

Realizing Article 24... ‘a piece of cake’? “We don’t think so”.
**An analysis of inclusive education in five different European countries
from a Critical Disability Studies Perspective .**

Geert Van Hove, Elisabeth De Schauwer & Rachel Vaughan

Contents

Introduction	3
Inclusive education and art. 24: a piece of Cake? A little ‘anthology’	3
From anthology to research.	5
Methodology	6
Analysis of the country reports: a three step process.	7
Results	8
From research to action: some stable foundations for the IE+ training program.	11
Final Discussion.	12
Bibliography	13
Annex 1	15

Introduction

In many places of the world, inclusive education is a topic of discussion. Some are still convinced that it should not be more than realising article 24 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities¹

With this Convention, the international community indicates that we should consider persons with disabilities as citizens who have the right to participate in all domains of public life. At the same time, a convention is necessary to give them – the most suppressed, abused, and marginalised group throughout our history – the support to realize this participation (Stiker, 1999).

Also before this United Nations Convention, the idea of inclusive education was heavily discussed internationally. Already in 1994 the Salamanca Statement declared – a non-binding agreement approved by 92 nations and 25 international organisations during the World Conference on Special Needs Education (under the auspices of UNESCO). ... They agreed a dynamic new ‘Statement’ on the education of all disabled children, which called for inclusion to be the norm. In addition, the Conference adopted a new ‘Framework for Action’, the guiding principle of which is that ordinary schools should accommodate all children, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions. All educational policies, says the Framework, should stipulate that disabled children attend the neighbourhood school 'that would be attended if the child did not have a disability.'...²

25 years after the Salamanca Statement and more than 10 years after the United Nations Convention one might expect important steps have been taken concerning the education of children and young people with disabilities (especially with regard to their participation in the regular education).

However, a number of very recent (we concentrate on publications during the first months of 2019) international scientific articles – published in two journals³ that are highly recommended with regard to inclusive education – show a different picture. Sometimes important steps are very hard to find... Please follow the process.

Inclusive education and art. 24: a piece of Cake? A little ‘anthology’

Findings (Brydne et.al., 2019) of a scoping review trying to bring together studies to summarise the perspectives of students without special needs concerning the social inclusion of students with physical impairments in mainstream classrooms, suggest that students without special needs avoid interacting with students with physical impairments, and are less accepting and less willing to befriend a student with a physical impairment...

¹This Convention came into action in 2006. On the 9th of May 2019 already 177 countries world wide ratified the Convention (<https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities>)

² <http://www.csie.org.uk/inclusion/unesco-salamanca.shtml>

³ International Journal of Inclusive Education - International Journal of Disability, Development and Education
IE+ Promoting positive attitudes and evidence-based policy for inclusive education
Agreement Number: 2017-3338/001-001



Results from single case studies in three inclusive classrooms (Schwab et.al., 2019) indicate that 7th grade students with hearing impairment feel less socially integrated and less accepted by their peers. They do, however, interact more with other students with special needs and most students with hearing impairment have friends in their class. Their teachers evaluated social integration, acceptance, interaction and friendships of their students with hearing impairment as average or as above average.

From a systematic review (Rekaa et.al., 2019) of 27 studies (both qualitative and quantitative) on what existing research tells us about the experience (or lack of experience) of inclusion in Physical Education (PE) among disabled students we can learn that students with disabilities experience exclusion and a lack of belonging in PE. Some of the most recent articles within the review report about students with disabilities who 'love PE'. PE teachers seem to share the normative goal of inclusion but perceive it as impossible to achieve due to a lack of competence and a lack of resources, but also mostly due to the presupposition of the constructed 'normate' PE student...

A study in the Republic of Serbia (Nikolić et.al., 2019) aimed to understand the gaps between policy and practices in inclusive education. The study compared the academic achievement in Mathematics of 249 eleven and 12 year old comparable students with mild intellectual disabilities (MID) in the fifth and sixth grade who attend typical elementary schools and special schools. Results indicate that students with MID who attend special schools scored significantly higher on mathematics achievements in comparison to their peers with similar disabilities in regular schools. Although the aim of the Republic of Serbia's new education policy focuses on inclusion, this research project indicates that students may be integrated and not included; and that regular classroom practices may not offer the necessary support for students with disabilities.

A recent 'state of the art' article (Stepaniuk, 2019) about inclusive education in Eastern European countries reveals that most of participants in attitudes studies accept inclusive education initiatives. At the same time these participants identified a large number of structural (e.g. poverty; lack of teacher training; low number of parent associations; lack of resources; lack of government policies,...) and cultural (e.g. stereotyped concept of persons with disabilities; misunderstanding of terms as 'inclusion' and 'integration'; no opportunities to experience exchange among parents and teachers;...) barriers. (p344) This overview shows an existing discrepancy between legal regulations and day-by-day school practices.(p346)

A comparative study (Sturm, 2019) comparing inclusive schooling in Germany, Norway and the United States indicates that the structure of the German school system differs explicitly from that in Norway and the US. (p656) The German school system is based on the idea that students with different achievements should be placed in different educational streams. It seems that the structure of the German school system is in contrary to the fundamental idea's of inclusion. This structure runs in parallel with the idea that low achieving students are seen as 'non-normal' (as a result of a continuous process of distinguishing students by achievement) (p667)

We hope this little 'anthology' makes clear that we are still confronted with a large collection of barriers, gaps and difficulties. These barriers can be observed beyond 'specific diagnostic groups' (hearing impairment, physical impairment,...) as well beyond countries that involved in the research articles (Germany, Eastern Europe, Serbia,...).

Therefore, it seems that the implementation of inclusive education will not be 'a piece of cake'.

From anthology to research.

It is with this knowledge that the European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD)⁴ submitted a project – with Spain, Portugal, Bulgaria, Belgium and Greece as the participating countries – within the Erasmus + Key Action Support for Policy Reform call. This call describes as one of its most important objectives :”... Promoting inclusive education and training and fostering the education of disadvantaged learners, including through supporting teachers, educators and leaders of educational institutions in dealing with diversity and reinforcing socio-economic mixity in the learning environment...”

EASPD describes the aim of its project as: ... the project is to provide decision-makers (policy-makers and education providers) with information, training and tools that allow for evidence based policy making. This will facilitate not only adequate policy frameworks but also their real implementation, with a special focus on the transition from segregated to inclusive education settings.

We decided to start by conducting research to find solid proof about the concrete contemporary situation concerning inclusive education in the different participating countries.

Parallel with the research phase, taking into account the research results, the EASPD IE+ project partners will start to build a training programme addressing decision-makers i.e. policy-makers and education providers, social partners but also persons with disabilities, families and representatives of persons with disabilities and involving them directly when developing the training modules (two out of the six planned modules). Moreover, (representatives of) children with disabilities will be cooperating closely when defining the co-production methodology which will be applied when co-producing and delivering the training. This will be tested through pilots. (where local stakeholders will be invited to provide feedback)

In addition, the IE+ project foresees the set-up of different National Network Groups of experts on Inclusive Education composed by stakeholder’s representatives of all target groups at national level (policy makers, education providers and support services) that will be reached during the preparation of the pilots as well as after the lifetime of the project. By involving decision-makers at the local level via our direct project partners, EASPD aims to address their needs and concerns specifically so the project outcome would have considerable impact. This strategy should also benefit the sustainability of the training and at the same time the upscaling of the project results...

It is clear that this article wants to report about the above mentioned start of the project using a research project to find solid proof about the concrete situation of inclusive education in Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Greece and Bulgaria.

In this article we present a comparative study with some specific characteristics.⁵ Local educational contexts and their history are put together in function of a very specific target group: children and youngsters with disabilities. In doing so, we do not compare educational systems in their broadest practices. More in particular, our study zooms in on one extremely specific component: the implementation of article 24 of the

⁴ <https://www.easpd.eu/>

⁵ to learn about straight forward comparative research we advice our readers to go to: Mark Bray, Bob Adamson & Mark Mason (eds.) (2014). Comparative Education Research, Springer International Publishing.
IE+ Promoting positive attitudes and evidence-based policy for inclusive education
Agreement Number: 2017-3338/001-001

United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities in the five different countries. We were more interested in finding a sturdy basis beyond the participating countries to connect the international training program of the EASPD with shared foundations and shared problems.

And last but not least we will work within the tradition of Critical Disability Studies. Following Goodley (2017) being aware of the fact that ...while Critical Disability Studies might start with disability it never ends with it, remaining ever vigilant of political, ontological and theoretical complexity... Critical Disability Studies is respectful to the building blocks of Disability Studies especially the social model of disability. It recognizes that our contemporary times are complex and marked by austerity, by a widening gap between rich and poor and globalisation...Critical Disability Studies remains mindful of global, national and economic contexts and their impact on the lives of disabled people. It adopts a position of cultural relativism while seeking to say some things about the global nature of disability. Critical Disability Studies stays always attuned to the relational qualities of disability... It keeps in mind the view that any analysis of disability should not preclude consideration of other forms of political activism... (p.191-192).

Methodology

To prepare a set of questions in support of our comparison we tried to make use of good practices of colleagues. We decided to combine the insights of a large and a small scale project.

At one hand we could rely on the extremely well documented large scale project: the “Pacific Indicators for Disability-Inclusive Education Project “(Sharma et. al., 2016a, 2016b, 2016c; 2018).

This project is based on a very specific methodology combining systematic literature reviews, surveys with Ministerial representatives of the 14 Pacific countries, focus groups in 4 selected countries and a final review through a Delphi method based reference group. The project tried to develop a set of indicators to measure progress towards disability-inclusive education. This whole process lead to a set of 48 indicators (Pacific-INDIE) organized in 10 different dimensions: policy and legislation (1) – awareness of the rights of children with disabilities (2) – education, training and professional development (3) – presence and achievement (4) – physical environment and transport (5) – identification (6) – early intervention services (7) – collaboration, shared responsibility and self-advocay (8)- curriculum and assessment practices (9) – transition pathways (10). These different dimensions formed a very stable background to built our set of questions.

We felt reassured by the ethical stance of this project based on the recognition of the fact that successful implementation of educational reforms requires attention to the context. Beside this phylosophy the project is also based on the well documented evidence that inclusion is unlikely to occur in settings where there is not enough support.

On the other hand we relied on the experiences of members of a small scale Erasmus+ Project “Evidence Based Education + Job Shadowing.((3 (Inclusion)3= MUST3)”. Schools from Belgium, Spain, Finland, Malta and Romania organized exchanges for principals, teachers and other school staff members. In each country good practices about inclusive education were collected (on class, school and organizational level). Trough a set of specific questions participants could observe the realities of their colleagues. Through blogs and reports team members staying at home were informed. Through specific blogs parents were informed about the project and the different visits.

Through a little local survey (22 Flemish school staff members) and an ‘observation scheme’ participants of the project got prepared to go abroad and learn, knowing how their personal, school and organizational goals

could be described.

This process led to an overview of the ‘strong practices’ in different countries and in an overview of ‘learning priorities for schools, class practices and (school) organizational networks’.

These two projects led us to a template with questions that could be used by the project partners to write a ‘country report’ about their situation about inclusive education in their countries. This set of questions can be found in annex 1 of this article.

Analysis of the country reports: a three step process.

After collecting data from the participating countries we organized a thematic analysis.

Following Braun & Clarke “...Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data. It minimally organises and describes your data set in (rich) detail...”

Themes or patterns within data can be identified in one of two primary ways in thematic analysis: in an inductive or „bottom up“ way, or in a theoretical or deductive or „top down“ way...”

We have chosen for an inductive approach: this means ... that the themes identified are strongly linked to the data themselves.

In this approach, if the data have been collected specifically for the research (here in our project collected through country reports), they are not driven by the theoretical interests of the authors and project members. Inductive analysis is therefore a process of coding the data without trying to fit it into a pre-existing coding frame, or the researcher’s analytic preconceptions. In this sense, this form of thematic analysis is purely data-driven...” We think this can help to stay as close as possible to the diverse realities in the participating countries. We hoped in this way to stay away from ‘evaluating’ / ranking/... the different realities, hoping to show our respect to different cultures and local practices.

We have been organising such a thematic analysis in two steps: first each country report was ‘broken down’ to themes that were directly linked with practices of inclusive education in each specific country. (A vertical country-by-country step)

After this vertical analysis we worked beyond the countries – in a horizontal process - to make sure we managed to stay as close as possible to the task given to Ghent University as a project partner: - we were asked to analyse the state of affairs in the participating countries

In a next step the first versions of the vertical and horizontal analysis were given back to the participating country representatives in a partner meeting in Brussels. We could organise a participant-back-to-participant process. (Birt et. al. 2016) This action led to necessary adaptations and final approval of the themes by the members as a quality check.

⁶ Braun, Virginia and Clarke, Victoria (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2). pp.77-101. ISSN 1478-0887

Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235356393_Using_Thematic_Analysis_in_Psychology [accessed Feb 14 2019].

Results

The results of the first round (the five Country Reports) and the second round (the vertical analysis country by country) can be found on:..

In this article we focus on the third step of the analysis: the themes we could discover beyond the country reports, hoping so to find a stable basis to built the EASPD training programme.

We will confront the **‘beyond the country themes’** (put in bold and all equally important) with *the idea’s of Roger Slee (2011), Tanya Titchkosky (2011) and Katherine Runswick-Cole (2018) (we will put the idea’s of Slee, Titchkosky and Runswick-Cole in italic) our leaders in the field making sure we ask questions that ...are intensely political...(Slee, p.151-152)*

If we look at the list of ‘beyond the country themes’ – showing **how difficult it seems to be to go from legislation to implementation** – it is as if a lot of countries don’t possess a comprehensive plan to meet the complexity of the lives of children and youngsters with a disability and their families. One result seems quintessential in all five participating countries: **we can’t speak about ‘real inclusion’ for children with (intellectual) disabilities yet.**

It looks like Titchkosky and Slee (ix, 2008, in Tichkosky) were right when they observed that...*the repetitive vocabulary of inclusion ‘deployed to saturation levels’ dulls imagination and imperils the possibility for real change... So (Titchkosky, 2011, xi) although we have article 24 of the UN Convention it seems that exclusion on the basis of disability is still a routine practice. We can observe that even when barriers and processes of exclusion are noticed they are still conceived as somehow natural, reasonable, sensible and even seemingly justifiable...*

We learned that beyond the involved countries a lot of problems occur because care systems, planned interventions, medical treatment and the school system seem to work in **a tradition of silos.** *We agree with Newhouse and Spring (2010) when they say we have a lot of terms (multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary) to describe our problems to move beyond disciplinary boundaries and roles all connected to a specific silo.*

We also know that in a lot of countries budgets are silo-ed. It already starts from the beginning; countries that work with a tradition of ‘a system of early intervention support’ are confronted with the reality that once children enter the school system at age 3 or 4, they already got labels and a diagnosis based on the medical model. Watson (2018, 142, in Runswick-Cole et. al.) *describes (together with e.g. Julie Allan) that this leads to a kind of ‘inclusive’ education that fails to interrogate the normative assumptions that shape it. ‘Inclusive’ education practices continue to operate within the framework and the tradition of ‘special education’, drawing on knowledge that focuses on pathologizing the individual child while measuring and comparing their difference from the norm. This translation of ‘inclusion’ has not yet taken the same leap forward as the children’s physical relocation, and the medical model of disability for the most part continues to inform ‘inclusive’ education practices.* In the five participating countries it seems indeed that **the ‘medical/individual model’ with diagnosis and labels** still stands very strong. *...There is a danger of reproducing disability as an individual problem. By individualizing disability through a diagnostic process we distance this phenomenon from other forms of difference in schools...* And Slee (2011, 159-161) also connects this labelling/Othering process with following political and tactical agreements between schools: *... while enrolment levels have remained fairly constant over time the TYPES (our capitals) of children*

attending special schools are changing. Regular and special schools have agreed new franchising and operating agreements creating satellites in and around the regular school. These new agreements serve pupils who challenge the institutional equilibrium of schools; they are a risk to the performance of schools. Ironically they are described as being ‘at risk’...

Trying to understand the reality of schooling trajectories of children with disabilities and the problems in the implementation of policies of inclusive education in our five participating countries we learned that it is important (Bines and Lei, 2011) to **give attention to the history and the context of educational systems, policies and practices**⁷. Following the well-known post-colonial thinker Edward Saïd (2000, in: Slee, 2011, 153) *inclusive education can be seen as one of those ‘travelling theories’ that were losing their original force by travelling across time and space. They are ‘tamed and domesticated’*. In most of our participating countries inclusive education should be understood as ‘another next step’ following up an area of ‘physical integration’ of children with disabilities. In the integration period pupils and students were forced to assimilate and to change while nothing really changed in the ‘school industry’ itself. And this discourse of physical integration in his turn tried to push back the historical reality of segregation of children and youngsters with disabilities in a specialized ‘sector’ of special education. This sector was based on the idea that you need to have expertise on the diagnosis and labels of the kids, in order to educate and teach them.

When looking for **‘hard data’ (statistics)** concerning children with (intellectual) disabilities and the reality of inclusive education in different countries it seems we come back empty-handed. If we can find any data at all, they don’t lead to a real analysis, they are just descriptive and they don’t give us an insight into the outcomes of children connected to their schooling trajectory.

We are confronted with a social reality in most of the participating countries that a lot of the children and youngsters are absent in the ‘wider and very vibrant diversity debate’. *Titchkosky points at this reality with the observation that ‘disability’s inclusion can be seen as an excludable type’*.

In most of the participating countries attempts to realise inclusive education are based on **organizing inclusive education in connection with remaining parts of special education** (some countries are organizing special units on a regular school campus – other countries keep (parts of) the special school system alive). Within this research project we don’t want to describe this reality as an example of the “twin track approach”. In rich countries the twin track approach is a strategy whereby individual needs of and support for children with disabilities are realized at the same time as eliminating environmental, economic,....barriers to education. In developing and poor countries, special provision is very limited, and the policy choice centres on whether to develop inclusive regular schooling and/or provide some interim specialist provision, as a ‘twin-track’ approach. In addition, influenced in part by northern practice, some countries are remodelling some of their existing specialist provision, for example, increasing the interaction between special and regular schools, developing special schools as resource centres and providing some peripatetic support services (Bines and Lei, 2011).

With Slee (2011) we observe that many attempts (p.160) to fabricate inclusive education by grafting special education onto the regular school seem to produce little more than a bifurcated system of sponsored and marginal students. When assessed against student destinations, it is possible to observe students being locked out. Described as being in their best interests and as saving them from the harshness of the regular school, these arrangements compromise the democratic enterprise. There seems to be little justification for allowing

⁷ In some countries like Spain en Belgium we observed numerous and important regional differences, we won’t discuss them in this article.
IE+ Promoting positive attitudes and evidence-based policy for inclusive education
Agreement Number: 2017-3338/001-001

schools to be harsh places for those students tagged as different. This is not a preparation for a peaceful and sustainable world where interdependence, mutuality and community will prevail. (Goodley et. al., 2019)

Beyond the participating countries we found **teachers** are worried, even negative about inclusive education. A lot of them felt unsure especially about their knowledge and expertise to teach children with special needs. This is not a new finding, other studies like the review about teachers' attitudes of De Boer et.al. (2011) showed that (348-349) ...teachers hold predominantly negative or undecided beliefs and feelings towards inclusive education. Teachers with fewer years of teaching experience were holding more positive attitudes towards the inclusion of pupils with special needs than teachers who have many years of experience. However, a contradictory result is found regarding experience with inclusive education. Clear differences in attitudes between teachers with and without experience with inclusive education are found, in which teachers with experience hold more positive attitudes than teachers without experience.... Besides the variable experience, teachers who received (long-term) training in special needs education held more positive attitudes towards inclusive education compared with teachers who did not receive training... The results of this study indicate also that teachers' attitudes are related to disability categories. Various studies showed clearly that teachers are most negative about the inclusion of children with intellectual disabilities, ADHD and other behaviour problems...

Together with Slee (2011, 172) we believe that teachers require greater incentive and encouragement to learn throughout their career and be instated as educational leaders in their communities. Consistency should be applied to the improvement of pedagogy and assessment and teachers should be dissuaded through a recasting of educational priorities from suspending teaching and learning to drill children for tests...

We are also worried about **the position of parents/carers** throughout the educational practices in the different participating countries. Parents seem to be involved in the schooling process and in the choosing of the school where their son/daughter will go. It is very difficult to see how they are a partner in school and how they are involved in the decision making process concerning individual educational plans and support. Are they taken seriously? Where can they go when they do not agree with decisions about the educational trajectory as planned/decided for their disabled child?

Last decades a lot of energy is given to the development of well established professional-parent relationships. Yet parents continue to report feeling marginalised and excluded within the schooling system. *It seems that professional-parents relationships are no more than policy rhetoric (Hodge & Runswick-Cole, 2018, 537-538). It is from our biographical standpoint that we interpret all that happens to us. Different biographical standpoints lead to different understandings of situations and interpretations of social exchanges. Those different standpoints cause at times an 'epistemical gap' (concept of MacKenzie & Scully, in Hodge & Runswick-Cole, 543).*

It is interesting to observe that we can learn a lot - while exploring micro-level interactions - about the political arena wherein parent-practitioner relationships are situated. *Hodge & Runswick-Cole reflect upon the language that is used in these interactions and they conclude that terms like 'special needs' are not just a description of a category of children. This kind of terms constructs and defines the limits for what disabled children are allowed to be: they tend to become non-children, different from, and implicitly lesser than 'normal' children... (p.544) A lot of professionals reveal that they had not anticipated that their words might be received so differently from how they were intended. MacKenzie & Scully (p.548 in Hodge & Runswick-Cole) suggest "sympathetic moral imagination" as one possible solution to close the described gap. This*

involves recognizing that a person is different from ourselves but trying to identify how an event is experienced by that actual person rather than how we think we would experience it if it happened to us. Practitioners (p.552) often feel that they do not have the ability, the time or sufficient contact with a parent to develop this degree of intimacy with a parent's particular situation.

Together with Hodge and Runswick-Cole we observe that a lot of parent groups provide information and training sessions about their experiences for practitioners. We strongly believe that such sessions have to become an important part of teacher/professional training programs. *We are also aware of the fact (p.549) that professionals do not operate within a vacuum. They are part of a system that promotes a particular view of disability and dictates many of their practices.*

From research to action: some stable foundations for the IE+ training program.

In following scheme we show how the themes we found as 'beyond the country themes' within the country reports of the five participating countries will be taken into account when building the training program.

Beyond the countries themes	Translation into the training program
The dominance of the medical model in most of the countries →	Will be covered in the program by the introduction of the ecological model to understand 'disability'
The worries we have about the position of parents and carers →	Will be covered by the involvement of parents and persons with disabilities as partners in the co-creation of modules for the program
The necessity to recognize the local historical and cultural context →	Will be covered by working with local training teams. They will be able to work in all openness to make sure the training modules stay attuned with the local educational reality
The danger of working in silos without connection →	Will be covered by opening up the course for policymakers from different departments and administrations. We think that administrators working for public transport, physical accessibility of the environment in local communities, budgets and financing, education, housing, care, welfare, urbanization,... can come to real transdisciplinary cooperation through this course
The research project came to the conclusion that we are missing hard data/statistics and almost no follow up of the trajectories of the children →	The course will be based among others on the framework of Quality of Life and will make use of evidence based methods making sure outcomes will be generated and follow up processes will become possible
We observed that the teachers were worried and showed negative attitudes to inclusive education →	This will be covered within the program by e.g. making use of the framework of Universal Design for Learning. This framework makes it possible to keep the trajectories for pupils with (intellectual) disabilities in touch with trajectories of pupils who are confronted with other challenges connected to

	diversity
Noticing that in most countries one or another way of connection with the special education sector is still a reality →	This will be covered in the course by moving from a language of ‘special needs’ to idea’s of ‘support’ (directly connected to the ecological model of disability) – idea’s of Quality of Life (framework used for all citizens) – and idea’s about ‘reasonable accommodations’ (focusing on the structural adaptations in parallel with trajectories for individual support)

Final Discussion.

Framing our analysis from a Critical Disability Studies to find a stable basis for the EASPD course made clear Slee is right when he points out (2011, 155) that inclusive education is not a pure technical-instrumental topic. It has to be seen as a precondition for democratic education within a process of restauration of human rights. It bears witness to injustice. It asks questions about power relations. It provides an educational settlement that will introduce knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to built a better world.

We are confronted with a process of reinstating value to those children with intellectual disabilities who have not been valued by or in schools. Schools will need to become a ‘community hub’. They have the opportunity to built rich and sustainable learning communities of difference. (Slee, 2011, 173).

We follow Titchkosky (2011) when she tries to go beyond the old fashioned way of looking for physical access. She tries to understand access (2011, ix-x) as a complex form of perception that organises socio-political relations between people in social space...

The EASPD course will help local policy makers to re-think the educational field, as Slee (2011, 158) describes very eloquent: ... as the high-street coffee shop becomes the learning space for the 21st century university student, we do need to re-think schools ...

Bibliography

Bines, H., Lei, P. (2011). Disability and Education: the longest road to inclusion. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 31, 419-424.

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member Checking: A Tool to Enhance Trustworthiness or Merely a Nod to Validation? *Qualitative Health Research*, 26(13), 1802–1811. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732316654870>

Brydne M. Edwards, Debra Cameron, Gillian King & Amy C. McPherson (2019) How Students without Special Needs Perceive Social Inclusion of Children with Physical Impairments in Mainstream Schools: A Scoping Review, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 66:3, 298-324, DOI: [10.1080/1034912X.2019.1585523](https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2019.1585523)

Anke de Boer, Sip Jan Pijl & Alexander Minnaert (2011) Regular primary schoolteachers' attitudes towards inclusive education: a review of the literature, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 15:3, 331-353, DOI: [10.1080/13603110903030089](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903030089)

Dan Goodley (2017). *Disability Studies. An Interdisciplinary Introduction* (2nd Ed.). Sage Publications: London.

Dan Goodley, Rebecca Lawthom, Kirsty Liddiard & Katherine Runswick-Cole (2019) Provocations for Critical Disability Studies, *Disability & Society*, DOI: [10.1080/09687599.2019.1566889](https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1566889)

Nick Hodge and Katherine Runswick-Cole (2018). “You say ... I hear...”: Epistemic Gaps in Practitioner-Parent/Carer Talk, 537-555, in: Katherine Runswick-Cole, Tillie Curran & Kirsty Liddiard (Eds.) (2018). *The Palgrave Handbook of Disabled Children’s Childhood Studies*. Palgrave MacMillan: London.

Robin P. Newhouse, Bonnie Spring (2010) Interdisciplinary evidence-based practice: Moving from silos to synergy, *Nursing Outlook*, vol.58, 6, 309-317, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2010.09.001>

Robin P. Newhouse, Bonnie Spring (2010) Interdisciplinary evidence-based practice: Moving from silos to synergy, *Nursing Outlook*, vol.58, 6, 309-317, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.outlook.2010.09.001>

Gordana Nikolić, Marija Cvijetić, Nataša Branković, Dejan Đorđić & Christopher Johnstone (2019) Not There Yet: Lessons Learned on the Journey to Inclusion in the Republic of Serbia, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, DOI: [10.1080/1034912X.2019.1589429](https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2019.1589429)

John O'Rourke (2015) Inclusive schooling: if it's so good – why is it so hard to sell?, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 19:5, 530-546, DOI: [10.1080/13603116.2014.954641](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2014.954641)

Susanne Schwab, Tanja Wimberger & Christoforos Mamas (2019) Fostering Social Participation in Inclusive Classrooms of Students who are Deaf, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 66:3, 325-342, DOI: [10.1080/1034912X.2018.1562158](https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2018.1562158)

Tanja Sturm (2019) Constructing and addressing differences in inclusive schooling – comparing cases from Germany, Norway and the United States, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23:6, 656-669, DOI: [10.1080/13603116.2018.1444105](https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2018.1444105)

Hege Rekaa, Halvor Hanisch & Borgunn Ytterhus (2019) Inclusion in Physical Education: Teacher Attitudes and Student Experiences. A Systematic Review, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 66:1, 36-55, DOI: [10.1080/1034912X.2018.1435852](https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2018.1435852)

Sharma, U., Forlin, C., Marella, M., & Jitoka, F. (2016a). Using indicators as a catalyst for inclusive education in the Pacific Islands. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*. ISSN: 1360-3116 (Print) 1464-5173 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tied20> doi: 10.1080/13603116.2016.1251979

Sharma, U., Forlin, C., Marella, M., Sprunt, B., & Deppeler, J. (2016b). *Pacific indicators for disability-inclusive education (Pacific-INDIE) Guidelines*. Melbourne: Author, Monash University. 77 pp. Retrieved from <http://www.monash.edu/education/research/projects/pacific-indie/outcomes.html>

Sharma, U., Forlin, C., Sprunt, B., & Merumeru, L. (2016c). Identifying disability-inclusive indicators currently employed to monitor and evaluate education in the Pacific Island countries. *Cogentedu*, 3, 1170754. doi:10.1080/2331186X.2016.1170754

Umesh Sharma, Filipe Jitoko, Setareki S. Macanawai & Chris Forlin (2018) How Do we Measure Implementation of Inclusive Education in the Pacific Islands? A Process for Developing and Validating Disability-Inclusive Indicators, *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 65:6, 614-630, DOI: [10.1080/1034912X.2018.1430751](https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2018.1430751)

Roger Slee (2011). *The Irregular School: Exclusion, Schooling and Inclusive Education*. London : Routledge.

Inna Stepaniuk (2019) Inclusive education in Eastern European countries: a current state and future directions, *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23:3, 328-352, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2018.1430180

Tanya Titchkosky (2011). *The Question of Access. Disability, Space, Meaning*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto.

Karen Watson (2018). Interrogating the 'Normal' in the 'Inclusive' Early Childhood Classroom: Silence, Taboo and the 'Elephant in the Room', 141-157, in Runswick-Cole et. al (2018)

Annex 1

Based on the two projects as described in the first section of our methodology following set of questions could be sent to the participating country representatives.

1. What dates did your country signed and ratified the **United Nations Children's Right's Convention AND the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities**? Were there **consequences for the educational policy**?
2. Can you describe your **national legislation about the right on appropriate education for all children** (with disabilities)? Are there **exceptions** for the right to education?
3. Can you specify on interesting **regional specifications of educational policies** concerning inclusive education and children with an intellectual disability?
4. What are the **statistics** available about students with disabilities and education in your country? (regular/special – preschool/primary/secondary)
5. Can you describe the **national inclusive education plan** that your country developed? – **legal implementation of inclusive education**
6. Can you describe the **national educational budgets** linked to inclusive education?
7. Can you describe **the diagnostical process for children with special needs** in your country? How is the **access to special education** arranged?
8. Can you describe **the relationship between special and regular education** in your country? How is the right to choose between mainstream and special education for children with a disability?
9. Can you describe the **teacher training programmes** in your country vis à vis inclusive education?
(a) – Does your country implement a lifelong learning program/**professionalisation** programme for teachers?(b)
10. Does your country implement **'early intervention programmes/services'** and what is the relationship to '(inclusive) education'?
11. Does your country implement a **legislation concerning 'accessibility'** – e.g. buildings ; e.g. public transport;... (and what is the relationship to inclusive education)?
12. Can you describe **the quality evaluation and control** linked to ('inclusive') education in your country?
13. Does your country works with a **national curriculum** and is this curriculum applicable for children with disabilities?
14. Can you describe the way your country works with the concept of **'reasonable accommodations'** for children with disabilities? – How is the **adaptation of the curriculum** arranged?
15. Can you describe the availability of **support material**?
16. Can you describe the availability of **support teachers/workers** for children with a disability?
17. Can you describe the **resource centers/knowledge centers** about inclusive education available in your country?
18. Can you describe the way **parent participation** is organised in your country (in relation to inclusive education)?

The representants were given following extra information to answer the questions of the template.

To organize the process of answering your questions it is important to:

- make sure everybody learns about the source of the collected data
- make sure everybody learns about the type of data you are introducing (statistics, legal frameworks, case studies of good practice,...)
- make sure everybody learns about the person(s) / services who collected the data