

SENSEMAKING AND EDUCATIONAL DESIGN: TEACHING METHODOLOGIES FOR INCLUSIVE AND MOTIVATING LEARNING

SENSEMAKING E PROGETTAZIONE EDUCATIVA: METODOLOGIE DIDATTICHE PER UN APPRENDIMENTO INCLUSIVO E MOTIVANTE



Enza Manila Raimondo
Kore University of Enna
enzamanila.raimondo@unikore.it



Marinella Muscarà
Kore University of Enna
marinella.muscara@unikore.it



Double Blind Peer Review

Citation

Raimondo, E.M., & Muscarà, V. (2025). Sensemaking and educational design: teaching methodologies for inclusive and motivating learning. *Giornale italiano di educazione alla salute, sport e didattica inclusiva*, 9(1).

Doi:

<https://doi.org/10.32043/gsd.v9i1.1373>

Copyright notice:

© 2023 this is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Open Journal System and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

gsdjournal.it

ISSN: 2532-3296

ISBN: 978-88-6022-509-2

ABSTRACT

The contribution proposes a theoretical-methodological reflection on the relationship between Universal Design for Learning, sensemaking and motivation, highlighting how student involvement is connected to the ability to attribute meaning to the educational path. Strategies that promote dialogue, critical thinking and authentic listening to student requests (Student Voice) are valued, deepening the debate and reflective narration as inclusive practices and tools for active participation.

Il contributo propone una riflessione teorico-metodologica sul rapporto tra *Universal Design for Learning*, *sensemaking* e motivazione, evidenziando come il coinvolgimento degli studenti sia connesso alla capacità di attribuire significato al percorso formativo. Vengono valorizzate strategie che promuovano il dialogo, il pensiero critico e l'ascolto autentico delle istanze studentesche (*Student Voice*), approfondendo il *debate* e la narrazione riflessiva quali pratiche inclusive e strumenti di partecipazione attiva.

KEYWORDS

Universal Design for Learning, Sensemaking, Student voice, inclusive teaching, debate

Universal Design for Learning, Sensemaking, Student Voice, didattica inclusiva, Debate

Received 30/04/2025

Accepted 11/06/2025

Published 20/06/2025

Introduction

In the changing and complex panorama of contemporary education, the school takes on an increasingly complex configuration, called to become a crossroads of cultural practices, formative experiences and relational plots. At the same time, the pervasiveness of artificial intelligences (Cristol, 2025), capable of offering immediate and automated answers but lacking experiential roots, and the overabundance of information often decontextualized fuel the risk of a progressive obscuring of the interrogative dimension of knowledge. The erosion of the spaces of question, comparison and reflection calls, today more than ever, for the need to rethink learning environments as places capable of supporting the long time of thought, the density of experience and the intentionality of the construction of meaning. This challenge directly questions the work of teachers, called to exercise a conscious and reflective planning in the construction of contexts capable of welcoming the multiple dimensions of human experience - cognitive, affective, social, cultural - and of valorizing the plurality of subjectivities that inhabit them. Students, on the other hand, cross the school threshold bringing with them much more than a baggage of knowledge: they enter the educational space with stratified biographies, dissonant expressive codes, plural ways of inhabiting the world, sedimented in different contexts and, at times, marginalized.

In this scenario, designing authentically inclusive learning environments does not only mean countering the fragmentation of knowledge or the impoverishment of cognitive processing, but requires constant attention to the quality of educational relationships, to the devices that activate them, to the conditions that make each subject recognizable and participating. The risk of a teaching method that limits itself to compensating for heterogeneity without questioning its own theoretical assumptions and professional postures requires a structural rethinking of the purposes of teaching. On the one hand, it is necessary to preserve the depth of the educational experience in a time that tends to dematerialize its plots; on the other, it is necessary to enhance the multiplicity of subjectivities as a lever for rethinking the forms of knowing and learning. It is at the intersection of these planes that otherness takes on generative value; an epistemic foundation from which to start again to redefine the very meaning of education.

Recognizing otherness and restoring depth to the educational process as structural dimensions of educational action implies, therefore, a critical review of pedagogical categories and teaching choices, orienting educational planning towards an idea of inclusion not as a compensatory response, but as a generative principle that

questions, at the root, the very meaning of teaching and learning. Starting from this reconfiguration, the contribution of Cottini (2016) acquires particular relevance, identifying four founding nodes for a teaching capable of responding to the complexity of contexts: the valorization of cooperative work, attention to the relational climate, the promotion of prosocial skills and the integration of the emotional dimension in teaching and learning processes. These elements are not limited to technical measures, but outline an intentional design orientation, centered on the quality of interactions and shared educational responsibility. Learning, then, also emancipates itself from the logic of accumulation to configure itself as a situated, relational experience deeply intertwined with the quality of exchanges and the narratives that accompany its unfolding (Giacconi, Del Bianco, D'Angelo, 2024; Boichichio, 2017).

In order for this possibility not to be exhausted in a declaration of intent, but to translate into significant teaching practice, it is necessary for educational reflection to deal with the conditions that make learning authentically inclusive and constructive. Questioning which spaces allow students to recognize themselves, which practices open authentic expressive channels and offer opportunities to attribute meaning to their presence in the class group constitutes a decisive step.

Starting from the premises outlined, the reflection develops around four interconnected perspectives that, far from configuring themselves as prescriptive models, outline a cultural and design framework aimed at supporting authentically situated, dialogic and accessible learning.

Universal Design for Learning represents the methodological horizon within which to think of flexible and inclusive educational environments, based on the assumption of variability as an epistemological principle, not as an exception to be managed. In continuity, *sensemaking* encourages the construction of shared meanings, rooting knowledge in experiences and restoring critical depth to disciplinary content. This tension between experience and knowledge is amplified through *Student Voice*, which recognizes students as epistemically active subjects, capable of orienting teaching action with their own narratives, visions and instances. In this framework, the *debate* is proposed as an educational practice with a high relational intensity, capable of structuring regulated discursive spaces where argumentation becomes an exercise in cognitive citizenship, generative comparison and collective construction of knowledge.

1. *Universal Design for Learning: a model for designing inclusive learning environments*

In the wake of the premises that animate inclusive teaching, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) emerges as a design proposal capable of giving substance to the principles of equity, participation and accessibility, translating them into concrete and transformative educational devices. Its theoretical genealogy is rooted in the concept of Universal Design (UD), developed by Mace (1985) in the architectural field, with the aim of promoting accessible environments and services from the design stage, overcoming the adaptive and compensatory approach at a later stage. This perspective introduces an ethic of prevention, based on the recognition of the rights of people with disabilities and on the principle of universal usability (UN, 2006), thus paving the way for a radical rethinking of design logics, even in the educational field. It is in this direction that the theoretical development of the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST, 2018) is placed, which, under the guidance of Anne Meyer and David Rose, has translated the foundations of UD into the training system, giving rise to the UDL model. Born with the aim of expanding access to education through digital technologies, it has progressively acquired a broader scope, becoming a real conceptual and methodological framework capable of orienting educational planning towards flexible, responsive and inclusive environments, consistent with the complexity of contemporary educational contexts. Supported by solid neuroscientific evidence (Oliverio, 2012; Geake, 2016) and inscribed in a cognitive matrix, the model assumes the interindividual variability of learning as an essential starting point. As Dainese (2019) observes, heterogeneity does not represent a deviation from the model, but constitutes its epistemological root. In this perspective, accessibility is not limited to the removal of material obstacles, but extends to the possibility of each subject to construct meaning, to activate connections, to inhabit the educational process in an authentic and meaningful way.

In line with this perspective, CAST has articulated a theoretical-methodological model that identifies three neural networks that are fundamental for learning: recognition networks, strategic networks and affective networks. Each of them is associated with a key function - respectively the "what", the "how" and the "why" of learning - which translates into as many guiding principles of UDL. More than a series of technical indications, these principles propose a structural change in the educational paradigm: it is about thinking of teaching as an intentional design capable of welcoming, right from the generative phase, the richness and complexity of presence (Mangiatordi, 2017).

The first principle, linked to the neural networks responsible for recognition, directs teaching action towards the pluralization of means of representation. In fact, each student accesses knowledge through different channels, filtering information with their own cultural and experiential tools. From this perspective, making multiple languages available – verbal, visual, auditory, digital – is not an accessory concession, but an educational strategy that legitimizes the plurality of cognitive accesses and promotes significant interaction with content (Cottini, 2019). The integrated adoption of concept maps, iconographic supports, multimedia codes and an accessible lexicon allows, in this sense, to build differentiated cognitive paths, anchored to contextual and culturally significant experiences (Arduini, 2020). The second principle, attributable to strategic networks, encourages the diversification of modes of action and expression. In fact, knowledge is not limited to being internalized, but asks to be returned, narrated, performed and reworked. Students learn and communicate through heterogeneous forms: writing, voice, gesture, image, body, digital. Offering a broad and intentional repertoire of expressive modes does not simply mean adapting to individual differences, but activating metacognitive, divergent and critical skills that enrich the relationship with knowledge. From this perspective, the evaluation system is also redesigned: standardized testing leaves room for authentic, situated and significant tasks, capable of documenting processes and making processes visible, not just the results (Savia, 2016).

The third principle, which is grafted onto affective networks, focuses on the motivational, relational and emotional dimension of learning. For knowledge to become a lived experience, it is essential that the educational space is perceived as a safe place, capable of generating trust, stimulating interest and nurturing a sense of belonging. Motivation, in fact, is constructed in a multiple and situated way (Tempesta, 2018): there are those who are activated by the challenge, those who are activated by cooperation, those who are activated by the possibility of choice, those who are activated by the predictability of the environment. Strategies that are able to intercept these nuances and intertwine with the student's internal experiences favor processes of affective and cognitive regulation, activating an authentic desire to learn.

Within this teaching architecture, active and inclusive methodologies prove to be fundamental devices for activating participation, consolidating involvement and supporting learning that is both effective and sustainable. A truly universal design also requires a careful reading of the composition of the class group, a clear definition of the educational objectives, as well as a conscious selection of strategies, materials and evaluation criteria (Sgambelluri, 2020). As CAST

underlines, one of the main obstacles to the implementation of inclusion lies in the persistence of rigid teaching models, conceived on implicit hypotheses of homogeneity, which neglect the richness of the ways in which each student constructs meaning. UDL, on the contrary, assumes variability as a generative principle: not an anomaly to be contained, but a resource from which to start to orient the design towards open, adaptive educational contexts, capable of accommodating the complexity of presences and situations.

Among the operational references that support its implementation we find equity in access, clarity of communication, modularity of content, the use of multi-sensory codes, tolerance for error, and the valorization of corporeality as an essential dimension of the educational experience. In particular, the principle of equity takes on both an ethical and strategic value. It is not a matter of offering everyone the same answers, but of guaranteeing everyone what they need to participate fully and with dignity in school life. As lanes and Cramerotti (2016) state, “equity” means building the conditions that make authentic, recognized and conscious learning possible for each student.

Numerous empirical evidence confirms the effectiveness of the UDL model, showing how environments designed according to its axes can not only favor the inclusion of students with special educational needs, but also raise the overall quality of teaching, restoring value to the entire school community. In this horizon, educational planning ceases to be a technical act, to become a transformative gesture: an action that takes shape from the recognition of difference as a founding condition of learning. Since all learning is rooted in situated, relational and significant plots, UDL calls for a pedagogy of listening, of conscious participation, of the shared construction of knowledge. The educational space, in this light, is redefines itself as a generative environment, in which plurality ceases to be an obstacle and becomes a lever of educational justice. And it is along this trajectory, in which accessibility and significance are intertwined, that the subsequent reflection opens.

2. Environments of meaning: *sensemaking* between knowledge and subjectivity

When educational planning recognizes plurality as the foundation of learning, it does not limit itself to guaranteeing access to content, but guides the construction of environments in which knowledge can resonate with lived experience. In this direction, the three principles of UDL - representation, expression/action and

involvement - are configured as interpretative tools capable of revealing the intertwining of identity, knowledge and participation. It is in the relationship between expressive modes and active presence that the urgency of a renewed teaching is affirmed, understood not as a neutral space, but as a place of recognition, rooting and attribution of meaning. Only by mobilizing subjectivity, generating authentic questions and intertwining with the symbolic dimension of existence, the experience of learning acquires depth and transformative value. The reflection on sensemaking (Weick, 1997) is grafted onto this terrain, understood as a propulsive principle that guides the shared construction of meaning in educational contexts.

Accessibility, in this perspective, cannot be said to be fully realized if knowledge does not question, does not take root in the interior landscapes of those who learn, does not connect to the symbolic matrices that shape the understanding of the world. Meaning is constructed in the meeting space between structure and life, between the order of disciplines and the disorder of vital worlds, where learning becomes relevant because it allows students to recognize themselves, to critically read reality, to orient themselves with awareness. It is not a question of multiplying knowledge, but of generating hermeneutic maps capable of supporting thought, nourishing action, offering tools to inhabit the complexity of the present.

Sensemaking, in this context, imposes itself as the cornerstone of meaningful learning: it orients its reflective quality, strengthens its existential density, expands its transformative scope. It is what allows knowledge to break free from the neutrality of the data to become a questioned, acted out and elaborated experience (Rosati, 2019). As Jonassen (2007) observes, the mind is fully activated only when it is involved in the resolution of authentic, situated and culturally dense problems: it is in these scenarios that knowledge takes shape, is shaped through action, intertwines cognitive, emotional, relational and ethical dimensions. Disciplines, in this light, cease to be closed systems and assert themselves as traversable symbolic and cognitive spaces, in which knowledge is contaminated by biographies and generates new connections. Novak (2002) highlights how meaningful learning occurs through the active construction of knowledge structures, in which new information is integrated into existing cognitive frameworks through a dynamic, reflective process. These cognitive spaces—where personal experience and conceptual understanding intersect—can be interpreted as “*theaters of meaning*”, in which knowledge and subjectivity engage in a continuous, co-constructive dialogue. It is within these contexts that one of the most essential and transversal competences of contemporary education is cultivated: *learning to learn*, understood as a metacognitive capacity and as the

ability to critically renegotiate the meanings of one's own developmental trajectory.

Bruner's thought (2002) also fits in this direction, urging us to adopt a narrative and constructivist conception of knowledge that does not remain abstract or suspended, but is understood as the product of shared discursive practices. It resides in the corporeality of learning, is renewed in the encounter with the other, is nourished by the desire for understanding and is structured as a continuous exercise in attributing meaning.

In the constant tension between systematicity and vitality, between methodological rigor and openness to the unexpected, learning finds fertile ground. It is not exhausted in the acquisition of skills, but generates critical awareness, ethical sensitivity and the ability to deeply read complexity. In this framework, teaching cannot be reduced to the mere organization of school time, but is structured as an intentional practice, rooted in relationships and oriented towards transformation: an action that enables subjectivity, calls upon plurality and fuels dense and transformative educational processes.

Sensemaking, therefore, asserts itself as a guiding principle of a reflective pedagogy, capable of combining depth and accessibility, theoretical rigor and openness to uncertainty, individual biographies and design horizons. The construction of meaning, however, does not only concern those who learn. In a complex educational ecology, the teacher is also involved in a continuous exercise of interpretation and renegotiation, called upon to compose disciplinary knowledge, emerging instances, personal experiences and cultural references, giving shape to contexts capable of questioning. Sensemaking thus becomes a strategic professional skill, which calls upon the teacher to build dynamic and productive environments: spaces in which questions have the right to citizenship, meanings are co-constructed and the educational experience is expressed in its relational and cognitive fullness. Teaching, in this perspective, is an intentional act and ethical responsibility, it is conscious planning and deep listening. It is, above all, taking care of the meaning that the educational experience takes on for those who live it, acting with attention, reflexivity and openness to the possible.

3. Towards a democratic teaching based on *Student Voice*

In the framework of an inclusive teaching that recognizes learning as a situated and deeply relational process, it is urgent to question the ways in which subjectivities manifest themselves, articulate themselves and legitimize themselves in school

contexts. Reflecting on who holds the word, on how it is welcomed, recognized in its discursive and cultural value, is equivalent to shifting attention from the sole content of learning to the conditions that make it possible, enhancing the dialogic dynamics that cross teaching and learning.

A teaching oriented to meaning is not limited to preparing accessible materials, but requires the intentional construction of generative environments, in which the student is not a simple recipient, but a conscious co-author of his own educational path. It is in this horizon that the perspective of Student Voice (SV) is placed, established in the Anglo-Saxon context in the 1990s, not as a simple pedagogical theory, but as a cultural paradigm that recognizes in the students' word an epistemic, ethical and political resource. The SV calls for a radical reconfiguration of educational relationships, based on practices of mutual listening, co-responsibility in negotiations and rethinking the role of the learner as an active and participatory subject. It is based on a radical assumption: learning deepens to the extent that the student is recognized as a competent interlocutor, capable of articulating thought, constructing knowledge and finding, in the educational path, a reflection of his or her own questions. Listening, in this perspective, cannot be reduced to an episodic disposition, but must be assumed as a structured educational practice, capable of welcoming the learner's voice as a reasoned proposal, a sign of reflective presence. It is only in this perspective that participation becomes a full exercise of cognitive and relational citizenship, supported by negotiating configurations and interpretative postures.

Numerous international studies have highlighted how authentic and systematic student involvement not only strengthens intrinsic motivation, but also contributes significantly to the creation of more equitable, participatory and inclusive educational contexts (Gemma, Grion, 2015). Giving value to the student voice, understood as a reflective and positioned expression, means defusing transmission and hierarchical structures, opening spaces for teaching based on the negotiation of meanings, on the valorization of argued dissent and on the conception of contrast and/or conflict as a resource. It is in this direction that Fielding's theoretical proposal (2015) moves, whose notion of "participatory democracy" takes on the features of a daily practice, based on attention and common commitment in the construction of educational meaning. Recognizing the student word as a discursive right implies a substantial change in the epistemological system of the school: it is not a matter of providing formal and ritualized moments of dialogic exchange, but of generating experiences in which the voice of the students acts as a transformative lever, capable of orienting the didactic action and of influencing the very structures of the school organization. As argued by Rudduck and Flutter (2004),

participation is not a concession from above, but a structural condition of learning; only starting from this recognition can the student inhabit the educational space as an epistemic subject, legitimized to question, negotiate and redefine the formative processes.

The Italian debate has also contributed significantly to the study of these issues. Studies by Grion and Dettori (2015), Ianes, Cappello and Demo (2017) highlight the fracture between institutional school culture and the plural experiences of students, a discontinuity that can compromise the very stability of the educational experience. The requests for greater protagonism, particularly in evaluation and decision-making processes, are accompanied by an implicit demand for openness, structured listening, legitimization of student thought as well-founded knowledge. Although many of these investigations retain an observational-descriptive perspective, they provide valuable indications for a redesign of teaching in a cooperative and proactive way.

In the academic context, research such as that of Cafagna (2015), Nigris and Zecca (2015) confirm the formative potential of reflective narration as a device for self-recognition and critical deconstruction of one's own path. Through autobiographical practices and projective writings, the student is put in a position to explore the connection between knowledge and subjectivity, between knowledge and identity. The studies of Ghislandi and Raffaghelli (2013) extend this perspective to the level of design and evaluation of learning environments, underlining the need to build spaces in which the word, presence and student agency are recognized as central elements of the educational architecture.

In this framework, the possibility of attributing meaning to the educational experience - also through the care of the word - re-emerges as a structuring variable of the quality of learning. Shared reflection on what is experienced - in classroom contexts, in group work, in writing activities, in discussion forums - allows knowledge to be anchored to experience, reconfiguring it as embodied and situated knowledge. Narrative practices, in this sense, do not constitute mere methodological aids, but real cognitive devices, capable of supporting critical thinking, symbolic elaboration and mutual recognition.

The SV does not limit itself, therefore, to outlining a theoretical framework, but provides a pedagogical orientation that assumes dialogue as a significant and generative principle of learning. Respect, co-responsibility and sharing cease to be rhetorical statements to translate into concrete design choices: from the co-construction of the curriculum to the valorization of differences, from the legitimization of plural points of view to the care of contexts in which sensemaking develops collectively and intentionally. In this perspective, practices such as *debate*

and reflective narration do not limit themselves to giving space to the student voice, but summon it as a hermeneutic and relational resource, capable of activating responsibility, critical awareness and a sense of belonging to educational processes.

4. The *debate* as a practice of inclusion

When teaching action is configured as a space for civil and constructive discussion and shared research, the debate establishes itself as an educational practice capable of supporting dense learning, oriented towards critical awareness, discursive responsibility, argumentation and refutation. Far from representing a marginal proposal or confined to selected contexts, the debate reveals itself to be a structurally complex pedagogical device, within which contents, experiences and subjectivity are composed in a dialogic plot that activates the word, solicits active perception and fuels critical thinking. Its methodological architecture effectively reflects the three founding axes of UDL - representation, expression/action and involvement - translating them into accessible, dynamic practices capable of intercepting the plurality of ways of learning (Cinganotto, Mosa, Panzavolta, 2021). The preparatory phase of the debate recalls the UDL principle of the variety of channels of representation. Students are encouraged to explore different sources – written texts, audiovisual materials, experiential data, testimonies – building a complex cognitive framework that stimulates a multiple and critical reading of reality. The use of visual aids such as concept maps, synoptic tables and graphic diagrams supports the organization of thought and promotes an autonomous and meaningful interaction with the contents. In this setting, the debate fuels a thought capable of deciphering complexity, integrating knowledge and experiences, generating transversal connections.

The second principle, relating to the diversification of forms of expression, finds particularly fertile ground in the debate. The functional distribution of roles – speaker, rebuttal, moderator, documenter, observer – favors functional participation, which respects individual inclinations and recognizes the value of multiple forms of contribution. In this context, oral argumentation is not reduced to a rhetorical exercise, but is realized as a cognitive and strategic practice: it requires time management, adaptability, situated awareness and cooperation. The variants that integrate multimedia or performative languages further broaden the participatory spectrum, including subjectivities that are often marginalized by more conventional teaching codes. Public intervention, thus understood, becomes a

generative act, a gesture of speech that questions, connects, and constructs meaning in the relationship with the other.

The third axis of UDL, focused on involvement, finds in the debate a privileged place to activate deep motivation. The discussion on issues of social, environmental or ethical relevance generates identification, mobilizes interest and strengthens the sense of belonging to a discursive community engaged in the shared construction of knowledge (Sanchez, 2018). The possibility of influencing the choice of topics, of defining argumentative strategies together with peers, of publicly assuming a position, fuels self-efficacy and increases commitment. Learning thus emancipates itself from the logic of appropriation to take the form of a negotiation process, in which critical elaboration and epistemic responsibility become founding nuclei of the experience.

In this configuration, the debate is organically intertwined with the Student Voice perspective: not only as an opportunity and space for expression, but as an educational practice capable of broadening perspectives, of encouraging active participation in the construction of educational paths and of involving students in the shared definition of meanings. In this scenario, the teacher redefines himself as an educational director, facilitator of dialogic dynamics, guarantor of the quality of the comparison (De Conti, Giangrande, 2018). The argumentation thus takes the form of an exercise in cognitive citizenship: it educates in shared responsibility, in the management of dissent as a transformative resource, in the construction of discursive bonds oriented towards the ethics of coexistence.

The effectiveness of the debate is further amplified in the dialogue with reflective narration: writing about oneself, reconstructing the experience, critically re-elaborating the path taken becomes an opportunity to transform knowledge into a story, to articulate a reflection that holds together concept and biography (Tassi, 2010). Narration is not a didactic appendix, but a practice of constructing meaning, through which the subject re-elaborates what he has learned, recognizes its value, anchors it to his own personal trajectory and opens it to a social dimension.

From the intertwining of debate and narration, a multivocal educational environment takes shape, in which languages contaminate each other, functions are redistributed and subjectivities recognize each other. Speaking in public, listening, writing, arguing, documenting become integrated educational actions, which mobilize lateral thinking, generate new connections and promote shared experiential learning. In this didactic landscape, knowledge opens up as a field of co-exploration, as a territory to inhabit and transform, in a continuous balance between lived experience and theorization, between individual voice and social

construction. It is in this movement that learning becomes a living practice, a space of awareness and a gesture of humanity.

Conclusions

In light of the path traced, taking on the challenge of inclusion means restoring educational action to its most authentic vocation: building environments in which each subjectivity is recognized in its uniqueness, finds effective possibilities of expression and actively participates in the construction of shared meanings. The school, in this perspective, is configured not as a simple place of transmission, but as a pedagogical and political space, capable of critically questioning the conditions that make learning accessible, significant and transformative.

Through the adoption of orientations such as Universal Design for Learning, sensemaking, Student Voice and debate, it has been highlighted how educational planning can transcend adaptive logic to become intentional practice, capable of enhancing the complexity of presences and promoting participatory dynamics. The teacher is thus encouraged to overcome the transmission logic, to assume a reflective and planning posture, attentive to variability, capable of generating open, inclusive and dialogic educational paths. Teaching translates, in this perspective, into a daily exercise of educational care, of epistemic responsibility, of openness to comparison as a source of renewal. At the same time, the student emerges no longer as a passive recipient, but as an active subject, owner of experiences, of perspectives, of questions that question and reshape knowledge itself. The recognition of his word, not as a formal concession but as a generative resource, opens up new ways of co-constructing knowledge, in which participation is rooted in the daily practice of educational citizenship.

In this framework, inclusive teaching is outlined not as a replicable model, but as an open field of research, crossed by planning tensions, by responsible choices and by educational relationships in continuous transformation. Each methodological decision is thus charged with an ethical and cultural meaning, measuring itself in the ability to make differences visible, to recognize every subjectivity as a resource, to weave memberships based on plurality.

Rethinking teaching starting from inclusion ultimately means broadening the horizon of the educational pact: from a simple agreement between formalized roles to collective responsibility in building a school that does not limit itself to managing complexity, but inhabits it as an epistemological and existential resource. A school that recognizes instability as the vital dynamism of learning, and in difference not

as an obstacle to overcome, but as the generative principle of its own formative identity.

Author contributions

The introduction and paragraph 3 are to be attributed to Marinella Muscarà; paragraphs 1,2,4 and the conclusions are to be attributed to Enza Manila Raimondo.

References

Arduini G. (2020), *Curriculum Innovation with Universal Design for Learning*, in «Education Sciences & Society», (11), 1, pp. 90-103.

Bochicchio F. (edited by). (2017), *L'agire inclusivo nella scuola. Logiche, metodologie e tecnologie per educatori e insegnanti*. Tricase (LE): Libellula.

Bruner J.S. (2002), *La fabbrica delle storie*. Bari: Laterza.

Cafagna V. (2015), Il mestiere di alunno attraverso i racconti testimoniali. Un'indagine esplorativa in Università. In C. Gemma, V. Grion (eds.), *Student Voice. Pratiche di partecipazione degli studenti e nuove implicazioni educative*. Barletta: Cafagna, pp. 185-198.

CAST (2018), *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines Version 2.2*. Author Da. Wakefield, MA.

Cinganotto L., Mosa E., Panzavolta S. (2021), *Il Debate. Una metodologia per potenziare le competenze chiave*. Roma: Carocci.

Cottini L. (2016), *Autodeterminazione nelle persone con disabilità. Percorsi educativi per svilupparla*, Trento: Erickson.

Cottini L. (2019), *Universal Design for Learning e Curricolo Inclusivo. Imparare a progettare una didattica funzionale ai bisogni della classe e dei singoli. Strategie e strumenti. Unità didattiche per tutte le discipline*. Firenze: Giunti Edu.

Cristol D. (2025), *L'apprendimento nell'era dell'intelligenza artificiale. Rivoluzioni Sfide Opportunità*. Roma: Anicia.

Dainese R. (2019), *La rete di relazioni a sostegno della Didattica per l'inclusione*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.

De Conti M., Giangrande M. (2018), *Debate. Pratica, teoria e pedagogia*. Milano: Pearson.

Fielding M. (2015). Student voice as deep democracy. In C. McLaughlin (Ed.), *The connected school: A design for well-being – supporting children and young people in schools to flourish, thrive and achieve*. London: Pearson, pp. 26-32.

Geake J.G. (2016), *Il cervello a scuola: Neuroscienze e educazione tra verità e falsi miti*. Trento: Erickson.

Gemma C., Grion V. (2015), *Student Voice: pratiche di partecipazione degli studenti e nuove implicazioni educative*. Barletta: Cafagna.

Ghislandi P., Raffaghelli J. (2013), La voce degli studenti per la qualità dell'Elearning nella formazione universitaria. Un approccio partecipativo. In V. Grion, A. Cook-Sather (edited by), *Student Voice. Prospettive internazionali e pratiche emergenti in Italia*. Milano: Guerini Scientifica, pp. 273-286.

Giaconi C., Del Bianco N., D'Angelo I. (2024), *La progettazione come dispositivo inclusivo*. In P. Aiello, C. Giaconi (eds.). *L'agire inclusivo. Interfacce pedagogiche e didattiche. Manuale per l'insegnante*. Brescia: Editrice Morcellania, pp. 75-98.

Grion V., Cook-Sather A. (edited by) (2013), *Student Voice. Prospettive internazionali e pratiche emergenti in Italia*, Milano: Guerini.

Grion V., Dettori F. (2015). Student voice: nuove traiettorie della ricerca educativa. In M. Tomarchio & S. Ulivieri (Ed.), *Pedagogia militante. Diritti, culture, territorio*. Pisa: ETS, pp. 851-859.

lanes D., Cappello S., Demo H. (2017), *Teacher and Student Voices: A comparison Between Two Perspective to Study Integration Processes in Italy*. In «European Journal of Special Needs Education», 32, 3, pp. 301-313.

Jonassen D.H. et Al. (2007), *Meaningful Learning with technology*. Merrill: Person Education.

Littlefield R.S. (2001), *High School Student Perception of the Efficacy of Debate Participation*, in «Argumentation and Advocacy», 38, pp. 83-97.

Mace R. (1985), *Universal Design, Barrier Free Environments for Everyone*. Los Angeles: Designers West.

Mangiatordi A. (2017), *Didattica senza barriera*. Milano: ETS.

Nigris E., Zecca L. (2015). «Student teachers's voices». Valutazione della formazione iniziale degli insegnanti e sviluppo della professionalità. In C. Gemma, V. Grion (eds.), *Student Voice. Pratiche di partecipazione degli studenti e nuove implicazioni educative*. Barletta: Cafagna, pp. 145-161.

Novak, J. D. (2002). Meaningful learning: The essential factor for conceptual change in limited or inappropriate propositional hierarchies leading to empowerment of learners. *Science Education*, 86(4), pp. 548–571.

Oliverio A. (2012), *Prima lezione di neuroscienze*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Piazza R. (2023), *Inclusione*. Brescia: Editrice Morcellania.

Rosati L. (2019), *Sense-making. Organizzare il mare dell'informazione e creare valore con le persone*. Roma: UXUniversity.

Rudduck J., Flutter J. (2004), *How to improve your school: Giving pupils a voice*, London: Continuum Press.

Sanchez C. (2018), *Il Debate nelle scuole*. Milano: Pearson.

Savia G. (2016), *Universal Design for Learning. Progettazione Universale per l'apprendimento e didattica inclusiva*. Trento: Erickson.

Sgambelluri R. (2020), *Dall'ICF all'Universal Design for Learning. Itinerari didattici e prospettive inclusive*. Roma: Anicia.

Tassi S.M. (2010), *L'arte dell'argomentare*. Perugia: Edizioni Corsare.

Tempesta M. (2018), *Motivare alla conoscenza*. Brescia: Editrice Morcelliana.

UN (2006), *United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. New York.

Weick K.E. (1997), *Senso e significato nell'organizzazione*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.