Pi

Analysis of the use and value of the Index for Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow 2011) and other instruments to assess and develop inclusive education practice in P2i partner countries

MAY 2012

EASPD

**IMPROVING SERVICES
IMPROVING LIVES**

MEMBERS OF THE PROJECT GROUP "PATHWAYS TO INCLUSION" (P2i):

Goedele Avau, European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD), Belgium

Phil Madden, European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD), Belgium

Franz Wolfmayr, Chance B / Die Steirische Behindertenhilfe, Austria

Karel Caesar, Vlaams Verbond van het Katholiek Buitengewoon Onderwijs (VVKBuO), Belgium

Annemie Jennes, Vlaams Verbond van het Katholiek Buitengewoon Onderwijs (VVKBuO), Belgium

Sisko Rauhala, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (FAIDD), Finland

Jenni Sipila, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (FAIDD), Finland

Henna Kara, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (FAIDD), Finland,

Veli-Pekka Sinervuo, Finnish Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (FAIDD), Finland

Yannick Lucas, Institute d'Education Motrice Charlemagne -Mutualité Française Indre-Touraine, France

Dr. Johannes Schädler, Zentrum für Planung und Evaluation Sozialer Dienste (ZPE), University of Siegen, Germany

Prof. Dr. Albrecht Rohrmann, Zentrum für Planung und Evaluation Sozialer Dienste (ZPE), University of Siegen, Germany

Beata Orosz, Association for Lifelong Learning (ALLL), Hungary

Zoltan Varkonyi, Association for Lifelong Learning (ALLL), Hungary

Brian ODonnell, National Federation of Voluntary Bodies (NFVB), Ireland

Miguel Valles, Centro de Educação para o Cidadão Deficiente (CECD), Portugal

Marianne den Otter, Fontys Opleidingscentrum Speciale Onderwijszorg (Fontys OSO), The Netherlands

Ronald Haccou, Fontys Opleidingscentrum Speciale Onderwijszorg (Fontys OSO), The Netherlands

Valerija Bužan, Draga Training, Occupation and Care Center (CUDV), Slovenia

Barbara Hegeduš, Draga Training, Occupation and Care Center (CUDV), Slovenia

Contents

Analysis of the use and value of the Index for Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow 2011) and other instruments to assess and develop inclusive education practice in P2i partner countries

This report is the outcome of work by Fontys OSO (Ronald Haccou and Marianne den Otter with support for writing up from Chris Lloyd) as part of the P2i project. (See list of all partners involved below)[1]

1.   Introduction and Background

This report provides the background, rationale and findings of the second phase of the European project Pathways to Inclusion (P2i).

P2i is funded by the EU and coordinated by the European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD). It began in 2009 and will conclude in 2012.

The central aim of the P2i project is to contribute to and facilitate national and European implementation processes for inclusive education for persons with special educational needs (SEN).   The project intends to develop a sustainable network of partners, committed to the implementation and development of inclusive education, in order

✦ to share and disseminate information about existing policy and practice in the field

✦ to provide a database of committed and interested practitioners and stakeholders

✦ to evaluate and assess progress in working towards inclusive education and

✦ to provide and disseminate a web based 'knowledge centre' on inclusive education.

 This network of ten EU member countries, referred to henceforward as the consortium, includes two universities and eight providers in the service provision field. It is a deliberately diverse consortium representing different organizations, providers and practitioners working across a range of disciplines in the field of inclusive education, all of which have strong, interactive relations with a wide range of stakeholders.

Phase one of the project, which took place during the first year, was led by Siegen University Germany. It involved research by the consortium partners into the situation with regard to inclusive education in their own countries and resulted in the development of the EASPD Barometer of Inclusive Education in Selected European Countries (Schädler et al 2012). This instrument was used to assess and compare the different national contexts in order to provide a macro perspective picture of policies, practices, perspectives and challenges in those countries. The objective of this assessment was to use the information gathered to inform and promote the process of inclusive education.   A number of conclusions resulted as an outcome of phase one of the P2i project, including the following:

✦ There is increasing awareness about inclusive education in legislation, policy and amongst a range of public bodies and organizations and other relevant parties.

✦ There is a mixed picture with regard to rights, for children with SEN, to inclusive education within the mainstream of schooling and a lack of appropriate resourcing to facilitate access.

✦ There is continuing dominance of a deficit, medical model of categorisation and labelling used to assess children and allocate school placements.

✦ At the same time, changes have occurred in the approach to assessing and identifying children's SEN from more traditional approaches, resulting in segregation, to more person centred inclusive approaches.

✦ Schooling systems are often restrictive, inflexible and category dependent, which prevents the development of inclusive education rather than supporting it as is the case with more universal, comprehensive structures.

✦ The increase in inclusive education has not been accompanied by a decrease in segregated education. Both have more children.

✦ Many accessibility and resourcing barriers continue to prevent the development of inclusive education.

✦ There is more involvement of parents in decision making although genuine involvement is often limited due to lack of resources in the mainstream.

✦ There is insufficient use and understanding of how assistive technologies can creatively support inclusive education.

✦ There is a lack of emphasis in teacher education on inclusive education, with SEN issues dominated by special school/special education perspectives.

✦ There is inconsistent and poor quality national monitoring of inclusive education.

✦ While a definite move toward more inclusive education can be identified there are concerns that pressures of the recent, and current, economic crisis in Europe might impede future development.

✦ There are many developments in teaching models to achieve inclusive education in all countries but little reduction in class size, except in countries where population is falling.

While the EASPD Barometer assessment paints a picture of increasing awareness about inclusive education in legislation, policy, it is clear that a number of barriers remain, which can be seen to be impeding its development in practice, a finding which is supported and endorsed by other such studies in the area, (e.g. European Foundation Centre Report *VC/2008.1214 2010)*.

Phase two of the project investigated the use of instruments and tools designed to support schools with processes of change, improvement and development in inclusive education.

This is the focus of this report.

Essentially, they should be seen as a form of quality assurance (QA). In common with other QA systems, the key elements are values, outcomes, analysis, evaluation and progress planning.

Colleagues from Fontys OSO, the partner responsible for co-ordinating phase two, carried out an investigation of available instruments and tools and also considered the possibility of designing a checklist themselves.

The particular focus was on the Index for Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2011) which is a well known tool, designed for exactly this purpose, translated widely into a range of languages and adapted for use in other countries.

The Index is wide ranging, and concerns ALL pupils and students. It is not disability specific.

THE PROJECT
✦ Investigated if and how the Index was being used in the partner countries,

✦ sought feedback on its strengths and weaknesses, and

✦ investigated whether other, similar tools were being used.

2. Supporting and Enhancing the Implementation of Inclusive Education in Practice – rationale for the investigation

The P2i project is underpinned by the Article 24 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities 2006 which clearly endorses inclusive education as a key vehicle through which the right to an equal education opportunity for all can be ensured. For this to become a reality it is necessary to provide a system in which all persons, including persons with disabilities, can access education at all levels on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live. They should not be excluded on the basis of any disability and should get the support they require.

"States Parties recognize the right of persons with disabilities to education. With a view to realizing this right without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunity, States Parties shall ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and life long learning." (Article 24)

It is important to note that the Convention is seen as a progressive instrument. It accepts that the present position regarding inclusion in any country will be imperfect. At the same time it expects those countries which have signed the Convention to develop plans for improvement.

This has important implications for any evaluative tool such as the Index, since it implies that any assessment should not be static but help produce a plan of action and progress.

The principles of inclusive education used to underpin the P2i project are also enshrined in the Salamanca Declaration (1994) which states that:

Art. 2: "regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes . . . building an inclusive society and achieving education for all";

And

Art. 3: "to include all children regardless of individual differences of difficulties and to adopt as a matter of law or policy the principle of inclusive education".

In line with these principles the aims of the P2i project are, as stated above, in summary, to;

✦ exchange, disseminate and create knowledge about inclusive education in order to improve and enhance quality and support change and development processes;

✦ develop and provide strategies and tools to enable these processes.

In order to;

✦ support and facilitate the inclusion of pupils with SEN into the mainstream of education in order to improve life chances in adulthood;

and

✦ ensure the right of every citizen to enjoy to high-quality education in an inclusive setting which meets his/her personal needs;

Currently it is possible to identify a gap between rhetoric and reality in the implementation of inclusive education. This is one of a number of barriers to change and development (Slee, 2001; Booth, 2003; Lloyd, 2008). Education practitioners are faced, on a daily basis, with many policy changes and developments- all of which they are expected to prioritise and implement, sometimes with insufficient training and professional development and expertise and often with insufficient resources, leading to stress and confusion. These pressures can also lead to resistance to change and reliance on the status quo. Well designed tools and instruments which raise awareness about what changes and developments are required, provide a framework for action and support change processes are very important.

The process of moving towards and implementing inclusive education requires changes in the organisation, the curriculum, teaching and learning, monitoring and assessment processes, roles and responsibilities and a wide range of other fundamental areas such as community context and characteristics. It is, therefore important, beginning with current practice, for all parties to work together to agree on what inclusive education will mean for their institution; to identify and define priorities for change; to develop strategies to bring about those changes and to devise effective and clear monitoring, evaluation and assessment procedures so that they can reflect on their progress during the change process.

3. The Index for Inclusion

The Index for Inclusion is an example of a developmental, self evaluation tool (Ainscow and Booth, 2011) which has been designed specifically to support and assist with the process of developing inclusive education. It can be modified for local use and adapted to meet the needs of individual institutions and is intended to support critical reflection and action through a process of self review and evaluation.

> "The 'Index for inclusion: developing learning and participation in schools' is a set of materials to support the self review of all aspects of a school, including activities in playgrounds, staff rooms and classrooms the communities and environment around the school. It encourages all staff, parents/carers and children to contribute to an inclusive development plan and put it into practice."
> (p.9)

The materials are focussed on processes and are intended to support the development of a framework for change and action through a whole school/institution approach.

The focus is on issues of participation that go beyond learning to include being valued, recognised, and accepted as a fully participative member of society. Valuing diversity and difference is seen as an essential part of the process of removing barriers to inclusion and increasing full participation and reducing exclusion are key the development of sustainable change and genuinely inclusive education. There is a clear recognition that defining inclusion and inclusive education is complex, problematic and that there is little consensus about what it means and that coming to a shared understanding about what is required must involve the whole school/institution and its community. While the materials are designed to support a process of change and development, they recognise that the starting point should be a process of self review, critical reflection and evaluation beginning with what is already known within the institution.

> "The materials are designed to build on the wealth of knowledge and experience of staff, children, young people and their families about the nature of their setting and how it can be improved. The process of working with the *Index* allows these rich resources to be shared and to make a difference. It is a comprehensive document that can help everyone to find their own next steps in developing a setting. However inclusive a school is thought to be currently, the *Index* can be used to support the unending processes involved in developing learning and participation for all and reducing all exclusionary pressures." (p. 19)

The materials in the Index assist and support the identification of pathways towards inclusive education by exploring three interconnected dimensions:

- ✦ Inclusive cultures - refers to the encouragement of those beliefs and value systems that generate a secure, accepting, collaborating and inspiring community for all participants. A central identifier within the organization is its congenial and welcoming atmosphere and the presence of inclusive values. People are encouraged to help each other and collaborate. Everyone (i.e. all stakeholders) is treated with respect.

- ✦ Inclusive policies - provides explicit aims for promoting inclusion in plans and other policy documents. It focuses on the policies towards admission and accessibility of the organization (and the buildings), towards recruitment of staff and students and on the policies the organization has developed to organize the support for diversity and maybe the celebration of diversity.

- ✦ Inclusive practices - focuses on what actually is going on in the organization: On the practices that reflect inclusive cultures and policies by ensuring that activities encourage the participation of all participants.

Each dimension has a set of indicators with questions which can be used to

- ✦ review and evaluate current practices
- ✦ stimulate critical reflection, discussion and debate and
- ✦ assist with the development of an appropriate framework for action. Emphasis is also placed on the importance for the development of inclusive education of linking actions to inclusive values in the process of development planning.

"Values are fundamental guides and prompts to action. They spur us forward, give us a sense of direction and define a destination. We cannot know that we are doing, or have done, the right thing without understanding the relationship between our actions and our values. For all actions affecting others are underpinned by values. Every such action becomes a moral argument whether or not we are aware of it. It is a way of saying 'this is the right thing to do'. In developing a framework of values we state how we want to live and educate each other together, now and in the future." (p21)

The inclusive values, identified in and underpinning the Index, are as follows

✦ Viewing every life and every death as of equal worth.

✦ Supporting everyone to feel that they belong.

✦ Increasing participation for children and adults in learning and teaching activities.

✦ Developing relationships and communities of local schools.

✦ Reducing exclusion, discrimination, barriers to learning and participation.

✦ Restructuring cultures, policies and practices to respond to diversity in ways that value everyone equally.

✦ Linking education to local and global realities.

✦ Learning from the reduction of barriers for some children to benefit children more widely.

✦ Viewing differences between children and between adults as resources for learning.

✦ Acknowledging the right of children to an education of high quality in their locality.

✦ Improving schools for staff and parents/carers as well as children.

✦ Emphasising the development of school communities and values, as well as achievements.

✦ Fostering mutually sustaining relationships between schools and surrounding communities.

✦ Recognising that inclusion in education is one aspect of inclusion in society.
(p.11)

The Index was, therefore, considered by the consortium to be a practical and useful example of the sort of tool which has the potential to

✦ raise awareness about inclusive education

✦ increase knowledge and understanding about the principles underpinning and informing inclusive education and

✦ play a role in assisting and supporting schools to implement and change and develop more inclusive education.

In addition the Index is widely known and available in translation in a number of different languages, which was considered to be an additional advantage.

4. Self-Evaluation

Perhaps one of the most important features of the Index is that it is firmly rooted in a process of self review and evaluation. The value and importance of this approach to generating change and development is clearly described in the Self Evaluation in Adult Life Long Learning (SEALLL; Alden Biesen, 2007)[2] a Grundtvig 1 project, which was part of the European SOCRATES educational programme. This project was concerned with improving the quality of teaching and learning and the quality of organisation and management in lifelong learning by promoting and supporting self-evaluation, described as

"……..the process of systematic collection, analysis and exchange of data concerning educational processes of either individuals, groups or organisations (institutions, etc.) in order to facilitate learning among all parties concerned so value judgments and decision-making may be based on evidence rather than on intuition". (p.8)

This view has been strongly supported and promoted in a range of studies and literature (McBeath et al, 1996; Smith & Barr, 2007; Bubb & Early, 2008; Roelande et al 2009) as well as in recent government policies for school improvement, as for example in England. In these studies and policies, self evaluation is seen as a key factor for high quality professional and school development and is also identified as an indicator of high quality.

"In terms of school self-evaluation and the quality of schools, our research confirmed the hypothesis that schools which implemented very few *self assessment* measures (Cluster 1) score significantly lower in mathematics. Furthermore, a significant relationship was found between the quality of the teaching-learning process and SSE clusters. Schools with an advanced SSE score highest on the teaching and learning scale. This indicates that schools with an advanced SSE system are on average of a higher quality (according to the Inspectorate) regarding the curriculum, the use of the available learning time, the pedagogical and didactic performances of teachers, the school climate, harmonization with the educational needs of pupils, an active and independent role for pupils, and finally, a higher quality of support and guidance for pupils, in comparison to the rest of the schools in our study." (P.66)

Smith and Barr (2007), looking critically at the implementation of inclusive education in Ireland, and further afield, identify a range of strategies and tools which should be used to make inclusive education a reality in practice which include the use of self assessment tools by whole school or department to guide development planning. Supporting this view SEALLL (2007) outlines three crucially important reasons why self evaluation can be seen to have a crucial role to play in bringing about change and development, in particular in the area of inclusive education.

✦ Self-evaluation empowers. The insights gained from shared reflection on their own practices provide people with the knowledge needed to defend more effectively what should be maintained and to launch improvement and change where necessary.

✦ Self-evaluation creates a sense of ownership and commitment. The work really becomes your own. Teachers, trainers, or educators are not just employees, they are professionals. Professionalism implies autonomy to make decisions and choices. The other side of the freedom to make these choices is the obligation to account for them. Self-evaluation will be crucial for that purpose.

✦ Self-evaluation enables dialogue between all parties concerned in teaching and learning. As such it makes things transparent and allows for a better match between what is needed from the perspective of learners and stake holders, and what is offered by teachers, trainers or educators. (p.7)

The development of inclusive education, as discussed earlier, can be seen to require all three of these processes if it is to be successfully implemented. The Index for Inclusion, and is also underpinned by, and dependent upon, them. The consortium, similarly convinced that a process of critical whole school self evaluation, supported by a range of developmental tools designed to support the process, was interested in phase two of the P2i project to investigate these ideas with practising practitioners in their countries to gather further information which could be shared and disseminated throughout the network.

2 http://www.sealll.eu/docs/manual/Sealll01_UK_web.pdf

5. The Investigation - methodology

5.1 The questionnaires – background and design

Initially Fontys produced a check list self-evaluation, using but not replicating the Index for Inclusion materials, to be used to identify how schools are working towards inclusive education. However, in discussion with Professor Tony Booth, one of the creators of the Index, it became clear there could be problems of misunderstanding and attribution if a new tool was used.

The concerns were

✦ that the check list could be seen as too static, and

✦ that partial use and adaptation of the Index materials could lead to the Index itself being misunderstood.

In addition, the discussion coincided with the launch of the third edition of the Index, and it was felt useful to see whether this launch was accompanied by increased usage.

As a result of all this the P2i partners and Fontys in particular, decided to produce two questionnaires on the use of the Index, with this being the central focus of the investigation.

5.2 The Questionnaires – design and piloting

Two questionnaires were designed, one for use at a national and one for school level, which were intended to be used alongside the Index for Inclusion, or other tools (see Appendix 1 and 2). The decision to gather information at national and school level was made in order to try to contextualise the individual school responses within a national framework so that national issues and constraints, concerning the implementation of inclusive education, could be separated out from what was happening in local contexts.

After some debate about the length of the questionnaires arising in which the desire to maximise responses by keeping them short was weighed against the need to produce sufficient data to ensure reliability, 23 questions concerning Inclusive education, the Index for Inclusion and

professional development were agreed upon. The main topics covered in the questionnaires are: school identity and the context; inclusive education; use of the Index for inclusion and/or other tools; professional development; suggestions for improving/adapting/modifying the Index for inclusion and /or other tools used and other comments.

5.3 School Level Pilot

The school level questionnaire was piloted in the Netherlands before being implemented to ensure that it was practical and useful and that schools would find it accessible. The pilot identified that about approximately an hour was required to fill in the questionnaire. However, it should be noted that during the pilot colleagues from Fontys OSO were on hand to introduce and explain the project and its aims, to exchange information and introduce a dialogue approach to completing it. Although this approach was considered important and useful as an introduction to the school it was also understood that it was necessary to avoid discussion during the actual process of completing the questionnaire in order to prevent influencing responses. Piloting also revealed the importance of adding the, *Other Comments* section to the questionnaire to allow for value added information to be included in returns.

5.4 Implementation

Partner countries in the consortium were given responsibility for providing the answers to the questions in the national questionnaire, by gathering information locally using national experts where appropriate. They were also responsible for translation, execution and analysis of the school based questionnaires. The questionnaires were distributed to all educational settings: primary, secondary, special, pre -school, and it was agreed that in each country a minimum of 5 and maximum of 10, local institutions would be invited to participate in the investigation.

Between December 2011 and February 2012 the questionnaires were translated into the language of the partners, distributed and returned.

6. Findings – analysis of the questionnaires

Before presenting the findings, conclusions and recommendations it is important to emphasise that this Investigation can only be seen as providing very tentative and indicative information about how well inclusive education is established in the 10 partner countries and what role the Index for Inclusion and/or other tools or instruments play. Within the limited budget and time constraints of the P2i project it was only possible to carry out a fairly light touch research and the consortium, therefore, opted for a practically oriented investigation intended to produce qualitative data which could be used to identify representative patterns and trends. The purpose of the research was not to draw hard and fast conclusions about what exactly is happening in each country but rather to provide useful practical information to stimulate and contribute to discussion, locally, nationally and across Europe, about the development of inclusive education in and, most importantly, about how to make it work.

The relatively low response rate should also make us cautious, though that in itself is possibly significant in reflecting work pressure and/or limited awareness of the Index.

6.1 Results

THE NATIONAL LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE

The intention of the national level questionnaire was to add to, and complement, the information already gathered during the first phase of P2i using the EASPD-Barometer of Inclusive Education. The focus in the questionnaire was specifically on the use of the Index for Inclusion, and/or other such tools in the implementation of inclusive education. Information was gathered from a range of sources including publications, reports of research from universities, teacher training centres for SEN, organisations which have translated the Index for Inclusion and/or are promoting inclusive education and/or are promoting the use of the Index for Inclusion or other tools. Partners were also asked to identify specific examples of best practice so that they can be added to the web based knowledge centre about inclusive education which is being created as an output of the P2i project.

Table 1: Findings relating to the index for Inclusion at national level

	Total	Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
1 Index is Used	**Yes 6** **No 4**	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
2 Use of Other methods	**Yes 5** **No 3** **? 2**	Y	Y	?	N	?	N	Y	N	Y	Y
3 Research on the Index	**Yes 6** **No 3** **? 1**	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	N	Y	Y	N	N
4 Specific examples	**Yes 10** **No**	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 An organization on Inclusive education	**Yes 8** **No 2**	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
6 Index used by an organization	**Yes 4** **No 5** **? 1**	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	N	N	N	N	N

■ Orange marked items indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

Analysis of the finding relating to the index for Inclusion and its use in the partner countries, presented in Table 1, reveals the following:

✦ The index is translated into all the partner countries languages with the exception of Slovenia.

✦ The Index for Inclusion is used in 6 countries.

✦ Also in 6 (not identical) countries research has been done on the Index.

✦ In four of the six countries which use the Index for Inclusion (as a whole or in part) other tools are used to develop inclusive education.

✦ In 8 countries, organisations which actively disseminate and/or develop inclusive education were identified. However only 4 use the Index for Inclusion for this purpose.

✦ All 10 partner countries have specific examples of best practice on methods/instruments regarding inclusive education.

It is possible to conclude, therefore, that the index for inclusion is relatively well known in 4 countries at national level and that it is used, by schools as well as by a range of other organisations to actively disseminate and promote inclusion. It should be noted however that all returns for all countries showed that the Index for Inclusion is only one of a range of tools or that parts of it are used. Not all of the other tools are widely translated.

Table 2: Findings relating to the use of the Index for Inclusion in relation to segregation in special schools in comparison with the findings of the EASPD-Barometer of Inclusive Education.

	Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
% segregated in SE	2.6	2.7	1.2	4.8	5.3	1.5	0.8	0.1	0.6	1.7
A Legal Basis **Supportive** **Mainly supportive** **Partly supportive** **Not supportive**	Mainly supportive	Mainly supportive	Supportive	Partly supportive	Not supportive	Supportive	Mainly supportive	Mainly supportive	Supportive	Mainly supportive
B Incl. Education = **Fully Realised** **Mainly realised** **Partly realised** **Not realised**	Partly realised	Partly realised	Mainly realised	Partly realised	Mainly realised	Mainly realised	Mainly realised	Mainly realised	Mainly realised	Partly realised
C Progression = **Very significant** **Significant** **Slow development** **No**	Slow	Slow	Slow	Slow	Slow	Slow	Slow	Significant	Slow	Slow

■ Orange marked countries indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

Analysis of the data collected in the national questionnaires when compared with the findings in the EASPD-Barometer of Inclusive Education research reveal the following:

✦ The 6 partner countries which have indicated that the Index for inclusion is used in schools (see table 1) have a higher percentage of children and young people with SEN who are segregated in special schools (average 3.0% for the partner countries who use the Index and an average of 0.8% for those who use not the Index).

✦ Inclusive education appears in countries which do not use the index for inclusion to have a more legal basis (A (rather) supportive) and be more realised (B rather realised) in comparison with countries which use the Index for Inclusion.

THE SCHOOL LEVEL QUESTIONNAIRE

(An overview of the *Other Comments* responses is included in Appendix 2a)

Where results are 50% or more of the total responses they are marked in blue. If we found responses to a question are 50% or more of the answers within that question they are marked in green. This decision was made because schools did not always answer all the questions. E.g Schools did not all fill in part E - the section relating to ideas for improving the index for inclusion, when they did not use it.

Table 3: Findings at school level relating to school identity and context

	Total		Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
N Total	41		4	8	2	2	7	5	5	3		5
Answered by	HT	20	4	4	1	1	4		2			4
	M M	1			1							
	Staff	7		4						3		
	Board	3							3			
	Others	3					2					1
A1 Age range	Pre S E	11	2		1		6			2		
	P E	33	4	7	2	2	6	3	3	3		3
	S E	4	1				1	1				1
	V E	5		1				1	2			1
A2a Number of Pupils	<100	5		1	2			2				
	<200	7	1	1		2		1		2		
	<300	12	3	2			4	2		1		1
	Larger	17		4			3		5			4
A2b Size of the school	< Nat Level	5		3				2				
	> Nat Level	5		3	1	1						
	= Nat Level	13	3	1	1			3	5			
A3 School easily within reach	Yes	38	4	8	2	1	7	4	5	2		5
	No	1				1						
	Some	1						1				
A4 Is part of a Consortium	Yes	22	2	8	2		7			2		1
	No	19	2			2		5	5	1		4
A5 works together with others	Yes	28	2	7	2	1	3	5	5	3		
	No	6		1		1	4					

(HT = Head teacher; M M = Middle Management; Pre S E = Pre School Education; P E = Primary Education; S E = Secondary Education; V E = Vocational Education; Nat level = National Level)

■ Orange marked items indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

Analysis of the data collected on school identity and context reveals the following:

✦ The majority of the responses related to primary education came from schools that belong to a consortium and are also easy for pupils to reach.

✦ In general the size of the school is within national average size levels.

✦ Most of the schools work together with other services/agencies on inclusive education.

✦ From the responses to question A5 about working together with other services/agencies (to be found in full in appendix 2a) 7 partners indicate that this working together generally takes the form of guidance or support by other services or organisations external to the school.

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Analysis of data collected on inclusive education reveals the following:

Definitions about the vision of respondents relating to inclusive education include that it is a process which:

✦ is concerned with all children - they are unique; nobody is left behind and it is beneficial for them;

✦ is a right which is necessary to ensure optimal development;

✦ is about acceptance of each other - everybody at school and all those related to the school in any way;

✦ is concerned with valuing diversity; is concerned with citizenship and is an opportunity and a challenge.

Table 4: Findings at school level relating to structures to support the implementation of inclusive education.

	Total		Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
B2 start a formal dialogue	Yes	19	4	5	1	2	4			2		1
	No	9		2	1		3	1		1		1
	?	8		1					5			2
B3 Who initiated inclusive education	Board	10		3			2		5			
	Management	12	2	4		2	2	1		1		
	Team	6	1	2				3				
	Parents	4			1			4				
	Others	12	1	4			2	2		2		
B4 What were the key agents to start inclusive education	Team	11	2	1	2	1		3				2
	Board	11	3	1	1		1		5			
	Particular	12	4	4	1		1					2
	External	17	1	2	2			3	5	2		2
	Others	14	2	3		2	5	1		1		
B5 instalment of special structures to support	Yes	33	1	5	2	2	6	5	5	2		5
	No	7	3	2			1			1		
	?	1		1								

■ Orange marked countries indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

Analysis of the findings relating to the structures used to support the implementation of inclusive education reveals the following:

✦ The majority of the schools have special structures to support the process towards inclusion which include, for example, extra forms of support, the use of special curricula or methods.

✦ Most of the schools have started a formal dialogue on inclusive education.

USE OF THE INDEX FOR INCLUSION / OTHER TOOLS

Table 5: Findings relating to the use of the Index for Inclusion and/or other tools to support the implementation of inclusive education.

		Total	Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
C1 Consider other Tools	Yes	14	1	3	1		1		5	3		
	No	18	1	3	1	2	4	2				5
	?	5	1	2			2					
C2 reason to choose for the Index	Already known	7	1	1		2	2	1				
	Recommended	10	3	3		1	2	1				
	Choice 1	6	1			1	4					
	Choice 2	5	1			1	3					
	Choice 3	6	1		1	1	3					
	Choice 4	7	1			2	4					
	Choice 5	4	1	3		2	1					
	Choice 6	8	1				2			2		
C3 Index is used as a whole	Yes	9	2	1	1	1	4					
	No	18	2	6	1	1	2	1	5			
	?	2		1			1					
C4 Easy to Select indicators	Easy	9	3	4	1	1						
	Not Easy	9		2	1		6					
	?	10	1	2		1		1	5			
C6a index helpful for Setting discussions	Yes	15	1	5	1	1	6			1		
	No	2		1				1				
	?	4	2	1		1						
C6b index helpful for actions by stakeholders	Yes	10	2	2		2	4					
	No	5		3	1		1					
	?	2	1					1				
C6c Other comments	Yes	2	1				1					
	No											
	?	1					1					
C7 Adaptation Index for a better match to the school	Yes	10	2	1	1	1	5					
	No	12	1	4		1		1	5			
	?	4		2			2					
C8 Index offer Clear outcomes	Yes	22	4	4	1		5		8			
	No	4		2		1		1				
	?	4		2		1	1					
C9 index create a better dialogue	Yes	17	4	5	1	2	4	1				
	No	2		1			1					
	?	8		2			1		5			
C10 Other methods	Yes	2					2					
	Covered	3		2		1						
	Familiar	7		2					5			
	Easier	2		1			1					
	Other	1					1	1				
	No	4		1			2					
	?	1					1					

(C2: Choice 1. Coherent structure: dimensions – indicators – questions; 2. Good manual to guide the school through the process; 3. The possibility to involve the different stakeholders; 4. The fact that we could make a choice out from the whole index for Inclusion; 5. Some indicators were clearly linked to the challenge we had to cope with; 6. Other choices)

■ Orange marked items indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

Analysis of the data collected relating to the use of the Index for Inclusion and/or other tools to support the implementation of inclusive education reveals the following:

✦ If schools do use the Index for inclusion it;

✦ was not used as a whole but parts of it were used;

✦ was found to assist with setting clear, relevant ongoing goals and objectives which nevertheless are difficult to put into action;

✦ encouraged them to look for possibilities instead of non-possibilities;

✦ was helpful for setting the agenda for discussions in the school;

✦ emphasised the involvement of parents which was positive;

✦ stressed teamwork which was challenging;

✦ gave insights into how inclusive education develops;

✦ was helpful to create a better dialogue on inclusive education and structured the dialogue;

✦ places positive emphasis on learning from each other;

✦ assist with planning concrete lessons;

✦ was helpful in identifying for actions to be undertaken by different stakeholders;

✦ was helpful in emphasising collaboration with other agencies, the community etc.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Table 6: Findings relating to professional development

	Total			Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
D1 Role of teacher is changed	Yes	1Meth	27	3	6	1	1	2	3	5	1		5
		2Cur	20	2	5	1	2	2	1		3		4
		3Other	12	2	3		1		1		2		3
	No		3					2	1				
	?		4		1			3					
D2 index analysis caused a new profession-alization Plan	Team Tr		8	1	2		1						4
	Tailor-M		6		2			1					3
	Intern Tr		8	4	2								2

(D1: 1 Methods of teaching;; 2Curriculum; 3 Other aspects)

(D2: Team Tr = Team training; Tailor-M = Tailor made training; Intern Tr = Internal training sessions is improved to cover different aspects of inclusive education)

■ Orange marked items indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

Analysis of the findings related to professional development and the implementation of inclusive education reveals the following:

✦ The implementation of inclusive education changed the role of the teacher as a professional.

✦ There is a need to change and develop new learning and teaching approaches including; team teaching; learning from each other; how to provide additional (individual) support to (groups of) pupils; differentiation on (a variety of) methods, instruction and adaptation to the level of the individual pupil.

IMPROVEMENT, ADAPTATION, MODIFICATION, OF THE INDEX FOR INCLUSION

Table 7: Findings relating to suggestions for the improvement, adaptation, modification of the Index for Inclusion.

		Total	Hungary	Netherlands	Finland	Germany	Belgium Flanders	Austria	Ireland	Portugal	France	Slovenia
E1a School organization	Yes	9	3		2	1	3					
	No	1		1								
	?	10	1	6		1	1	1				
E1b Curriculum	Yes	14	4	4	2	1	3					
	No											
	?	6		3		1	1	1				
E1c Staff competency	Yes	13	4	3	2	1	3					
	No											
	?	7		4		1	1	1				
E1d School management	Yes	12	4	2	2	1	3					
	No	1		1								
	?	7		4		1	1	1				
E1e Material circumstances	Yes	8	1	3	2		2					
	No	4	1	1			2					
	?	9	2	3		2	1	1				
E1f Environment of the school	Yes	13	4	3	2	1	3					
	No											
	?	7		4		1	1	1				
E1g Other elements	Yes	10	3	3	2	1	1					
	No											
	?	8	1	3		1	2	1				

■ Orange marked items indicate use of the index for Inclusion.

The responses making suggestions for improving, developing, modifying, the Index for Inclusion included:

✦ Educational elements to improve the curriculum of approaching the SEN-pupils
✦ Competencies of the staff
✦ Management of the school
✦ Context or the environment of the school

N.B. Respondents only ticked the answers above without providing further information (see in Appendix 2a).

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY P2I-PARTNERS

Additional comments from Consortium Partners with regard to improving, developing, modifying, adapting and using the Index for Inclusion

Austria: The use of the Index would need more resources in the schools and a clear ministerial directive. Without that it is more or less in the hands of the teachers. In general the head teachers request more resources to support inclusion. Tools like the index are seen as being helpful.

Belgium: The Index offers too few answers and strategies to assist in practice in classes and school. In its current form it is also too complicated and lengthy. A 'lighter' version of the Index may be more attractive.

Hungary: The Index is a professional aid or manual, not only for the social integration of children with SEN, but it also can shape the inclusive approach. This material should be widely published or even should be used in teacher training. Few young teachers leaving higher education know about this approach. Kindergarten and school teachers could use in the everyday practice if they could gather the knowledge about is on accredited training courses.

The Netherlands: The Index is used in part, not in whole. Where thus used it is helpful and clear.

The Index is a good instrument to start the development of Inclusive education; a starting point for a discussion about inclusive education when what you have to is different from what you want to.

Portugal: In one case it changed the entire school. By working towards an inclusive school ALL students benefited from the range of activities created initially for specific disabilities. It allowed the school to make important partnerships with other organizations and to become open to the local community. The main reason for the delay in wider implementation of the Index for Inclusion is because of the new school territories organization in Portugal. Schools have lost some of their autonomy. Some teachers cite the amount of work and report this to the ministry as the main reason for not accepting the Index for Inclusion,

as they feel it will add even more work. The only way to start using the Index widely is through a ministry decision.

6.2 Data Collection – Issues and Constraints

In spite of the fact that all partners did their utmost to find schools which were willing to participate in the investigation, often sending repeated requests the overall experience in all the countries was that it was very difficult to find schools to participate in this investigation. This led to a limited number of responses and a paucity of data gathered.

This partly reflects the considerable pressure of work in schools. In addition many schools did not use the Index for Inclusion and/or did not know of its existence. Sometimes when it was known it was not used or they had developed their own tools and methods. Another reaction was that it does not suit the specific context of a particular country e.g. in Ireland and Finland.

Another contributory factor to the low response rate was identified as the launch of new national policies, guidelines or strategies in some countries. This was the case in Ireland for example, which has recently launched a new guide from the National Council for Special Education for schools on the inclusion of pupils with special educational needs.

The guide is called "The Inclusive Education Framework" (to download from **www.ncse.ie**). It sets out good practice criteria for including pupils with special educational needs and provides an interactive tool to assist schools to plan, measure and improve how those pupils are supported. Similarly in Finland they are also thinking about how to reorganise inclusive education of disabled children and are experimenting with new approaches.

However it is important to repeat the point made earlier that the intention of the research was to provide information which could contribute to the discussions and debates which continue to range around the implementation and development of inclusive education.

There is still a great deal of food for thought from what has been achieved and received.

Issues have been identified which can stimulate critical discussion and further research about the development of understanding about the processes involved in implementing inclusive education.

6.3 Conclusions

It is possible draw the following conclusions and raise the following questions from the responses. These complement the conclusions from the Barometer analysis.

✦ In all the partner countries it is possible to identify examples of good practice in the development of inclusive education. These developments are more widespread in primary education and especially so where schools are linked to a consortium, have small classes (within national guidelines on class size) and are situated in the community within reach of the pupils (i.e. all pupils are expected to attend local schools).

✦ Most respondent schools had begun formal discussions on inclusive education over the past 10 years. They had also developed special structures to support the process towards inclusive education such as extra forms of support, the use of special curricula or learning and teaching methods. They are working together with a range of other services or agencies especially in the areas of guidance/counselling and support.

✦ Implementing inclusive education changes the role of the teacher as a professional, particularly in the area of teaching approaches, for example team teaching, mutual learning, incorporating additional individual support to groups of pupils and a greater variety of teaching methods to adapt to the needs and learning levels of each pupil.

Conclusions concerning the use of the Index for Inclusion

✦ The index for inclusion is quite well known in most of the participating countries at a national level but not well known or widely used by organisations or schools.

✦ A relationship between the use of the Index for inclusion and the percentage of children and young people with SEN who are segregated in special schools was identified where a high percentage of segregation was linked to more use of the Index for Inclusion. This is possibly because inclusive education is still regarded as a special school issue and is not seen as an issue for mainstream schools or perhaps because the need for tools to support the implementation of inclusive education has not yet been recognised. It may also, importantly, be correlative and not causative. Similarly, small sample size requires caution in deducing patterns.

✦ If schools do use the index for inclusion, for the most part, they use only parts of it. But these parts give clear support and are helpful for setting the agenda for discussions, creating a better dialogue on inclusive education and identifying actions to be undertaken by different stakeholders.

✦ The respondents' suggestions for improvement and modification of the Index for Inclusion related to the second edition of the Index. In the light of the introduction of a third edition, further research could usefully be carried out to gather further information on this topic.

6.4 Recommendations

What emerges, from analysis of the limited data collected by the 10 network partners in phase two of the P2i project, confirms and supports the outcomes of other studies and research in the area of inclusive education and its implementation.
The analysis thus adds weight to the general recommendations of the consortium. For example:

✦ There is a growing need for a paradigm shift to a vision which recognises that - Inclusive education requires and demands the right to full participation for all children together with the full development of the education professionals who work with them, within a context of mutual acceptance and respect.

✦ A different approach is required to school organisation, characterised by dialogue between all stakeholders, including the pupils themselves, and support agencies and organizations.

✦ Professional development for education professionals is required which develops knowledge and understanding about inclusive education as an issue for the mainstream of education –and indeed for all children, not just children identified as having SEN.

✦ Carefully designed, developmental self evaluation tools, such as the Index for Inclusion, can play a valuable role in schools and education focussed institutions to support the process of moving towards inclusive education.

There are of course many pathways to inclusive education. These pathways may differ from partner country to partner country in methodology and content. In every country there are schools and organisations which are developing tools and methods to implement inclusive education. For some it is useful to use tailor made tools such as the Index for Inclusion, or at least parts of it, and for others it is more useful to develop their own tools.

What is clear is that to ensure that inclusive education is implemented and continues to develop, schools and organisations need help. They need strategies, tools and instruments which support them to identify current good practice and develop progressive plans of action encourage regular critical self reflection and monitoring.

The overall aim of the P2i project is to provide knowledge and understanding which will contribute to and promote inclusive practice.

The responses to the Index analysis, further endorsed the message that inclusive education

✦ concerns all children – each is unique and no one is left behind.

✦ is a right for optimal development.

✦ is about acceptance of each other - everybody at school and all those related to the school.

✦ is concerned with valuing diversity; is concerned with citizenship and is an opportunity and a challenge.

✦ The message that inclusive education means inclusion for ALL children has important implications for disability education strategies. Clearly it is essential to have knowledge of the particular characteristics or common features of some disabilities-whilst still 'beginning and ending with the person.'
At the same time disability integration requires a wider approach encompassing all potentially disadvantaged groups. A general culture of openness to all is vital.

There is growing understanding about the concept itself and what is necessary to achieve it. However it is also possible to identify, throughout the responses, concerns about how it is possible to put inclusive education into action within current constraints with regard to resources, time and expertise. Inclusive education cannot be achieved by schools alone and co-operation and collaboration with a consortium of other schools, parents, and the whole range of guidance and support agencies and organisations are required.
This sort of co-operation can and should be extended nationally and internationally through effective dissemination of knowledge, understanding, ideas and good practice, by networks such as the P2i consortium. Such networks also have the potential to promote, disseminate and support the use more widely of useful tools such as the Index for Inclusion and to provide a platform for practising professionals to share their experiences.

Finally, it is vitally important to develop comprehensive and effective professional development geared towards the development of inclusive education. This professional development should include how to use evaluative tools such as the Index for Inclusion.

There is no perfect system. This applies in the wider world of QA-though some systems are marketed as magic answers.

To be successful, any system must
+ have a clear set of values
+ have clear outcome measures
+ not be too expensive
+ not be too long
+ be flexible
+ be person centred.

Experience shows that if these criteria are not met then
+ people do not know where they be going or how to get there
+ they do not get started or soon stop
+ they apply people to systems and not systems to people

The recommendations set out below are focussed on different levels. However the values and responsibilities apply to all, as do the essential activities.

P2i will comprehensively disseminate the overall outcomes and messages.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT EUROPEAN LEVEL

+ A strong vision of inclusive education should be promoted and adopted in order to assist with creating a paradigm shift in thinking about inclusive education. This must clearly reflect the values incorporated in the UNCRPD, and also the specific outcome measures in Article 24.
+ It must also reflect the European Disability Strategy and the Council of Europe Disability Action Plan
+ Sustainable European networks are needed, funded by the EU, to enable educational professionals to promote, share and disseminate and celebrate good practice in inclusive education, inspired by this vision.
+ European web based resource banks and knowledge centres (such as the P2i Knowledge Centre) should be developed, with funding from the EU, to support different aspect of inclusive education. These could also be used as professional development resource banks. The maintenance of these data banks should also be funded by the EU.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT NATIONAL LEVEL

+ Recognising that there are many pathways that lead to the implementation and development of inclusive education, the following pre conditions for inclusive education should be recognised and addressed by all concerned, albeit in different ways in different countries.
+ A shift in thinking for all those involved towards preventing exclusions and recognising that inclusive education is a benefit for everyone and is not just a SEN issue.
+ Dialogue and discussions with all the stakeholders including the pupils.
+ A wide range of guidance and support and resources, to facilitate these processes.
+ National web based knowledge centres should be developed to promote, disseminate and celebrate good practice in inclusive education in each country. Data bases should be in the mother tongue of local stakeholders to maximise participation and understanding.
+ National programmes of professional development which address the range of problematic and controversial issues surrounding the implementation of inclusive education in practice should be developed.
+ The use of developmental self assessment tools, such as the Index for Inclusion, should be required and promoted by national policies for inclusive education.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT SCHOOL LEVEL

+ Networks should be established so that instruments, methods and tools and examples of good practice can be exchanged, shared and disseminated between schools and organisations.
+ Self-evaluation tools and instruments should be used as part of a strategy to develop critically reflective practice in schools and to support the processes of change, development and improvement. Teachers and other professionals involved should be supported to change their roles to meet the challenges of implementing inclusive education.
+ The crucial role of the whole range of external support services should be recognised and they should also be supported.
+ A strategy for the development of a new role for existing segregated special schools as resource centres should be developed.

7. References

Booth, T. & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools.* Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education

Booth, T. (2003) Views from the institution: overcoming barriers to inclusive teacher education?, in: T. Booth, K. Nes & M. Stromstad (Eds) *Developing inclusive teacher education* . London, Routledge/Falmer.

Booth, T. & Ainscow,M. (2009) *Index voor inclusie (2e druk).* Tilburg / Antwerpen / Apeldoorn: Fontys OSO / Garant.

Booth, T. & Ainscow,M. (2011) index for inclusion developing learning and participation in schools, Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education

Bubb, S & Earley, P (2008), *From self evaluation to school improvement; the importance of staff development.* Institute of Education and CfBT Education Trust, London

Claasen, W., de Bruïne,E., Schuman,H., Siemons, H., van Velthooven,B.(2009), *Inclusief Bekwaam, Generiek competentieprofiel inclusief onderwijs onderwijs* [*Competencies for Inclusion, a generic competency profile for inclusive education*] . Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Garant

European Foundation Centre Report (EFC), *Study on challenges and good practices of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities VC/2008.1214 2010*

EASPD (2009) Manifesto on Inclusive education, Dublin

Lakerveld van J en Caals,A (2006): *SEALLL: Self Evaluation in Adult Life Learning*; Grundtvig (www.sealll.eu/docs/SealllframetextJaapAnita.pdf)

Lakerveld, van J. & den Otter,M.(red) (2009*): Perspectief op Inclusief: vruchten van praktijkonderzoek* [*Perspective on inclusion: fruits of practical research*]; Apeldoorn/Antwerpen: Garant

Lloyd, Christine ,(2008) 'Removing barriers to achievement: A strategy for inclusion or exclusion?', *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* Vol 12, No.2 . pp 221-236

MacBeath, J., Boyd, B., Rand, J. & Bell, S. (1996) *Schools must speak for themselves: towards a framework for school self-evaluation* (Glasgow, Quality in Education Centre, University of Strathclyde).

Roelande H. Hofman, Nynke J. Dijkstra & W. H. Adriaan Hofman (2009): *School self-evaluation and student achievement, School Effectiveness and School Improvement,* International Journal of Research, Policy and Practice, 20:1, 47-68

Schädler, Johannes / Dorrance, Carmen (Eds.) (2012): EASPD-Barometer of Inclusive Education in Selected European Countries, European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD), Brussels/Siegen, ZPE-Schriftenreihe, University of Siegen

Slee, R. (2001) 'Inclusion in practice': does practice make perfect? *Educational Review,* 53(2), 113

Smith, Ron and Barr, Séan (2007) 'Towards educational inclusion in a contested society: from critical analysis to creative action', *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 1 - 22

UNESCO-World Conference On Special Needs Education in Salamanca, Spain, 1994

UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006), Article 24: Education

Where to find more information: **www.pathwaystoinclusion.eu**

Education and Culture DG
Lifelong Learning Programme

EACEA
Education, Audiovisual & Culture
Executive Agency