

## Helpdesk Report: Inclusive and Effective Schools

Date: 26 July 2013

**Query:** Identify the characteristics and practices of schools that are both inclusive and effective in terms of pupil attainment

### Content

1. Overview
2. Case studies
3. Inclusion reports
4. Further resources
5. Additional information

#### 1. Overview

It was difficult to find research where effectiveness in terms of attainment was reported. The goal of inclusive education often seems to be inclusion itself or attendance rather than completion or graded learning outcomes. Outcomes of inclusive education are often illusive and difficult to measure. The World Bank suggest tests of content knowledge provide only one indicator of impact, and are not strongly linked to success in adult life, nor do they provide a measure of creative and analytical problem-solving skills needed for survival. The challenge is to measure success in terms of broad indicators of outcomes and impact.

Education in Lao People's Democratic Republic has focussed on quality alongside inclusivity and is the key case study in this report. The characteristic identified as important was changing the dominant educational pedagogy from teacher-centred to child-centred. In-service training for teachers was not found to have an impact. An important initiative was establishing schools into groups so they could work on similar issues together and provide mutual support. Development and use of the Inclusive Education School Improvement and Self Evaluation Tool was also important. The data show an increase in students passing grades in Inclusive Education schools. Data also show an increase in children with special needs and disabilities passing (from 2418 in 2005 to 3052 in 2007).

An evaluation team found the following initiatives and factors contributing to success:

- Strategic training covering key areas of teaching and school management designed to develop school quality.
- Monitoring and support was regular, ensuring that every school received 4 visits a year from district implementation teams.
- Schools tended to be located in or near to towns, or close to roads to enable access to training and support. This meant that most project schools found it relatively easy to attract teachers to work in them.

- Motivated and enthusiastic teachers, who usually lived in the local community. The attitude of the teachers was fundamental in ensuring that inclusive child centred practice was being developed in the school.
- A Principal with good understanding of learner friendly practice who offered regular support and monitoring to teachers.
- Schools which had a close and collaborative working relationship with their local community and parents were far more likely to be successful in developing learner friendly environments.

A case study of inclusion in Romania reports some success in terms of attainment. It highlights support such as a family counselling unit as important to success. Positive attitudes and training of staff is also identified.

Study of UK data has found a very small and negative statistical relationship between the level of inclusivity in a school and the attainments of its pupils. However, the researchers note that this is unlikely to be a causal relationship. A different study of data in England found that disabled students performed better in mainstream schools than in special schools.

A World Bank report finds that retention and drop-out in inclusive schools in the South is linked to curriculum and instruction. Innovative approaches to making the curriculum relevant, tying it to functional life-skills, and matching it with cultural beliefs and priorities is directly related to improved retention rates.

## 2. Case studies

### **A Quality Education for All. A History of the Lao PDR Inclusive Education Project 1993-2009**

Grimes, P. 2009. Save the Children

[http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/A\\_Quality\\_Education\\_For\\_All\\_LaoPDR.pdf](http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/A_Quality_Education_For_All_LaoPDR.pdf)

The Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) Inclusive Education (IE) Project ran for 16 years ending in May 2009. One of the main aims was to ensure that the education that all students receive was of a high quality. This has necessitated focusing on trying to change the dominant educational pedagogy from teacher-centred to child-centred. The original design of the IE Project tried to maximise its impact in terms of quality and the range of children whose needs could be met.

#### Target Group:

- Children with disabilities including those with mild and moderate disabilities
- Children failing in school whether because of learning problems or because of other factors

#### Features of the Project Design:

- Special help and concern for the whole target group.
- Changes in teaching methodology so that diversity is catered for.
- Flexible approach to the curriculum and assessment.
- Where extra help is not available, group work and peer tutoring support techniques are used instead. Families are used to provide back up where needed and where possible.
- Children are required to start at Grade 1 and follow the basic curriculum, with amendments as necessary.
- The needs of children with severe learning needs may not be met, particularly as they get older.
- The needs of children with profound and multiple disabilities may not be met because the standard curriculum may be unsuitable.

The first IE Project school identified more training as integral to supporting the development of practice. In fact the school received 60 days of training over the course of the first two years but this had relatively little impact on classroom practice. This is a pattern that seems to be repeated in many countries, where teachers and policy makers will tend to identify in-service training as being the most important initiative to support the inclusion of students with disabilities, yet, as in this case, training does not always have impact. It needs to be supported by a combination of other factors.

An important initiative was to introduce schools into the project in small groups. The importance of establishing local groups of schools working on similar issues together, cannot be overemphasised. Whilst the implementation team could offer support and monitoring to schools, the benefits arising through schools working collaboratively together and offering mutual help could prove invaluable. This would be built on through an annual meeting of all the participants to review progress, share experiences and plan for the coming years. One crucial factor in their success is the role of local facilitators experienced in the context in which schools are working, who can bring schools together on a regular basis and set a clear focus for them to work on together.

Initially the Project expansion appeared to be successful. Monitoring of the schools showed:

- An increase in the numbers of children with disabilities in the 10 schools
- All groups of children were making better progress due to improvements in teaching
- Grade passing was improving
- Local communities welcomed the project because they could see that all the children were benefitting from improved quality of education
- Neighbouring schools were actively seeking to become involved in the project expansion

Significant lessons learnt by the IE Project team in relation to the structure and management of the project include:

- The Ministry of Education must take on management and administration of any education project as early as possible to ensure sustainability, capacity building and dissemination of lessons learned.
- Projects concerned with the education of children, should be located within the Ministry of Education. Other Ministries may have supporting roles, working in partnership and collaborating to ensure appropriate expertise is in place, but they should not have management or coordinating responsibility for education projects or provisions.

The mid-term review of the Inclusive Education Project in May 2002, recommended the development of an assessment tool for use in schools which could also be used to improve the quality of educational provision. This suggestion led one of the most significant developments in the life of the project – the Inclusive Education School Improvement and Self Evaluation tool, or, as it has now become known, ‘Developing Quality Schools for All – a school improvement and self evaluation process’.

The data for the number of students passing grades in IE schools, shows an increase from 2004 to 2007 with a total grade pass rate in 2006 of 86%. The data for children with special needs and disabilities also shows an increase from 2418 in 2005, to 3052 in 2007. However, it is important to note that the percentage of children with special needs passing grades is lower than the percentage figure for other children – 78% compared to 86% in 2007. Despite an increase in the number of students with special needs and disabilities passing grades in 2005 – 6, from 2418 to 2642, when expressed as a percentage of the number of children in school with disabilities, there is in fact a drop of 4% from 73% to 69%.

A summary of the impact of the IE Project on school performance would seem to indicate that there are positive outcomes for students attending IE schools, particularly those students with disabilities and special needs. This publication does not present a detailed comparison with national data sets on the performance of all schools across the country. However, it seems clear that many IE schools are presenting data indicating a high level of performance, which can be seen to be significant in a country which is trying to improve grade passing, retention and primary completion rates. The evaluation visits to schools explored the context for these positive outcomes. It was the view of the evaluation team, that where schools were being successful this could be attributed to a number of important factors.

These factors were linked to the strategic expansion of the IE Project and the ways in which schools were supported through key initiatives:

- Strategic training covering key areas of teaching and school management designed to develop school quality.
- Monitoring and support through Phase 1 and 2 of the Project was regular, ensuring that every school received 4 visits a year from district implementation teams, who in turn received 2 visits a year from PIT.
- It is also important to recognise that the schools chosen for the expansion of the project tended to be located in or near to towns, or close to roads to enable access to training and support. This meant that most project schools found it relatively easy to attract teachers to work in them. Additionally, as the Project did not engage with schools in very remote or inaccessible areas, it did not face more significant challenges to enrolment and completion of Primary School.
- During the evaluation visits to schools, over 100 lessons were observed. The judgements of the evaluation team indicated that most of the teachers observed working in IE schools, were motivated and enthusiastic about their work. They were found to be genuinely engaged in trying to support children with disabilities and they reported that the IE project had had a very significant and positive impact on their practice, the school and the community as a whole. The evidence from classroom observations indicates that many teachers were actively trying to move from a teacher centred pedagogy to a child centred approach. There was evidence of teachers experiencing success with initiatives such as the use of resources to support lessons, organising the students in groups and encouraging discussion, relating lessons to students own experiences and the real world.

The IE Project Evaluation Team found that where schools are developing a learner friendly environment there tended to be certain key factors:

- Motivated and enthusiastic teachers, who usually lived in the local community. The attitude of the teachers was fundamental in ensuring that inclusive child centred practice was being developed in the school.
- A Principal with good understanding of learner friendly practice who offered regular support and monitoring to teachers.
- Regular monitoring and support from District Advisory Implementation Teams who also had a good understanding of child centred learning.
- Teachers who had received in-service training in IE / child friendly approaches within the last 3 or 4 years. Schools where teachers had received IE training or refresher courses in IE relatively recently were more likely to be aware of developments in child centred teaching pedagogy.
- Good communication / partnership working with the local community. Schools which had a close and collaborative working relationship with their local community and parents were far more likely to be successful in developing learner friendly environments.

The overall finding of the IE evaluation, was that children with mild and moderate disabilities are mostly being successfully included in their local schools; their attendance is good and

grade repetition has dropped significantly following MoE guidance on this issue. Teachers are actively supporting students mostly through key strategies that they have been taught in IE training:

- Actively giving extra attention in class to children with disabilities. The most effective support for students with disabilities was observed where teachers were actively sitting with or working with students individually or in a group. Many students need help and support from the teacher to practice certain skills or just to understand the concepts which are being taught.
- Ensuring that they are sitting with other children who can support them in their work. It is not possible or beneficial for teachers to sit with or support students with disabilities all the time. It is more beneficial for students to support each other with their learning. Enabling children to experience a range of groups and friends supports the development of positive self-esteem, which is a key component of being a successful learner.
- Wherever possible using resources to support student's learning; usually comprising of stones or chopsticks for maths, pictures and flashcards for Lao language. The IE Project has provided schools with a small amount of money each year, approximately \$50, to support the production of resources using local materials. The most effective IE schools have organised themselves, and often members of the local community, to produce these materials on a regular basis. In schools which are developing learner friendly classrooms, these resources are being actively used in the classroom to support children's learning.
- Collaborating and communicating with parents to encourage them to support and work with children at home. Many students need support at home – in effective IE schools the teachers, parents and community have worked closely together to develop innovative approaches to supporting learning out of school.

The report goes on to describe challenges and detail some case studies of good practices.

### **Including the Excluded: Meeting diversity in education. Example from Romania.**

UNESCO, 2001

<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001231/123165eo.pdf>

#### **The inclusion of children with disabilities at the School: 'Dimitrie Sturdza' of Iasi.**

In 1990, the school opened its first special class for children with (specific) learning difficulties. There is a new intake annually and when the children with learning difficulties reach the lower secondary classes, they enter the mainstream classes, as the school management considers that at this stage special classes are no longer the most effective way of educating them.

The teachers in the school were responsible for setting up the special class. They decided that the teacher in charge should be "tenured"; that is, he or she has to sit a senior degree examination at the end of the school year. They felt this would help to ensure the teacher's commitment. This view was borne out by the inspector's positive reaction to the teacher's work.

The school estimates that currently nearly 200 of its students (10% of the school population) have special needs.

The key strategies and methods used in the inclusion process were:

- Informing and assisting the teaching staff, the pupils and parents by various means, including the school Family Counselling Team (FCT).
- Paying special attention to the students most opposed to the inclusion of children with special needs. The children with special needs were invited to join in all the class and school activities (in-school and out-of-school). The teachers were asked to make

correct progress assessments on each child, define operational objectives for the “minimum” level of the continuous and final evaluation and provide all possible support in the educational process.

- Providing support and counselling to the most reluctant families.

Strengths contributing to the success of the children’s inclusion:

- The positive attitude of the head teacher, based on both her own beliefs and her experience as a teacher in residential special schools has facilitated the integration.
- The positive attitude and the experience of some of the teachers who had previously worked in special schools has been a great asset.
- Five teachers participated in a training course given in 1995-1996 by the School Inspectorate of Iasi which was based on the UNESCO ‘Teacher Education Resource Pack: Special Needs in the Classroom’ within the framework of the National Programme for the Integration of Disabled Children carried out by the Ministry of Education in cooperation with UNICEF Romania.
- The education authorities (the School Inspectorate of Iasi) have been very open and supportive to the initiative.
- The in-school Family Counselling Unit (1996 onwards) has facilitated to work with families.
- The specialist departments of the University of Iasi have shown interest.
- The technical assistance provided by the University of Iasi, the FCU and the Special Needs in Classroom course have helped the developments in the school.

Both the in-house and external evaluation showed clear positive outcomes:

- School failure and drop-out rates decreased.
- A smaller number of children from the area are now going to special schools.
- A more positive attitude towards disabled children has been developed and there is recognition of both their potential and achievements.
- Teachers have developed and are using better educational strategies and practices for all the children.
- There is a more efficient collaboration between school, family and community.
- Families show more interest in the education and rehabilitation of children with special needs (the parents have free access to school and attend classes in order to assess the children’s participation and results).
- There is better social integration of children with disabilities.

In addition, the teaching staff shows more tolerance and understanding of child-related issues, and teachers’ views about disabled children have changed. The psycho-social benefits to the disabled children were positive. They were all promoted to the next class and some came top. The disabled children in ordinary classes join in all school and extra-curricular activities and, when special adjustments or help are required, they have their peers’ support.

### **Inclusion of disabled children in a school in Timisoara**

The major positive factors contributing to the success of inclusion in this case study are:

- The parents’ initiative, supported by the NGO Sperantu, which is an illustration of how parents can act as a pressure group to bring about educational innovation.
- The human and professional profile of School No. 22 teaching staff, particularly the head teacher and the psychologist, who were willing to take on this challenge. The head teacher’s influence and attitude are crucial in any school.
- The openness of the county School Inspectorate.
- The contribution of the Rehabilitation Centre S’eranta - an NGO until 1996, when it became a Centre for Special Education reporting to the Ministry of Education. The first group of eight children with special needs, and most of those included in the following years, were given community-based rehabilitation support by the Centre.

## **Making Schools Inclusive. How change can happen. Save the Children's experience.**

Save the Children, 2008

<http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/Making%20schools%20inclusive%20SCUK.pdf>

### **China: Sign-bilingual education for Deaf children**

Since 1999, Save the Children has been working in partnership with a small number of special schools to pilot 'sign-bilingual' education, developed for China with Amity Foundation. A Deaf teacher is given access to Save the Children and other international NGO teacher training, and is supported to teach children in their own language – natural sign language, termed 'China Sign'. Chinese script is taught as a second language (using natural sign language as the medium of instruction), so that children can communicate in writing with hearing people and progress through the formal education system. Children are supported and encouraged to communicate with their parents through sign language.

The pilot projects are being run in a small number of special schools in Anhui and Yunnan provinces. The immediate impact of sign-bilingual teaching on children is dramatic. Children are progressing better in school, and are able to communicate with hearing people and more fluently with other Deaf children, because their language is being developed in the classroom as well as socially. Children in the bilingual pilot classes are significantly happier and have higher educational achievements and communication skills than other Deaf children in the same schools. The attitudes of many parents and teachers towards the teaching of Deaf children have, as a result, been radically altered.

### **Training mainstream teachers to include disabled children**

Save the Children ran in-service inclusive training sessions for teachers and parents of young children in Dornod, Hovd, Bayan-Ulgii and Bayanhongor aimags (provinces), as well as in Ulaanbaatar. The sessions focused on methodologies for teaching disabled children in mainstream classes. Several workshops have been run for teachers at different levels within the pilot aimags (sub-divisions in Mongolia), including for preschool and lower primary school teachers.

The design and content of the training drew on the expertise of special educators who had been trained under the previous segregated education system. Their knowledge of ways to support learning and active living for disabled children was important. Involving special educators meant they did not feel shut out of inclusive education efforts, making it less likely they would resist change towards inclusive education in mainstream schools.

A 2005 review indicated that teachers who were trained are convinced of the difference they can make for disabled children. They are more keen to work with parents, partly to show them the results of their children's progress and achievements, and partly to persuade other parents to bring their disabled children to kindergarten and school. There was a clear increase in the numbers of disabled children enrolling in preschool and primary school: from 22% to 44% in aimags where the approach was used.

Disabled children have expressed their confidence in coming to school because they are treated well by teachers. Parents and classmates of Deaf children have attended sign language classes as part of a programme to improve community support for disabled children. Classmates have enjoyed learning to sign and are happy to be able to communicate with and support their friends. Such processes contribute to further attitude change. Before, Deaf children were isolated within their families – now they are part of the community.

The teacher training has evolved to help teachers develop skills for identifying and recording the particular characteristics of all their pupils. This gives them some knowledge and confidence to refer children to local health or social protection services when they think that

physical rehabilitation, medical interventions or family financial support would help the child to be more effectively included in education.

### **Community-based Education Management Information System**

C-EMIS is a tool which helps community members, children, parents and teachers to come together, collect information on barriers to education, look at the causes and identify solutions. Often, the main concern of C-EMIS is to obtain information about the number of children not in school and reasons for this. Schools then develop local community action plans that address the problems.

Save the Children projects in Nepal and Tajikistan are described and increased attendance of disabled children is reported.

### **Inclusion Made Easy. A quick program guide to disability in development**

CBM, 2012

[http://www.cbm.org/article/downloads/78851/CBM\\_Inclusion\\_Made\\_Easy\\_-\\_Complete\\_Guide.doc](http://www.cbm.org/article/downloads/78851/CBM_Inclusion_Made_Easy_-_Complete_Guide.doc)

### **Case study: Alternative Basic Education centres provide opportunities for children with a disability in rural Ethiopia, Plan Ethiopia**

#### **Programme summary**

The goal of Universal Primary Education can be challenging to attain in countries where formal primary education is not reaching all children, especially the most disadvantaged. Access to school is affected by a range of factors including distance, overcrowding, low teacher–student ratios and lack of learning materials.

In Ethiopia, Plan International Ethiopia is expanding primary education in rural areas through establishing low-cost Alternative Basic Education (ABE) centres with community members, local NGOs and local district education offices. The ABE centres are designed so that students gradually move into formal primary schools and provide opportunities for out-of-school children in Grades 1 to 4. Through a process of community consultation, communities and children decide on a location for the centres. Plan also trains the ABE teachers and covers salaries until the community is able to mobilise resources. The programme provides appropriate learning materials and, where necessary, school feeding programmes. Plan's ABE programme assists the Ethiopian government to provide education to the most disadvantaged children who cannot attend school due to distance and disability.

#### **Lessons learned**

Plan's experience shows that community-based alternative education centres can provide pathways into formal education. Access to education was increased with improved attendance and decreased number of dropouts, particularly of girls. The ABE centres have also proven to create access to primary education for children with a disability and other marginalised children.

## **3. Inclusion reports**

### **Inclusion and Pupil Achievement**

Dyson, A. et al. 2004. Department for Education and Skills and the University of Newcastle.

<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR578.pdf>

This study looked for evidence of the effect that inclusion has on attainment levels. A very small and negative statistical relationship between the level of inclusivity in a school and the



attainments of its pupils was found. The possibility that this is a causal relationship cannot entirely be ruled out, though this seems unlikely.

There are four reasons for this:

- 1) There is considerable variation in the performance of schools with similar levels of inclusivity, suggesting that school level factors are more important than levels of inclusivity per se.
- 2) The small negative relationship between inclusion and school performance can be explained by the fact that schools with higher levels of inclusion tend to be schools serving more disadvantaged – and hence lower attaining – populations.
- 3) The case studies suggest that highly-inclusive schools tend to manage inclusion in broadly similar ways which seem likely to minimise any impact inclusion might have on attainment. Both higher and lower performing schools operate a similar model of provision.
- 4) Although there are observable differences between highly-inclusive schools with different levels of performance, these are complicated by broad similarities between schools and considerable variation within schools. Moreover, they seem to relate to factors (resourcing issues, skill in responding to the achievement agenda, detailed implementation of the inclusion model) which are not directly attributable to the level of inclusivity in the school.

### **Inclusive Education: Achieving Education For All By Including Those With Disabilities and Special Educational Needs**

Peters, S.J. 2003. World Bank.

<http://www.hiproweb.org/fileadmin/cdroms/Education/EducationIntegreeEN.pdf>

Large-scale cross-national studies in developed countries provide extensive information on best practice for Inclusive Education. A high priority involves teacher training, perhaps not surprisingly, due to the fact that personnel resources constitute approximately 80% of all school expenditures. All of the studies cited in this review recommend that teacher training focus on enhancing the skills of classroom teachers in areas of pedagogy, curriculum development and adaptation. Training should be intentional and classroom-based, intensive, and on-going in order to promote sustainable effective practice. Second, in priority, is school-as-a-whole reform to support classroom practice. Important factors in whole-school reform include involved leadership, co-ordination of services, multi-disciplinary planning, parental involvement in decision-making, and in-school support systems to build capacity.

Although a definite trend toward inclusive practice and increase in inclusive education programming is evident in all developed countries, considerable variation exists, most notably in the areas of classification and placement decisions. In addition, all countries face several challenges. The most significant of these are meeting the needs of SEN (Special Educational Needs) students in secondary schools, funding, and resource constraints. Special issues of accountability are exerting enormous pressures on schools to document effectiveness in terms of outcomes. This emphasis on accountability represents a significant shift from issues of access and quality of services. Systems of evaluation and documentation of effectiveness in terms of outcomes are lacking and need attention. While the studies provide some evidence of positive Inclusive Education effects, gaps in research are most noticeable in this area. Finally, significant gender differences exist that reveal a bias toward boys and were noted as a potentially significant area of concern that was largely omitted in the studies. These lessons from developed countries constitute a first-wave of Inclusive Education reform in terms of practice.

In order to describe the dynamics and comprehensiveness of Inclusive Education in the developing countries, this review uses a framework for analysis that includes four domains of inputs, processes, outcomes, and contextual factors in an open-system. An open-system not

only accounts for external factors influencing Inclusive Education (e.g., policy, legislation, cultural and socio-economic conditions), but considers these 'external' factors as integral components of Inclusive Education development as a whole. This open system is a particular strength of Inclusive Education in countries of the South.

The most challenging and critical aspects of Inclusive Education (IE) development in terms of inputs include: (1) student access, retention and drop-out rates; (2) finding, identifying, and encouraging children to go to school; (3) poverty and associated characteristics of student background; (4) attitudes toward SEN and students with disabilities; (5) conditions of teachers' work; (6) flexible, adaptive and functional life - skills curriculum relevant to students' lives. In terms of process, school climate, collaboration, support, and integrated services/teacher training prove challenging as process domains. Outcomes of Inclusive Education are often illusive and difficult to measure. Student achievement tests of content knowledge provide only one indicator of impact, and are not strongly linked to success in adult life, nor do they provide a measure of creative and analytical problem-solving skills needed for survival. The challenge is to measure success in terms of broad indicators of outcomes and impact. Research suggests that IE programmes should look for improvements in terms of contextual factors: individual, family, community, organisation, and government. Specific indicators include: presence, participation, choice, respect, knowledge and skills.

Validated Programme Approaches and Key Lessons:

- Education goals are often elusive and difficult to measure.
- Development takes time.
- Process is often as important as product.
- Decentralisation and autonomy are important tools but not panaceas for solutions.
- Partnerships and networks are needed at all levels of the system.
- Integrated and multi-sectoral approaches to learning are essential.
- Good practices must be carefully analyzed and promoted, and models of good practice must be creatively used.
- Diversity, not standard solutions to complex problems, must be the norm.
- Mobilisation and advocacy at all levels are essential.

In the developing countries, retention and drop-out rates have been linked to curriculum and instruction. Typically the focus has been on adapted curriculum and upgrading teachers' skills by providing training in child-centred, active pedagogy/instruction. Less often, the curriculum content itself is challenged. Innovative approaches to making the curriculum relevant, tying it to functional life-skills, and matching it with cultural beliefs and priorities is directly related to improved retention rates. The lesson that has been learned is that adapting a curriculum that is not relevant or is not teaching functional life skills in the first place, does little to motivate students to stay in school. In India, for example: Many parents cite the irrelevance of the curriculum as a reason for not sending their children to school. They feel the curriculum is not geared to real life, and fruitful years of income generation will be lost even if the child receives only a primary education.

Curriculum development is therefore seen as an important input to IE programmes as well as process. An in-depth case study of Uganda describes an alternative basic education programme that focused on functional life skills, and built on the cultural values of the semi - nomadic Karaimojong families. While still in implementation phase, the project has already reached 8,000 children.

The Open School Methodology in Brazil addresses exclusion and focuses on links between curriculum and retention rates.

Outcomes of IE are often illusive and difficult to measure. Student achievement tests of content knowledge provide only one indicator of impact, and are not strongly linked to

success in adult life, nor do they provide a measure of creative and analytical problem-solving skills needed for survival. The challenge is to measure success in terms of broad indicators of outcomes and impact. One suggestion is that IE programmes look for improvements at all levels: individual, family, community, organisation, and government. Specific indicators include: presence, participation, choice, respect, knowledge and skills. Another recommendation is evaluation of IE programmes at all levels (institutional and teacher performance as well as student performance) and against the goals of inclusion within a democratic, human-rights-based environment.

Qualities of successful inclusive schools in developing countries include:

- Early intervention when children are still in the formative stage of development.
- Small classes.
- Well-trained and valued teachers.
- Multi-ability groups.
- Positive learning environments (that is, a sense of community and commitment to mutual benefit).
- Strong parental involvement.

This literature review provides overwhelming evidence that training and professional development are central to IE practice in countries of the North and South. The review has highlighted exemplary training programmes and provided detailed descriptions of factors that promote effective training, as well as challenges and barriers. Positives include:

- When special and general education teacher training are integrated and/or complementary.
- When teachers learn innovative child-centered strategies to teach a diverse range of abilities, as well as strategies that promote active student learning and adaptations to meet individual student needs.
- When teachers learn curriculum development strategies that encompass broad common goals; facilitate flexible structure; provide alternative/multiple assessments based on individual progress; address cultural/religious/linguistic diversity of learners; and content, knowledge and skills are relevant to learners' lived experiences.
- When teacher training provides hands-on experiences and opportunities for critical reflection as well as continuous/on-going feedback and support in classrooms.

Negatives include:

- Training that focuses on individual "generic" deficits and categories of disability.
- Training that expects teachers to change their ways of teaching without addressing changes needed in conditions of their work that may act as barriers to these changes (e.g., class size, lack of classroom materials and supports).
- Training that promotes alternative assessments while schools require performance on standardised tests as the primary indicator of success.
- Teacher training that does not also include training school administrators, who without this training, may impede teacher reform rather than facilitate or support it.

School Effectiveness Reform and IE are not synonymous. Some aspects of school effectiveness reform act as barriers to IE; e.g., evidence suggests that schools may reject students who do not measure up on standardised test scores, or who are 'difficult' to teach. The narrow emphasis on performance outcomes as measured by standardised test scores often disadvantages students when consideration for accommodations such as alternative formats and primary language differences are not given. Many SEN students can and do perform as well or better than their peers, when given appropriate accommodations. As a result, policy implications point to school restructuring and reform that considers broader policy/practice—especially in terms of outcomes. However, standards need not be lowered for SEN students. IDEA 1997 in the United States mandates high expectations through requiring documented progress of SEN students in the general education curriculum. This requirement, however, emphasises individual progress towards broad goals, and not

comparative measures. The literature also provides a growing body of evidence that IE benefits all students, not just SEN students. School reform policy should therefore focus on a unified system that provides an environment in which all students have an equal opportunity to reach their maximum potential. The distinction between equal opportunity and equal treatment is central to IE policy. IE does not mean that everyone should be treated equally (one-size-fits-all), but that individualised supports (treatment according to need) aim toward equal success that is measured broadly.

### **Implementing Inclusive Education. A Commonwealth Guide to Implementing Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**

Rieser, R. 2012. Commonwealth Secretariat.

<http://bit.ly/134jEgZ>

In this revised and expanded second edition of *Implementing Inclusive Education*, a picture of the future is constructed by critically examining programmes geared towards inclusive education across the Commonwealth and beyond. Article 24 of the United Nations Convention of Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) requires the development of an inclusive education system at all levels, where children and students with disabilities can be part of their local school alongside their non-disabled peers, with the right support and accommodation to develop academically and socially.

One of the conclusions is in different achievement outcomes for disabled pupils in various types of education in England. The figures for pupils who have Statements – the highest level of need – are revealing. In 2010, 54.8 per cent of pupils with a Statement attended mainstream schools. While it is true that 30,000 of those attending special schools had severe or profound learning difficulties, the remaining 60,000 had the same range of impairments as pupils who attended mainstream schools. Data demonstrates great inequality of outcome between special and mainstream schooling for groups of children with similar impairments. At the end of primary school, children on the autistic spectrum who attend mainstream schools are 23 times more likely to do well than children in special schools. This disparity continues at age 16 with a 25-fold difference at higher qualifications or a 12-fold difference at lower level basic qualifications. There is a similar difference of outcomes for pupils who have moderate learning difficulties as their main presenting impairment – with children in mainstream education doing 20 times better than children in special schools at the end of primary school, with no pupils in special schools recorded as achieving the required Level 4. At the age of 16, four times as many secondary school pupils with moderate learning difficulties in mainstream schools achieved five GCSE passes at Grades A–C as their peers in special schools and 35 times as many achieved the lower level of five GCSE passes at Grades A–G. Similar disparities are found for those with physical and sensory impairments and to a lesser extent for those with behavioural, social and emotional difficulties. It could be argued that these figures do not compare like with like, but the placement of pupils with special educational needs is a combination of parental choice and postcode lottery for pupils with these type of impairments. This is more influential than the severity of the pupil's impairment and so in aggregate provides a useful comparison.

### **Overcoming Resource Barriers: The challenge of implementing inclusive education in rural areas**

Miles, S. 2000, EENET

[http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/bonn\\_1.php](http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/bonn_1.php)

In the UK the term inclusion has come to mean effective schooling. It no longer refers only to the needs of children with impairments. This quote: "An effective school is an inclusive school" is from a document from the government's school inspectorate. Although reluctant to encourage the uncritical exporting of ideas from the UK to countries of the South, it is

important to be aware of the current trends in countries of the North, as in the past they have been followed in the South. Hopefully there will be a more genuine sharing of experience and lessons learnt in the future since the Northern countries have a great deal to learn from the South about overcoming resource barriers, as their resources become more and more over-stretched.

Selected lessons learnt from experience in the UK and from UNESCO include:

- **Teachers and pupils are the greatest resources available for promoting inclusive practice.** This is true of all contexts, but is perhaps more obviously the case in impoverished rural areas in Africa and Asia, where school buildings are poor, teaching materials scarce and teachers have little training.
- **Build on existing practice.** Lessons learnt from the UNESCO Special Needs in the Classroom project indicate that finding ways of making better use of local knowledge and building on existing practice is where all development must start.
- **Teachers invariably know more than they use.** Teachers therefore need to be helped to learn from their own experience and from that of their colleagues, by becoming reflective practitioners and by building upon what they know, and what they understand about what works and what doesn't work. In this way teachers can begin to take more responsibility for their own professional development.
- **Schools as problem-solving organisations.** Essentially the more problems that teachers meet, the more successful they are likely to become at solving problems, or overcoming barriers. Problems can therefore be seen as opportunities for collaborative learning. In the context of collaborative problem-solving, including children who have impairments, or who have been identified as having 'special needs', can therefore be seen as an opportunity for the whole school to learn and develop, and so become more effective.
- **Examine the practice of ordinary teachers.** We need to look at the practice of what we sometimes call 'ordinary teachers', as this is more likely to be the appropriate starting point for understanding how classrooms can be made more inclusive.

### **Education that Fits: Review of International Trends in the Education of Students with Special Educational Needs**

Mitchell, D. 2010. Education Counts, New Zealand.

[http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/special\\_education/education-that-fits-review-of-international-trends-in-the-education-of-students-with-special-educational-needs/chapter-eleven-inclusive-education](http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/special_education/education-that-fits-review-of-international-trends-in-the-education-of-students-with-special-educational-needs/chapter-eleven-inclusive-education)

There is a considerable, almost bewildering, body of research that addresses the question of how inclusion impacts on the achievements of students with and without special educational needs. In interpreting these studies, several cautions must be taken into account: (a) some of the earlier studies may not be relevant to current conditions, (b) many of the studies compare placements only and do not 'drill down' into the nature of the educational programmes the students received, (c) many studies are methodologically flawed, and, of course, (d) all studies are specific to the context in which they were conducted.

In general, methodologically sound studies have come up with mixed results, the majority reporting either positive effects or no differences for inclusion. (Some would argue that if there are no differences, this is also an argument for inclusion: why have segregated education programmes when they are no better than placement in regular classes?). The article describes a representative sample of research carried out in this area.

#### 4. Further resources

Many case studies and guidelines were found on inclusion in education but not included in the report as the focus was on effectiveness in terms of pupil attainment. The following are a selection of these:

**Towards Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities: A Guideline**

<http://www.uis.unesco.org/Library/Documents/disabchild09-en.pdf>

**Design For All: Implications for Bank Operations**

[http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Resources/Universal\\_Design.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Resources/Universal_Design.pdf)

**Reaching the Unreached. Bridging the social divide in Cambodia through inclusive education.**

[http://www.vsointernational.org/Images/reaching-the-unreached-inclusive-education-cambodia\\_tcm76-32441.pdf](http://www.vsointernational.org/Images/reaching-the-unreached-inclusive-education-cambodia_tcm76-32441.pdf)

**Effective Use of Assistive Technologies for Inclusive Education in Developing Countries: Issues and challenges from two case studies**

[https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fijedict.dec.uwi.edu%2Finclude%2Fgetdoc.php%3Fid%3D4311%26article%3D1136%26mode%3Dpdf&ei=qYXiUdG4EZG2hAeh\\_IDQDg&usg=AFQjCNEfyd38BwppHKye-RgtiPX6dnouww&sig2=yeAmsTrKhYXx4AC6DfQAIw&bvm=bv.48705608,d.ZG4](https://www.google.co.uk/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CDYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fijedict.dec.uwi.edu%2Finclude%2Fgetdoc.php%3Fid%3D4311%26article%3D1136%26mode%3Dpdf&ei=qYXiUdG4EZG2hAeh_IDQDg&usg=AFQjCNEfyd38BwppHKye-RgtiPX6dnouww&sig2=yeAmsTrKhYXx4AC6DfQAIw&bvm=bv.48705608,d.ZG4)

**C-Emis as a Tool for Inclusive Education For All**

[http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/eenet\\_newsletter/news8/page16.php](http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/eenet_newsletter/news8/page16.php)

**Inclusive educational practices in Kenya: Evidencing practice of itinerant teachers who work with children with visual impairment in local mainstream schools**

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0738059310001203>

**Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities**

[http://www.crsprogramquality.org/storage/pubs/education/edhowto\\_vietnam.pdf](http://www.crsprogramquality.org/storage/pubs/education/edhowto_vietnam.pdf)

**Inclusive Education: A new approach to scale up education of disadvantaged children in South Asia**

<http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/joyful.php>

**Inclusive Education. An overview of international experiences and approaches**

<http://www.lightfortheworld.nl/docs/policies-and-papers/inclusive-education.pdf?sfvrsn=8>

**Inclusive Education in the Indian Context**

[http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/inclusive\\_education\\_indian.php](http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/inclusive_education_indian.php)

**Inclusive education**

[http://www.sightsavers.org/in\\_depth/policy\\_and\\_research/education/13179\\_Policy%20and%20Practice%20in%20Inclusive%20Education%20in%20Sri%20Lanka%20and%20Pakistan.pdf](http://www.sightsavers.org/in_depth/policy_and_research/education/13179_Policy%20and%20Practice%20in%20Inclusive%20Education%20in%20Sri%20Lanka%20and%20Pakistan.pdf)

**Education for children with disabilities - improving access and quality**

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/67664/edu-chi-disabil-guid-note.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67664/edu-chi-disabil-guid-note.pdf)

#### 5. Additional information

**Author**

This query response was prepared by **Laura Bolton**

**About Helpdesk reports:** The HEART Helpdesk is funded by the DFID Human Development Group. Helpdesk reports are based on 2 days of desk-based research per query and are designed to provide a brief overview of the key issues, and a summary of some of the best literature available. Experts may be contacted during the course of the research, and those able to provide input within the short time-frame are acknowledged.

For any further request or enquiry, contact [info@heart-resources.org](mailto:info@heart-resources.org)

HEART Helpdesk reports are published online at [www.heart-resources.org](http://www.heart-resources.org)

**Disclaimer**

*The Health & Education Advice & Resource Team (HEART) provides technical assistance and knowledge services to the British Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes in education, health and nutrition. The HEART services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations in international development, health and education: Oxford Policy Management, CiBT, FHI360, HERA, the Institute of Development Studies, IPACT, the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine and the Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development at the University of Leeds. HEART cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, HEART or any other contributing organisation.*