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**Annex vii 1 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country**: Indonesia, Yogyakarta Province Global Region: East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Organisations**: Education for Children with Disabilities: A Local Authority Framework for Inclusion. ASB-Germany, European Union, Ministry of Home Affairs, Yogyakarta Education Authority

Contact Person/Source Issue 9 of EENET Asia Newsletter at http://www.idp-europe.org/eenet-asia/index.php. http://www.inclusive-education-in-action.org/iea/index.php?menuid=25&reporeid=277

Dr. Alex Robinson alex.robinson@asbindonesia.org **Phase:** District Advisors/headteacher/teachers Date 20 months (January 2010–August 2011)

**Aims:** A set of context specific guidelines based on recognised international principles were developed to: define criteria for inclusive schools; develop a teacher training strategy; support inclusive school management and inclusive school monitoring. An Inclusive Education Steering Team (IEST) composed of representatives from provincial and district education authorities and with responsibility for coordinating and overseeing the implementation of inclusive education was also established to ensure sustainability.

**Context:** Yogyakarta Province, Republic of Indonesia has 4 Districts and 1 Municipality; 113 registered ‘inclusive’ schools (please note: the term in the Indonesian context refers to schools that enrol children with disabilities) across the province and 10 ‘unregistered’ inclusive schools that accept children with disabilities. 1,870 Children with disabilities are currently attending inclusive schools; 2,003 children with disabilities do not attend school.

**What they did** : Inclusion of children with disabilities is a relatively new and little understood concept. The project was implemented by Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund (ASB) in partnership with the provincial education authority of Yogyakarta and with the involvement of key stakeholders including various government and non-governmental organisations, parents’ associations and Disabled People Organisations (DPOs). The project also established a standing body (Inclusive Education Steering Team- IEST) composed of representatives from provincial and district education authorities and with responsibility for coordinating and overseeing the implementation of inclusive education in the province. The IEST was a key partner in implementation.

- A school-based survey was organized in 57 inclusive schools in Yogyakarta Province from April 1 to May 12, 2010, applying 7 separate survey methods including school and class observation, interviews with school administrators and CwDs, and focus-group discussions with school supervisors, teachers in inclusive schools, school committees, and a special school headmaster;

- Inclusive Education technical resources have been developed for teacher training including ‘10 tips to teach children with disabilities’ and, in collaboration with IDPN Norway, the translation into Bahasa Indonesia and adaptation of 3 specialised booklets from the UNESCO Inclusive Learning-Friendly Environment Toolkit;

- A set of context-based Guidelines called ‘Minimum Standards Technical Guidelines for Inclusive Education Implementation in Yogyakarta Province to Support Children with Disabilities’ were developed using secondary sources and based on the school survey. The Guidelines cover the following topics: Guideline 1: Criteria for Inclusive Schools; Guideline 2: Strategy for Regular Teachers Training; Guideline 3: School Administrators’ Management; Guideline 4: Monitoring Criteria and Checklist. Specific training was given to District and Provincial officials and school supervisors of the Province

**Outcome/Effect**- The 4 Guidelines have been adopted by the 5 Districts of Yogyakarta Province starting in July 2011 in 132 inclusive schools; The IEST is a trained, standing body with official Terms of Reference (ToR) and is now officially responsible for overseeing all aspects of Inclusive Education within the provinces; 52 District and Provincial officials, all school supervisors of the province (94) and 93 headmasters received awareness raising on the topic covered by the Guidelines (see above); A new budget has been allocated for Inclusive Education by local government in 2 Districts; Local regulations for Inclusive Education at District and Province levels have begun to be created; The Inclusive Education Resource Centre in the Province has been revitalised by the Provincial Education Authority, which is also planning to establish 5 further sub-centres at District level.

**RR Comment** . Cost effective project that has produced a number of valuable training resources in local language. Setting up of IEST has meant the project will continue when the European funding has run out. Involvement of various stakeholders, local and national government ensure buy-in.

**Annex vii 2 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country**: **Vietnam**  Global Region: East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project**: A national strategy for supporting teacher educators to prepare teachers for inclusion

**Contact Person/Source** Forlin, C., & Dinh, N. T. (2010) A national strategy for supporting teacher educators to prepare teachers for inclusion. In C. Forlin (ed.), Teacher Education for Inclusion: Changing Paradigms and Innovative Approaches. Abingdon: Routledge.cforlin@ied.edu.hk ; dnguyet@vn.seapro.crs.org

http://www.inclusive-education-in-action.org/iea/index.php?menuid=25&reporeid=139 **Phase:** Higher Education Trainers of Teachers Date 2008 and repeated 2010

**Aims-**The aim of this national project was to implement a train-the-trainer program to prepare teacher educators from national and provincial universities and colleges across Vietnam for teaching about inclusion. The training course in inclusive education had two major objectives: 1. Up-skill the teacher educators themselves; and2.Engage them in appropriate pedagogies they could then employ to embed the core curriculum framework on inclusive education into their own initial teacher education programs.

**Context**: The Government of Vietnam has shown its commitment to a more inclusive education approach by clearly indicating its desire to provide educational opportunities for children with disabilities in its Education Law (National Assembly, 2005) and particularly in the development and approval of the Education For All National Action Plan 2003–2015.To expand inclusive education into all preschool, primary and secondary schools in Vietnam where an estimated 944,410 teachers require up-skilling (Statistical Source Office, 2008), appropriate teacher education is required. In 2008, the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET) in collaboration with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and an external consultant, developed a national core curriculum and pedagogical framework on inclusive education for ensuring that all teachers in training at all universities and teacher colleges received quality and equitable training. There was, however, a difficulty in implementing this due to the relatively few faculty members who themselves had sufficient knowledge to teach the program. Thus measures had to be taken to provide appropriate training for the teacher educators in the universities and colleges, considered key institutions for delivering and disseminating inclusive education approaches throughout the country.

**What they did**? A total of 47 teacher educators from eight cities and provinces together with representatives from the MOET and CRS participated in a five-day intensive 40-hour training course held in Hanoi. All aspects of the new core curriculum framework were discussed and multiple opportunities were provided to learn, identify and practice the pedagogical skills needed for teaching an inclusive curriculum.

**Outcome/Effect** The participants gained the knowledge and appropriate dispositions towards inclusion and had sufficient practice to be able to feel more confident in becoming inclusive teacher educators. On completion of the course the teacher educators identified four specific areas they had learned that they would apply in their teaching, namely, theory and knowledge; instructions and skills; inclusive education practices; and a much greater awareness about inclusion. These trained educators will be the resource experts for delivering inclusive education in their ITE programs and for disseminating information to other training institutions nationwide. The course allowed them to deeply reflect about their own beliefs and engage in constructive dialogue as they grappled with an understanding of the philosophy of inclusive education; the needs of children from diverse backgrounds; the challenges faced by teachers; and their own role in furthering inclusion. They were still concerned that they needed a lot more information about inclusion and best practices for supporting children with disabilities.

**RR Comment** . This course was a useful initiative, but only covered trainers of teachers from 8 Higher Education establishments and left rest 47 teacher training departments untouched9 apart from one supplementary course by same consultant). Relied on external consultant-no structure left behind to continue training. Danger medical model based professionals take over running the training. Little evidence of practice changing on the ground.

**Annex vii 3 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Cambodia** Global Region: East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source .** 'Theory into Practice' for trainee teachers in Cambodia’

http://www.inclusive-education-in-action.org/iea/index.php?menuid=25&reporeid=113

**Contact Person** Charlene Bredder, Education Advisor, VSO, PO Box 912, Phnom Penh, Cambodia

Email: cbredder@hotmail.com

**Phase** Pre-Service Primary working rural schools **Date** 2010

**Aims** Trainee teachers at the Teacher Training College learn theories about how to include all children in learning. However, they have no practical experience to help them understand these ideas. The College partnered with a local NGO, Epic Arts, which supports students with physical disabilities, deaf students, and students with learning disabilities. Trainees watched a performance about disability, asked questions of students with disabilities, heard testimonies from students about being excluded, learned some sign language, experienced and learned games that include all students and experienced a simulation of having learning disabilities. Students' understanding of inclusive education was greatly deepened through this contact.

**Context** The Teacher Training College is located on the coast in Kampot, Cambodia. It has 200 trainees in the two-year programme for primary school teachers who will work in rural districts. Epic Arts trains students to be performing artists and does community performances to help people understand disability and inclusion. Teacher trainees get theoretical training in including all students in their classrooms. However, the actual practices of how to do this are not experienced or taught. In most classrooms in Cambodia, students with disabilities are excluded. The trainees have little or no personal experience of disability and inclusion. The teacher trainers, who also lacked practical experience in including all students in learning, set out to address this issue. Epic Arts was, at this time, producing a play about disability that was shared with local communities. A VSO volunteer placed at the college talked with Epic Arts about doing a morning of activities about inclusion.

**What they did?**The Deputy Director of the Teacher Training College, the VSO volunteer education advisor placed at the college, and the Epic Arts NGO staff worked on this initiative together. This year (2010) both the first and second year trainee teachers attended a half day session with Epic Arts to take part in various activities designed to deepen their understanding of disability and inclusive practices. Trainees were able to walk to the Epic Arts Center from the College. This will now happen for each First Year intake without the intervention of VSO.

**Outcome/Effect** :Trainees learned games and activities to include all students

- Trainees interacted with people with disabilities, some for the first time in their lives

- Trainees were exposed to students’ perspectives and came to understand more about the issues facing students with disabilities.

This initiative gives trainees real experiences to rely on when making decisions in their classrooms. The trainees all commented that this approach is clearer and provided a better understanding of issues than their reading of text books – it was also fun!

The biggest challenge has been finding time for this activity. Both Epic Arts (NGO) and the College have very busy schedules. A pre and post survey of the students their understanding of students with disabilities had increased. Many commented that the problems faced by students are more social, for example bullying and exclusion, than educational. Many came up with ways to help students with disabilities join their classrooms. They said it was easier to think about these interventions because they had experienced and learned from students with disabilities.

**RR Comment** Such disability equality training is essential for both trainee and in-service teachers where there is a culture of exclusion of children with disabilities and student teachers are unlikely to have first-hand experience of relating to children and adults with disabilities, unless they are in their families. Time needs to be made both for more of such activities, linking with local DPOs and there should be more practicum in schools where there are children with disabilities included.

**Annex vii 4 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Cambodia** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** It is a five-days-training for DTMTs, school directors and teachers UNICEF Country Office with MOEYS, FTI/WB and local NGOs. **Contact Person** Peter De Vries pdevries@unicef.org **Phase :**Pre-Service/ DMTS Advisors/headteachers **Date** 2009-2012

**Aims/context** :Policy on Education of Children with Disabilities was approved in 2008 with the main goal to ensure access to equitable and quality inclusive education. The policy is aligned with the six ‘dimensions’ of the CFS framework. The ESP 2009-2013 also aims to improve the quality of education for children with disabilities and to pilot inclusive preschools.

The Basic Education Teacher Training Curriculum was approved in August 2011. CFS concepts and practices (58 hours) and inclusive education teaching methodologies and techniques (28 hours) were included in the newly revised curriculum. This means that CFS and inclusive education concepts have officially been integrated into pre-service training curriculum. In 2012, there is a need to develop supporting materials for the pre-service inclusive education curriculum framework. All basic education teachers (grade 1-9) of all subjects who are trained in 12 Provincial Teacher Training College (PTTCs) will have knowledge of basic inclusive education and teaching methodologies to teach children with disabilities in the schools to which they are deployed. This is basic and aimed at child impairments

**What they did?** Training so far 756 teachers were trained and to date, on the basic inclusive education course has been conducted in 15 provinces.(out of 24 provinces)

•Basic inclusive education manual was used for this training

•The in-service preschool teacher training module developed for a 5 day training. This followed by refreshing session afterwards. It was initially for 30 preschool teachers.

•The special training on teaching children with deaf and deaf-mute is a three week course and was for 10 selected preschool teachers and 2 POE/ECE officers from different provinces

•The trainings have been conducted for DTMTs and school directors in 15 provinces:

•For 540 District Training and Monitoring Team members, and 669 school directors

According to the training manual approved in 2009, there are 4 chapters with 19 key lessons. The following are the key contents: Chapter 1: Awareness or understanding of disabilities: Types of disabilities, Use of questionnaire/checklist to identify types of disabilities, Rights of disabled people, Attitudes toward disabled person. Chapter2: Inclusive Education for Children with disabilities (CWD)

Chapter 3: Response to different needs of CWD-9 key principles including communication, management of attitude of CWD, provision of appropriate support to CWD (children with disabilities) ….etc

Chapter 4: How to support CWD in the classroom:- Children with vision difficulties, Children with hearing difficulties, Children with speaking difficulties, Children with learning difficulties Children with mobility difficulties …etc.,

**Outcome/Effect** With the help of agencies like UNICEF and funding from Fast Track initiative training is now moving to scale. A survey of teachers identified the following areas for more specialised training in 2010: additional training for selected teachers in special education: for children with intellectual disabilities, on education for children with hearing impairments, and on Braille and mobility education for children with visual impairments. Consultants have been hired and these more specialist course are being developed.

**RR Comment** There seems to have been a big push by the MOEY and donors to develop the capacity of teachers for including children with disabilities. Cambodia is on the way to getting inclusion up to scale. The local District Training and Monitoring teams and training of school directors and mandatory pre-service training are all important. School access has not been taken seriously enough and there is little focus on the quality of learning and the need for more flexible curriculum and assessment. Despite the DTMTs there is a shortage of in-depth experience of inclusion and management. The GPR 2012 survey shows 6.9% mild and 3.2% moderate or severe impairments of 2-9 year olds. This will mean far more resources will be needed to support the inclusion of children with disabilities.

**Annex vii 5 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Samoa** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source**: Inclusive Teacher Education in Samoa

http://www.inclusive-education-in-action.org/iea/index.php?menuid=25&reporeid=236

**Contact Person**: Niusila Kueni Utuga Faamanatu – Eteuati, Lecturer/Coordinator of Inclusive Education Program E-mail: n.faamanatu-eteuati@nus.edu.ws or niusila01@ yahoo.co.uk. Faculty of Education National University of Samoa

**Phase**: Teacher Trainers, school principal, primary/secondary teachers. Date 1995 to 2003

**Aims :** To train more teachers equipping them with knowledge on Inclusive Education for primary and secondary education;

To encourage the inclusion of all children with disabilities in schools;

To provide equal opportunities for all children regardless of their abilities;

To provide teachers and policy makers with ideas and knowledge of inclusive policies and practice.

**Context :** Samoa is an independent island country in the South Pacific with a population of not more than 200,000 people. According to the latest survey for people with disabilities conducted in 2009–2010, there are close to 5,000 people with disabilities in the country and 46% of these are children. The Ministry of Education have strongly supported programs moving towards the inclusion of children with disabilities in schools. At the moment, the Samoan government sponsors all trainees who wish to take up teaching as a career. The Faculty of Education therefore offers three programs for these trainees to specialise in: 1. General Education, 2. Special Needs Education, 3. Early Childhood Education. The main issues and challenges are trying to change people’s attitudes and beliefs not only children in schools but educators, parents and even the community as a whole.

**What they did?** Lecturers at the Faculty of Education were initially given scholarships to be trained in the area of special needs education so they can return and train the teachers towards Inclusive Education;

Consultation was carried out with the Ministry of Education and stakeholders on programs and courses;

Education Programs were offered at the Faculty of Education especially courses specifically designed for teachers of special needs; Education workshops and training with the Ministry of Education was offered for all Principals and teachers of primary and secondary schools around the country;

Working collaboratively with the Ministry of Education, attending workshops and training overseas, engaging in research and studies have all helped with the successful implementation of the program.

This started in 1997. In February 2000, the Inclusive Education course was made compulsory for all teacher trainees. At the end of that same year, the first 6 trainees graduated from the Faculty of Education, majoring in Special Needs Education.

**Outcome/Effect** There is an increasing number of teacher trainees in the program who wish to major in Special Needs education; Increasing number of teachers of special needs are involved in national organisations and committees for children with disabilities; Teachers of special needs are increasingly involved in curriculum development; The new Samoa Education Act 2009 highlights the importance of inclusive education for all children with disabilities and the support of teachers and community; An outreach program to the community has been developed e.g. this year trainees undertook visits to the hospital and were able to conduct education activities for children there. There was positive feedback from the hospital and community. Teachers’ performance is also monitored by school inspectors and most are coping well and accommodating the various needs of children in the community.

**RR Comment.** This was a good initiative getting lecturers at University of Samoa trained first and then principals and school teachers. It is good that all pre-service teachers have to undertake a course in inclusive education. The partnership between the Ministry of Education and University of Samoa has been productive. Bottom- up work starting in the community and DPOs is more likely to produce methods that are more appropriate to the culture and the economic level of the country. Senese is an NGO in Samoa that has done agreat deal of screening and training on inclusive education. There seems a lack of integration and demonstrates the need for countries to have an Article 24 Implementation Plan.

**Annex vii 6 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Samoa** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** SENESE support for inclusive education SENESE http://www.seneseinclusiveedu.ws

**Contact Person** Dona Lene senese@samoa.ws **Phase** Primary,Secondary,Parents, support staff Post School **Date** 1992 to the present. 2011

**Aims :** SENESE provides specialist support for visually impaired and blind children and young people, hearing impaired and deaf children and young people, children and young people with significant learning difficulties and those with physical impairments. SENESE also provide a wide range of training and support for teachers, families and the community and work with young people with disabilities on recreation, leisure and transition to work and higher education/vocational training

**Context** : Covering both islands of Samoa,. They provide services at two centres and increasingly strive to bring the services and support to schools to enhance inclusive practice. SENESE also provide a wide range of training and support for teachers, families and the community and work with young people with disabilities on recreation, leisure and transition to work and higher education/vocational training. Donna Lene, Principal of SENESE Inclusive Education, has been working in Samoa for 20 years to develop education for children with disabilities. In recent years funded by AusAID and the European Commission, SENESE now has 61 professional staff.

**What they did?** Workshops are organised for teachers to enhance their teaching skills, to make them fully aware, sensitive towards their attitude and methodologies/strategies required to enhance skills/abilities of every child, as every child in the class is unique. The learning environment at regular pre-school, primary, secondary schools that are nominated outreach schools as SENESE partners will be barrier free and provide high quality learning for a diverse range of learning styles and abilities, including children with disabilities. SENESE seeks to establish and strengthen a national model of Inclusive Education for children with disabilities 0-18 years and their families, facilitates cooperation with other educational and health organizations, teachers, parents and students. In 2011 SENESE provided:- Early Learning for families of children from birth to 5 years, rose to 30 families and children; Primary Inclusive Education support increased to support 80 students in over 59 primary schools; Secondary Onsite Inclusion Program with Faatuatua Christian Secondary School increased to 26 students. The program also supports 3 students in Amoa and St Joseph’s secondary school; Vision Screening Services-47 schools have a trained teacher able to screen vision problems; Samoa Vision Services: 10-20 customers a day . Children able to receive testing and spectacles locally; Audiological Service: over 100 children fitted with high quality hearing aids and over 50 children screened for possible hearing impairment; Promotion and Awareness campaigns in National TV and newspapers around disability awareness, inclusive education and International Day of People with Disabilities; Various adult and transition services getting young people with disabilities into jobs, providing support for Special Olympics and Deaf activities; Training for teachers, families and support workers

**Outcome:** When a school embarks on an inclusive education process, that school commits to change. The changes are many and from all levels within the school:- how a principal enrols all students, how a class teacher sets up group work in the classroom and changes in how the school community engages with all families, including those who have a child with a disability. This has been the case for 59 schools in Samoa that SENESE Inclusive Education Support Services funded under the AusAID Inclusive Education Demonstration Program SENESE Has produced some really useful low tech guides for working with children with different impairments http://www.seneseinclusiveedu.ws/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=168&Itemid=160

**RR Comment** : SENESE work shows the importance of having expertise on screening, meeting impairment specific needs as well as the general inclusion approach. That educating in-service teachers for the inclusion of children with disabilities has to be part of a whole-school, whole community change process. This work needs to be linked up with Ministry of Education in a strong Implementation Plan.

**Annex vii 7 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Indonesia** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** Opportunities for Vulnerable Children Towards Inclusive Education

Programme Fact Sheet June2012 Funded USAID

**Contact Person** Helen Keller International, Jl Bungur Dalam 23 A-B, Kemang, Jakarta 12730 Indonesia

Phone: +62 21 7199163 Fax: +62 21 7183804

**Phase** Primary/secondary **Date** 2003-2013

**Aims:** -Improve coordination of policy and funding between the national, provincial and district levels. Improve capacity of universities to provide strong practical based pre-service teaching programs to new teachers.-Improve in-service training programs implemented by the Ministry of National Education and Culture for teachers currently working with children with disabilities throughout Indonesia.-600 policy makers, administrators and government officials trained and sensitized to develop supportive policies and allocate budgets on inclusive education -Improve awareness and publicity of inclusive education and Education for All within the education system and the public.

**Context:** In Indonesia, there are an estimated 1.5 million children with disabilities, yet less than 4% (Government claim 30% in 2000 schools) have access to educational services that are appropriate, inclusive and affordable. The lack of disability-specific training at the university level leaves many special education teachers ill-equipped to meet the diverse needs of their students. Despite the many advances made for inclusive education, Government Policy from 2009, there is still a need to build public awareness and national support for special education programs throughout the country. Helen Keller International (HKI) Indonesia and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)-, though the Opportunities for Vulnerable Children (OVC) program, in partnership with the Ministry of National Education and Culture, the Provincial Departments of Education in seven provinces (Aceh, Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, Yogyakarta, East Java and South Sulawesi) and over 20 local non-governmental partners have worked to develop an inclusive education model for improving access to education and the provision of support and supplemental curricula for children with visual impairments and multiple disabilities, learning and intellectual disabilities, and hearing impairments. This has led to the successful schooling of 23,000 children with disabilities.

**What they did?** Aceh, Jakarta, West Java, Province of Yogyakarta, Central Java, East Java and South Sulawesi have developed Provincial Inclusive Education Action Plans in line with the National Inclusive Education Action Plan. Jakarta, South Sulawesi and East Java have drafted their Inclusive Education Technical Guidelines. All seven provinces have increased the provincial Inclusive Education budget allocations for financial year 2011 and 2012. HKI has developed 20 model inclusive schools in 4 districts in East and West Java, through teacher training and district policy development to support the implementation of inclusive education. Five national Mentor Teachers on Inclusive Education trained. Each Mentor Teacher supports up to 27 school teachers working with children with special needs. Ministry of National Education and Culture has adopted the HKI-developed manuals for pre-service training on Assessment and Remediation for Children with Learning and Intellectual Disabilities. Support training of resource and mainstream teachers, information dissemination and running costs of inclusive schools and Five lecturers from four national universities completed the 18-month training on Learning and Intellectual Disabilities. Four university lecturers from three state universities, in partnership with Hilton Perkins, completed the first phase of Early Intervention/Multiple Disabilities Visual Impairment training. Developed a syllabus for visual impaired children with State University of Makassar.

**Outcome/Effect** :600 administrators trained; 2000 school heads and in-service teachers trained; Drafted Technical guidance for inclusion; 1,400 teachers and teachers‐in‐training trained to work in inclusive education and with children with learning and intellectual disabilities, visual impairment and multiple disabilities. Expertise in Universities enhanced. Developed key messages and a communication strategy to raise public awareness for inclusive education in program focus areas. Designed a multi-media (print, electronic media, radio, posters, flyers) communications campaign to increase public awareness on inclusive education. The Government is aiming for 65% of children with disabilities to be in 5000 schools by 2015.

**RR Comment** . The work HKI and other NGOs is doing is vital as a catalyst, providing technical support, training and in running demonstration projects. It is crucial that the Indonesian Government takes over full responsibility, funds it adequately and requires all teachers and all schools to be inclusive. Previously programmes funded by Brillo, Norway were not maintained after funding finished. The maintenance of some 74,000 students in 1500 special schools needs to be seriously challenged with the turning of these schools into resource centres where children with disabilities are not regularly taught, but only receive periodic support and the development of district resource centres in all of the 5000 districts. Indonesia now has many of the ingredients of moving to scale for the inclusion of children and students with disabilities it now requires the political will to make it happen.

**Annex vii 8 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: China Golden Key Project** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** Inclusion into practice EFA 2000, No. 32, July-September 1998; UNICEF http://www.childinfo.org/files/childdisability\_InclusiveEducationConsolidatedReportEastAsia.pdf

Contact Person

**Phase** Primary/secondary Date 1996- to present

**Aims** The goal is to integrate the majority of blind children, who live in the nine poorest provinces of China, before the year 2005. In 1994 only 500 went to school. By 1998 2000.

**Context** Until 1984, China had no national policy on special needs education. At the time, large-scale surveys indicated that some 3 million disabled children were not attending any form of school. In 1990, China adopted a law on the protection of disabled people ... Six years later the government launched an ambitious plan to provide school places for 80 per cent of disabled children. Golden Keys was started by an architect who went blind. The project was preceded by an experiment in 1987 on integration of blind children in four provinces of China (Shanxi, Jiangsu, Hebei, Heilongjiang) and Beijing. Based on these pilot projects, the State Education Commission (formally the China Ministry of Education) invited the China Disabled People’s Federation (CDPF) and chiefs of provincial education departments to visit the project sites in Jiangsu. Consequently, the State Education Commission and the CDPF agreed in 1990 to expand the work to other provinces. In 1995,UNESCO China with Education Commission Guagxi region, launched an ambitious national plan on inclusive education for children with disabilities. Some 1.8 million school places for children with disabilities will be created over the next five years. A number of successful integration initiatives such as the Golden Key Project are already a reality.

**What they did?** The project functions in the following way: each blind child is guided by a personal instructor - so far some 2,000 mainstream teachers have been trained. They are mainly trained in the summer holidays. The blind pupils follow, to the extent possible, the same curriculum as their classmates, The project provides resource materials to teachers, as well as Braille books, writing boards and cassette recorders to the blind pupils. Supervision and administration networks have been established, and a school for the blind has been converted into a resource centre. 2000-2003 expanded to Inner Mongolia.

Training The project supports the concept that training of regular mainstream teachers is the most practical and efficient approach to VI education. Thus, specific teachers are selected from schools where VI children are or will be enrolled (usually one teacher per school, as the rate of VI children is close to 1 per school). Because teachers cannot absorb everything they need to know in one training, several trainings are carried out in a “step-by-step” process.

Teachers are first grouped according to their needs of teaching either low vision or blind students. National specialists from universities or special education schools instruct them in both theory and practical skills. There are three levels of trainings. The first is basic training that teachers of blind or low vision students covering basic theory, teaching methods and techniques for teaching each kind of disability. This includes the psychology of visually impaired children, relevant educational policies and statutes, Braille teaching methods, homemade teaching aids, and living skills such as mobility, social communication and self-care. A second training combines theory and practice, providing more in-depth technical skill in working with blind and low vision children. A final training of 4 days ensures that the teachers have a good command of the teaching methodologies. Because Chinese Braille is relatively simple, teachers can learn to teach it under this training schedule. Based on experiences from the Quangxi phase, the project now also trains prefecture and county level education officials in the beginning of the project to: raise their awareness of the benefits of the project; explain the history of special education and the right to education for all children; and, describe the organization, objectives, and implementation procedures of the project, including financial administration

**Outcome/Effect-** During the three years in Guangxi (1996-1998) a total of 2,364 teachers and special education personnel were trained, and a total of 2,154 children with visual impairments were admitted to schools. The enrolment rate for children with visual impairments was raised from 14.8 percent to over 81.8 percent. However, the most impressive achievement of the project is its impact on the lives of blind children. The Golden Key Project has sensitized communities and teachers, raising awareness and mobilising support for these children. When blind children enter school, they are able to dispel traditional attitudes by showing their peers, teachers and parents that they can make an active contribution to their communities.

**RR Comment –** A very effective project that has got many blind and partially sighted children into schools successfully. It allowing the children to live at home and develop independence and mobility skills as well as communication is a good strategy for dealing with a low incidence impairment. It is dependent on high calibre trainers to run the training course. For a country starting on such a project they would need to start by capacity building in universities and/or the districts to develop high calibre trainers.

**Annex vii 9 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Lao PDR** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** :A Quality Education for All. A History of the Lao PDR Inclusive Education Project http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/A\_Quality\_Education\_For\_All\_LaoPDR.pdf

**Contact Person** Save the Children Norway. Peter Grimes, Canterbury University

**Phase** :Primary 6-10 year olds **Date** 1993-2009

**Aims** IE Target Group1990s: Children with disabilities including those with mild and moderate disabilities (2.5% severe,7.5% mild/moderate. Children failing in school whether because of learning problems or because of other factors (28%).Accomplished by: Finding ways that children may take part in an activity that would otherwise not be possible ...Making small changes in activities that will enable a child to take part in an activity that would otherwise not be possible ...If this is insufficient then by: Providing the child with the least amount and the least intrusive form of help that is needed. And if this is insufficient, by:Planning and carrying out additional activities in school aimed at reducing the difficulties the child is facing; Planning activities with the family so that additional training and help can be given.

**Context** The education system is grade based with a primary national curriculum which relies on set text books, although these are currently being re-written to make them more learner-centred. The country currently has 867 Pre-Schools, 8,529 Primary Schools and 926 Secondary Schools. The teaching language medium in Lao PDR is the Lao language, but there are 49 indigenous groups., many with own language. It was clear from the beginning of the IE project that in order to ensure that the students with disabilities were successfully included in mainstream settings, the teachers would need to change the way they taught. Enabling teachers to move away from traditional pedagogy and adopt more learner friendly approaches was to become one of the major challenges

**What they did?** The Inclusive Education (IE) Project was introduced in the 1993-94 academic year. This was seen as a significant step towards fulfilling the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), as well as the United Nations World Programme of Action Concerning Disabled Persons. With support from UNESCO and Save the Children UK, the project had expanded by 1995 -1996, to include 9 primary schools and 3 pre-schools. Each year since then, with SIDA becoming the major donor, expansion to new schools, provinces, and districts took place. In 2004, Save the Children Norway took over responsibility for the management of the project and in partnership with the Ministry of Education. After Pilot formed National Implementation Team NIT-Staff three Ministries(Education, Teacher Training Health/ Rehabilitation) and staff from IE schools. NIT provided short training course for Principals and Grade 1 / 2 teachers before the school joined the IE Project; Grade 3/ 5 teachers in the following year. They also tried to ensure that schools only recruited children of the appropriate age in Grade 1.The importance of establishing local groups of schools who working on similar issues together, cannot be overemphasised. Eventually the importance of local advisors to facilitate development who knew local circumstances became crucial. In 1997 when they expanded to 4 provinces , Provincial Implementations Teams (PIT) were established, advisory officials who would be trained to take over local monitoring, support and training. By the beginning of 2000, the number of schools in the Project had grown to 78 in 22 districts. Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) had become the main donor. In Phase 2 of the Project, 2000 – 2005 extra 289 schools and Phase 3, 2005-2009 extra 172 schools, and establish a Quality Standard for Education in all IE schools. The main focus because of EFA targets was primary but increasingly pre-schools and lower secondary schools joined. Schools were chosen for their experience and willingness to take part. The child centred approach was a particular problem in the secondary. The three special schools established for VI and HI became more resource centres running short course for teachers on Braille and Sign language. The PIT and the networks they established and support they provided and the inclusive problem solving approach used were crucial to the successful expansion.

**Outcome/Effect** Before the establishment of the special school for blind and deaf children in Vientiane, Lao PDR had no educational provision for disabled children. In order to address this, the Inclusive Education Project aimed to establish at least two or three IE schools per district. At present there are 539 such schools including 3 special schools in 141 districts and 17 provinces throughout the country. There are currently more than 3,000 disabled children being educated alongside their peers. Although the IE project formally ends in May 2009, the Ministry of Education is committed to ensuring that the principles of inclusion continue to underpin the provision of quality education to Lao children. By 2009 it had become a project which focused on the importance of ensuring that all students were fully participating and achieving in school. At the same time it continued to emphasise the rights of all learners with disabilities to equal access to education.

**RR Comment** The project had to find a balance between providing a high quality program and not spreading itself too thinly by trying to work with too large a group. The project NIT should have been in Ministry of Education only as it became too medical model. The long term commitment of donors was crucial as was the incremental approach. This is a great model though thinking changes in line with developments of the 15 years.

**Annex vii 10 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Vietnam** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** Pham Minh Muc, Ph.D – Vice director of Research Center for Special Education, Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences – 101 Tran Hung Dao, Hanoi, Vietnam. UNESCO Bangkok (2009)Towards Inclusion.

**Contact Person** Email: phamminhmuc@yahoo.com.

**Phase** Primary and Secondary **Date** 1991 to 2011

**Aims** Develop inclusive education for children with disabilities in inclusive schools by training teachers.

1) Hearing impairments, 2) Vising impairments ,3) Intellectual disabilities, 4) Language and language learning impairments, 5) Moving disabilities 6) The other impairments (example, autism spectrum, ADHD, emotional behaviour problems, etc.)

**Context** Of 82 million Vietnamese people with around 30% children, there are more than 1 million are CwDs. Before 1991 (the year IE model were being piloted and implemented), very few CwDs had been educated because there were around 70 educational bases for CwDs at that time (each of those bases could meet the leaning need of fewer than 200 CwDs). IE model gradually became the main solution in meeting the learning needs of CwDs, and it was officially documented in The IE Regulation in 2006 by Ministry of Education and Training. By school year 2009 – 2010, the percentage of CwDs enrolling IE schools made up approximately 50%.

**What they did**?: For last 2 decades, The Research Center for Special Education under the supervision of Vietnam Institute of Educational Sciences, in cooperation with UN organizations and International NGOs such as UNICEF Vietnam, UNESCO Vietnam, Sweden Save Children, CRS & USAID, World Vision, Plan International... have developed training curriculum and materials as well as delivered training courses for in-service teachers on IE. Of those training, there were:

- 12 day training courses on IE of CwDs for key teachers which cover issues of: 1) The rights of CwDs, specially learning right; 2) The abilities and needs of CwDs; 3) The effective teaching in IE classrooms; 4) The educational assessments of CwDs; 5) Building friendship circles of CwDs; 6) Teaching and learning aids and materials for and of CwDs.

5 day training thematic courses for IE classroom teachers, including: 1) Teaching children with hearing impairment in IE; 2) Teaching children with vising impairments; 3) Teaching children with intellectual disabilities; 4) Teaching children with language and language learning.

5 day directly supporting training courses for IE classroom teachers conducted by special education experts.

5 day following training courses for IE classroom teachers who had taken part in 5 day thematic training.

For the school leaders and the district officers of education sector, there were 5 day training courses on IE which covered the contents of: 1) The leadership and management of IE; 2) Supporting room in IE school and Resource Center for IE.

Lectures/researchers of universities/colleges or academic institute working on IE and special education have been provided variety of training such as special education, educational psychology, pedagogy, social work, pre- and primary education. Most of them had graduated 4 year training in special education and then trained on IE by international experts in training workshops. Now, there are MA and PhD candidate on IE and special needs being trained overseas.

**Outcome/Effect** In the Vietnamese Strategy of Education and Training Stage 2012 – 2020 issued by the government, the indicator of CwDs enrolling schools by 2015 would reach 70%.

**RR Comment** The type of training initiative seems impressive until compared with data from the Vietnam Census/Out of School Children in 2011, which suggests 85% of Vietnamese children with disabilities (CwDs) have never been enrolled in school or have dropped out before completion. The model being used is largely focussed on the individual with disabilities and about rehabilitating them. This medical model approach is in sharp contrast to the approach adopted in Lao PDR where efforts have been made in the pilot schools to identify barriers and come up with solutions. Structural changes need to be made to the curriculum, methods of assessment and the development of a child-centred pedagogy. The approach is very centralised with some local examples of success where there is local commitment. As of 2009 no guidelines existed on inclusive education implementation and much confusion reigns concerning the concept. Teachers would like to see real policy directives as well as financial support to help them include and teach children with disabilities in their local schools.

**Annex vii 11 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Thailand** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** Towards Inclusive Education for Children with Disabilities: A Guideline

UNESCO Bangkok

**Contact Person**: UNESCO Bangkok / Office of Special Education (part of Ministry Basic Education)

**Phase** primary/secondary/higher education **Date** 1999-2009

**Aims:** Implementation 1999 Act Education for all children with disabilities

**Context:** The right to education for children with disabilities is enshrined in both the 1997 Constitution and in the 1999 National Education Act. The key catalysts for these achievements have been sustained advocacy by leaders of strong disability organizations, and their historical involvement in the establishment of nongovernmental organization educational programmes for children with disabilities, before government accepted responsibility for this task. The disability organizations have worked in partnership with parent organizations over a long period of time. Teacher training has been an important area of focus for the Ministry of Education and significant developments in the training of teachers to teach children with disabilities in special and integrated educational settings have taken place during the 1990s.There are more than 600 universities, approximately 80 of them run by the government. There were 43 government special schools in 2004. Blind children had their needs meet by well- established NGO funded special schools. There 349 integrated schools with a fast growing projection to 2000 by 2005. The Office of Special Education(part of Ministry Basic Education) is responsible for 76 Special Education Centres. Special Education Centres are the implementing and support mechanism.

**What they did?** Primary school teacher in an integrated setting must complete a four year university degree, with entry level set at school completion or year 12; Secondary school teachers in integrated settings must complete a basic three year degree plus one year of additional training; No untrained teachers are employed in Thai schools. All teacher trainees receive one course on teaching children with special needs within their basic teacher training course.

Regular teachers who wish to become special education trained teachers can undertake: Short training courses of one, three and 15 days, which are offered at 19 universities; One year Special Education Teaching Certificates are offered at seven universities; Two year Master’s degrees, offered at four universities. Students can specialize in Learning Disabilities and Emotional Problems. In 1994 a new curriculum was introduced into the four year special education training degree. It included curriculum for deaf, blind and mentally retarded students but did not include autism. Educational reform of 2003 led to teacher training of teachers for children with disabilities being moved to a higher priority. Policy on personnel training and learning reform to focus on child-centred learning strategies were developed. There are also many short courses for existing teachers.

**Outcome/Effect**. Despite the policies and training of teachers many children with disabilities remain out of school. The special education centres, schools and the community organizations need to take steps to find families with children with disabilities, to provide them with support and encourage them to send their children to school. They need to ensure that parents are welcome and fully involved in decisions about their children’s schooling. A close relationship is needed so that the family and school work in partnership to best assist and promote the development of children with disabilities. It is important to find out the reasons why families with children with disabilities do not send them to school, when school attendance is available or compulsory. EFA Plans in place -Phase 1: 2002-2006 Phase 2: 2007-2016“EFA must cover all target groups including the special needs groups in society, such as those with physical, mental, intellectual, emotional, communication and learning disabilities, as well as all disadvantaged groups.” Includes-Drafting of Ministerial Regulations (2002) to guide implementation and ensure quality of educational services for persons with disabilities; Establishment of a Committee for the Educational Reform for Persons with Disabilities, the Underprivileged, and the Gifted; Support for a system of integrated education moving towards inclusive education. A coupon scheme entitles each child with an Individualized Education Plan to special support of 2,000 baht, five times the allocation given for each non-disabled child. It is planned to extend this scheme throughout the country. An increasing number of schools are accepting children with disabilities each year.

**RR Comment** Many programmes offered at the university, with compulsory courses included in training courses for regular teachers, and short-term and in-service courses available but teacher training is not well coordinated or organized. Courses are also run for parents and DPOs. The key problem is attitude and a lack of change from a rigid and teacher centred curriculum.

**Annex vii 12 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Hong Kong**  Global Region Asia Pacific EAPRO

**Name of Project/Source**: **Upskilling Mainstream teachers in Hong Kong-** **Teacher Professional Development Framework for Integrated Education(Circular No 13/2007) Hong Kong Government**

**Contact Person**- Kuen-fung Sin, Director of the Centre for Special Needs and Studies in Inclusive Education at Hong Kong Institute of Education. [kfsin@ied.edu.hk]

**Phase** Primary and Secondary **Date** 2007-2012

**Aims** In 2007 the Education Bureau launched a five-year teacher professional development framework to develop the capacity of school teachers to integrate children with disabilities.

**Context** The government in Hong Kong has mandated that all schools should start to accept children with special educational needs by employing a whole school approach. This is not a simple move for teachers as inclusive education is complex, involving a range of issues including developing appropriate government and school policy; providing relevant support; enabling academic and social inclusion; changes to curriculum, pedagogy and curriculum and classroom management; and developing functional multi-agency collaboration to support all students

**What they did?** A three stage training model. Tier 1 10% of teachers complete the Basic Course on Catering for Diverse Learning Needs.

Tier 2 leadership training in SEN, at least three teachers in a school must attend the Advanced Course(90 hours). This includes study about students with special needs, school based attachment experience and a school based project.

Tier 3. In addition Thematic Courses on children with specific needs of 60 hours e.g. Autism, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. After these courses participants are meant to be able to manage students with more severe learning difficulties.

The Hong Kong Institute of Education got the contract to provide these course. The annual intake of teachers on these courses reached 200 in 2007 and 2008[[1]](#footnote-1). Teachers were released on paid study leave and were either volunteers or nominated by the principal.

The core areas of the course were:

1.Learning the concepts of inclusion

2. Examining knowledge about supporting students with special needs.

3.Mastering instructional needs for diversity Sharing successful experiences.

5.Reflecting on their beliefs in teaching.

6.Participation in professional dialogue.

7.Using community resources.

8. Disseminating research outcomes.

9. Advocacy of whole-school approach (WSA).

**Outcome/Effect** Although teachers follow the guidelines on inclusion they still plead ignorance of inclusion and the policies such as the Code of Practice on Education derived from the Disabiity Discrimination Ordinance 2001. Teachers are meant following the courses to demonstrate competency in identification, needs analysis, removal of barriers to learning and differentiated teaching strategies, but many overlook this and continue to focus on individual pupil incompetency. The short course does provide enough time for teachers to gain mastery of all the techniques demonstrated. Attitude change is the most challenging task to be dealt with on the course. Teacher returning to school can set up professional dialogues with for example physiotherapists. Primary school course participants were more likely to be catalysts for whole school development of inclusion , than secondary course participants. The Tier 3 needs were hardest to be satisfactorily met.

**RR Comment** This was an ambitious programme, but perhaps should have started with the training of principals so they could lead change. Attitudes towards inclusion have improved among teachers, but there are still many problems. The online resource centre was innovative and useful.[[2]](#footnote-2) Transforming the curriculum and assessment still needs addressing. There is still a reliance on special schools that makes ordinary teachers think they do not have to take inclusion very seriously.

**Annex vii 13 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country: Thailand** Global Region East Asia Pacific

**Name of Project/Source** Towards Inclusion UNESCO Bangkok 2009 p65

**Contact Person** Tawathburi Special Education Centre, Thailand.

**Phase** primary/secondary **Date** 2009

**Aims** Implement 1999 Education Act so all children with disability are in school

**What they did?**

The head teacher is qualified with a degree in special education and a master’s degree in psychology. The centre has nine staff. Eighty four per cent of children seen at the centre are placed in regular schools. The remaining 16 per cent are receiving early intervention or specialized programmes, designed to prepare them for entry into regular schools.

The special education centre is responsible for finding out-of-school children with disabilities and working with CBR programmes, health workers and village community officials to educate families about their obligation to send their children to school. Early intervention programmes are one of the major activities of the centre and these are carried out in the home and at the Centre. The special education centre is responsible for assessment and placement decisions. Children may be placed at the centre, in a special school or in a regular integrated school. Major activities include arranging placements for children in local regular schools and providing on-going support to the child and family and to the school and classroom teacher.

Individualized education plans may be developed at the centre or in the school, but always with a team of people which includes the family. A second major focus is on training activities for several target groups. Awareness training is given to all schools in the area, with the purpose of encouraging schools to accept children with disabilities. Attitudes are still negative in many schools and it will take time to break down these barriers. Regular on-going support is provided to teachers who are teaching children with disabilities in their classrooms, but broader training for all teachers in a school is carried out. Training is also provided for parents and families and for community workers and volunteers. Training teachers to make their own teaching devices and aids from local materials is also conducted. The special education centre is responsible for the budget which allocates resources to schools on a per child basis. Centre staff saw increasing numbers of children coming forward for an education.

**Outcome/Effect**

The staff would like to see full enforcement of the 1999 Education Act which made education compulsory and requires parents to send their children to school. They would also like to see compliance from more schools on their legal obligation to provide education to children with disabilities. The progress is encouraging.

**RR Comment**: The Centre is educational not medical and staffed by teachers. This model of support centres staffed by trained specialist staff who can find children with disabilities, work with families, assess children, work with schools to develop IEPs, train staff in regular schools in general to change attitudes and train and work with teachers of particular children including on making low cost alternative devices seems to be a good one. The Centre has an incentive of 50 baht for each child with an IEP and the school gets 2000 baht for each IEP agreed. That is five times what the school gets funded for a child without disabilities. The centre also provides training for parents of children with disabilities and works with local CBR staff on the medical and rehabilitation needs of the children. This can work because there is a training infrastructure in higher education to provide teachers with the specialist training necessary. The system is still promoting integration, but the centre is working towards inclusion. There are 79 such centres in Thailand and they play an important role in turning policy rhetoric into reality.

**Annex vii 14 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

Country  **Bangladesh** Global Region ROSA

Name of Project/Source The Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee Education Programme Ryan, A, Jennings, J and White, J (2007). ‘BRAC Education Programme. BEP 2004–2009. Mid-Term Review’, NORAD, Oslo, Norway.

<http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/in_the_black_with_brac>

Contact Person <http://www.brac.net>

Phase Primary Date 1985-to 2007 and continuing and expanding.

**Aims** To develop primary education in rural areas which are not covered by state primary schools. Set up by Fazel Abid in the wake of the cyclone and war on independence in early 70’s. It is a not for profit social enterprise that now provides health, education, micro loans, training and social enterprises. Now works in 70,000 villages in all 64 districts of Bangladesh. Improve education through non-formal schools. In 2008 began training programme for Government schools.

**Context** According to the baseline survey conducted for the Primary Education Development Plan II, the net enrolment rate in the primary education system for the baseline year 2005 was 87 per cent (gross enrolment of 95%), with a survival rate to Grade 5 of about 54 per cent. When compared to government primary schools, there is a very low drop-out rate in BRAC schools. In 2005, for example, the survival rate to Grade 5 in BRAC primary schools was 94 per cent. In 2006, 98.6 per cent of BRAC primary school Grade 5 leavers went on to secondary school, compared to less than half from government schools.

**What they did?** When setting up a new primary school, BRAC ensures there are sufficient poor children (30–33%) in the area; that 65 per cent are girls; that pupils with special educational needs are not in school in the area; that there is no other school within 1.1km; that there is a suitable person to become the teacher – a female aged 20–35 years with SSC (Grade 10), preferably married; that a certificate of non-enrolment is signed by the local government primary school; and that there is a suitable building or land on which to build a school.

In 2003, BRAC set out to include children with disabilities in its schools. With four central staff and 14 regional trainers, staff were trained, assistive devices supplied and materials produced to develop positive attitudes. By 2006, 24,565 children with some form of special need had been enrolled in BRAC primary schools and pre-schools. In the Bangladesh context the mere enrolment of such a large number of children with special needs and their integration are major achievements, particularly considering that a few years ago there were no children with disabilities in BRAC schools and that even today there are very few in mainstream government schools. Training has been provided for 1,861 teachers and staff, medical support (surgery and/or treatment) for 2,324 children and assistive devices for 2,300 disabled children. Where needed, entry to centres has been adjusted to allow for wheelchair access. The unit has produced a number of materials, including a guide on disability issues for BEP staff, an awareness poster, a video on children with special needs and story books.

At the end of 2006, the education support programme (ESP) was supporting 624 NGOs in providing education from Grades 1 to 3 for 164,838 children in 5500 non-formal primary education (NFPE) schools. The coverage extends to 63 of the 64 districts in Bangladesh. The materials and methods used in the ESP schools are the same as those used in BRAC Education Programme schools with a few modifications, and a number of studies have confirmed that children achieve similar levels in the two programmes at the end of Grade 3. This also empowers local disabled people’s organisations and NGOs. Including schools that are to be opened with new funds approved by the European Commission, the ESP expected to have 7,000 schools in 2007 with over 200,000 pupils

One of the most notable recent initiatives undertaken by ESP is a joint programme with Sightsavers International (SSI) to integrate sight-impaired children into ESP schools. SSI has provided training for staff of BRAC and partner NGOs as well as for teachers, including in the use of Braille. A number of sight-impaired children are now enrolled in ESP schools. Discussions are underway with SSI on setting up a Braille production centre. The additional costs are not high, and the initiative represents a major step forward. The initiative is at a pilot stage and issues such as the additional resources required will be considered before scaling up the programme.

**Outcome/Effect** Primary schools remain the largest component of the BRAC programme. The target groups are the poor, those living in remote areas, girls who have dropped out or never enrolled in school, children from ethnic minority groups and disabled children. To date, 3,115,031 children have graduated from the BRAC primary system and 2,876,472(2007) have made the transition to the formal system. Each phase has contributed to the overall aim of providing educational opportunities for children who are not served by the mainstream educational system. The programme is NGO based and aims to eventually dovetail with the government primary education system and become a resource provider. These figures included over 25,000 children with disabilities. In 2011 boat schools were commissioned in waterlogged areas of south Bangladesh.

**RR Comment** In August 2012 BRAC signed an agreement with DfID and AusAID to provide a further expansion of village schools to accommodate a further 680,000 children over the next five years. BRAC throughout believes in developing the capacity of all it’s staff on a long term basis spending 10% of turnover on training. This is very different to many development projects and is one of BRACs success factors. All of its 50,000 one room rural schools are now connected by high speed internet access to improve teacher training and the curriculum. There was no internet in many rural areas but BRAC created it by linking up with San Francisco based internet company to create BRAC net. This model has been so successful in reaching rural poor that it is now being replicated by BRAC in Afghanistan(2002),Pakistan(2007),Sierra Leone & Liberia(2008),Haiti (2010), Philippines( 2012).

**Annex vii 15 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country**: **Bangladesh** Narsingdi and Bogra Global Region South Asia ROSA

Name of Project/Source Sightsavers Programme Bangladesh

Contact Person Sightsavers, 2010. Sightsavers Bangladesh Country Office, Sheltech Venus, Apartment 5B & 5C, House # 07, Road # 33, Block CWS (B), Gulshan – 1, Dhaka – 1212.

Phase Primary/secondary Date 2002-2011

**Aims** The ultimate aim of Sightsavers’ ‘education change theme’ under the Sightsavers strategic framework 2009–2013 is that governments will ensure that all disabled children can receive a quality education within the wider education system. The short- to medium-term aim is that: ‘Sightsavers will demonstrate approaches to delivering high quality education for visually impaired children in their local context which are scalable, adaptable and cost effective’.

**Context** In Bangladesh, disabled children are among the most marginalised groups in the mainstream education system, especially children with visual impairment. The education of people with disabilities is still administered by the Department of Social Services under the Ministry of Social Welfare (MoSW). Since late 2004, Sightsavers Bangladesh Country Office, with its NGO partners

Centre for Disability in Development (CDD), Action for Blind Children (ABC) and Gram Bikash Sangstha (GBS), has put in place an inclusive education programme for disabled children (especially blind and low vision children) with permission from the Ministry of Primary and Mass Education in Narsingdi and Bogra districts. The programme includes capacity-building initiatives, provision for supply of educational materials, and school adaptation and awareness raising. At the same time, advocacy initiatives at local and national levels have continued, creating significant changes for disabled children in selected mainstream schools.

**What they did?**

Sightsavers’ programme has meant that:

• 517 visually impaired children are studying in 105 mainstream primary schools (214 children) and 36 GIEP schools (303 children);

• 182 government primary school teachers received training in inclusive education and Braille;

• 38 mainstream schools were adapted for visually impaired learners;

• 23 instructors at Cox’s Bazar Primary Teachers Training Institute have been trained in inclusive education;

• 48 self-help group members have been provided with training in Braille;

•18,896 students were tested, diagnosed, received treatment or were referred to eye care services for refraction. 698 students were prescribed spectacles through a schools sight testing programme;

• Nine resource centres were established at Narsingdi, Gaibandha, Chuadanga, Moulvibazar, Dhaka,

Khagrachari, Barisal, Lalmonirhat and Laxmipur schools under the Government Integrated Education

Programme (GIEP);

• 441 Braille books and 275 Braille equipment were supplied to GIEPs;

• 58 resource teachers and house parents/GIEP teachers received training on inclusive education and mathematics for visually impaired children;

• 48 general GIEP teachers attended a one-day orientation course on inclusive education;

• 14 DSS instructors and trainers received orientation on inclusive education30 November–2 December 2010.,

**Outcome/Effect**

Despite many NGO initiatives showing how disabled pupils can be successfully included, the Government of Bangladesh has not yet developed a comprehensive plan to scale up inclusive education. This needs sufficient political will and funding to make it a reality, as required under the progressive realisation provisions of Article 24 of the UNCRPD. There are many DPOs in Bangladesh and they need to be systematically trained and involved at all levels.

**RR Comment:** This project has demonstrated that with the right training and support blind and visually impaired students can make educational progress. Screening and provision of spectacles and on-ward referral, if blind, so the training can be provided for their class teachers in Braille and mobility and support in class to support the visually impaired pupil learning from specialist teachers. Collaborating with BRAC spread the impacts, but an NGO can only do this work in a few districts. There needs to be Government will and determination and a plan. Things will not move forward with the Ministry of education not having responsibility for children with disabilities.

**Annex vii 16 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country India** Global Region :South Asia ROSA

**Name of Project/Source** :**Universal Elementary Education** **National Planning and Training for Inclusion of children with disabilities.** *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2010,* p. 183, drawing upon National Sample Survey Organisation, 2003; *Disabled Persons in India* – NSS 58th round, Report No. 485 [58/26/1]), Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, National Sample Survey Organisation, New Delhi; Singal, 2009; O’Keefe, 2007; District Information System for Education, *Elementary Education in India: Progress towards UEE*, National University of Educational Planning and Administration /Ministry of Human Resource Development[[3]](#footnote-3),

**Contact Person** Dr Anupriya Chadha, Department of School Education and Literacy, New Delhi. **Phase Primary** Date 1997 to present

**Aims** Education planning documents in India enshrine a strong commitment to inclusive education. The aim is to provide all disabled children, irrespective of the type or degree of impairment, with education in an ‘appropriate environment’, which can include mainstream and special schools, as well as alternative schools and home-based learning. Delivering on this commitment requires a concerted political effort backed by reforms in provision. Yet disability remains a major limitation on progress towards universal primary education in India

**Context** There are at least 50 million children with disabilities in India and fewer than 10 per cent attend elementary school (Peters, 2003). In 1998, India’s National Council of Educational Research and Training reported that 20 million children require special needs education, but as the enrolment of children with disabilities is 5 per cent, compared to 90 per cent for non-disabled children, this is a big underestimate. Tembon and Fort (2007)[[4]](#footnote-4) show that the gender difference in school attendance rates is lower for disabled children, reflecting low attendance levels. Illiteracy is 52 per cent for disabled people, compared to 35 per cent in the general population, and in India as a whole the proportion of disabled children who do not attend school is 5.5 times that for the general population. Even in the best-performing states, a significant proportion of out-of-school children are disabled (27% in Kerala and over 33% in Tamil Nadu). Disabled children rarely progress beyond primary education. . While there are inconsistencies in national data, estimates suggest that school participation among disabled children never rises above 70 per cent, far below the national average of around 90 per cent. According to a World Bank analysis of India’s 2002 National Sample Survey, disabled children are five and a half times more likely to be out of school than children who are not disabled. Public attitudes lag behind policy a survey in Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh demonstrates 50% public did not think children with disabilities could attend school and that almost three-quarters of households that include a disabled member are unaware of their eligibility for aids and appliances, and only 2 per cent directly benefited from such aids in 2005. Less than half of these households were aware that stipends were available and only 4 per cent had received them.

**What they did?** In 1997, disabled children were explicitly included in the DPEP. Initially, the focus was on children with mild or moderate learning difficulties. Recently this was extended to the full range and severity of impairments. In the first six years, 877,000 disabled children were identified across India and 621,760 were enrolled. Through a combination of state, regional and district resource centres and widespread in-service teacher training, practice has begun to change significantly. By 2003 over one million teachers had received a day’s training, 171,000 had attended three- to five-day orientation courses and over 4,000 had attended a 45-day orientation course to become master trainers. Different states have adopted different training models, some relying on NGOs, some on consultants and others on full-time district officers. The project has identified the following key aspects of training for inclusive education:

• Awareness generation

• Community mobilisation – especially of parents

• Early detection of impairment

• In-service teacher training

• Resource support

• Curriculum adaptation

• Multi-sectoral convergence

• Provision of essential assistive services, aids and appliances

• Removal of barriers to access

Because many children did not attend school, the DPEP has set up an alternative schools programme. This provides schools for children aged 6–14 years old, organised flexibly to meet local conditions, which open for four hours a day in single or double shifts. Each school has two teachers, one of whom must be female so that girls are encouraged to attend and their particular needs are met. 200,000 such schools have been built by 2001.

From 2005 under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, SSA the federal programme was accelerated. This led to a big acceleration in the state training programmes, though uneven. Overall up until; 2010 2.5million teachers underwent the one day training, 1.1million underwent the short courses(up to 20 days-the majority 3-6 days).106,000 teacher undertook the 90 day course. 2,264,682 extra children with disabilities were identified and 7,607 resource teachers have been employed. But again this is very uneven as federal money is channelled through each state. As of 2010 5 States had employed 0 and 7 States under 100[[5]](#footnote-5).

**Outcome/Effect:** This has been a major training initiative, but there seems to be little accountability of States to National Federal; Government for expenditure. Children with more significant severe and multiple impairments are being home educated. There has been a big increase in the numbers of children with disabilities attending school, but drop out is high and completion low. This is still only a minority of children with disabilities.

**RR Comment**

**This is a major effort under SSA since 2005 to bring the education of children with disabilities to scale in India. The results are very mixed. This is not a high enough priority throughout the education system and the increasing use of private education is causing greater fragmentation. A recent study by IDA has demonstrated that a very small proportion of the money allocated at Federal level is reaching the teachers and children on the ground. The curriculum and assessment is too rigid and the grade system is still too rigidly applied.**

**Annex vii 17 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country** :**India, Mumbai** Global Region South Asis ROSA

Name of Project/Source **Developing Inclusive Schools in Mumbai**

**Hooja V (2010). ‘Preparing Schools for Inclusion’, Confluence, 8.**

Contact Person Vasha Hooja ADAPT [varshahooja@hotmail.com]

**Phase** Primary/Secondary Date 2002-2010

**Aims** Following on from the ground breaking work in Dharavi described in ‘Invisible Children’ ( M.Alur)[[6]](#footnote-6), disabled and non-disabled students from the three Spastics Society of India centres in Bandra, Colaba and Dharavi were included in 76 schools across Mumbai. These are now partner schools and include both state-run and private schools. Hooja (2010) describes how the setting up of an Inclusive Education Coordination Committee (IECC) eased the process of inclusion.

**Context**: It was found that disabled students and young people do need additional resource support until the environment (including teachers, parents and the community at large) is sensitised and made conducive to inclusion. Experience showed that to sustain this inclusion, it was critical that the children, parents and schools received on-going support. Enabling students to make a successful transition from a special school to an ordinary school was a difficult task. Parents, schools and students required frequent counselling and attention needed to be paid to seemingly insignificant issues. Inclusive Education Coordination Committee. To address this, SSI (now renamed Able Disabled All People Together (ADAPT)), set up the Inclusive Education Coordination Committee (IECC) to initiate and monitor the inclusion of disabled and non-disabled children into mainstream schools. A team comprising teachers, therapists, social workers and researchers provided support to the partner schools attended by the students.

**What they did?** The IECC’s role was to identify the students whose progress was to be followed; provide the inputs needed to support inclusion; and research the perspectives of the various stakeholders. It found that the key barriers to inclusion were in attitudes, access, curriculum and class size, training and support systems.

Based on this analysis, the IECC provided support that included:

• Orientation programmes for mainstream schools;

• Preparation for inclusion for disabled students, their parents, peers and staff;

• Dissemination of information on the availability of state board concessions for children with special needs;

• Arranging for the provision of writers for examinations;

• Guiding the mainstream schools on curricular modifications and assessment techniques (based on state board concessions);

• Counselling support for disabled students and their parents;

• Evaluating, modifying and designing furniture and mobility aids adapted to the requirements of the child;

• Identifying physical barriers such as inaccessible buildings and toilets;

• Designing simple modifications such as ramps and grab bars and simple modifications for toilets;

• Sharing with teachers tips on classroom management and strategies in inclusive education;

• Providing physiotherapy and occupational therapy that is unavailable to any disabled child attending a mainstream school.

• Students can access therapy services at ADAPT centres.

The IECC now provides an child-centred orientation session to the mainstream school prior to inclusion; whenever possible, the parents of the child and the management are included in this. A regular follow-up is maintained, especially in the first year and any challenges that arise are directed to the appropriate member of the team. Arrangements for remediation, therapy, psychological inputs or meetings with teachers are made by the social worker. This empowerment of the mainstream schools by a continuum of support has led to a slow process of taking ownership of the inclusion. Some schools have taken their own initiatives in making the adjustment process easier. Staff at various levels, from the principal to ancillary staff, have contributed in theirown way to making situations more comfortable for included children.

**Outcome/Effect** The strategies outlined in the culturally appropriate policy and practice (CAPP) programme formed a basis for the technical inputs required by the mainstream schools. SSI also developed CAPP resource material, that focuses on putting inclusion into practice through change at three different levels:[[7]](#footnote-7)

• CAPP I (the whole policy approach to inclusive education) is on the macro level of policy, legislation, political culture at local, state, national and global level;

• CAPP II (the whole community approach to inclusive education) is on the mezzo level of community workers and local administrators and bureaucrats;

• CAPP III (the whole school approach to inclusive education) is on the micro level of classroom and school values, culture, policies and practice.

ADAPT has also produced the ‘How To’ series of flip charts, manuals, CDs, audio-visual material and films. Over ten years, the IECC has provided resource support to all the key stakeholders, the main recipients of which have been mainstream schools.

**RR Comment** The grouping of a range of professionals from an NGO- ADAPT SSI(Abled Bodied Disabled Together-Spastic Society of India) working with 76 schools in Mumbai through the formation of the IEEC linking with principals, teachers and parents and disabled people have provided advice, training and support. The strength of this type of collaboration is through their interventions they are able to deal with teacher’s fears, concerns and lack of specific impairment knowledge in such a positive manner that they have prevented many children with disabilities dropping out. A number of the children with disabilities in these schools have now graduated at Grade 12 and gone on to higher education.

**Annex vii 18 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country India St Mary’s School, New Delhi.** Global Region South Asia Pacific ROSA

Name of Project/Source Annie Koshi, Principal- personal communication August 2012 for information. School website <http://www.stmarysdelhi.org/home.html>

**Contact Person** Annie Koshi Principal [koshiannie@gmail.com]

Phase Primary/Secondary Date 2000-2012

**Aims** to increase the participation of all students. It implies the equal right to education for all children irrespective of their caste, religion, gender, disability, financial status. A rights based approach to education is consistent with providing support to the inclusion rather than to the segregation of children on the basis of caste, gender, disability, economic status. Inclusion means that all students in a school, regardless of their strength or weakness in any area, become part of the school community. They are included in the feeling of belonging among other students, teachers and support staff. It is a right of every child who is born to get an education. The school is working in collaboration with students, teachers, professionals and parents. The focus for all children is not only academia or sitting in a class with a group of children, it’s much more – they are all part of extra-curricular activities – games, music, dance, picnics and outstation trips. In an all India survey conducted by the Ministry of HRD in the year 2004, the school was found to be ‘The No. 1 School with a Heart’.

**Context:** Children with special needs study with other children. We believe that every student can learn – is capable of learning. We see an inclusive school as one where all children learn together. St Mary’s in the Safdarjung Enclave, Delhi was started in 1966 by Sara Mathews, a mother of three, as a co-educational school, from 3 to 18yrs. It is an un-aided Christian school. It has around 1500 pupils with 140 places a year. It is recognized by the Delhi Administration and is affiliated to the Central Board of Secondary Education. It is fee paying and to gain entry to the secondary department candidates need 6 years primary education successfully completed. 35 places are reserved for children from poor families and children with disabilities.

**What they did?** All children are expected to hit the maximum of their potential and this includes children with disabilities. IEPs are co-constructed through continuous discussion between parents, teacher and special educator. All possible support is offered from a rights based perspective to the child so as to enable her to avail to the fullest, opportunities provided to her by the school and life in general. A writer, infrastructural support such as disabled friendly toilets or lifts and attendants are some assists offered. The role of the special educator is not to take children one to one, but to offer advice and guidance to mainstream teachers to show them how to manage special children within the given community. Keeping in mind the social responsibilities of educators, the school has also fought through public interest litigation to get equal rights for disabled children in the National examination. We work at creating an inclusive environment, which means that we first and foremost do not discriminate in admissions.

Workshops are/were organised for teachers to enhance their teaching skills, to make them fully aware, sensitive towards their attitude and methodologies/strategies required to enhance skills/abilities of every child, as every child in the class is unique . As a result many reasonable accommodations were made . These included:-

• Internet and multimedia software to transport students beyond their physical environment to access information electronically.

• With technology, many teachers have found greater participation, involvement, and success for all their students and a renewed feeling of power and possibilities for those who struggle.

• Word processing has enabled children in documentation to use scanners, which are used to copy the teacher's notes if the student has difficulty in writing.

• Voice to text software is a great help for children with a writing disability because notes given by teachers can be recorded after the lecture is finished. Excel and Word can provide structure and scaffolding.

• Headphones with microphones are used to record notes, and present subject based power point presentations for visual learners.

• ‘Jaws’ software for visually impaired students. This software helps to convert text on the computer into speech which helps students to work independently.

• Use of Voice Recognition, offered by Microsoft, which converts speech to text. Children with cerebral palsy have been immensely benefited by this technology.

• Initiating a system of examinations for these students on the system based on using Jaws and Voice-Recognition, especially as CBSE proposes to enable children to take their exams on computers. Visually impaired children are being trained to use the keyboard effectively

**Outcome/Effect** There are 120 children with disabilities at the school. Different entry criteria apply to these groups. The school cover a wide range of impairments including visually impaired, hearing impaired, Down’s syndrome, cerebral palsy, intellectual impairment, children on the autistic spectrum, children with a variety of learning disabilities and those with ADHD. The school expects and celebrates difference among its students and has worked hard over the years to develop a pedagogy and assessment policy that seeks to cover every aspect of a child’s growth, while recognizing that parameters will be different for every individual

**RR Comment:** St. Marys is an example of what can be achieved in one school where there is a leader of vision prepared to challenge the status quo to develop a school based upon human rights. As the principal says **“**This is narrative time and it illustrates how changing minds and understandings are crucial as a first step to inclusion”. Like many schools that become inclusive it started with a parent challenging the school to take her child with disabilities. The teachers were prepared to adapt what they did with training and support for each other. They encouraged peer support from which all children at the school benefitted.

**Annex vii 19 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country India, Karnataka** Global Region South Asia, ROSA

Name of Project/Source Joyful Inclusion Pack, CBR Network, Bangalore, Karnataka. Examples of Inclusion (2003) UNICEF <http://www.unicef.org/rosa/InclusiveInd.pdf>

**Contact Person** Indumathi Rao Joyful Inclusion Unit, CBR NETWORK (South Asia) Secretary, IEDC Advisory committee, Govt of Karnataka 134, 1st Block, 6th Main, Banashankari III stage, III Phase Bangalore 560 085 email: [cbrnet@vsnl.com](mailto:cbrnet@vsnl.com) **Phase** Primary **Date** 1995-2003 continuing

**Aim** Apply Community Based Rehabilitation(CBR) methods to develop a training course and materials to be used to help teachers in both Government and private schools support the inclusion of children with disabilities.

**Context:** CBR Network is an example of a community-based initiative that undertook to train general teachers in 30 rural government schools in Karnataka in inclusive education. Materials were developed for this training at a 10-day workshop attended by NGOs, special educators, general teachers, education experts, and education department officials. The concepts of the NCERT curriculum were broken down into sub-concepts and learning outcomes to devise a curriculum based criterion-referenced checklist. The learning outcomes were simplified to ensure that any child could achieve them. The checklist took into account that every child learns at a different pace and, therefore, ensured that targets were achievable by any child. Facilitator cards were developed to describe the activity to be performed to achieve the learning outcome, the materials required for the activity, the place where it should be performed, the steps to be taken to complete the activity, and the levels of success that may be achieved. Multi-sensory materials and child self-learning activity cards were also prepared.

**What they did?** Thirty teachers were then trained in the use of the Joyful Inclusion Pack over five days.

The course consisted of the following:Familiarizing teachers with the Joyful Inclusion Pack and particularly the curriculum-based criterion-referenced checklist.

* Skills training in developing activity cards for children.
* Training in evaluating the baseline learning level of children.
* Training in generating and maintaining individual files consisting of the baseline, the individual

education plan—annual, half-yearly, monthly, weekly and daily—and the evaluation format.

* Training in classroom methodology adaptations to make the learning experience joyful.
* Training in physical adaptations to classrooms to make them ideal for all children.
* Training in ensuring community participation.
* Training in collection, labelling and use of teaching–learning materials.
* Teachers found it easy to follow and assimilate the principles of the Joyful Inclusion Pack.

**A criterion-referenced checklist was developed for the following:**

* Braille, abacus, Taylor frame, orientation and mobility, low vision, teaching games, daily living

skills for the blind.

* Communication and language development, auditory training, hearing aids for the deaf.
* Remedial learning, training adolescents to live in the community, gross and fine motor

development, sensorial training for children with loco-motor disability and mental retardation.

Facilitator/teacher cards were developed, but activity cards have yet to be developed. Regular classroom teachers are to be trained in teaching the Plus Curriculum Pack to children with disabilities.

Six DPEP schools were selected to identify good practices in the application of the Joyful Inclusion Pack: the Spastics Society of Karnataka’s special school in Magadi Taluk; a UNDPsupported community school at Pavagada Taluk, Tumkur district; a private school called Sajjan Rao Vidya Samsthe in Bangalore’s city slums; a rural, government primary school in Alahalli; and two other rural schools in Dodballapur Taluk. Selection was intended to produce a representative sample of rural and urban schools, special and inclusive schools, and government- and NGOmanaged schools.

Children with special needs participate in all activities in the classroom. The functional limitations of children were accepted both by the teacher and the peer group. In government schools, teachers were reluctant to enrol children with disabilities even though it was government policy; however, they were enrolled. There has been an awareness campaign by NGOs that targets both teachers and parents. Teachers and peers have become more sensitive to the needs of children with disabilities, and accept their functional limitations.

**Outcome/Effect** Teachers were using a common curriculum-based criterion-referenced checklist to establish baselines, for planning and evaluation, and for cooperative learning methods as set out in the UNESCO Teacher Education Resource Pack guidelines. Use of disability-friendly learning materials such as multi-sensory cards and activity cards were used. There was a multipurpose resource room available in the rural school in Alahalli. Teachers felt that children were receiving class-appropriate feel that children show progress when there is support from a resource teacher. The attitude of teachers towards children with disabilities was found to be positive and friendly. They were aware of the right of every child to have access to education. Many teachers expressed the need for technical support from resource teachers.

In the three government schools in Dodballapur Taluk, general teachers received training in IEDC and inclusive education. It was noted that teachers followed inclusive education strategies because they found it helped all children to learn, including children with disabilities. Teachers from the private school Sajjan Rao Vidya Samsthe and the Spastic Society’s school have received one year training in the education of children with special needs. In the DPEP schools, teachers received short-term training in Braille, sign language, etc., but were not confident in their use. NGOs implementing IEDC provide resource-teaching support in the form of supplementary classes.

**RR Comment** Though this training was carried out some years ago it demonstrates the utility of a CBR approach in that it gives teachers hands on practical tools and skills. It also underlines the need for a twin track approach. Teachers need to develop both the impairment specific skills as here, but they also need to develop the broader skills of teaching inclusively- child friendly, collaborative and supporting peer learning and mediation. Those teachers who had 1 year’s training extra in the private schools felt much more comfortable including the children with disabilities.

**Annex vii 20 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country**  **India Mumbai and Pehlar,** **Maharashtra** Global Region South Asia ROSA

**Name of Project/Source ADAPT on Shiksha Sankalp to develop Inclusive Education 2010-2013.** Personal Communication / <http://india.cbm.org/programmes/ADAPT-Able-Disabled-All-people-together--342721.php> The Project is co-funded by BMZ (Federal Ministry of Economic Co-operation and Development, Germany) CBM (Christian Blind Mission) and ADAPT.

**Contact Person** Dr Mithu Alur [mithualur@hotmail.com] **Phase Primary Date 2011-Ongoing**

**Aims** The project aims to improve the quality of life, the reduction of social exclusion and poverty of children with disabilities in India by creating a model that supports inclusive education services. The specific objective is to allow and support children with disabilities in both project locations (“A” Ward & Pelhar) in accessing the regular school system. The children hereby receive a higher level of education. The joint school enrolment together with children without disabilities gives children with disabilities a new status. They are on par with the other normal children with regard to education, which is the prerequisite for their professional development.

The aim of the project is to determine the structural gaps that exist in the delivery of educational opportunities for all children, particularly children with disability and identify inputs that will be required (sustainable, replicable, scalable), to meet their basic educational and health needs within the two catchment areas for the project:

• Urban: ‘A’ ward of Mumbai District

• Rural: Pehlar a cluster of 22 villages in Vasai Taluka, Thane District

**Context** Finding that no reliable statistics exist on the exact number of disabled children out of school, with different estimates made by different bodies, the project will undertake an extensive door to door mapping in the two catchment areas.

The first area - The Urban Ward ‘A’ covers Colaba, Fort, parts of Dock Area, Ballard Estate, Shahid Bhagat Singh Road, D'Mello Road, Netaji Subhash Marg (Marine Drive), AP Marg, Lokmanya Tilak Marg and is a generally well provided area.

The second area is the Pelhar village cluster consisting of 22 villages, where the Mithu Alur Foundation (MAF) was set up a few years ago to extend services to the villages. MAF has already established a community centre in the area. For the first time in the country, ADAPT is undertaking a door to door census of all children in the age group of 6 – 14 years – the age group who now have a fundamental Right To Education.

A survey of all organizations (schools, NGO's, hospitals) will also be conducted in the two administrative jurisdictions. ADAPT will explore the challenges faced by these organizations and identify the barriers that exist. Further to the census and mapping survey, we will seek to bridge the structural deficits in the health and education system, through planned and sustained intervention.

**What they did?** It is a three – year longitudinal project. We expect the outcome to be a replicable, sustainable model of universal education. The various components of the projects in the two catchment areas are listed below:

Mapping and Identification:

a. Identification of children who are not in school through household and institutional surveys.

b. Identification of children with disability (CWD).

c. Conduct health and educational screening for validation of identified CWD.

d. Provide a snapshot of existing health and educational resources in the catchment areas in order to identify the existing gaps in the system.

A door to door mapping of these two areas will help create a robust data base. The project will not create new infrastructure. It will use the existing Government and Public network to identify, bridge and fill in the gaps in provisioning and services, thereby seeking to make them more universal.

The project will map the number of children with disabilities in the age group 6 to 14 years in a manner that the data generated may help to bring about policy responses, to ensure access to education for all disabled children.

Intervention: Based on the findings of the mapping exercise and the gap analysis, strategies will be developed to implement interventions. Interventions will aim at removing barriers to inclusion and providing a continuum of support for the health and education needs of CWD and to energize the educational system to receive and retain CWD.

**Capacity Building and Training:** Enrolment alone does not guarantee educational success. Teacher Training for inclusion children with disabilities. Some of these teachers had earlier helped us with the mapping and screening processes. This contributed to their acceptance of children with disabilities. A three day course has been conducted on Inclusive Education for the teachers of all the schools in Pelhar (government aided, private and the pre-schools or anganwadis run under the government’s Integrated Child Development Scheme, ICDS). The philosophy of inclusion was shared and a case study approach was adopted to explain disability and the key principles of inclusive education. The training was based on an interactive, participatory approach and involved group work. Brainstorming on solutions to the challenges the teachers faced helped the teachers focus on problem solving and supporting each other. An analysis of the pre and post survey showed that though some of the teachers were aware of inclusion and the Right to Education, they did not know ‘how’ to implement this. Though they brought the children to the schools because they were asked to, they did not know what to do with them. After the training, the teachers stated that they felt more confident of teaching children with disabilities in a regular classroom. Some requested for regular training to address their difficulties. In ‘A’ Ward, teachers from the pre-schools under the ICDS have been trained. Trainings have been scheduled for the teachers of mainstream schools. In addition, on-going continuum of support is provided to the teachers under the Shiksha Sankalp project. The teachers have been more supportive in the rural areas than in the urban perhaps due to the fact that there are no special schools there.

Empowerment Courses will be introduced. Their aim will be to empower people with disability and their families to advocate for the implementation of all provisions of the Right to Education, Persons with Disability Act (PWD) and other relevant legislations in the catchment areas. Disabled Persons Organizations (DPO's) will be established in the two catchment areas.

Monitoring and Evaluation: In order to make the process replicable, sustainable and robust, research and project documentation will capture the findings and record the methodology used to capture the findings. In-house and peer review will be an integral part of the methodology.

Community Based Resource Support Centre: Two Hubs in Colaba and Pelhar will provide the support services, treatment, training and guidance to referral services for CWD in the two catchment areas.

The Rationale-Good Inclusive Education Practice Through its activities the overall objective of the project is to create a model that supports inclusive education of all children with disabilities in a composite educational administrative jurisdiction. To date, there is no single ward, cluster or block in the country demonstrating a good inclusive education practice that provides universal coverage for all children in that cluster, ward or block.

This project proposes to create a strategy that would demonstrate good inclusive education practices in an Urban ward (‘A’ Ward Mumbai) and in a rural ward (Pelhar). It proposes to set up a universal model for the entire country that would enable all children in need to have access to education and related services .

**Outcome/Effects** School heads and teachers have been sensitised and made aware of the mandate of the Right to Education Act to include children with disabilities. Resource Support has been promised and teacher training conducted. The students have been included in this academic year and will be tracked. Many out of school children with disabilities have been identified, screened and transitioned into school. The project has already led to further macro developments. Government of India has requested an expansion proposal of the mapping process to 10 districts (629 districts in India.) The State of Maharashtra has sought a proposal to extend the screening process to 5 districts in the State and to eventually roll it out to all the 35 districts in the State.

**RR Comment:** This is project that brings together in a practical way several of the essential ingredients for making inclusion work. Firstly children with disabilities are identified going door to door, parents are supported and encouraged to bring their children with disabilities to school and clinic, parental perceptions are checked soon after by invitation to screening by medical personnel, schools are identified for them and staff trained in what their specific needs are. Disabled advocates train staff and empower disabled youth. The schools can get on-going support from specialist staff. This approach has the advantage of not waiting for a large household survey, but instead quickly identifying and supporting their inclusion on an on-going basis.

**Annex vii 21 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Pakistan, Bagh district of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Global Region South Asia ROSA**

Name of Project/Source **Inclusive education in Pakistan: experiences and lessons learned from the ENGAGE project** <http://unesco.org.pk/education/icfe/resources/res30.pdf>

**Contact Person** The American Institutes for Research’s (AIR) **Phase**: Primary **Date** 2005-2007

**Aims**: ENGAGE selected an existing teacher programme, ‘Revitalising, Innovating and Strengthening Education’ (RISE), to show the benefits of integrating inclusive education curriculum and materials. 7,000. Integrating curriculum about disability and inclusive education into a teacher training project and developing a pilot-inclusive education project

**Context**: People with disabilities are the most marginalized group within Pakistan and face great stigmatization in society This may be due to the fact that independent assessments have found a significant lack of information, rules and regulations, rehabilitation centers, and specialized services for people with disabilities This also may be due to the fact that some in society, particularly those with limited education, view disability as a curse or punishment or view those with a disability as a burden to society). Because limited information is available in Pakistan, this may have contributed to a lack of awareness to or misconceptions about people with disabilities. Teaching is not child centred. District of Bagh is composed of 230 villages. This area falls within the lesser Himalayas zone, most of the population live in rural areas. Bagh consists of 230 villages in the Himalayan foothills. There are 123 primary schools, Grades 1–5.

**What they did?** 7,000 teachers were trained with these materials. It was introduced to selected areas after the 2005 earthquake. Teachers undergo a 12-day training course, which is focused on student-centred learning methods. After completion, RISE brings together teachers to support each other in monthly cluster meetings. A further three-day follow up workshop is provided at the end of the two-year cycle. After the first cohort of teachers had completed the two-year cycle in Bagh district, ENGAGE initiated a pilot inclusive education project providing extra training so that 25 teachers would be able to educate disabled children in their classes. Teachers were selected by RISE and the District Education Office, taking into account gender balance, location and whether they already taught disabled pupils. Most disabled children in the district were not enrolled. The teachers enrolled 48 disabled children. Nineteen schools were involved, mostly with multi-grade classes. Four local teachers who had completed a Master’s course in inclusion were taken on as mentors. The mentors, professors and trainees had regular meetings and training sessions throughout. The pilot project used three approaches to provide training and support: workshops; onsite support with mentor teachers; and cluster meetings, whereby the group of teachers met with inclusive education experts (i.e., university professors) to answer questions and discuss solutions or strategies to resolve difficulties.

The ENGAGE pilot project also worked with parents of children with disabilities and members of the School Management Committee (SMC). Information sharing about disabilities was particularly needed in the District of Bagh because people had nowhere to go for resources, information, support, and services. As a result, the project became a conduit for information for parents and community members to learn about different types of disabilities and available interventions.

**Outcome/Effect** Teachers’ attitudes, knowledge and skills were recorded as becoming more pro-inclusion with increased confidence. As a result, teachers are becoming aware of how to create inclusive classrooms and more sensitive to the needs of all students. The trainee teachers changed their classroom environment and made it much more conducive to inclusion and more interactive, project work and peer tutoring was witnessed. As a result, some of the disabled children showed improvement in school assessment, parental involvement increased dramatically and more resources were provided, such as audiology and hearing aids. The pilot project, changes were witnessed in teachers’ attitudes, knowledge, and skills. Based on the experiences of the ENGAGE Project and others in Pakistan (UNICEF, 2003), there are encouraging signs that inclusive education is possible in Pakistan, if the appropriate resources and supports are provided. This project demonstrated that when training was provided to Pakistani primary teachers, they were able to make changes in their pedagogy and become more accepting of differences in their students, which are necessary initial steps to making classrooms and schools more inclusive.

**RR Comment :** The positive change demonstrates that inclusive methods can succeed in rural Pakistan. Such projects need to have a longer timescale and to be built into the administrative structure of the whole country.

**Annex vii 22 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Pakistan Global Region South Asia ROSA**

**Name of Project/Source** http://www.idp-europe.org/eenet/index.php and personal communications from Terje Magnussønn Watterdal (IDP Norway) and Professor Muhammad Rafique Tahir, Federal Directorate of Education, Islamabad, 1 February 2008.

**Contact Person Federal Directorate of Education Pakistan (FDE) and IDP Norway**

**Phase Primary/Secondary Date 2008-2010**

**Aims** To develop the support for the development of the inclusion of children with disabilities among mainstream schools and teachers through collaboration with DPOs, teachers and the local community.

**Context** Interpreting a wider set of data for the Disability Education and Poverty Project (DEPP), Singal and Bhatti (2009)[[8]](#footnote-8) set out to examine the connection between poverty, disability and education in two areas of Pakistan, focusing on 15–30 year olds, an often overlooked group. In a stratified random sample of households in nine districts in Punjab and North-West Frontier with around 9,000 respondents, questions were based on functional limitation, following the WHO and UN Statistical Division interactional approach, rather than previous medical approaches. The survey found an overall impairment rate of 20 per cent, far higher than the 2.5 per cent found in the 1998 census, and 9 per cent of the target group, young people. Despite a constitutional right to education, over one-third of children had not attended primary school and only 25 per cent had attended secondary school. The UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) estimated that only 4 per cent of disabled children are enrolled in school (UNESCAP, 2006).

**What they did?** Published a compendium on conventions, agreements and laws guaranteeingall children equal rights to quality education in an inclusive setting;Received guarantees from the Ministry of Women’s Development, SocialWelfare and Special Education that it will make a special educator availableto each of the 16 pilot schools; Held extensive training for headteachers and class teachers in managinginclusive and child-friendly classrooms. This programme ran from February2007 to the end of 2009; 200 teachers were trained; Collaborated with the Pakistan Disabled Foundation to provide a team of disabled young people who will tutor children and assist their class teacherswith the orientation and mobility activities needed for daily living andBraille literacy;Trained school counsellors, because many children (with and withoutimpairments) experience social and emotional difficulties;Worked with activists within the deaf community to assess different signlanguages used in schools and communities throughout Pakistan, to ensurethat the use of indigenous sign languages is promoted in the inclusiveschools (complementing the use of the standard Urdu sign language); Developed a glossary of terminologies (in English and Urdu) related todisabilities, inclusion, barriers to learning, development and participation toreduce the ‘disabling’ labelling of children.

**Outcome/Effect** Pilot implementation of inclusive education started in four schools in Quetta, Balochistan in April 2008. By 2010, 843 children with moderate impairments had been successfully included in the 16 schools in the Capital District. This initiative was financed by the Norwegian Government (Rs30m) and implemented in collaboration with the Provincial Education Department in Balochistan, IDP Norway, the FDE and the Pakistan Disabled Foundation. Following the success of these 16 pilot schools, President Zadarie[[9]](#footnote-9) introduced an education policy, approved by the Federal Cabinet in September 2009, to achieve Education for All. This focused on the building of two inclusive schools in every district and the adoption of a child-friendly inclusive school framework.204 In November 2010, the Federal Government, in conjunction with UNESCO, UNICEF, Sightsavers and the Federal Education College, ensured that the Secretary of Education from each provincial ministry of education signed the Islamabad Commitment to Child Friendly Inclusive Education.

**RR Comment** Pakistan has a long way to go to achieve education for all with 35 % of girls no schooling compared to 44 per cent of girls with moderate or severe impairments ( equivalent figures 12 and 29% for boys). There are some examples of change. In the Punjab, the provincial government has established an independent department for special education and there has been a substantial increase in financial allocations. Ninety new special education centres have been established at tehsil level and special education teachers receive double pay[[10]](#footnote-10). There are also incentives for disabled students. There needs to be a concrete strategy of training and development of inclusive education at every level of the education system under the Ministry of Education.

**Annex vii 23 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Iraq Global Region Middle East MENA**

**Name of Project/Source** UNICEF Iraq-WASH and inclusive Education UNICEF Iraq (2012)PROGRESS Report to the Government of Australia “Increasing access to quality primary education through improving water and sanitation facilities and educational opportunities for disabled children and youth"[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Contact Person** Unicef Iraq office

**Phase Primary Date 2011-2013**

**Aims-**Increasing access to quality primary education through improving water and sanitation facilities and educational opportunities for disabled children and youth.

**Context**

**What they did?** Under the WASH programme 194 schools were selected and detailed Bill of Quantities (BoQs) were finalized in 166 schools; hygiene clubs established in 148 schools; and, 324 teachers from 162 schools were trained on sanitation and hygiene promotion. In addition 68 staff from directorates of education and NGO partners in the 18 Governorates were trained on Child Friendly WASH design, implementation and supervision. This is a two year programme. With the purpose was to increase primary school enrolment and attendance for 100,000 students in 200 schools in the most vulnerable communities in Iraq with a focus on two components: one is on WASH in Schools and the other is inclusive education for children with disabilities. a total of 106 master trainers were trained on CFS teacher training package as well as education for children with special needs, who will conduct cascade teacher training in 200 target schools.

Teacher Trainings: Based on the study undertaken by CARA, with the support of AusAID, a special training package has been designed to create a group of inclusive education master trainers at the institute of teachers education. Three training courses to train master trainers were conducted during the reporting period. The first course was for 40 master trainers (17 female; 23 male) on Inclusive Education with a special focus on children with disabilities. The training focused on how to create conducive and friendly environments in school for children with special needs, so that every child in school can learn and develop to their full potential. The second training was for another 39 master trainers (18 female; 21 male) on the CFS teacher training package in order to improve quality teaching. The training course included the CFS concept, child-centered teaching methodology, Early Childhood Development (ECD), psychosocial support, community engagement and school management. The third group of 27 supervisors (16 female; 11 male) were trained to better supervise this initiative. The plan is to conduct cascade training for teachers in the targeted 200 schools by ensuring inclusion of out of school children and children inside the schools and classrooms

**Outcome/Effect**

For the Education programme, quality monitoring has been ensured through close coordination with Ministry of Education and the Dept.of Educations at the governorate level. CFS national and local committees in each DoE were established, and CFS focal points were identified to follow up all the activities under CFS initiative. In addition, the UNICEF country office as well as the three zonal offices in Erbil, Baghdad and Basra conducted field visits to monitor the work on the ground including the training

**RR Comment** This is an interesting demonstration of the need for a twin track approach to ensure the impairment specific needs of children with disabilities are covered. The fact that the WASH assessments include making wash and toilet facilities accessible at the same time demonstrates the potential of such programme collaborations. A possible weakness is the reliance on cascade training rather than a whole school training model and secondly the key importance of getting the hearts and minds of school leaders on board. It will be of interest and significance to track the next stage of implementation. Another weakness is that the purchasing of furniture, equipment and learning materials is being left to the third year. This could well lead to high drop-out as children with disabilities are not receiving the reasonable accommodations they need. This provision needs to come earlier in the process.

**Annex vii 24 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Kenya, Oriang &** **Nyanza Global Region East Africa ESARO**

Name of Project/Source Developing Inclusive education in 5 rural primary school Kenya then expanded. <http://www.school4all.org.uk/?lid=10331>

Contact Person Leonard Cheshire Disability East & North African Regional Office No. 2, Oloitoktok Road Off Ole Odume Road Nairobi 00600 Kenya

**Phase Primary Date 2001-2006, expanded to the to present**

**Aims** To include children with disabilities in local schools and develop teachers to meet their needs.

**Context** Leonard Cheshire Disability has been working with the Kenyan Government and higher education establishment to retrain teachers and support a pilot inclusive education programme in five schools in Oriang, Western Kenya since 2001. The two biggest challenges were the cultural aspects and feelings of hopelessness. The wider community held the view that having a disabled child was a curse and made their parents objects of pity and social welfare.

**What they did?**

Through community meetings (barazas ), funeral gatherings, church services and youth theatre, a community project educated local people about disabilities and helped to change negative attitudes. The community is now much keener to find practical ways to adapt the environment for the benefit of disabled children. Attitudes to schools were also tackled. Parents had abdicated their parenting roles to schools, instead of working in partnership with them. The wider community believed that the role of developing schools belonged to parents whose children were enrolled and the teachers. This is now changing.

Under an agreement with the Kenya Institute of Special Education (KISE), Oriang teachers are receiving on-going in-service training leading to KISE certificate and diploma qualifications. The course includes distance learning during term time and meetings with tutors in the holidays. This model is the first of its kind in Kenya to incorporate inclusive education. The results of a survey by LCI in 1999 played a significant role in the design of the course. Fifteen teachers went on an in-service diploma course in inclusive education, which included sign language, Braille and the use of teaching and adaptive aids.

**Outcome/Effect** The project benefits 2,200 children, 174 of whom have minor to severe impairment (mainly low vision, physical disabilities, epilepsy or learning impairment). A few have hearing difficulties. Many children have intellectual impairments caused by malaria and lack of access to treatment. More recently, over 700 disabled children have been included. Since 2007, the project has been extended to 300 schools in Kisumu Province. Currently the project caters to 2,700 students, of whom 564 are children with disabilities. The successful implementation of this pilot project has led to the overwhelming demands for a consolidated and integrative expansion to the broader Nyanza province and the country as a whole. The expanded programme was launched in July 2007 by Hon. Beth Mugo, Assistant Minister for Education. This five-year programme will build on the gains of the Oriang pilot project, continuing to focus on teacher training and building the capacity of parents and local community groups to lobby for educational policy change for the inclusion of all children. The programme office will be based in the Leonard Cheshire Disability Resource Centre in Kisumu City, the Nyanza provincial headquarters.[[12]](#footnote-12)

The Nyanza Inclusive Education Programme (NIEP) was designed to meet the educational and developmental needs of disabled children by facilitating their inclusion within mainstream schools and the wider community.

The programme has enabled over 4000 children with disabilities to be enrolled and retained in 125 primary schools in 10 districts in Nyanza, namely Siaya, Kisumu East, Kisumu West, Kuria East, Suba, Rachuonyo, Migori, Kisii Central, Nyando and Bondo. Over 473 teachers have been trained on Inclusive education approach and 20 model schools adapted and made accessible for children with disabilities. Over 600 children have been assessed and assistive devices provided to those requiring them. These include wheelchairs, hearing aids, speactacles and adapted desks.

The programme office is based in the Leonard Cheshire Disability Resource Centre in Kisumu City, the Nyanza provincial headquarters. An additional 5 disability resource centres have been established in 5 satellite model primary schools in the project area to support learners with educational learning support materials. These centres also support neighbouring schools[[13]](#footnote-13).

**RR Comment** This has been a very successful project starting in Oriang and then expanding to Nyanza. They key is having a link with the University Kenya Institute of Special Education - able through distance learning and holiday tutorials to upgrade and accredit teachers knowledge, skills and understanding. In parallel with this the awareness raising in the community in the community and providing practical tools and support in local resource centres. This model is capable of being developed to scale, but plans for greater expansion got caught up with political turmoil after the last election.

**Annex vii 25 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Tanzania Global Region East Africa ESARO**

**Name of Project/Source** Developing Inclusive education in Tanzania

EENET, Newsletter No. 6, 2005, Santa Kayonga and Anne Nkutu, ‘Evaluation of Inclusive Education Project in Zanzibar’, 2007.

Contact Person MOEVT

**Phase Primary Secondary and Vocational** Date 2007-2010

Aims Develop capacity of teachers, schools and positively influence attitudes to disability in the community.

**Context** Tanzanian mainland, the MoEVT took over the pilot project. It was already running a national pilot scheme and it has adopted several of the features of the pilot project supported by NFU. This involves 22 schools in four districts (16 primary, 2 secondary and 4 folk development colleges (FDCs)), and was a collaboration between a local DPO, Tanzania Association for the Mentally Handicapped, the MoEVT, the Ministry of Labour, Youth Development and Sports (MoLYDS) and the Ministry of Health. NFU was unable to continue supporting this pilot project after 2007, but a Finnish agency was looking at education policy on the Tanzanian mainland. It was hoped that the MoEVT would try to combine these two initiatives to create a more holistic approach.

**What they did?** Seven teachers from each school (including school inspectors and head teachers) received intensive training courses on a general introduction to inclusive education, what it means, how it benefit students and teachers, placement in class, sign language and Braille, behaviour modification, making of individual education plans and files, how to produce and use teaching and learning materials using locally available resources, and assessment and identification of the needs of students. Although there are 20 pilot schools, 144 teachers have been trained in advanced Braille and sign language. These teachers then trained their colleagues, so that all teachers at the school have knowledge of the various inclusive education concepts. Sometimes this worked well, but in other cases it would be more beneficial to provide training for all the teachers. Resources were limited, so this was the only way to reach more schools.

**Outcome/Effect** The most significant contribution of the project has been to show that inclusive education is achievable and to provide practical examples of how it can be carried out. It has underscored the importance of teacher training, teaching/ learning materials, community and parental involvement and modification of the school environment to create an inclusive environment for disabled children and young people.

• Its contribution to the formulation of the inclusive education policy and its subsequent implementation;

• Improved attitudes towards the education of children and youth with developmental and other disabilities and reduction in the stigma associated with disability at grassroots level;

•An improvement in the ability of teachers to handle children with diverse learning needs

• Increased technical capacity of the MoEVT and schools to deliver inclusive education;

• Involvement of the special needs education/inclusive education unit in the MoEVT in developing and delivering training – thereby improving prospects for sustainability;

• An increase in the range of resource materials available for inclusive education;

• Establishment of parent support and community support mechanisms for disabled children and young people;

**RR Comment** The involvement of the Ministry in developing resources and helping provide training is important. But the project did not continue without external funding. The issue is for countries to take ownership of such project, build them into the budget and plan to bring them to scale. Global donors such as GPE should be supporting such efforts were pilots have shown them to be effective.

**Annex vii 26 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Zanzibar** Global Region ESARO

**Name of Project**/**Source *Zanzibar Inclusion in Action*** For Videos Zanzibar A series of video programmes describing the development of inclusive education in Zanzibar Association for People with Developmental Disabilities (ZAPDD), Zanzibar Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT), NFU

<http://www.ii.inclusioneducativa.org/Africa.php?region=Africa&country=Zanzibar&experience=Inclusion_In_Action#6>

**Contact Person** Roy Mc Conkey ( [r.mcconkey@ulster.ac.uk](mailto:r.mcconkey@ulster.ac.uk) ), Lilian Mariga( [nfu@africaonline.co.zw](mailto:nfu@africaonline.co.zw)) and Mpaji Ali Maalim **Phase** Primary, Secondary, Post School Training Date Initial Pilot, 2004–2006.

**Aims**From the outset Zanzibar’s inclusion plans were a co-constructed effort between North and South. The initial partners included the Zanzibar Association for People with Developmental Disabilities (ZAPDD ), NFU (Norwegian Association for Persons with Developmental Disabilities) and the Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) , with funding from the Norwegian youth organisation “Operation Day’s Work”.

**Context** A push for inclusive education began in Zanzibar after education officials visited Lesotho and were inspired by the changes shown in the Lesotho education system. The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) has adopted an inclusive education policy and at the moment is developing guidelines for the implementation of the policy. This work is supported by CREATE. The MoEVT has also changed the name of the Special Needs Education unit to the Inclusive Education unit. A push for inclusive education began in Zanzibar after education officials visited Lesotho and were inspired by the changes shown in the Lesotho education system. The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training (MoEVT) has adopted an inclusive education policy and at the moment is developing guidelines for the implementation of the policy. This work is supported by CREATE. The MoEVT has also changed the name of the Special Needs Education unit to the Inclusive Education unit.

**What they did?** The project started in 2004, and the initial pilot period was over in 2006. The first steps were to create awareness about inclusive education. Out of the 100 schools, 20 pilot schools were selected, based upon the following criteria:

1. Schools already including students with disabilities   
2.Schools who had a negative attitude towards inclusion   
3.Schools who had special units   
4.Schools who had a positive attitude towards inclusive education

The project was evaluated and proved viable, and a consolidation phase was recommended prior to expansion. A specialist team has assessed 528 students, 162 of whom were diagnosed as having a disability. By the end of 2006, assistive devices (glasses, tricycles, etc.) were provided to some of the students. 180 textbooks for maths, English, Kiswahili, social sciences and natural science were translated into Braille for schools in Zanzibar in 2006. **There have been many changes, particularly in attitudes, among teachers, students and local communities.** Although big challenges remain, the project has shown that inclusive education can be achieved with very limited resources. Particularly important was the inclusion of children with learning difficulties and the vocational training for young adults with learning difficulties. The partnership with government, parents and Disabled People’s Organisations (DPOs) was very successful. This project has now been scaled up to 20 more schools with the potential for another 20.

**Outcome** The Ministry has incorporated inclusive education into its new Policy Statement (2006) and plans to extend the programme to a further 20 schools in 2008 and this will continue on a rolling basis in future years. Teacher training capacity will be increased as will the Inclusive Education Unit. **Today there is even more evidence of international co-construction.**  As The efforts in developing inclusive education and youth development in Zanzibar are now continuing through support from, NFU, NORAD (Norwegian Aid), the MoEVT is collaborating with SIDA, Sight Savers International, UNESCO, CREATE (USAID), and WHY (World Homes for Youth), and several other actors – local as well as international.

The project produced a series of video-programmes with seven objectives:[[14]](#footnote-14)

* To raise awareness of inclusive education in Zanzibar among schools, families and people with disabilities.
* To document the methods used in the pilot project on Inclusive Education and Youth Development in Zanzibar.
* To produce practical tools for schools to assist with the consolidation and expansion of Inclusive Education in Zanzibar.
* Inform the wider international community of strategies that have proved successful in establishing a more inclusive education system in countries with limited resources.
* Prove useful in other African countries as well as other less developed countries.
* Contribute to the growing international experience in making inclusive education a reality
* Inform donor agencies about the types of investment required in order to make Education for All children a reality. The Authors of the project also have a book in preparation focusing on mobilising social capital from parents, DPOs and Community to deliver the teacher training And support necessary.

**RR Comment** This project is an excellent model of how to develop inclusive education for students and children with disabilities. The only reservation is that the approach appears tpo be influenced by medical model and special education thinking. Perhaps excusable given where the project started from. But it underlines the importance of Ministries of Education and Donors to see the importance of involving and training DPOs to do this crucial work based on the UNCRPD.

**Annex vii 27 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Countries** Algeria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, China(Tibet),Cuba(Partly ), DR Congo, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Niger, North Korea(partly), Rwanda, Senegal, Togo and Vietnam **Global Region** EAPRO, ESARO,WACRO, TACRO.

**Name of Project**/**Source: Handicap International: A review of teacher training activities within Handicap** International’s Inclusive Education projects

Contact Person Lies Vandenbossche, Hannah Corps [hannah.corps@hi-uk.org](mailto:hannah.corps@hi-uk.org)

**Date**  September - December 2011

**Aims**:The review of teacher training activities within Handicap International’s Inclusive Education projects is part of a broader drive to “strengthen the capacity of Handicap International’s education staff and partners” across all country programmes.

**Context** Handicap International’s work on Inclusive Education in 20 countries has a focus on the education of disabled children. This may be in formal education (education in schools) or in non formal education (education at home or in the community) HI’s work takes an inclusive approach it inevitably promotes education opportunities for many other excluded groups within mainstream learning environments. The six main areas of activity within all education project are:

* awareness-raising
* identification (of disabled children out-of-school & in-school)
* support to parents
* teacher training
* accessibility
* development of inclusive education policies.

**What they did?** During the four month review period a variety of tools were used to collect information relating to current project practices in teacher training; the most influential being a questionnaire completed by sixteen HI programmes. The responses to the questionnaires highlighted the diverse approaches to teacher training both at internal project and partner level, and some of the challenges of providing adequate and accurate knowledge and skills to teachers to ensure a positive impact at classroom level for the inclusion of children with disabilities.

**Findings/Effect Challenges**:

- A weak process in place for identifying teacher training needs (baseline assessment)

- Teacher training viewed as a discrete project activity rather than its broader implication for national education policy reform

- Insufficient in-house technical skills and knowledge to support the development of teacher training programmes and course materials

o Difficulties to provide a coherent representation of inclusive education

o Over usage of a medical approach to disability to explain ‘inclusive practices’.

**Key recommendations:**

- More detailed attention to teacher training should be paid at the development stage of any inclusive education project

- Sufficient allocation of time, budget and human resources is needed to improve effectiveness and impact of current teacher training activities

- Teacher training should always be developed in line with national, provincial and district level teacher training institutes/colleges (MoUs), to ensure synergies and coherence with the national frameworks and policies

- Monitoring, evaluation and follow up (impact at policy and classroom level) should be regarded as important as the teacher training itself, and as such planned for in detail.

Apart from a critical analysis of current field practice in relation to teacher training the review had two main concrete outputs which are intended to respond to the needs identified by field programmes and partners during the process. These **outputs** are:

1) A manual with guidelines to support the development of teacher training

2) A manual with contents of teacher training on inclusion (with a focus on children with disabilities)

**RR Comment** In the report there is no mention of developing the training of trainers to include DPOs, people with disabilities and parents. HI does do this e.g. Mali, but it needs emphasising. The majority of training course were by withdrawal from school of teachers for 2 to 5 days and then participants were expected to return to school and train their colleagues. This method has been found to be ineffective unless it is subject to follow up and monitoring. Most trainers were found to develop their own resources and the Output of producing manuals of guidance is welcome. The predominance of medical model thinking recognised as a challenge undermines the development of a whole school approach

Annex vii 28 Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities

**Country South Africa** Global Region ESARO

**Name of Project/Source** **District Based Resource Teams and Institution Based Support Teams** Conceptual And Operational

Guidelines for The Implementation of Inclusive Education: District-Based Support Teams

2005 <http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=9DinPB1DQ9Y%3D&tabid=436&mid=1752>

**Contact Person** Department of Education Republic of South Africa, Directorate Inclusive Education

Sol Plaatje House Schoeman Street, Pretoria Marie Schoeman [Schoeman.M@mweb.co.za](mailto:Schoeman.M@mweb.co.za)

**Phase** Early Childhood Centres, Primary and Secondary , Further Education and Adult Training Date 2005

**Aims** The guidelines for district-based support teams refer to integrated professional support services at district level. Support providers employed by the Department of Education will draw on the expertise from local education institutions and various community resources. Their key function is to assist education institutions (including early childhood centres, schools, further education colleges, and adult learning centres) to identify and address barriers to learning and promote effective teaching and learning. This includes both classroom and organisational support, providing specialised learner and educator support, as well as curricular and institutional development (including management and governance), and administrative support. Initially these were developed in 30 out of 80 Districts. The ultimate goal for educators, schools and other education institutions, and for those who support them, is the development of learners. This is dependent on effective teaching, which, in turn, relies on the development of effective curricular and supportive teaching and learning environments. Educators and their institutions need constantly to learn and grow, and must have ongoing support to achieve this. Therefore, the Department of Education’s function is to provide the necessary infrastructural and human resource support for success. The district-based support team is a primary channel through which this should be provided.

**Context** Education White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System suggests a field-testing exercise over a three year period. Regarding implementation, the following will be done as part of short-term steps (2004-2006):

a) Implement a national advocacy and education programme on inclusive education.

b) Plan and implement a targeted outreach programme, beginning in Government’s rural and urban development nodes, to mobilise disabled, out-of-school children and youth

c) Complete an audit of special schools and implementing a programme to improve quality and efficiency

d) Designate, plan and implement the conversion of 30 special schools to special schools/resource centres in 30 designated school districts

e) Designate, plan and implement the conversion of thirty primary schools to ‘full service schools’ in the same thirty districts as (d) above

f) Designate, plan and implement the district support teams in the same 30 districts as (d) above

g) Establish, within primary schooling, on a progressive basis, systems and procedures for the early identification and addressing of barriers to learning in the Foundation Phase (Grades R-3)

**What they did?** **District-based Support Teams** (DBSTs) are trans-disciplinary teams that have representation from several units in the district, such as Early Childhood Development, Curriculum, Institutional Development/Education Management and Governance, Behaviour, Teacher Development and Inclusive Education. The guidelines and funding are provided by National Government. Implementation is through the 9 Provincial Governments and they in turn work with District Offices where the Support Teams work to support the development of Institutional Support Groups to identify barriers and support teachers and learners. Institutional Based Support Groups(IBSGs) are set up in up to full service schools and many other schools varying by province and are posited on the idea of a collaborative team jointly problem solving barriers to learning.

**Outcome/Effect.** There have not been comprehensive evaluations of this process, but several studies point to mixed results dependent on some key factors. Dreyer (2010) examining schools in the Western Cape found that IBSGs were only effective if the principal was fully involved and supportive and that generally the members of the IBSG had not had sufficient training from DBST to become collaborative problem solvers[[15]](#footnote-15). A qualitative study in the Kwa Zulu Natal Province of South Africa by Ntombela (2009) also highlighted the problems with a cascade approach. The research examined the extent to which, and the ways in which teachers in the Philani district were trained for the implementation White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education. The findings suggest that the cascade model was ineffective for disseminating innovations and preparing teachers for implementing these innovations. Teachers did not acquire adequate understanding of inclusive education and so the desired re-culturing of schools and classrooms did not occur – with knock-on implications for the implementation of inclusive school and classroom policies and practices[[16]](#footnote-16). Naicker (2006), Chief Director of Education Planning in the Western Cape suggests that because of concern for the conservatism of many academics, the training needed to implement White Paper No. 6 was left largely to government bureaucrats, who did not connect with wider pedagogical and philosophical change and did not allocate sufficient time for training. Secondly, ‘teaching practices do not emerge from just anywhere. They are informed and shaped by theories of learning’[[17]](#footnote-17).

Developing Inclusion in South Africa, a film shot in 10 schools demonstrates that IBSGs can be effective in developing inclusive practice[[18]](#footnote-18), but that the quality of interventions is as good as the training and confidence levels of teachers. Reliance on special schools varies province by province with Mpumalanga leading with over 150 full service schools. The OECD(2008) in an independent evaluation of South African Education Policy found that there was a need to “Strengthen financial and methodological incentives and supports at provincial, local and school level, leading stakeholders to include inclusiveness for all in their strategies and empowering them to fulfil their missions. Schools should be invited to implement tools for individualising educational approaches, diversifying educational options and identifying appropriate support”[[19]](#footnote-19).

The field tests [[20]](#footnote-20)document demonstrates more than 2000 District staff were trained in inclusion, but “One of the main challenges experienced has been the lack of capacity in the District-based Support Teams to ensure the establishment of Institution-level support teams in all schools in their jurisdiction, and the ongoing training, mentoring and monitoring of teachers and school managers as they implement what has been learned in the various orientation sessions. There needs to be a broader understanding of the importance and role of a wider range of units within the district office that have to be held responsible for monitoring the implementation of all aspects of the policy from admissions to management of inclusive schools, classroom practices and methodologies, curriculum support, early identification and intervention, parent mobilisation and resource provisioning”.( p13) Kwa Zulu-Natal, Western Cape, Northern Cape and Mpumalanga have established DBST in every District and Kwa Zulu Natal, Western Cape and Mpumalanga have IST in nearly every school.

**RR Comment** The theoretical model of DBSGs and IBSGs is a good one and there are examples of both working, where there is commitment at school level from principals, SENCOs or teachers, and at District level where Officers have understood and support a shift from a medical model where the problem is the child’s deficits to a social model which focuses on barriers. From personal observations during a lecture tour of 5 provinces in 2008 there seemed to be an issue of psychologists and special school principals both of whom, have a lot of power in determining where children with disabilities go to school choosing in too many cases special. To be fair in recent years the Inclusion Unit have developed important guidelines and training to counter these pressures. In 2008, the Department of

Education introduced the National Strategy for Screening, Identification and Assessment and Support (SIAS)[[21]](#footnote-21). In 2010 the Education Department produced Guidelines for Full-Service/Inclusive Schools , based on field tests undertaken between 2004 and 2009[[22]](#footnote-22). These provide a coherent rational for the development of inclusive practice. In 2011 Guidelines for Responding to Learner Diversity in the Classroom [[23]](#footnote-23)

In additionThe ‘**National Policy Framework for Teacher Education and Development in South Africa** (2007)’ emphasises that Continuing Professional Teacher Development (CPTD) should ensure that: "All teachers need to acquire skills in recognising, identifying and addressing barriers to learning and creating inclusive and enabling teaching and learning environments for all learners, including those with disabilities and other special needs." (Section 48) Furthermore the Policy states: "A sizeable proportion need to develop specialist skills in areas such as ...teaching learners with disabilities, diversity management, classroom management and discipline, and so on."  (Section 48)

The political commitment to White Paper No 6 and the development of Inclusive education for students with disabilities has varied. A recent UNICEF report[[24]](#footnote-24) on the views of children with disabilities shows there is still a long way to go with teasing, bullying and exclusion still the norm in both rural and urban areas, but there are also isolated examples of inclusion working. The key to developing the pedagogy of inclusion is sufficient trainers who understand the principles of inclusion and have the experience to implement it. South Africa is playing catch up, but is seeking with top down training and guidance issues to close the gap and in the meantime responding to situations on the ground by expanding special school provision.

**Annex vii Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Lesotho Global Region EASARO**

**Name of Project/Source: Developing Inclusive Education in Lesotho**.

Khatleli et al, 1995 <http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/lesotho_feasibility.pdf>

Mittler 2003 , [www.eenet.org.uk/theory\_practice/ internat\_exp.shtml\_internat\_exp.shtml](http://www.eenet.org.uk/theory_practice/%20internat_exp.shtml_internat_exp.shtml)

**Mphohle and Paneng 1997**<http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/eenet_newsletter/news1/lesotho2.php>

Miles 2002 <http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/docs/bonn_2.php>

**Contact Person** **Palesa Mphohle and Hilda Paneng can be contacted at: LSMHP, Box 7699, Maseru 100, Lesotho**

**Ministry of Education and Training, Maseru,**

**Phase Primary, Secondary Further Education** Date 1995 onwards

**Aims** In Lesotho, a project was initiated in which intensive training workshops on inclusion were provided to local teachers with a view to developing expertise and tools that could be generalised.

**Context** Lesotho, with a landlocked population of less than 2 million, offers points of contrast, as well as similarity with Uganda. The national movement of disabled persons took the initiative in pressing the government to open its schools to disabled children. In addition, a strong national parents' organisation initially developed with support from a Norwegian NGO, has helped to achieve dissemination and sustainability and has also provided high quality empowerment, support and training to parents in rural areas, strongly encouraged partnerships between parents and teachers at local level and has played a leading role in the training and support of teachers at all levels. In 1993 the MOET set up a unit to develop the inclusion of children with disabilities into primary schools. A feasibility study conducted by Khateli et al in 1995 of 26% of primary schools found 17.4% pupils with disabilities casually included and teachers did make efforts to include the. 12.4% had learning difficulties and they presented the greatest problems given the rigid curriculum.

**What they did?** Lesotho adopted a policy of inclusion and identified ten pilot schools (eight primary and two secondary, mostly in rural areas) and providing intensive three week training workshops to nearly all the teachers in these schools, one school in each of the ten districts in Lesotho. Despite large classes and an absence of basic resources in the 10 pilot schools that were selected, most teachers were found to be already teaching along inclusive lines by ensuring that all children − even those in the largest classes − were participating, understanding instructions or getting appropriate support from other children. Additional training received by these teachers provided them with basic information about impairments and helped them to develop positive attitudes towards children with disabilities. This training gave teachers the confidence to refer children to local health workers for treatment of common eye and ear infections that can affect a child’s learning. The teachers from these schools then went into neighbouring villages and, working through local chiefs, announced that their schools were now open to disabled children and tried to persuade parents to allow their children to attend. Valued support was provided by trained itinerant special needs inspectors (e.g. for sensory and intellectual disabilities) and by local district inspectors. It was decided at the outset not to appoint a specialist resource teacher or teachers specialising in a particular disability to the pilot schools because this might reduce the sense of ownership of the other teachers in the school. All teachers in the pilot schools eventually received training. The training was enhanced by a series of videos Preparing Teachers for Inclusion [[25]](#footnote-25)

**Outcome/Effect** The success of the pilot schools encouraged the government to adopt the inclusion of children with disabilities as a national policy and to expand the number of schools involved. Teaching children with disabilities was made part of mandatory teacher training requirements and is part of the four year distance learning teaching qualification aimed at unqualified teachers. The rolling out of this initiative was impacted upon by the high numbers of orphans with HIV/AIDs 23% of children and loss of income to the country with changes to the migrant labour to mining in South Africa. Nevertheless from 2004 all new schools have to be accessible and bursaries for school fees for disabled and other vulnerable groups. There has been criticism that and emphasis on equality has led to low quality but this is being addressed by reorganisation of the school inspectorate and efforts to train all teachers.

**RR Comment** In the 1990’s many were impressed by Lesotho’s commitment to inclusion routed in the their Constitution. The model adopted with its emphasis on teachers identifying various impairing conditions(out lined in the feasibility study) and the three week training for inservice teachers in selected schools backed up by the training videos is a good model. The problem comes with the roll out. The setting up of a parents organisation of children with learning difficulties made a big difference- Lesotho Society of the Mentally Handicapped Programme (LSMHP), but a BED study [[26]](#footnote-26) in 2007 identified big barriers that still need addressing .

These include

i) Parental poverty impacting on transport( where children are expected to walk for up to 1.5 hours to school) and meeting medical needs;

ii) Conventional teachers lack the skills of teaching children with learning disabilities. Even if parents’ advocacy were stronger and succeeded in getting their children into the schools, the teachers are ill-prepared for the special needs of such children. Heads of schools in this regard are also hesitant to enrol them, because of the inadequacies of their teachers and other relevant resources, and

iii) Shame and embarrassment. Despite the training parents have had, they are still ashamed and embarrassed about their children’s disability. This is because of the negative attitude the society has towards such children.

iV)The curriculum does not cater for the people with learning disabilities in Lesotho.

The Government has plans to address these issues but they do not seem to be a priority and are not mentioned in the Lesotho UN Country Plan 2009 or the Report to UNESCO IBE 2008.

What this demonstrates is that excellent initiatives to develop teachers capacity to include children with disabilities can be severely effected by changing priorities of international donors, agencies and governments and changes in economic circumstances. Teacher training initiatives in including children with disabilities need to be long term and sustained.
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**Annex vii Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities**

**Country Brazil Global Region TARCO**

**Name of Project/Source** Ministry of Education (2008) ‘ Brazil:The Development of Education Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future’ Report to UNESCO International Conference on Education

Contact Person Ministry of Education

**Phase Whole Education System Date 2008**

**Aims** Inequalities in the conditions of the access to education and in educational performances are very evident among Brazilian children, young people and adults. It particularly jeopardizes specific ethnic-racial social groups: the poor and rural populations; students with disabilities and youth and adults who have not concluded compulsory education at the right age. However, a firm commitment from President Lula and his successor, Dilma Rousseff, to social equality, a steady economic growth of 10% and support from donors is leading to the development of real social change and inclusive education in Brazil. This is representative of a country that is guiding its own development because of its robust economic growth it is able to implement reforms that work for Brazil

**Context** From 2001, the National Education Plan objectives featured many pro-inclusion initiatives, including special education to organise partnerships with health and social care in all cities; adequate educational interaction in early childhood; transport, spoken textbooks, large print, Braille; Brazilian Sign Language and architectural access. In the same year the National Guidelines on special education in basic education tried to enrol all students and make schools responsible to ensure a quality education.

Legislation required the care of all students with special educational needs (SEN) to be realized in ordinary classes of regular education.[[27]](#footnote-27) The state’s education systems.. ‘ should ensure access for students identified with special educational needs, through the elimination of urban architectural barriers, in building-including the facilities, equipment and furniture-and in school transport, as well as the barriers in communication, providing the schools with necessary human resources and materials.’

In 2006, out of a population of 170 million, 56 million were enrolled in early years education and school. Primary net enrolment was at 96% having risen from 90% in 2000. However the census identified 28 million disabled people in Brazil and so there is still a long way to go to enroll everyone into basic education. Traditionally special education was organised as a parallel system with a strong presence in the private sector. The numbers of children with disabilities in ordinary schools has risen from 21% in 2000 to 47% in 2006.

**What they did**? In 2007 the Ministry of Education launched the Educational Development Plan (PDE). This includes 40 programs or actions to reduce social exclusion. Most crucially for the inclusion of disabled students the installation of **Multifunctional Resource Rooms**: the rooms are earmarked for regular education public schools, equipped with television, computers with printers, scanners and webcam; DVD and software for accessibility; furniture and educational and pedagogical material specific to Braille, sign language LIBRAS, augmentative and alternative communication, among other resources of assistive technology for offering a complementary specialised education service . By 2011 30,000 schools had these resources rooms installed.

Changes to educational infra-structure are matched by a training programme for inclusive education which starts with local administrators and is then rolled out for teachers. The national seminars and the regional courses have a duration of 40 hours and feature a wide range of themes relating to inclusive education, including theoretical and practical justifications for inclusion, the role of the family in inclusion, technological approaches, and even instructional methods for students with specific types of disabilities. This featured a wide range of themes relating to inclusive education, including theoretical and practical justifications for inclusion, the role of the family in inclusion, technological approaches, and even specific types of disabilities.

**Outcome/Effect**

**Initial and on-going training of teachers is a central question. The Ministry of Education (MEC) has developed regular programmes for the training of teachers in Regular Teaching and Special Education through agreements with states and municipalities. These programmes, with the emphasis on distance training, use texts translated and prepared by the MEC on special educational needs and, according to the reports of the Special Education Department (SEESP), have reached about 70.000 teachers in the past three years. The target is to reach a total of 1.200.000 teachers (http://www.mec.gov.br/seesp). In these projects, financed by the FNDE, 22.860 teachers were qualified in 1997, 11.927 in 1998, 14.000 in 1999, 16.100 in 2000, 19.135 in 2001 and 7090 in 2002[[28]](#footnote-28)**

RR Comment

**Annex vii**  Exemplars of Good Practice Training Teachers for the Inclusion of Children with Disabilities

**Country**  Australia, Queensland Global Region EAPRO

Name of Project/Source Carrington, S., Robinson, R. (2004) **Queensland Australia :A case study of inclusive school development: a journey of learning.** The International Journal of Inclusive Education 8(2):141-153. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/1711/1/1711.pdf> See also Index for Inclusion in various languages <http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/resource_search.php?theme=indx&date=0&author=0&publisher=0&type=0&country=0>

**Phase** Pre School Grade 7 **Date** 2001-2002

**Aims** Work with a staff of large primary school in deprived neighbourhood with large number SEN children and those with behaviour difficulties. Using 2 staff who also studying Queensland University as critical friends through whole staff training And voluntary focus groups to use the Index for Inclusion process to develop inclusive learning at the school.

**Context.** In 2000 Queensland adopted a policy of increasing Inclusive Education. Responsibility for professional development, once a system responsibility, has been devolved mostly to school organizations. Principals have the role to manage the pace and path of change in schools: to manage the anxiety and stress that can accompany change. Because it is recognized that human minds need stability, the change process needs to involve school leaders creating a climate of collaborative effort and ownership of the change process. To bring about effective change, school leaders and teachers must be actively involved in the change process together. This will determine the capacity of the school to become more inclusive.

**What they did?** A dual approach was taken to professional development in the school: staff meeting activities for the whole staff, combined with a small group approach (voluntary) where personal professional development needs were met in a more intensive way. Data were collected in staff meetings, which included 48 teaching staff and three administrators, including the principal. The small group of teachers who participated in the study included two preschool teachers, two part-time grade two teachers who were working with one group of students, and one teacher from the Special Education Unit. The journey of professional growth and learning described here began with a series of meetings at the school (Phase 1: Starting the Index process). The first author, second author, deputy principal and principal established a collaborative relationship aimed to address the professional development needs in the school. Individuals in this group familiarized themselves with the Index and the associated process stages and discussed the school and community. A full day of meetings took place between the critical friend (first author) and the whole staff on apupil free day. Staff were organized into three groups of year levels and teaching areas. The first

author facilitated each group with the following focus: (1) short presentation of a model for professional development incorporating the *Index* and including plan for whole staff activities, and small group voluntary activities; (2) identification of barriers in the school that impede student learning and participation; and (3) brainstorming of focus areas for staff and personal development in the school. Each session was introduced by the principal who established links to current QueenslandState Education priorities and initiatives. Each group worked with the critical friend for 1.5 hours. Data were collected from each group in the form of a written record of the barriers for learning and priorities

for professional development.

**Outcome/Effect** *Summary and future directions*

The data presented here indicate that the *Index for Inclusion* provides a useful framework for professional development related to inclusive schooling. Development in this project occurred on two fronts: at a whole school level through an analysis and revisiting of the beliefs and values underpinning policy and practice at the school and at an individual level through the enhancement of teachers' knowledge and skills. The *Index* process clearly encouraged communication and collaborative problem-solving between members of a school community.

The *Index* process has been enhanced by the professional development model cultivated in this collaborativeuniversity and school partnership which engaged teachers in professional dialogue at a number of

levels. The combination of the roles of critical friend, peer mentors and use of the action research model of cycles and spirals has ensured a depth of learning for all involved in the process.

The findings from this case study are significant in the ongoing development of models of review and development of school culture, policy and practice for more inclusive schooling. Importantly, the focus on curriculum, pedagogy and staff pupil relationships have contributed to the extension of teachers' practices in teaching, learning and assessment to meet the needs of diverse learners. In addition, the enhancement and maintenance of a culture of innovation and high teacher morale is an ongoing aim of the second stage of this study. This ongoing process will ensure that this model for inclusive school development addresses school culture, policy and practice through collaborative reflection and learning that will result in improved outcomes for teachers and students.

**RR Comments**

The Index process can enhance the development of teachers’ capacity to meet the learning needs of children with disabilities with a collegiate approach. Based as it is on the Social Model of disability it fits with the orientation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in particular Article 24. That the Index is now used in 70 countries and is a flexible tool attests to its success. It allows the staff of the school through examining barriers in terms of school culture, policies and practices to take ownership of the process of both their professional development and school change. The spiral nature of the index allows different barriers to be tackled in each cycle on an ongoing basis and to hang other professional learning on this process. In this particular example parents and school pupils were not involved and studies in other places have pointed to the importance of their inclusion. The need to train trainers in this interactive process is crucial
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