

BEYOND Project

To Inclusive Education and BEYOND
2018 – 2021



Study on developing methodologies for an effective transition to inclusive education





Acknowledgements

This document was written with the support of the Erasmus+ funding programme under grant agreement 2018-1-BE02-KA201-046900



The European Commission's support to produce this publication does not constitute an endorsement of its contents, which reflects the views only of the authors. The Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

This study was written by Yousra Sandabad, Centre de la Gabrielle with the support of the 'To Inclusive Education and BEYOND' project partners:

- Miguel Valles, Centro de Educação para o Cidadão com Deficiência, C.R.L
- Rute Miroto, Centro de Educação para o Cidadão com Deficiência, C.R.L
- Vanessa Neves, Centro de Educação para o Cidadão com Deficiência, C.R.L
- Priska Schukoff, Chance B
- Rachel Vaughan, European Association of Service providers for Persons with Disabilities
- Annemie Jennes, Katholiek Onderwijs Vlaanderen
- Marleen Clissen, Katholiek Onderwijs Vlaanderen
- Jenni Kerppola, Kehitysvammaisten Palvelusäätiön
- Katjaana Järvinen, Kehitysvammaisten Palvelusäätiön
- Katri Hänninen, Kehitysvammaisten Palvelusäätiön
- Els Teijssen, Hogeschool Leuven-Limburg
- Michelle Milants, Hogeschool Leuven-Limburg

The BEYOND project partners would like to thank those who contributed to this study at a national level. The other deliverables of the BEYOND project can be found on the project webpage www.easpd.eu/en/beyond

INTELLECTUAL OUTPUT 4

Study on developing methodologies for an effective transition to inclusive education

Table of contents

Introduction	5
I. Co-production as a key step towards inclusive education	6
1. Inclusive education: a global challenge	7
2. Co-production as an innovative tool	9
II. Co-production partnerships in Europe: crossed perspectives	11
1. Methodological approach	12
2. Results	14
A. Inclusion and participation	14
B. Communication	14
C. Involvement and collaboration	15
D. Teaching	16
E. Training	17
F. Network	18
G. Positive points, barriers and axes of improvement	19
III. Assessing challenges and opportunities in implementing co-production	20
1. Challenges revealed by the survey	21
A. Inclusion and participation	21
B. Communication	21
C. Involvement and collaboration	21
D. Teaching	21
E. Training	22
F. Network	22
G. Positive points, barriers and axes of improvement	22
2. Further steps for an effective transition towards inclusive education	23
Conclusion	27
References	28
Appendix	30

Introduction

The following study falls within the framework of the Erasmus+ project “To Inclusive Education and BEYOND” designed to facilitate the transition to inclusive education.

The BEYOND project is conducted with different European partners: the European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD) based in Belgium, Katholiek Onderwijs Vlaanderen (KathOndVla) in Belgium, University College Leuven in Belgium (UCLL), the Centre de la Gabrielle in France, Chance B in Austria, Centro de Educação para o Cidadão com Deficiência (CECD) in Portugal and the Service Foundation for People with Intellectual Disability (KVPS) in Finland.

Centre de la Gabrielle was responsible of the study on the basis of the results of the survey run by all partners.

Inclusive education refers to “education environments that adapt the design and physical structures, teaching methods, and curriculum as well as the culture, policy and practice of education environments so that they are accessible to all pupils without discrimination¹” according to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities².

Beyond this definition, for the consortium producing this study, inclusion means also embracing diversity as well as recognizing and accepting the unique characteristics and talents of all students (and staff members). It is a growth

mindset: all students can learn, grow and develop their skills. An inclusive learning environment should offer learners these opportunities.

Through this report, we are aiming to assess inclusion in the field of education via a reflection on the co-production methodology.

Co-production refers to both the “co-creation” of services as well as their co-production³. This implies that citizens are involved in both the design and the delivery of public services.

In the field of educational co-production, this methodology aims to develop a partnership between all the stakeholders involved in the support of pupils with special needs, creating an effective network to strengthen the capacities of pupils, families and professionals. Within this model each stakeholder is able to support the self-determination of the pupil. The goal is to consider the barriers, challenges and opportunities implied by the development of these networks.

In order to explore the efficiency of the co-production methodology, we will first examine how **co-production crystallizes a key step towards inclusive education (I)**. We will then move on to our field study in order to assess the status of the inclusive educational environment among **the networks questioned by the consortium (II)**. Finally, based on the analysis of the survey, we will explore **the challenges and opportunities in implementing co-production (III)**.

1 “Inclusive Education - Understanding Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities”, UNICEF, septembre 2017, 8.

2 Body of independent experts which monitors implementation of the United Nation’s Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities by the States Parties.

3 Evan Odell, “Inclusive Education and Co-Production”, s. d., 28.

Co-production as a key step towards inclusive education

Before plunging into the heart of the co-production topic, it is important to realize the extent of the call for inclusive education. Thus, first we will see how this transition constitutes a global challenge (1) before focusing on the innovative dimension of co-production (2).



1. INCLUSIVE EDUCATION: A GLOBAL CHALLENGE

At the global level, with regards to education, Article 24 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities is central. It recalls, among other points, that “States Parties shall ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and lifelong learning”.

The call for inclusive education is explicit, it requires concrete commitments. Indeed, Article 24 stipulates that State Parties must ensure that:

- Persons with disabilities are not excluded from the general education system on the basis of disability, and that children with disabilities are not excluded from free and compulsory primary education, or from secondary education, on the basis of disability;
- Persons with disabilities can access an inclusive, quality and free primary education and secondary education on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live;
- Reasonable accommodation of the individual’s requirements is provided;
- Persons with disabilities receive the support required, within the general education system, to facilitate their effective education;
- Effective individualized support measures are provided in environments that maximize academic and social development, consistent with the goal of full inclusion.

This set of clarifications around the notion of inclusion demonstrates a strong commitment on a global scale to overcome the divisions between pupils.

In fact, there is a profound attention given to the idea of being equal as community members when participating in education. This notion is very important to assess as it is the core idea driving the co-production methodology.

Article 24 insists on the necessity of a focus on inclusion at all levels of education and on the implementation of concrete measures in terms of training. Teachers must be alert on disability issues and open to alternative models of support. The emphasis on education is particularly important in the context of our study insofar as the methodology we propose involves above all a reinvention of the relationships between the different actors involved in the education of the student, including the pupil.

The aim is to stimulate the connections between the partners in order to improve the student’s environment as much as possible. In this context, effective communication is a sine qua non condition for the success of an effective network. We will develop the subtleties of this approach in the next sections of our study.

The United Nation’s Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD) entered into force in the European Union in 2011. Since then all EU Member States have signed and ratified the convention. Thus, beyond a common will to converge towards an inclusive education system, it is necessary to take into account the differences between countries and to consider effective common methodological models.

One must be able to enjoy the advantages offered by the institutional architecture of the European Union. Programmes such as Erasmus+ offer a window of opportunities for actors involved in supporting people with special needs. Through initiatives such as the BEYOND project we can better appreciate the influence of international legal frameworks on the daily practices of professionals, with this study allowing the acknowledgement of barriers, challenges and opportunities in terms of inclusion in the field of education.

With the BEYOND project being a transnational project, it is very important to keep in mind the fact that not all European countries tackle inclusive education through a common perspective. Hervé Benoit reminds us, on the basis of the typology developed by the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, that we have a multi-speed Europe that regards educational policies for people with special needs⁴. He explains the difference between these three categories:

- **“One track approach”:** Children and adolescents with special needs are systematically enrolled in regular classes.
- **“Two tracks approach”:** There are two separate schooling approaches, one ordinary and one specialized. These two tracks are exclusive of each other.
- **“Multi tracks approach”:** Countries opting for this approach develop both school integration and special education in separate establishments.

Acknowledging these differences allows us to have some perspective on our study. We have to design new practices and propose new tools and/or adapt existing ones to move towards the model of inclusive education, which remains incomplete.

However, within the framework of this project, all the European partners involved agree on the relevance of the key axes developed by the Index for Inclusion⁵. Therefore, the project revolves around a triple strategy:

- To promote inclusive cultures: building a community and establishing inclusive values.
- To support the evolution of inclusive practices: developing the school for all and organizing support for diversity.
- To facilitate the production on inclusive policies: constructing curricula for all and orchestrating learning.

As mentioned in the project’s rationale, it is crucial for education to be acknowledged as a clear priority for every community. The ratification of the UN CRPD has obligated its signatories to make their education systems inclusive.

The BEYOND project is in line with this dynamic and aims to raise awareness and empower schools and service providers to support the transition towards inclusive educational settings and, as a consequence, increase social inclusion.

In this study, we are focusing on the co-production methodology. The innovative nature of this approach will be developed in the following section.

2. CO-PRODUCTION AS AN INNOVATIVE TOOL

The BEYOND project offers different tools to support the transition towards inclusive education. Our study focuses on the effectiveness of the co-production methodology in this transition.

We assume that the transition to inclusive education is a work in progress. It is an objective towards which we aim to converge and there is an urge for innovative tools to support this process. We suggest an approach in terms of co-production that promotes collaboration between the different actors revolving around the student.

In her study on the benefits of this methodology⁶, Lilia Angelova-Mladenova defines it as “equal partnership and collaboration between service providers and people using services”.

Once again, the notion of equality is central. According to Angelova-Mladenova, co-production is about recognizing that people who use services are experts in their own right, rather than passive recipients of care: they are directly involved in the design of the service. The legitimacy is made even more obvious by the fact that the users are perfectly aware of all aspects of their disabilities. They experience it directly. Therefore, there would be no reason to exclude them in the enhancement of their environment.

Moreover, the co-production methodology is not limited to users and service providers but to all the actors revolving around the person with special needs, including the family. What is particularly interesting in Lilia Angelova-Mladenova’s definition is that she perceives co-production as being inextricably linked to a shift of power and control from service providers towards people

using services. She deepens her understanding of co-production by associating it to three key concepts:

- **Shared power:** it is about sharing the decision power and the process of shaping services between both service providers and users.
- **Equal participation:** there must be no exclusion in the process of co-production. Everyone’s experience and skills are valued.
- **Reciprocity:** there are reciprocal relationships within the community. Responsibilities and expectations are mutual. Lilia Angelova-Mladenova adds that people involved in co-production receive something back for what they do.

This approach is perfectly juxtaposable to the field of education. Just like in Lilia Angelova-Mladenova’s approach, the idea is that co-production gives more choice and control over services.

To nuance her definition, Lilia Angelova-Mladenova reminds us that there are different levels of co-production. Depending on the organizations that embrace this process, some may choose a basic level of involvement and others a more advanced level of transformation. In a basic stage, she explains that users are heard through consultation events. In more advanced stages, co-production is included across all hierarchical levels of the structure. Thus, the level of involvement varies from one organization’s policy to another. This distinction must be kept in mind, especially in order to understand the fact that there is no convergence in terms of inclusive education, each structure being the master of its

4 Hervé Benoit, “Pluralité des acteurs et pratiques inclusives : les paradoxes de la collaboration”, La nouvelle revue de l’adaptation et de la scolarisation N° 57, no 1 (2012): 65-78.

5 Tony Booth, Mel Ainscow, et Denise Kingston, Index for inclusion: developing learning, participation and play in early years and childcare (United Kingdom, Europe: Centre for studies on inclusive education, 2006), <http://sdc-rproxy.u-strasbg.fr/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsbas&AN=edsbas.881593BB&lang=fr&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

6 Lilia Angelova-Mladenova, “Study of co-production in services for people with disabilities” (European Network on Independent Living, 2016).

own policy. These cleavages can be observed despite the existence of guiding legal recommendations, as we have seen in the previous section.

Another point to note is that the list of actors involved in co-production is not exhaustive. This is what Éric Plaisance reminds us⁷. In fact, he insists that all the actors of the school must be involved, but reminds us that other spheres can be concerned, such as: health professionals, social workers, local authorities, etc.

Thus, Éric Plaisance specifies that it is inconceivable to make an exhaustive list of all the potential actors since local contexts are essential to identify the available resources, which are often insufficiently mobilized. According to the author, the aim is not to juxtapose a plurality of actors but, on the contrary, to contribute, thanks to a clever partnership, to the educational and social empowerment of children or teenagers with special needs.

In this study, we focus on a collaboration network between five key stakeholders: the student, the teacher, the parent, the school leader and the support service. This perspective allows us to conceive a strong and efficient empowering network including the student. The environment created is beneficial for all these actors. Each actor being able to support the student's sense of self-determination. The barriers, challenges and opportunities must be taken into account in the development of these effective networks.

In the next section, we will explore these ideas through a transnational field survey. The survey is based on hypotheses and ideas discussed among the partners during previous meetings.



Co-production partnerships in Europe: crossed perspectives

So far, we have been focusing on the need for innovative methods to support the transition to inclusive education. Through the BEYOND project, we are working to find effective responses to best move towards this model. Thus, we evaluated the extent of co-production in the European landscape through a survey.

In this section, we will describe the methodological approach **(1)** before highlighting the results **(2)**.

⁷ Éric Plaisance et al., "Paroles d'acteurs de l'école inclusive", La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation N° 57, no 1 (2012): 93-110.

1. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

In order to better evaluate the level of co-production between the different actors revolving around the pupil, our survey was conducted through a network study.

The choice of a study by networks, i.e. by groups of people interconnected around common interests (here the education of the pupil with special needs), reflects our effort to develop a methodology for an effective transition towards inclusive education around the co-production methodology. Thus, it is important for us to assess how efficient the networks around the student are in terms of partnerships.

We studied the relationship between five key actors: the student, the parents, the teachers, the school leader and other professionals (different from one country to the other) involved in the education of the student with special needs. A total of 99 people filled in a survey⁸ in Belgium, Portugal, Finland, Austria and France. The choice of these countries is explained by the origin of each participating partner of the BEYOND project.

	Parents	Pupils	Teachers	School leaders	Other professionals	Total
Austria	7	7	6	5	6	31
Belgium	3	3	3	3	3	15
France	2	1	0	2	7	12
Finland	4	5	12	1	6	28
Portugal	0	5	2	1	5	13
Total	16	21	23	12	27	99

The questionnaires distributed within these networks have been designed around variables specifically conceived to evaluate the level of co-production between the above-mentioned actors and best evaluate the synergy between them. These findings will allow us to open the more general debate on inclusive education in the European context. However, it is very important to note that the results do not in any way depict the situation at the European level since the data at the European or even national level is too limited. However, it allows us to highlight some common challenges between similar institutions and therefore to highlight some resurgent issues at the level of service providers.

The questions are partly closed and partly open with short answers. Each target group was asked the same questions, but they were partly adapted to the specific recipients. The partners distributed the questionnaires within their networks and the answers were collected in the countries mentioned above between December and June 2020.

Before diving into the analysis, it is first of all important to understand the logic behind the conception of the survey. Let's reflect on the variables, one by one. What do they reveal about the extent of co-production per country?

Inclusion and participation:

This first part of the questionnaire provides us with an overview on the general sense of inclusion. We refer to perceptions because even if there is general enthusiasm and effort for a more inclusive environment, the facts can be very far from the expected reality. The question of participation offers a first nuance within which it marks a difference between the idea of inclusion and the action to achieve it. That being said, participation per se remains incomplete. There are different parameters that come into play in the evaluation of inclusion, which we will see through the following variables.

- **Communication:** This is a central pillar in the co-production logic. Without communication there is only a constellation of actors. It is inconceivable to imagine any form of partnership without fluidity in sharing information and experiences between the different stakeholders.
- **Involvement and collaboration:** Through both variables we have a much more practical perspective on co-production, on whether stakeholders feel a real investment in the inclusion effort. If some feel a form of distance, this would already be indicative on the state of the partnership. Furthermore, this part involves the question of equality in terms of action, a fundamental element in terms of inclusion, as we had the opportunity to highlight earlier.
- **Teaching:** This part of the questionnaire allows us to see how the courses are designed and how support for pupils with special needs is addressed. These elements reveal a great deal about the level of inclusion at schools.

- **Training:** Evaluating the character of the teaching is intrinsically linked to the training of the teaching staff. This is an essential dimension in the path towards inclusive education as training structurally reflects educational policies on this matter.
- **Network:** This section describes whether effective networks are well defined. The questions in this category also open the way to the question of alternative networks. Indeed, beyond the school environment, it is important to remain open and flexible with regard to other socialization environments for pupils with special needs (e.g. the extracurricular environment). These windows are further opportunities in terms of effective partnerships.
- **Positive points, barriers and axes of improvement:** This is where the different actors can express their views. Their perspective is much more apparent in this part of the questionnaire because they are called into retrospection by using their own words.

Thus, through these different variables, this questionnaire has been designed to evaluate the level of collaboration between the actors involved in the education of pupils with special needs. In this sense, we are aiming to provide a mapping considered necessary in order to understand the level of inclusion within the European educational sphere. In the following section, we will analyze the results of the survey.

2. RESULTS

In the previous section, we presented the different variables explored in our survey. Now, we will focus on the results. To do so, we will proceed to a synthetic analysis, variable after variable. The idea is to highlight the points of convergence and rupture between countries.

However, it is very important to note again that the results mentioned per country only refer to the data collected and do not reflect the situation of the whole country.

Inclusion and participation

Questions (agree – disagree – do not know):

1. **The school works towards inclusion in general (e.g. regarding accessibility – not only physical; schooling of children with disabilities, etc.).**
2. **Students with disabilities take part in all activities (e.g. learning activities, activities during breaks at the playground, school trips, etc.) at school.**

- **Austria:** The majority of actors agree on the general inclusiveness of the school. Indeed, 24 out of 31 participants give a positive opinion. There is a similar enthusiasm for the students' ability to participate in activities.
- **Belgium:** Similar trend. 12 actors out of 15 recognize both the inclusion and participation of students with special needs.
- **France:** All participants agree that schools play a key role in achieving inclusion. However, there is disagreement about the level of participation. Not all stakeholders agree that all pupils in the school participate fully to all activities.

- **Finland:** The case of Finland also marks a difference with other countries. Only 33% of parents recognize the inclusive orientation of the school, although 75% of them consider that students participate well in all activities. The contrast here is interesting to observe as regards the students themselves: only 20% affirm their ability to participate. If they themselves are doubtful about their inclusion in the activities, this implies a disconnection with the real life experience of people with special needs.
- **Portugal:** Overall, as in the previous cases, the majority of the actors interviewed agree that the school is making an effort to work towards inclusion. That being said, there is an obvious skepticism from the other professionals, who share a more reserved view of inclusion. In fact, of the 5 interviewed, 3 of them consider that students with special needs do not take part in all activities, one doesn't know and one didn't answer. This suggests that, given their specialty, they may be led to take a more lucid and intransigent view of inclusion issues.

Communication

Questions (agree – disagree – do not know):

3. **There is a communication on a regular basis between all actors involved (i.e. child, parent, teacher, school leader, other type of professional) in the child's education.**
4. **I know who I can refer to when I have a problem or a question, regarding any school related topic.**
5. **The child can easily communicate about his/her problem or question, regarding any school related topic.**

- **Austria:** 25 out of 31 participants agree on the regularity of communication between the actors. The two people who disagree belong to the target groups of other professionals. It is interesting again to note the rupture between this group and the others. For the rest, we do not have answers. Moreover, teachers are identified as being accessible by all participants combined.
- **Belgium:** The overall view of communication between partners is positive. 13 out of 15 participants find that communication is regular and 14 out of 15 know who to contact if there is a problem or question. The main nuance concerns other professionals, where 2 out of 3 consider that the student with special needs has communication difficulties. This observation reflects a concrete cleavage between the different stakeholders.
- **France:** Communication divided the panel. There is an explicit break between other professionals, in this case special education teachers. They consider that there is insufficient communication between the partners. However, we know how essential communication in the partnership is to the success of inclusion. On the other hand, a majority of actors consider that the parents have the means to communicate about their child's education: it is therefore understood that where communication is insufficient, it is between the different institutional partners, outside the parents.
- **Finland:** Concerning the first question, stakeholders tend to agree on the quality of communication.
- **Portugal:** The group of other professionals (i.e. medico-social specialists) is rather skeptical: 3 out of 5 consider that there is no regular communication between the stakeholders. They believe that communication with the family does not occur systematically and that articulation with teachers is not always effective. There is a call for more frequent meetings. One of the specialists even states that information is kept within the special education team and that the management and the teaching staff show a lack of knowledge about pupils with special needs and about their individual educational program.

Involvement and collaboration

Questions (agree – disagree – do not know):

6. **All actors are actively involved in this inclusive education on an equal basis.**
7. **I am happy with my level of involvement in the child's education. (this question will not be asked to children)**

- **Austria:** There is a general feeling of commitment to inclusive schools, with 24 out of 31 participants considering that all stakeholders are involved in this issue. However, we note the reticence of a professional who reminds us that not all teachers are committed at the same level. This discord will appear to be a constant in our study.
- **Belgium:** 7 participants out of 15 consider that the actors are not actively involved in inclusive education at the same level. This dissatisfaction is observed in all categories, except that of teachers. Criticism is most often addressed to them. We will

note in particular the testimony of two professionals. One considers that the teacher prefers to send “difficult” children to special education as soon as possible without, in addition, ever being present at the meetings. Another professional also points out the difficulty some teachers have in accepting inclusion and making accommodations. Both students and parents express criticism towards the school leader. Thus, given these answers, it is the school body that appears to be the most distant from inclusive education.

- **France:** Once again, there is a gap between specialized professionals and the others: they consider that the basic teacher and the director are the linchpins of the school project for children with special needs, that they communicate with the parents, but that there is poor collaboration with the other partners, due to a lack of time and consultation; they mention in particular the role of school psychologists, who are not sufficiently listened to.
- **Finland:** There is general satisfaction with the level of commitment to inclusive education. However, it should be noted that the school leader agrees with all issues. There is no hindsight or self-criticism.
- **Portugal:** More mixed results in Portugal, where only 6 out of 11 participants agree that all stakeholders are involved in inclusive education. The same criticism of the management and teachers was found from other professionals.

Teaching

Questions (agree – disagree – do not know):

- 8. The teachers design the lessons and learning activities starting from the child’s needs (when necessary).**
- 9. The child’s teachers can get support from other actors to design lessons and learning activities starting from the child’s needs.**

- **Austria:** The notion of differentiation is recurrent in the comments. This must be understood in terms of awareness about the specific needs of certain pupils. Teachers point out that precise action is planned to this end, for example, in the arrangement of classrooms, the destination of class trips or the adaptation of teaching methods.
- **Belgium:** Feedback is positive in Belgium. However, we note the reluctance of parents, with only 1 out of 3 considering the lessons to be designed around the specific needs of the student. Among the teachers, through the comments we can see that special attention is given to the design of the lessons according to the child’s special needs. It is also important to note that students do not feel fully included. Indeed, none of them are satisfied with their level of inclusion. One of them doesn’t feel at all included and two cannot respond. The testimonies reflect this dissatisfaction. For example, one explains that he works more slowly than the other students but produces as much homework and the other does not know if the teacher will make an adjustment for him. However, we should note

that the results reflect the perspectives of only 3 students, it would be irrelevant to generalize.

- **France:** In France, 8 out of 12 responses acknowledge the effort made by teachers to adapt the content. The negative response comes from a school principal who argues that adapting to the needs of students is not possible when there are too many students with special needs. A majority of respondents believe that teachers are not alone and can get help from other partners. It should be noted that parents are still more positive about practices and inclusion than the rest of the partners.
- **Finland:** 75% of the participating pupils do not know if the lessons are designed according to their needs. The position of the parents echoes with the children: none of them consider that the teachers design the lessons according to the child’s needs. This break between the family and the institutional circle goes hand in hand with the communication problems observed earlier.
- **Portugal:** Teachers are satisfied with their level of adaptation to the needs of the student when preparing lessons. One even states that activities are planned hand in hand with the special education teacher with the aim of fully including the students in their regular class. The principal agrees with the teaching staff on this point. However, the contrast is explicit with the other professionals: none of them consider that the regular teacher makes efforts to adapt the lessons to students with special needs.

Training

Question (agree – disagree – do not know):

- 10. The child’s teachers are trained to teach students with disabilities.**

- **Austria:** Opinions are very mixed regarding the training level of the teachers. Teachers themselves are critical of their training: 4 out of 6 do not consider themselves sufficiently trained to teach students with special needs. 2 out of 5 principals agree with them on this opinion. It should be noted that this type of positioning by the directors is rare insofar as it is often a positive view of the institution that is defended.
- **Belgium:** Opinions are divided among teachers. Out of the 3 questioned about their level of training, one is satisfied, the other is not and the last one doesn’t know.
- **France:** Except specialist teachers and parents, the other respondents believe that teachers are lacking training.
- **Finland:** 41% of teachers agree and 41% disagree. Once again we note the cleavage with the administration, which, as we pointed out earlier, always answers in the affirmative and thus shows a disconnection with the concrete challenges of inclusion. As far as parents are concerned, 75% of them do not know what to answer. This rupture between the actual teacher training and the level of awareness of parents underlines a division in terms of communication and calls for a deeper reflection on its fundamental role in the path towards inclusive education.

- **Portugal:** The majority of participants, 4 out of 6, do not consider teachers trained to meet the needs of students with special needs. This is therefore common in all the surveyed countries.

Network

Questions (agree – disagree – do not know):

11. There is a clearly identified network gathering all actors involved in the school's inclusive education.
12. Support is provided (to children with disabilities, parents, teachers, school leaders, service providers) when needed to ensure inclusive education and the child's inclusion in school.
13. Alternative networks (e.g. sports association) are efficient in supporting inclusive education of the child.

- **Austria:** The actors clearly identify a network gathering all actors involved in the school's inclusive education. 23 out of 31 look positively at the availability of support when needed to ensure inclusive education and the child's inclusion in school. However, attention should be paid to the efficiency of alternative extracurricular networks, with 12 out of 31 people not knowing how to respond.
- **Belgium:** The majority of participants identify a network around the student, however, there are 4 negative comments and 3 "I don't know" out of 15 answers. It is interesting to see that 3 out of the 4 negative feedbacks are expressed by school leaders. The feeling that these stakeholders do not belong to the partnership network resonates with the disconnection

observed on many occasions between the principal and the other actors. That being said, 10 out of 15 participants find support to ensure inclusion.

- **France:** A large majority of respondents say that there is a clearly identified network around the child: this strongly supports the efforts to structure the inclusive school that have been made for several years now.
- **Finland:** On the identification of networks, the availability of support and the effectiveness of alternative networks, the feedbacks are very dispersed in Finland and therefore difficult to interpret, except for a lack of convergence and therefore still some progress is to be made towards functional partner networks.
- **Portugal:** The partnership network is identifiable. Same trend in terms of support, with a positive response from 10 out of 13 participants. Finally, just as in the other countries, there is a divergence in terms of the effectiveness of alternative networks, with responses very scattered among the different actors.

Positive points, barriers and axes of improvement

Questions (open questions):

14. I define the current three main barriers to inclusive education in this school (e.g. lack of communication, accessible information, commitment, collaboration, willingness, etc.)
15. I define the three things I like most about this school.
16. I define the three things I like most about how inclusive education is implemented in this school.
17. I identify three things I would most like to change about this school.
18. I identify three things I would most like to change about the way inclusive education is implemented in this school.

Here, respondents answer to open questions on positive points, barriers and axes of improvement. The responses reflect the trends observed in the previous sections.

In terms of barriers, communication issues are recurrent. This translates into a break between the ordinary institutional circle and the family circle. As we observed previously, within the school environment itself, there are ruptures between people coming from ordinary training and those from the specialized environment. These limits are reinforced by other obstacles, notably in terms of time, consultation and means. Too much bureaucracy can also be a barrier to inclusion.

Moreover, it is interesting to note that, from one country to another, pupils emphasize the importance they attach to recreation time and extracurricular activities, especially sports and art. This encourages reflection on which actors to include in partnership networks and on the need for flexibility in imagining co-production. There is also great enthusiasm for online courses. This attraction to digital tools should be further explored with regard to co-production instruments.





Assessing challenges and opportunities in implementing co-production

After having first looked at the role of the co-production methodology in the transition to inclusive education and having analysed the state of partnerships through our European networks, we will now focus on the challenges revealed by the survey **(1)** before reflecting on further steps for the implementation of the co-production methodology **(2)**.

1. CHALLENGES REVEALED BY THE SURVEY

In this section, we will be interpreting the results of the previous section in order to better assess the broader challenges related to the development of co-production.

Inclusion and participation

Throughout the questionnaires, when asked whether the school is moving towards inclusion, the stakeholders generally agree that this is the case, except in Finland, where only 33% of parents agree.

However, it is worth recalling the “general” nature of the question. It is a feeling of effort towards inclusion that emerges, which is quickly nuanced by the second variable that comes into play: participation. Indeed, there can be difficulties across the countries in the implementation of inclusive actions.

Communication

Three aspects of communication are tackled in this part of the questionnaire. Firstly, we need to know whether there is regular communication between the different actors. Then, it is a question of knowing if the different actors are able to identify the referent in function of the questions they have to ask. The last evaluated point is the capacity of the student with special needs to communicate his/her problems or questions.

Communication vectors are generally well defined. The different actors are reachable within the school environment. However, a rupture between specialized and non-specialized staff can be noted, based on weaknesses in terms of communication highlighted by other professionals.

The position of the specialists reflects skepticism about the actual success of inclusion.

Lastly, very often the participants confirm the students’ ability to communicate their problems or questions. However, it is by no means unanimous, there are cases where the students consider themselves unable to express their ideas.

Involvement and collaboration

Questions in this section allow us to get to the heart of the matter. They attempt to assess the level of investment and satisfaction of stakeholders in the inclusion effort. The previously observed cleavage between the teaching and directing staff with other professionals can also be guessed in this section. The statement on this rupture is often shared by parents as well. The gap between the school staff and the rest of the partners demonstrates the after-effects in terms of communication problems and therefore difficulties in setting up a co-production methodology. There is a problem of time and concertation arising from these obstacles.

Teaching

In order to have a precise idea of the level of school inclusion, it is necessary to focus on the content of the courses and learning activities. Therefore, it was asked whether teachers design lessons based on pupils’ needs and whether they receive support from other actors during the conceptualization. The feedback is rather positive but there remains a heterogeneity in the positions.

There is a convergence between teachers and directors in the perception, the latter being satisfied with the level of adaptation of the courses. However, it is interesting to note once again the reticence of families and the other professionals.

Training

The question asked here goes hand in hand with the previous one. It examines whether teachers have been trained to teach children with special needs. The position of the teachers is revealing in terms of training weaknesses. It is also rare for directors to admit this lack of training. This shows a strong will to promote an inclusive image of the school, despite the realities on the ground, which are far from this ideal. Moreover, it is difficult to find criticism of the school environment at the leadership level. In the Finnish questionnaires, the administration answers positively to almost all the questions.

Network

This part of the questionnaire crystallizes the essence of the issue, as co-production is based on the development of efficient networks. Participants were asked whether there is a clearly identified network of all the actors involved in the student's educational environment. It was also asked whether actors are supported to ensure inclusive education. Finally, the theme of alternative networks was explored.

Beyond all the limits that we have been able to underline so far, we find very well defined networks of actors and mutual support in order to best tend towards an inclusive model. This resonates with the efforts to structure the inclusive school that have been made for several years.

Last but not least, there is vagueness around alternative networks, and opinions are often mixed on this subject.

Positive points, barriers and axes of improvement

This part was the main open question section and therefore gave us an interesting insight into co-production within the different networks.

As explained in the previous section, the results described echo the set of results collected through the other variables. Beyond the different scales of involvement of the actors, we will retain the need for greater coordination between them.

Therefore, the analysis of these questionnaires reveals a number of points about the networks around students with special needs to include them in mainstream education. Efforts towards structuring inclusive education can be seen overall.

However, there are various common denominators in terms of limits that constitute obstacles within the partnership, the most vivid being communication and training. On the one hand we observe communication problems: as we have seen, if this dimension is compromised, the rest of the partnership will remain complicated to consider. On the other hand, there is also a lack of training in addressing the needs of pupils with special needs: many teachers recognize it by themselves. This point is central because the training could offer the teachers, beyond skills, a more comprehensive perspective on special needs. If, on the contrary, training omits this awareness, the road to inclusion will remain long.

Furthermore, in order to best consider the challenges of co-production, it seems relevant to draw a parallel with the results of similar studies.

Lilia Angelova-Mladenova addressed likewise the issue of co-production⁹ and pointed out various limitations to the implementation of the co-production methodology¹⁰. She observed different limits for the implementation.

Firstly, there is an inequality in terms of power relations, whether on logistical issues such as process planning or more structural issues such as the potential pressure in the definition of the "life project". She also points out that the way in which co-production is integrated can be problematic in that it can be difficult to ensure that people with special needs have the support they need to participate meaningfully.

Lilia Angelova-Mladenova goes on to point out the challenges related to the process of involvement, especially in terms of the difficulties related to the convergence of the satisfaction of each actor. Finally, she underlines the essential dimension of the continuous and active engagement of people using services.

Another interesting perspective is developed through a collective multilevel analysis on inclusive practices using a social network approach¹¹ based on a data covering 441 teachers in 24 primary schools. The authors highlight the following points:

- Teachers in highly dense networks are more positive towards inclusion.
- Teachers in highly dense networks implement more differentiated instruction.
- Teachers in highly centralized networks implement less differentiated instruction.

These points prompt us to consider the hierarchical structure of the school and the place given to the different actors in the different networks. Thus, even if the intention and the will to embrace inclusive education exist, if the structure of the institution itself is centralized, the transition will be more complex.

After having noted through our survey the stakes and challenges of the co-production methodology, we will now take the discussion to another level and consider the further steps for an effective transition towards inclusive education.

2. FURTHER STEPS FOR AN EFFECTIVE TRANSITION TOWARDS INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

So far, our focus has been on the significance of co-production in the process of transition towards inclusive education. In this section, we will focus on further steps for an effective transition. We consider that three key points are to be considered in this process. First, the unfinished and complex path towards inclusive education cannot be based exclusively on co-production methodology. Secondly, institutional actions are intrinsic to the transition process. Last but not least, there is a need for a paradigmatic shift in the way we approach inclusion. We have assessed the benefits and difficulties in terms of implementation of the co-production meth-

⁹ However, Lilia Angelova-Mladenova is not specifically addressing the field of education. We quote her study mainly due to the focus on co-production.

¹⁰ Angelova-Mladenova, "Study of co-production in services for people with disabilities".

¹¹ Jasmien Sannen et al., "Connecting Teacher Collaboration to Inclusive Practices Using a Social Network Approach", *TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION* 97 (2021), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103182>.

odology. Now, a first step in moving forward is acknowledging that co-production alone won't be enough.

The interest of such an explanation is to demonstrate that co-production involves much more than simply linking different actors. In order to be most effective in its implementation, it is necessary to be alert to its deepest flaws.

Thus, it is necessary to reconsider the cleavage between ordinary schools and specialized environments. Sandrine Amaré and Philippe Martin-Noureux, in a joint article¹², consider that co-operation is challenged when dealing with these two different cultures. Indeed, they affirm that there is a metamorphosis in progress and that an environment favorable to partnership between the school and medico-social environments is emerging. However, they recall that these two universes remain separate and that, within each environment, the educational actors are being influenced by their own representations.

The goal, according to them, is therefore to create a new cultural space for interaction while promoting the interests of the child. They also mention the work of Abdallah-Pretceille¹³, who uses the expression "learning to meet" when referring to this process. This idea represents the challenge we are facing. Given the recent and developing nature of the interactions between both kinds of actors, much remains to be invented. We need to be able to shift the prisms and reconfigure the two spaces, educational and medico-social, around collaboration. This invites us to ask ourselves the right questions and to take a retrospective look at both kinds of institutions.

Sandrine Amaré and Philippe Martin-Noureux are precisely in line with this trend, through precisely such questioning. For example, they propose an interrogation on the way society looks at teachers and educators: is it a diametrically opposed view, likely to be an obstacle in any attempt of collaboration between actors? Representations are key elements in the way we think about co-production because they define the way we act with our partners.

They also raise the issue of self-perception by asking whether there can be a shared professional identity between specialized educators and teachers from ordinary schools. This dimension is very important because identifying with a professional category means adopting certain postures and adhering to certain shared values, beyond personal subjectivities. In the context of co-production, this subtlety is essential as it can unconsciously translate into obstacles when it comes to collaboration. Moreover, they return to the solidity of a "collective consciousness" among the teaching body in France. This would date back to the Second Empire. They believe that beyond the entrance exam, there are rituals imposed on apprentice teachers and that these schools of standards will allow teachers to appropriate a collective spirit aiming at standardizing not only practices, but also an ideology based on common values. They went on to point out that the political power of the second half of the 19th century participated in the structuring of the body of teachers.

Although this history is specific to the case of France, it is nonetheless important to take into account the anchoring of collective imaginations in order to better understand the ruptures observed in the field.

Moreover, as we have seen in the analysis of the questionnaires, we also notice a division between institutional and family circles. Although the co-production methodology has many advantages, one must remain clear about the difficulties of implementation.

Jean-Marc Lesain-Delabarre¹⁴ offers a very pragmatic analysis on this subject where he returns to the complex cooperation between parents and teachers considered to be a misleading obviousness. Referring to the work of Philippe Perrenoud, he believes that there is a myth of a sacred union of adults to educate youth. Lesain-Delabarre's posture is interesting insofar as it suggests moving from an ideological view of cooperation to a critical view of the latter.

Finally, for a more complete look at the stakes involved in setting up co-production, it seems important to approach the methodology beyond its educational impact. In fact, it should be noted that the support of persons with special needs can involve the definition of a life project. Therefore, if the co-production is carried out successfully, this life project will be better structured and better adapted to the specific needs of the user. Hence, the central nature of the partnership logic: its repercussions are very defining in the life of the person with special needs.

This dimension has been explored by Dominique Leboiteux¹⁵. She develops a reflection around the notion of "belonging to society" by considering that the idea concerns all the times of the person's life and that it requires a strong accompaniment system as well as the setting up of real platforms of cooperation.

Dominique Leboiteux describes a real social contract, each person being considered as a fully-fledged member of society. Therefore, this awareness allows, according to Leboiteux, to prevent exclusion, fight against discrimination, give people with special needs (children or adults) and their families any responsibility in the choices and implementation of their life project.

It is therefore from this type of perspective that we can affirm that the idea of co-production alone remains insufficient to effectively move towards an inclusive model of education. The shift needs to be paradigmatic and profound in its consideration.

In this sense, Lilia Angelova-Mladenova¹⁶ distinguishes co-production from participation. Participation refers to a more limited process, involving only the effort of consultation. In this case, she explains that people are only consulted at the beginning of the process and then quickly find themselves disengaged. On the other hand, when dealing with co-production, engagement is maintained throughout the process and an equal partnership is found.

Angelova-Mladenova considers that the introduction of a co-production approach in the work of an organization requires a number of changes to be made in the culture, policies, practices and structures of the organization.

Beyond this first set of acknowledgements, the transition towards inclusive education goes hand in hand with concrete institutional actions. However, how do we move from idea to action? European institutional apparatus appears to be an optimal means of carrying these develop-

12 Sandrine Amaré et Philippe Martin-Noureux, "La coopération à l'épreuve de deux cultures : l'école et le secteur médico-social", *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 181-95.

13 Martine Abdallah-Pretceille, *L'éducation interculturelle*, Presses Universitaires de France, Que sais-je ? (Paris, 2004), <https://www.cairn.info/l-education-interculturelle--9782130544029.htm>.

14 Jean-Marc Lesain-Delabarre, "Penser la coopération entre parents d'enfants handicapés et enseignants : un défi", *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 79-92.

15 Dominique Leboiteux, "Des pratiques inclusives aux plateformes de coopérations pour appartenir à la société...", *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 111-16.

16 Angelova-Mladenova, "Study of co-production in services for people with disabilities".

ments forward. The EU Commission continually encourages Member States to develop inclusive education; its Communication on achieving the European Education Area (EEA) by 2025 reflects this ambition. The EEA clearly states that “Education systems at all levels should comply with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities”. This convention is, as we have seen through our project, a guiding framework in the advancements related to educational inclusion.

Lilia Angelova-Mladenova¹⁷ insists on the fundamental dimension of legal frameworks and inclusive policies in supporting co-production. She addresses this recommendation to service providers and policy-makers at EU, national, regional and local levels. Thus, it is not only a matter of designing such approaches, but above all of implementing them.

Regarding the legislation and policies supporting co-production, she underlines two important points. She believes that it is essential to ensure that existing legislation does not create barriers to the involvement of people with special needs in decision-making and considers that supported decision-making legislation needs to be adopted asserting the right of people with special needs to take part in decision-making. On the other hand, co-production needs to be supported on a multi-level scale: from a local, regional and national perspective.

The issue of funding is also decisive. Funders need to be deeply alert and aware on inclusion issues. This requires a long-term commitment through concrete measures, such as involving people using services in setting the goals and the outcomes to be achieved with the funding. Funders also must ensure the implementation of the policies they fund.

Last but not least, Angelova-Mladenova highlights in her study a number of additional recommendations for an effective implementation of the co-production method. According to her, even before taking action, a rights-based approach to thinking is needed. This dimension echoes the points we made in the previous section in terms of paradigm shift: co-production alone will remain insufficient. It is not a set of guidelines to be followed, but rather a true philosophical stance that is to be embraced.

Last but not least, in order for institutional measures to have a long-term resonance, it is important for them to be embedded in the minds. This requires a true paradigmatic shift. Thus, beyond simply promoting institutional mobilization, we recall the importance of anchoring the reasoning in the triple approach set by the Index for Inclusion¹⁸, for the transition towards inclusive education deeply requires the creation of inclusive cultures, the production of inclusive policies and the evolution of inclusive practices.

Conclusion

Through this report, we aimed to approach the transition to inclusive education in a practical way. The methodology of co-production appeared to us as an ideal tool to move towards this model, considering the person with special needs as an active and full member of the educational community in which he or she evolves.

Our study was divided into three phases. Before getting to co-production, it seemed essential to explore the connection between co-production and inclusive education. In this way, inclusive education stood out to us as a transition driven by global impulses and co-production as an innovative tool to support the process.

This hypothesis was then confirmed by our transnational field study. Through the analysis of partnership networks gathering pupils, parents, teachers, school leaders and other professionals in five countries (Austria, Belgium, France, Finland and Portugal) we identified clear efforts in favor of a transition towards inclusive education. However, these efforts remain subject to various constraints, particularly in terms of communication and training.

The study was concluded with an opening reflection on the challenges and opportunities in implementing co-production. Co-production alone remains insufficient. We identified a strong need of institutional actions on a transnational level and the necessity of a concrete paradigmatic shift in the way we conceive inclusive education.

Finally, it is necessary to embed our study in its current context, namely a global background disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The health crisis goes hand in hand with major societal changes. It has resulted in a deep reconfiguration of

educational and medico-social environments. Thus, how can the methodology of co-production be envisaged in a world now marked by the notion of social distancing? How can this notion, based on the principle of interactions between actors, be developed when the encounter is compromised? It is essential to stress that the logic is not to be abandoned in any way. On the contrary, this crisis should be seen as an opportunity to reinvent the relationship with the other, particularly through the emergence of digital tools.

When the health crisis began, the scenarios were not very optimistic as the spread of the virus effectively had repercussions on different sectors. However, beyond the difficulties encountered, new and surprisingly positive mechanisms started to emerge quite instinctively. For example, support for people with special needs usually goes hand in hand with a great deal of administrative formalities. Surprisingly, given the bureaucratic flexibility observed during the period of confinement, educators were able to explore their relationship with users in a new way through the use of computers. Free of great administrative pressure, greater flexibility was offered and they were thus able to develop their creativity in new ranges of possible activities.

In this way, COVID-19 forced individuals to reinvent social bonds. It is now up to us, members of the civil society, to convert these limits into new spectrums of opportunities.

¹⁷ Angelova-Mladenova, “Study of co-production in services for people with disabilities”.

¹⁸ Tony Booth, Mel Ainscow, et Denise Kingston, Index for inclusion: developing learning, participation and play in early years and childcare (United Kingdom, Europe: Centre for studies on inclusive education, 2006), <http://scd-rproxy.u-strasbg.fr/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsbas&AN=edsbas.881593BB&lang=fr&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

References

Academic articles

- Amaré, Sandrine, et Philippe Martin-Noueux. "La coopération à l'épreuve de deux cultures : l'école et le secteur médico-social". *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 181-95.
- Benoit, Hervé. "Pluralité des acteurs et pratiques inclusives : les paradoxes de la collaboration". *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 65-78.
- Leboiteux, Dominique. "Des pratiques inclusives aux plateformes de coopérations pour appartenir à la société...". *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 111-16.
- Lesain-Delabarre, Jean-Marc. "Penser la coopération entre parents d'enfants handicapés et enseignants : un défi". *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 79-92.
- Plaisance, Éric, Jean-Michel Labbay, Laetitia Le Bomin, Michel Salines, Hugues Albert, et Patrice Fondin. "Paroles d'acteurs de l'école inclusive". *La nouvelle revue de l'adaptation et de la scolarisation* N° 57, no 1 (2012): 93-110.
- Ployé, Alexandre. "Comment pense-t-on la désinstitutionnalisation dans une institution ? Regards croisés". *Unlocking freedom through adult education*. Erasmus +, s. d. <https://unlockingfreedom.files.wordpress.com/2018/10/unlocking-freedom-rapport-de-recherche-version-finale-upec1.pdf>.
- Sannen, Jasmien, Sven De Maeyer, Elke Struyf, Elisabeth De Schauwer, et Katja Petry. "Connecting Teacher Collaboration to Inclusive Practices Using a Social Network Approach". *TEACHING AND TEACHER EDUCATION* 97 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103182>.

Books

- Abdallah-Pretceille, Martine. *L'éducation interculturelle*. Presses Universitaires de France. Que sais-je ? Paris, 2004. <https://www.cairn.info/l-education-interculturelle--9782130544029.htm>.
- Booth, Tony, Mel Ainscow, et Denise Kingston. *Index for inclusion: developing learning, participation and play in early years and childcare*. United Kingdom, Europe: Centre for studies on inclusive education, 2006. <http://scd-rproxy.u->

Reports

- "Inclusive Education - Understanding Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities". UNICEF, septembre 2017, 8.
- "Innovation in deinstitutionalization: a WHO expert survey". WHO and the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 2014. https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/112829/9789241506816_eng.pdf;jsessionid=D113FB7B19861799600BA5F06BA11F8F?sequence=1.
- Angelova-Mladenova, Lilia. "Study of co-production in services for people with disabilities". European Network on Independent Living, 2016.
- "Report on "Inclusive education in the European schools"". Brussels: Schola Europaea, 2018. <https://www.eursec.eu/Documents/2018-09-D-28-en-4.pdf>.
- Odell, Evan. "Inclusive Education and Co-Production", s. d., 28.



Interviews

- Foucault, Michel. *L'œil du pouvoir - Entretien avec J.-P. Barou et M. Perrot*, 1977.
- Ployé, Alexandre. *Qu'est-ce que la désinstitutionnalisation?*, mai 2017. <https://centredelagabrielle.fr/spip.php?article289>.

Conventions

- "Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities - Articles | United Nations Enable", 2008. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-2.html>.

Appendix

The data collected via this questionnaire will comply with the provisions of the relevant applicable data protection laws. The BEYOND Project Partners commit to carefully handling the privacy and data protection of natural persons whose personal data will be provided to them in this process. The data collected will be used strictly for purposes of research into the stakeholder networks that support effective transition to inclusive education. The BEYOND partners will take appropriate measures to ensure your personal data is not kept for longer than necessary for the intended purposes.

INTRODUCTION

This questionnaire is initiated by a study, which is itself part of a project entitled BEYOND. "To Inclusive Education and BEYOND" (BEYOND) is a European project, co-funded by the Erasmus + programme of the European Union, which aims to empower special schools and service providers supporting children with special needs, to facilitate the transition towards fully inclusive education.

This study will be about developing methodologies for an effective transition to inclusive education. It will try and show how an effective network around the child with special education needs, involving all stakeholders (children, parents, teachers, school leaders, support services, that is to say any professional present to support the child-youngster in school) can facilitate the transition towards inclusive education and strengthen the capacities of all the professionals involved, the parents and the children.

This questionnaire will be the first step to building the study. Indeed, by questioning actors involved in inclusive education, it will emphasise the

strengths, weaknesses, areas for improvement, etc. regarding the current inclusive education system in Austria, Belgium, Finland, France and Portugal.

Your answers to the questionnaire will be analysed and will help to build the framework of this study.

This questionnaire was partly based on the Index for Inclusion. Please see in endnote the full reference to this Index for more information.¹⁹

CONCLUSION

Thank you for taking the time to answer our questionnaire. We hope this will give us the opportunity to reflect upon the realities regarding inclusive education: what are the positive aspects? What main challenges have been identified by the key stakeholders? And most importantly, how to address these challenges to enable children with disabilities to fully enjoy their education in a mainstream setting?

Please tick the box whether you are:

- A child/youngster**
Your age:
- A parent**
- A teacher**
Years in practice: 0-10 years 10-20 years 20 years or more
- A school leader**
Years in practice: 0-10 years 10-20 years 20 years or more
- Other professional**
Your job:
Years in practice: 0-10 years 10-20 years 20 years or more

THEMATIC QUESTIONS

Inclusion & participation

1. The school works towards inclusion in general (e.g. regarding accessibility –not only physical; schooling of children with disabilities, etc.).

Agree 😊 Disagree 😞 Do not know 😐

2. Students with disabilities take part in all activities (e.g. learning activities, activities during breaks at the playground, school trips, etc.) at school.

For the child: I can take part in all activities (e.g. learning activities, activities during breaks at the playground, school trips, etc.) at school.

For the parents: My child can take part in all activities (e.g. learning activities, activities during breaks at the playground, school trips, etc.) at school.

Agree 😊 Disagree 😞 Do not know 😐

¹⁹ The Index for Inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools

Communication

3. There is a communication on a regular basis between all actors involved (i.e. child, parent, teacher, school leader, other type of professional) in the child's education.

For the child: There is a communication on a regular basis between me and all the adults involved in my education (including my teacher, my parents, etc.)

For the parents: There is a communication on a regular basis between all actors involved (i.e. child, parent, teacher, school leader, other type of professional) in my child's education.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you disagree, who is missing in the communication?

.....

.....

4. I know who I can refer to when I have a problem or a question, regarding any school-related topic.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you agree, please specify their role:

.....

.....

5. The child can easily communicate about his/her problem or question, regarding any school-related topic.

For the child: I can easily communicate about my problem or if I have a question, regarding any school-related topic.

For the parents: My child can easily communicate about his/her problem or question, regarding any school-related topic.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

Involvement-collaboration

6. All actors are actively involved in this inclusive education on an equal basis.

For the child: All adults are involved my education in the same way.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you disagree, who is not involved?

.....

.....

7. I am happy with my level of involvement in the child's education.

For the parents: I am happy with the level of involvement of other actors in my child's education. (this question will not be asked to children)

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you disagree, how would you like to be involved? (max. 2 sentences)

.....

.....

Teaching

8. The teachers design the lessons and learning activities starting from the child's needs (when necessary).

For the teacher: I design the lessons and learning activities starting from the child's needs (when necessary).

For the parents: The teachers design the lessons and learning activities starting from my child's needs (when necessary).

For the child: The teacher designs the lessons and learning activities starting from my needs (when necessary).

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you agree, describe in one sentence how this is possible. If you disagree, please define the barriers to such a design.

.....

.....

9. The child's teachers can get support from other actors to design lessons and learning activities starting from the child's needs.

For the child: My teachers can speak with other actors to get support so as to design lessons and learning activities.

For the teachers: I can get support from other actors to design lessons and learning activities.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you agree, please define who these actors are.

.....

.....

Training

10. The child's teachers are trained to teach students with disabilities.

For the teachers: I am trained to teach students with disabilities.

For the parents: My child's teachers are trained to teach students with disabilities.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

Network

11. There is a clearly identified network gathering all actors involved in the school's inclusive education.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

If you agree, who is part of this network?

.....

.....

If you disagree, do you think there should be such a network? Please define who, in your opinion, should be part of this network.

.....

.....

12. Support is provided (to children with disabilities, parents, teachers, school leaders, service providers) when needed to ensure inclusive education and the child's inclusion in school.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

13. Alternative networks (e.g. sports association) are efficient in supporting inclusive education of the child.

Agree 😊
 Disagree 😞
 Do not know 😐

Positive points, barriers and axes of improvement

14. I define the current three main barriers to inclusive education in this school (e.g. lack of communication, accessible information, commitment, collaboration, willingness, etc.)

For the child: I define the current three main barriers to my education in this school (e.g. lack of communication, accessible information, commitment, collaboration, willingness, etc.)

For the parents: I define the current three main barriers to my child's education in this school (e.g. lack of communication, accessible information, commitment, collaboration, willingness, etc.)

1)

2)

3)

15. I define the three things I like most about this school

For the child: I define the three things I like most about this school.

For the parents: I define the three things I like most about this school.

1)

2)

3)

16. I define the three things I like most about how inclusive education is implemented in this school.

For the child: I define the three things I like most about how my education works.

For the parents: I define the three things I like most about how my child's education is implemented.

1)

2)

3)

17. I identify three things I would most like to change about this school.

For the child: I identify three things I would most like to change about this school.

For the parents: I identify three things I would most like to change about my child's school.

1)

2)

3)

18. I identify three things I would most like to change about the way inclusive education is implemented in this school.

For the child: I identify three things I would most like to change about my education.

For the parents: I identify three things I would most like to change about my child's education.

1)

2)

3)

About the BEYOND Project

'To Inclusive Education and BEYOND '(BEYOND) is a Erasmus+ funded project, which aims to empower special schools and service providers supporting children with special needs, to facilitate the transition towards fully inclusive education systems.

The project partnership is comprised of the following organisations:



The European Association of Service providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD) is a wide European network which represents around 17.000 services across Europe and across disabilities. The main objective of EASPD is to promote the equalisation of opportunities for people with disabilities (through effective and high-quality service systems).



Kehitysvammaisten Palvelusäätiö- the Service Foundation for People with an Intellectual Disability (KVPS) is a national service provider and developer with its roots set in parent-led governance. The foundation supports people with an intellectual disability and others with special needs as well as their families.



The **Centre de la Gabrielle** is a private, non-profit organisation founded in 1972. Today the Centre de la Gabrielle is an organisation with 300 employees who assist 500 children, young adults and adults with mental and/or intellectual disabilities.



Katholiek Onderwijs Vlaanderen is a public authority and the official institution, recognised and funded by the Flemish department of education, responsible for the support of Catholic schools in Flanders. Katholiek Onderwijs Vlaanderen represents approximately 1400 schools in primary education, more than 600 schools in secondary education and approximately 150 special needs schools.



Chance B was founded in 1986 as a 'self-help association' by parents with children and young people with disabilities as well as by teacher of the Giesdorf special school for children with intellectual disabilities. The aim of the association is 'to assist and support old, ill and people with disabilities so that they can live life to the full' in their communities.



Centro de Educação para o Cidadão com Deficiência, C.R.L. - C.E.C.D. Mira Sintra is a Cooperative for Social Solidarity, a non-profit organisation and was recognized by the Government as an organization of Public Utility. At the present, provides services for more than 2.000 people, since toddlers, children, youth and adults who need specialised support, due to problems in their development and/or deficits in academic, work or social performance.



University College Leuven-Limburg (UCLL) is renowned for the high quality of its teaching, research and regional development. UCLL's strong commitment to research ensures state-of-the-art training programmes for its 15,000 students. Within the teacher education department of UCLL a centre of expertise concerning education for all is active.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

