HEADS UP patterns and questions in attempts to represent and engage with non-dominant communities

Historical pattern of engagement and representation	Whose idea of development/ education / the way forward?	Whose template for knowledge production?
Hegemony (justifying dominance and supporting domination)	What assumptions and imaginaries inform the ideal of development and education in this initiative?	Whose knowledge is perceived to have universal value? How come? How can this imbalance be addressed?
Ethnocentrism (projecting the views of one group as universal)	What is being projected as ideal, normal, good, moral, natural or desirable? Where do these assumptions come from?	How is dissent addressed? How are dissenting groups framed and engaged with?
Ahistoricism (forgetting historical legacies and complicities)	How is history, and its ongoing effects on social/ political/ economic relations, addressed (or not) in the formulation of problems and solutions?	How is the historical connection between dispensers and receivers of knowledge framed and addressed?
Depoliticization (disregarding power inequalities and ideological roots of analyses and proposals)	What analysis of power relations has been performed? Are power imbalances recognized, and if so, how are they either critiqued or rationalized? How are they addressed?	Do educators and students recognize themselves as culturally situated, ideologically motivated and potentially incapable of grasping important alternative views?
Self-congratulatory and Self-serving attitude (oriented towards self-affirmation /CV building)	How are marginalized peoples represented? How are those students who intervene represented? How is the relationship between these groups two represented?	Do individuals recognize themselves as part of the problem? Who is exalted by the resource? Who benefits from this exaltation?
Un-complicated solutions (ignoring the complexity of epistemological, ontological and metaphysical dominance)	Has the urge to 'make a difference' weighted more in decisions than critical systemic thinking about origins and implications of 'solutions'?	Are simplistic analyses offered and answered in ways that do not invite people to engage with complexity or recognize complicity in systemic harm?
Paternalism (seeking affirmation of superiority through the provision of help)	How are those at the receiving end of this initiative expected to respond to the 'help' they receive?	Does this initiative promote the symmetry of less powerful groups and recognize these groups' legitimate right to disagree with the formulation of problems and solutions proposed?