wording of the principle above:
   a. Does the wording and explanation make sense?
   b. Has anything been missed?
   c. Is this reasonable and viable as a principle?
   d. Would it work in your particular context?
2. For this particular principle, can you suggest any guidelines that might be appropriate to enact this principle?
3. Can you think of any appropriate implementation strategies? Please comment.
4. Any other comments or suggestions about the principles and guidelines overall? (e.g. collectively do the principles and guidelines make sense, etc?)

Groups recorded feedback and ideas onto a sheet of paper, with a large group feedback and discussion held after the small group conversations. The facilitators recorded the key feedback points with the recording sheets collected for summary and analysis as part of a face-to-face meeting of the Project Team.
Summary of general feedback, comments, questions from the individual groups

1. Need definitions of “inclusion”, “inclusive practice”, “diversity” within the final documents and resources. Some kind of summary regarding what diversity and inclusion really means these days.
2. Question - what does universal design mean in this context?
3. Presence of all stakeholders in the principles is somewhat imbalanced – it needs to be clear who these Principles and Guidelines are for.
4. Institutions and individuals could evaluate performance against these principles.
5. Flexibility and adaptability needs to feature in guidelines.
6. There can be increased risks for the institution if we have mandatory WIL – where/how do we address issue of “risks” in the principles? Maybe this is something to consider for the guidelines which enact the principles.
7. Concern about how achievable given some programs are “a flagship” for institution, and they only send best students as don’t want to risk reputation by widening access. Discussion around this as an example of non-inclusive WIL.
8. Discussion around the “disconnect” between aspiration and practices – the challenge to change. But agreed that aspirations need to be set high and communicated.
9. Does there need to be a “WIL experience” principle specific to students? Students also need to be responsible.
10. Will this work for a global audience or not? Need to consider in our scope.
11. Notion of “give and take” by all stakeholders needs to be present.
12. Are practicable and workable the same thing when it comes to “sustainable” approaches to inclusive WIL?
13. Seem to be on the right track with the principles and no key messages are missing.
14. Liked the structure – i.e., short statement, followed by an explanation.
15. One size does not fit all - principles and guidelines need to fit all, but implementation strategies would be particular to an institution.
16. At the end of the day it is all about institutions being committed to these principles of inclusion and to WIL pedagogy as something for all students no matter what the disciplinary area.
17. Build student resilience and capabilities – self efficacy of students big issue regarding student success – include in guidelines.
18. Avoid negative language/framing where possible.