CONCEPTUAL PAPER

December 2004

The Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities:

Towards Inclusion

AN EFA FLAGSHIP

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Achieving the right to education for persons with disabilities in basic education is a challenging task, but entirely necessary to achieve the Millennium Development Goal of education for all by the target date of 2015. The EFA Flagship entitled **The Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion** has been created to spearhead such a global initiative. This paper presents a rights-based case for inclusiveness for all persons with disabilities not only in access to basic educational opportunity and accomplishing the comprehensive EFA mission, but most importantly also in their engagement at all levels in the policy and processes necessary for such inclusiveness to actually work.

The paper consists of three sections. The _first_ traces original commitments made at Jomtien through the relevant UN and other signatory instruments up to the setting up of the resultant Flagship. In particular, the shift is noted from global to regional EFA frameworks at the Dakar World Forum on Education, which permitted regional definition policy and strategy more directly related to national realities, and in some regions, especially relevant to the rights to education of persons with disabilities. The complexities are presented of the concept of disability and of its relationships with inclusiveness in education policy and practice. The metaphor of the Flagship is introduced, and the purposes of the initiative (and of the paper) are outlined.

The existence of a Flagship implies special focus on important, and otherwise unaddressed, concerns. Six major issues are presented in the _second_ section as representative of the immediate problem context for the work of the Flagship: **definition, scope and statistics** for the Flagship effort; associated demands on the **capacity of educational systems,** with particular emphasis on several aspects of national planning, such as balancing equity with quality, early childhood education, life skills, inclusiveness _vs._ special classes/schools, and the role of non-formal education; the **financial and pedagogical resources** required; **intersectoral and cross-professional cooperation** necessary to achieve results; the **special considerations** due to education of girls and women, and the unique problem of HIV/AIDS; and ultimately how to measure success through **monitoring of the EFA process,** with reference to some examples of good practice.

Finally in the _third_ section, a practical action framework is proposed, focusing on pragmatic options, with four global, and seven regional/national activities, as follows:

Global level actions:
resource mobilization;
global/regional/national/local networking & advocacy;
technical cooperation;
and improved statistical information.

Regional/national/local actions:
articulating national EFA plans with policies and strategies on rights of persons with disabilities ;
training initiatives for educational personnel;
introductory community-level orientation workshops;

case studies;
policy/legal assessments of national strategies;
economic studies;
internet web networking; and

It is clear that meeting the basic education needs of persons with disabilities will be a central challenge of the next decade if the MDGs are to be achieved. However, this case needs to be made more persuasively and persistently, and from a practical perspective based on empirical evidence. It is a case best made by persons with disabilities themselves, who are emerging globally as a diverse and increasingly effective constituency for change. To this end, discussions were held, and early outlines, and initial versions of this paper were widely shared with as many constituencies as possible in the international community (and even at state and local levels in the US) for obtaining broad input and useful insights for the Flagship (see Acknowledgements in Annex 1).

THE EDUCATION FOR _ALL_ (EFA) FLAGSHIP: _The Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion_ [i].

`The disability movement is becoming a global force for change, with increased collaboration among disability groups, between the disability community and governments, and between the disability community and the human rights community.'_ **Hessa Al-Thani. UN Special Rapporteur for Disability in Report to the UN Commission on Social Development February 2004**.

`Education for learners with barriers to learning and development..... has experienced massive changes during the last decade in some..... countries...includ[ing] major shifts in attitude and awareness. For example it is no longer common to hide children with disabilities, and many parents now understand the need to educate these children. These changes not only benefit and enrich the lives of children with disabilities, but also enhance the learning experiences of all children.'(**Kristensen et al 2004**).

`Interest in the performance of national education systems has never been as strong as it is at present'. **OECD 2004 (a)**

1.   **INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND**

This is an action paper for the EFA disability `flagship' initiative which draws global attention to the fact that `education for all' is a fundamental human right which cannot be realized without full inclusion of all people who are in any way disabled. Much of the conceptual work has already been done in recent studies[ii]. Furthermore, the draft International Convention[iii] (Article 17 of which is devoted to education) marks an important and ongoing effort to bring consensus to a diverse field. This paper is the result of discussions with many of the relevant organizations/agencies, and is intended to map pragmatically the Flagship agenda onto EFA progress in the future, and show how Flagship constituencies can take advantage of a new window of opportunity offered by international concern about meeting the eight Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)[iv] [v]. Achieving full inclusiveness for the two educational MDGs by their assigned time-lines will require unprecedented intersectoral and interagency collaboration among partners that are used to working together, and in some cases, that are not. Education must be viewed as a facilitator in _everyone's_ human development and functionality, regardless of barriers of any kind, physical or otherwise. Disability must never be a disqualifier. Adequate resources must be matched with political will, and constituent pressure maintained on governments to live up to their obligations. Ultimately however, success will be judged by the quality of basic education provided to _all_ people with disabilities, and such judgment will be appropriately passed by them, not by donors, or even governments. It is towards these criteria, and requirements for their satisfaction, that this paper is directed.

i)   The original EFA promises were made at Jomtien, Thailand in 1990 by a consortium of agencies including the World Bank, UNESCO, UNICEF and UNDP and 155 countries in a landmark declaration. In the same year, the first UNDP Human Development Report documented the importance of education for all as the foundation for development. The Jomtien World Conference on Education was an extraordinary event, signaling global acknowledgement that education **for some** was no longer an acceptable goal for basic education systems in any country. Article III of the Jomtien Declaration addressed universalization of access and promotion of

equity as essential goals for basic education, which `should be provided to all children, youth and adults' who need it.  Paragraph 5 states `Steps need to be taken to provide equal access to education to every category of disabled persons as an integral part of the education system'[vi]. Yet this promise has remained disturbingly elusive.

The disability theme was not mentioned explicitly in the mid decade assessment at Amman (1996)[vii]. Subsequently, the Dakar Forum (2000) in Senegal led not only to 180 country assessments, marking the most comprehensive global review of basic education ever conducted, but also to six regional frameworks. This shift from global focus outwards to the regions lent credibility to the perception that responsibility for EFA momentum was devolving constructively away from the donor community agendas originated in Jomtien, and set the course for concerted regional/national action[viii] and showing, in some cases, greater concern for the rights to education of people with disabilities.

Three of the Dakar regional frameworks underscored issues of disability separately and specifically in their own regional contexts. The <u>Sub-Saharan</u> framework notes the low educational participation rates among those with disabilities, and re-affirms basic education as a universal right recognized in several international and regional instruments. The <u>Asia-Pacific</u> framework calls for increasing the visibility of people with disabilities, and for specific measures to be taken to ensure inclusion of women and girls with disabilities in all educational processes. In addition, `....*EFA process at all levels must be made barrier- free in attitudinal, informational and physical terms so that people with disabilities and socially disadvantaged groups can participate meaningfully in EFA activities'*. This framework was particularly forward-looking as regards inclusiveness, and led to progressive initiatives for disabled persons in the region detailed later in this paper. It also suggested inclusion `*of the issue of disability as an indicator in all future country assessments'*. In paragraph 46, the <u>Arab States</u> Framework pointed to `new and creative ways ....now available ....for reaching out to learners with disabilities or learning difficulties, as a means of ensuring that their capacities for learning are given the utmost chance to flourish'.

Both the Latin American/Caribbean and European/CIS frameworks also address these issues, but more generally within the conceptual themes of inclusion and poverty. The terms are more traditional, in that disability is blanketed under overall accessibility for disparate groups of disadvantaged people, and not defined or singled out as a distinct priority. Notably, social inclusion was the `orphan' theme of the 1995 Copenhagen World Summit on Social Development, lacking organized agency and constituency support[ix]. In contrast, and as a consequence of a new momentum in the human rights approach to development, the psychosocial, medical, and economic implications of disability are emerging through several international instruments (see Section 1 [iii] below) as definable, and of particular concern for education, most especially during the early years. Donor agencies have picked up on both the intersectoral (health, education) as well as poverty priorities of these frameworks in supporting collaborative initiatives such as FRESH[x] and Fast Track[xi].

ii) `**<u>Disability</u>'[xii]** (as variously defined: see Section 2 below) is viewed increasingly as a major factor in those who are school-excluded, either through non-enrollment, or dropout. Though data are still remarkably weak even in the more

developed and statistic-intensive nations, it is estimated that around 40 million (or just over one third) of the 115 million children currently out of school have disabilities, most of which are often neither visible nor simply diagnosed[xiii]. A disability may consequently not be regarded as something that is not normal. Actually the presence of disabilities in a given society lies within the normal variety of life while a total absence of disabilities in a population would be quite abnormal. A disability might lead to a handicap dependent on demands and requirements from environment and/or society. The social and physical environment thus has an impact on a person's functioning. Some children are considered to be in need of special assistance or equipment to be able to meet these demands. This is why the terminology and programs have arisen around "children with special needs."

Country-by-country information is sporadic at best, and comparisons are particularly difficult since definitions differ, and statistical survey methods (where they are available) often vary even within countries (e.g. urban and rural areas) and across studies[xiv]. Estimates of rates and types of disabilities tend to be higher in countries with better diagnostic and statistical systems[xv], hence the extensive reference in this paper to data from OECD countries. Certain generalized facts are well established however, particularly regarding more observable disabilities. Recent studies in Ethiopia and Peru have documented the global reality that `the majority of poor families cannot afford the mobility aids that might make it easier for children with (physical)  disabilities to attend school, so many are simply kept at home'[xvi]. Furthermore, links between poverty and disability are strong[xvii]: `disabled people have a higher likelihood of experiencing poverty because of the institutional, environmental and attitudinal discrimination faced, from birth, or the moment of disablement onward'[xviii].'

Even when disabled students make it to school, they often don't make it to graduation. Studies for example in the US show that `the high-school graduation rate for students with disabilities....continues to be far below the national average'[xix]. Although rates vary by type of disability, and data are only approximate and usually lagged by at least a year, roughly a third of students with disabilities drop out[xx] , a rate about twice that of other students, currently causing much concern `because of state and local education agency experiences with high-stakes accountability in the context of standards-based reform'[xxi]. Many of these children have emotional or learning disabilities, constituting two of the groups most neglected in developing regions. Worldwide, and especially in poorer countries, a plethora of in-school barriers face learners with disabilities, or `apartheid by design'[xxii]. Though this term originally applied to more obvious characteristics of buildings such as steps, narrow passages or doors, inaccessible transportation methods, or lack of any accommodation of pedagogy to the needs of disabled students (e.g. Braille, or signing or audio aids), its implications extend also to attitudinal barriers both in homes and schools which foster low expectations, overprotection, and ostracism from teachers and peers. This is partly due to mythical patterns of attribution and historical tradition which rationalize shame for, and rejection of disability or deformity through various filters, which go back a long way, even in the western world[xxiii], and have been perpetuated through colonialization. Examples of intolerance and exclusion of those with disabilities abound throughout world literature and oral and written histories, and continue to this day[xxiv]. In India, although more general integration of disabled children into schooling has begun, yet `people with disabilities

are shunned, abused, or abandoned at birth'[xxv]. In parts of Africa, despite great progress in some areas documented later in this paper, disability is still often considered indicative of evil, witchcraft, bad omens[xxvi].

Most of this traditional fear of difference or burden has typically been expressed towards the most visible of physical or psychological deformities or disabilities. As has been emphasized many times, children and adults with disabilities are not a homogeneous group. Less discernible handicaps, and particularly learning disabilities, may garner more subtle discrimination which may be internalized in ways that are self-reinforcing and psychologically very damaging. Disability can also affect young peoples' schooling indirectly. Street children begging or working errands in Ghana were found to be supporting disabled family members[xxvii].

So, much more emphasis is required on the importance of the family in dealing with children with disabilities, of appropriate development during the early years, attacking discrimination early on, and creating a supportive environment for inclusion. Education systems have the capacity to perform two crucial roles, both requiring closer coordination between education and health policies. The first is to ensure that whatever the disability, those children with permanent disabilities are diagnosed soon enough so as to offer opportunities for parental training on how to provide adequate supports, and for those children with correctable disabilities (e.g. eyeglasses, hearing aids) screening is effective enough to ensure that such devices are appropriately (and promptly) available. The purpose is to guarantee, as a mater of public policy, that each individual has access to educational opportunity commensurate with his or her needs, so as to maximize the probability of optimal functioning in adulthood. Secondly, appropriate health, developmental and other information should be provided to those who will become mothers and fathers so as to minimize the occurrence of preventable disabilities in children. In both cases, the importance of perinatal health, and early childhood intervention can not be over emphasized.

Childhood attitudes to tolerance for those different from themselves are formed early, and cannot be left unaddressed. Disabilities also require early assessment, diagnosis, and appropriate care, starting perinatally, and with special attention to preschool and early primary schooling experience. UNICEF estimates that `10% of children are born or acquire a disability of which no more than 10% receive appropriate rehabilitation. In low-income countries, children's disabilities are usually identified when they are 3 to 4 years old. As a consequence, rehabilitation starts too late, losing the opportunity to provide an early intervention during a period when rehabilitation has a larger impact'.[xxviii]

The absence of societal responsibility, and resultant loss of effective human resource development and full economic and social contribution is felt at several levels, and especially in poorer countries. For the individual and immediate family, the costs are psychosocial as well as economic. Frustration can run high at the arbitrariness of exclusionary factors which not only obstruct successful schooling, but also inhibit eventual productive occupational engagement for adults with disabilities.

Financial costs (individual, familial, and societal) of supporting a disabled person have not been extensively studied outside OECD countries, but a few cases illustrate their significance. Disabled workers in south India spend an average of four months

wages (of an agricultural laborer) on their treatments[xxix]. The costs of assistive devices were found to be prohibitive in most cases in a South African survey[xxx]. In the more advanced countries, supportive programs, even where available, are costly. `OECD countries spend at least twice as much on disability-related programs as they spend on unemployment programs. Disability benefits on average account for more than 10 percent of total social spending. In the Netherlands, Norway and Poland they reach as much as 20 percent of social expenditure'[xxxi].   Not only do governments (and voluntary organizations) face additional per capita program costs such as special education[xxxii], but eventual economic costs to society include substantial loss of revenue through incapacities of persons with disabilities to function effectively in occupational settings[xxxiii].   These costs can be substantially offset if children with disabilities are schooled in inclusive settings, and if training of general education teachers also includes training for working with children with disabilities. Moreover, one of the benefits of education of disabled children is that to the extent they can be empowered to sustain their own livelihoods, there will be reduced need for economic supports because they will ultimately become tax contributors.

As OECD has noted[xxxiv], because of rising retirement rates and declining birth-rates, all available skills will be needed to maintain economic growth at acceptable levels. Sustaining livelihoods in the future particularly in the less developed countries will necessitate better and more inclusive, tolerant education and health care, and more enlightened attitudes and practices towards disabilities of all kinds. A new urgency in addressing these issues is reflected in several recent and ongoing international declarations.

iii)   Relevant   international   instruments   and   initiatives: Over the last three decades, through the committed efforts of several agencies and organizations, the international community has formally and progressively recognized the rights of people with disabilities[xxxv] - and particularly children - with important implications for EFA. In 1976, the General Assembly proclaimed 1981 as the International Year of Disabled Persons[xxxvi]. Among the outcomes was the World Program of Action concerning Disabled Persons contained in GA Resolution 37/52 of 3 December 1982. According to the UN, ` the Year and the World Program of Action provided a strong impetus for progress in the field. They both emphasized the right of persons with disabilities to the same opportunities as other citizens and to an equal share in the   improvements   in   living   conditions   resulting   from   economic   and   social development. There also, for the first time, handicap was defined as a function of the relationship between persons with disabilities and their environment.'[xxxvii].

In September 1990, six months after Jomtien, the Convention on the Rights of the Child mandated protection against all forms of discrimination against children on the basis of disability. Article 23 recognizes that a mentally or physically disabled child should enjoy a full and decent life, in conditions which ensure dignity, promote self-reliance and facilitate the child's active participation in the community. It also acknowledges the right of the disabled child to special care, and requires `the extension, subject to available resources, to the eligible child and those responsible for his or her care, of assistance for which application is made and which is appropriate to the child's condition and to the circumstances of the parents or others caring for the child'.   Special mention is made of the need for international cooperation in exchange of appropriate information ` in the field of preventive health

care and of medical, psychological and functional treatment of disabled children......with the aim of enabling ... parties to improve their capabilities and skills and to widen their experience in these areas. In this regard, particular account shall be taken of the needs of developing countries. An Ad Hoc Committee has been established by General Assembly resolution "to consider proposals for a comprehensive and integral international convention to promote and protect the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities…"[1] The Committee is presently in the process of working on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities. Other important recent and current international instruments and their implications for the EFA Flagship efforts are included in Annex 3.

iv)   EFA flagship metaphor and its purpose: Subsequent to the Dakar EFA World Forum, several areas were identified which merited special and concerted `flagship' efforts. The flagship metaphor is a signal of the creation of a command or knowledge base to turn to when one needs to direct actions.[xxxviii] Goals of the flagship initiatives are knowledge sharing and partnerships towards clearly identified priorities in nine areas[xxxix] one of which is disability. The National Commission of UNESCO in Norway, in cooperation with the other Nordic countries, played an active role in the creation of this Flagship. The Nordic countries requested the creation of this Disability Flagship at the UNESCO General Conference in 2001), though its roots go further back.[xl]. The International Working Group on Disability and Development (IWGDD), an alliance of global disability groups and experts and donors, was established in 1997 to serve as a forum for discussing strategies to make the global development agenda more inclusive. As early as 1998, it worked to convene the global EFA partner organizations to discuss moving disability squarely onto the global EFA agenda.

IWGDD members in attendance at the 2000 Dakar World Education Forum were disappointed that disability and inclusive education issues were sidelined. At the very next IWGDD meeting, in April 2000 in Geneva, the IWGDD established an EFA task force for the express purpose of advocating for a visible disability dimension within the EFA effort, in support of UNESCO's role as leading the EFA follow-up.

Over the next 18 months, with funding from USAID and Finland, the IWGDD alliance[xli] continued to seek for ways to influence the global EFA effort. The IWGDD EFA Task force, from 2000 to 2002, held a series of meeting and training sessions with UNESCO which resulted in participation by representatives of the disability community for the first time in both the technical and high-level EFA panel meetings. This was followed by a commitment in 2002 by the UNESCO Secretary General to establish the EFA Flagship on disability. The IWGDD then assisted in establishing a framework for the Flagship, which was formally launched in the fall of 2002. The Department of Special Needs Education at the University of Oslo showed interest in hosting a secretariat for the Flagship, with support from the Ministry of Education and Research in Norway. From January 1st 2003 the Flagship was formally established with a joint secretariat hosted by UNESCO Paris and The University of Oslo, for a period of three years. A steering committee for the Flagship has been appointed.[xlii] The success of the Flagship depends on the commitment and active involvement of

---

[1] General Assembly resolution 56/168 of 19 December 2001.

the steering committee members and those they represent. The aims of the Disability Flagship[xliii] are to `act as a catalyst to ensure that the right to education, and the goals of the Dakar Framework, are realized for individuals with disabilities'[xliv].

The purpose of this paper is to provide a Framework for Action for the Flagship Secretariat as outlined in the remaining sections. To achieve effective results within the overall EFA policy context, linkage between all the Flagships will be essential. But the existence of a Flagship implies special, targeted focus on key, and otherwise unaddressed concerns. A number of key issues have been raised in discussions, meetings, and background papers associated with implementation of the Flagship goals. Six of these issues are of immediate relevance, and are discussed below.

2. __MAJOR ISSUES:__

__i)__ __Definition, scope and statistics:__ No satisfactory international working __definition__ of disability exists for all applications, though there is a consensus among all constituencies that any future definition must be broad enough to encompass the complexity of disability in all its (visible and non-visible) forms and types, be based on the current WHO International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF)[xlv], and reflect the social, rather than the medical model of disability[xlvi]. Part of the difficulty is `there are many definitions ...not only across countries but also within the same country. These varied definitions demonstrate that disability is a social construct, as much rooted in cultural, social, political, legal and economic factors as in biology'[xlvii]. Disability may involve physical, intellectual or sensory impairment, medical conditions or mental illness, and may be more or less visible to others. According to the ICF classification, disability and functioning can be viewed as outcomes of interactions between diseases, impairments, disorders and injuries on one hand, and contextual factors concerning environment and personal factors on the other. In these terms therefore, disability encompasses impairment, activity limitations and participation restrictions. Furthermore, as science uncovers more knowledge about the neurochemistry and biology of our human condition, and technology broadens our approach to ability and disability, categories and definitions are bound to change over time, as are our techniques for human development.[xlviii]

It is the avoidance of stigma, and the recognition of under-utilized (and too often dormant and unrealized) human capacities that are paramount in describing and classifying disability for policy purposes, and recognition of individual human diversity, both in the way disability is perceived and compensated for by each person, and the way such disability is perceived by others. A person may view his or her disability very differently from the way others view it, and in the absence of clearer and more universal understanding of disability, this disconnect can be divisive[xlix]. Also crucial is to acknowledge the indispensable role of sound data and rigorous analysis (and thus unambiguous classification) in informing monitoring and assessment of progress towards MDG achievement.

Defining disability broadly for policy purposes involves some measure of the relationship between an individual and his or her environment. As the World Bank has suggested `when individuals with different levels of functioning encounter barriers to health services, education, employment, public services, and infrastructure, they are disabled….. disability is thus an interaction between human functioning and an environment which does not account for different levels of

functioning. In other words, people with physical or mental limitations are often disabled not so much because of their functioning level, but because they are denied access to education, labor markets, and public services'.[l] In this kind of conceptual framework, current numbers may be imperfect definitionally and statistically, and essentially incomparable, so a major task for the Flagship is to promote development of an overall working definition for international use in educational settings within the EFA domain, and specific indicators against which national EFA progress can be assessed.

There is also a need for a practical working definition of inclusive education. This definition must be simple, but still complex enough to emphasize the importance of mainstreaming persons with disabilities (physical, social and/or emotional) wherever possible into general education, but leaving open the possibility of personal choice (acknowledging WFD, WBU and WFDB concerns[li]), and options for special assistance and facilities for those who need it. A working definition of inclusion is presented in the UNESCO Conceptual Paper "Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education. A Challenge and a Vision" (2003). "Inclusion is seen as a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education. It involves changes and modifications in content, approaches, structures and strategies, with a common vision which covers all children of the appropriate age range and a conviction that it is the responsibility of the regular system to educate all children."

The **scope** of the Flagship approach to disability and education must include the full life span and any kind of disabling condition. The Jomtien Declaration went beyond formal primary education by embracing basic learning needs of all children, young people and adults. The Dakar Framework, both at international and regional levels, also adopted this broad interpretation. Out-of school children, those not adult, but beyond primary school age, and adults with unmet basic learning needs are thus of necessity included in the definition of `*all'.* In addition, the learning disabled are an important consideration, since their cognitive disabilities may not be as externally evident, nor become identifiable as early in their development. Paradoxically their disabilities may require sophisticated and early diagnosis for adequate educational engagement and successful completion in school.

Issues of scope also include awareness of shifts in disabling precursors that may lead to expansion in numbers and types of disability. `While some forms of congenital or disabling long-term illnesses may be declining, other conditions have emerged over the last two decades from problems such as AIDS, oil spills, nuclear or chemical pollution, and armed conflict, including limb loss from landmines'[lii]. There are several background papers for the EFA Monitoring Report of 2003/4 addressing these issues[liii]. Increasing incidence of intra-national conflict with growing numbers of civilian wounded is clearly affecting the numbers of disabled children, both physically and psychologically.

Statistical considerations include not only the above two issues, but also global and national estimates[liv], as well as measurement/assessment. Data collection on disability has been largely through census surveys, and the work of the Washington Group has focused so far on these methodologies. It will be necessary however to go

beyond, and in greater depth into incidence and characteristics of disability, including gender disaggregation and analysis of differences, through discrete and specially designed household surveys wherever appropriate, and where resources are available. The World Bank, OECD and others are collaborating in studies on the impact of disability on schooling attainment in five countries[lv] using household survey data to quantify relationships between disability and schooling outcomes for children of primary and secondary school ages (roughly ages 6-12 and 13-17, depending on the country). Analyses will enumerate the number of children classified as disabled, and determine their socio-economic and educational status, identifying relationships between these variables. Further studies are planned to look at ways of identifying children with disabilities in selected African countries, with the purpose of developing inclusive education policies at the country-level and subsequently providing school-based services. Methodologically, these studies would build on experience with use of the Ten-Question Survey in Latin America (Brazil) and Bangladesh. It is hoped that surveys will be extended to up to ten countries within two years, and will contribute to improvements in both standardization of survey methods and the quality of data on disability.

The Ad Hoc Working Group on Statistics and Indicators (WGSI) for the EFA Disability Flagship has been established initially for a period of two years from 2003 to 2005 to examine and report on the relationship between EFA and disability. It envisions reports to the Flagship Secretariat by October 2005 on how aspects of quality education for persons with disabilities are included in global and national statistics, using both primary and secondary data.

For both these initiatives, it will be important to explore as far as possible the extent to which the less visible impairments and environmental factors are barriers to learning, and how more sensitive indicators can be developed for improved and cost-effective measurement of progress (since `good' data collection is an expensive and highly technical process). As scientific and medical knowledge expand in conceptualizing, classifying, and diagnosing disability, the problems of measurement/assessment become more complex, even in advanced industrialized countries with extensive research capacities. `Given the enormous variability in the population of students with learning disabilities, the proliferation of tests on the market, and the problems...in applying the definition, it [remains] extremely difficult to identify specific assessment instruments that consistently and appropriately identify these students[lvi]. In the US in the 1990s, `more children with learning disabilities are being served through special education than any other single category of exceptionality. ....in addition, the number of children identified as having a learning disability has grown more rapidly than any of the other areas of disability.'[lvii] This has stretched the capacity of school systems to respond effectively.

ii) `**The capacity and competencies of the educational system** – the right to quality education in early schooling (including preschool and early childhood development) has several purposes, including prompt addressing of developmental disabilities as they affect learning, socializing of the learning process, and ultimately greater social cohesion and productivity for communities. Education systems have a crucial role to play, but are under great stress, institutionally and professionally. Thus the question is: how to extend their systems' capacities to meet equitably the basic learning needs of all (children, youth, and adults) with due recognition of individual diversity, without overload, or compromising quality?

For some persons with disabilities for whom schools in their localities are not sufficiently adapted to their special needs, is it better to exclude them temporarily perhaps, and concentrate more individually on their development integration in every day life – than to include them involuntarily in inappropriate schools? The question of timing and extent of inclusion is an important issue[lviii] and goes beyond education in relation also to workforce and other policies[lix]. EFA refers of course to the basic learning needs of all, and `to tapping each individual's talents and potential, and developing learners' personalities, so that they can improve their lives and transform their societies'[lx]. The vast majority of basic learners in the developing world do not go past primary school, so the links remain very important, from a policy perspective, between early (basic) education and life skills, and energetic, creative and productive contributions to family, community and society. At the heart of this process of developing human resourcefulness must be a national consensus, expressed in terms of policy and practice through *EFA National plans*.

National plans: UNESCO has been a leader in promoting the Dakar commitments to develop EFA national action plans, and guidelines have been developed.

UNESCO has developed policy guidelines focusing on access to education for all. These guidelines will be available from UNESCO by the end of 2004[2]. By following these guidelines, those working with and analyzing National Plans for education can identify gaps and strategies in order to take steps to ensure that within their educational school system, every child has access and right to quality education. An essential component of national planning for successful completion of basic education for all persons with disabilities is to show how pedagogical processes can be made `learner friendly' for all i.e. such that optimum learning can take place for everyone regardless of their ability/disability. However there is still much work to do in ensuring that such plans truly take into account the needs of all, including persons with disabilities. An essential component of national planning for successful completion of basic education for all persons with disabilities is to show how pedagogical processes can be made `learner friendly' for all i.e. such that optimum learning can take place for everyone regardless of their ability/disability. Depending on the type and extent of disability, this goal may be attainable in general education settings where tolerance is practicable and the norm, where teachers have sufficient training, the learning environment is equipped with the necessary tools, physical aids, teaching and communication materials, and where extra personal and teaching assistance are available as appropriate. This is clearly preferable for many reasons. Children with disabilities can benefit from a non-discriminatory learning experience. Other children learn valuably, if indirectly about living with disabilities, and can benefit from the interaction. Teachers expand their own experience and skills, and broaden the benefits of education for the larger society, However, where the necessary conditions are lacking, or where other external factors inhibit access (e.g. inappropriate transportation), alternatives should be made available such as special education facilities and programs, or home-assisted learning opportunities. New electronic direct and remote-learning options are becoming available which may be able to transform education and make it more accessible in diverse ways that are

---

[2] Guidelines will be available on the website: www.unesco.org/education/inclusive

much more flexibly responsive to characteristics of the learner. Adaptive and assistive technologies[lxi] are a rapidly growing field, which while not now widely applicable to poorer countries due to lack of infrastructural support especially in rural areas, are nevertheless opening up exciting new avenues for education, with major implications for learners everywhere.

Several aspects of school and classroom organization, and especially the over-arching principle of professional in-service and pre-service training [lxii] at all levels must be addressed in national plans. One important issue is how to achieve equity without compromising quality.

Equity and quality: `Developing equitable education for the growing diversity of students is not an easy task to achieve, and it is made more difficult because of a lack of clarity over what equitable provision would look like.'[lxiii] Three equity aspects or conditions are central to the attainment of EFA goals for all people with disabilities: equal access to opportunities for basic learning with peers; equity in terms of learner-friendly and gender sensitive educational experience of sufficient quality to ensure competent completion; and equity in terms of assurance that education can be of sufficient quality so as to adequately meet the basic learning needs of persons with disabilities (both male and female, and with respect for the differences) for maximization of their potential in relation to an eventually sustainable livelihood. Individual and voluntary choice is paramount in each of these aspects, as is the recognition of education as a right, so that failure to fulfill any of the conditions may be construed as a violation of that right.

Education, appropriate to the needs of the learner, must be viewed as a facilitator in the human development of *everyone*, regardless of status or comparative ability, but with due recognition that boys and girls with disabilities may have different needs and expectations. Moreover, the broad spectrum of individual human capacity to learn must be recognized, and *operationalized* so that the concepts of `special needs' and `disability' become practically manageable in all educational policy and practice. This is the perspective of the capability approach which sets functionality as a goal, or 'the actual living that people manage to achieve'[lxiv], and the ensuing quality of life of a society. Investment in good education for all, including persons with disabilities becomes not just an investment in them, but justifiable as a collective investment in society, and for future generations.

Early childhood education: development research has consistently shown the importance of cognitive, physical and emotional development of appropriate exposure to learning experiences during the early years of childhood, especially between three and five[lxv]. Considerable efforts have been made by UNESCO and others to promote these opportunities for children with disabilities in several countries[lxvi]. Training of mothers and community groups can be most helpful in providing information and promoting beneficial outcomes, and for example reducing isolation of families facing barriers to greater involvement of their children in early educational experience.[lxvii]

Life skills: with the ultimate goal of working towards societies where all are capable of sustainable livelihoods with the necessary (and individualized) support systems for maintaining sustainability, basic education and training in life skills must

acknowledge the fact that most primary school children in developing countries may not go on to secondary school. Furthermore, education systems must be responsive to basic education needs of adults with disabilities. The ENABLE program in Kwa-Zulu Natal, South Africa, is one example of recruitment and training of local educators to help adults with disabilities learn independence and self-reliance through developing occupational skills[lxviii].

Inclusion or special classes/schools: Education systems respond in most industrialized countries by offering a dual-track approach to students with disabilities. Those who can thrive in general education programs are encouraged to do so. Those who are unable to be in general education have the option to choose specially designed instruction or other assisted learning programs and an array of related services (e.g. psychological and counseling services, language, speech and hearing, guidance, social work, transportation, physical and occupational therapy, and medical services required for diagnosis or evaluation)[lxix].These services and opportunities vary considerably, even across OECD countries. Data for 1999 presented by OECD indicate `that the same type of child could be in a special school in country X and fully included in a regular school in country Y'[lxx]. The OECD report goes on to say that these differences can profoundly influence the futures of individuals with disabilities, and affect their capacities eventually to sustain their own livelihoods. The authors recommend that countries continue to monitor how these `tracking' decisions are made, and what are the comparative outcomes.

Education systems in the less developed, poorer countries often struggle with the concept of schooling for persons with disabilities against competing priorities and in the context of limited or poorly managed resources. Exceptions abound in all regions however, and are beginning to be documented with implications for modeling on the basis of good practice. Africa is moving through its second decade in formal acknowledgement of rights of persons with disabilities, and (as referenced below) the Bangkok toolkit is based on a wealth of experience from the Asian and Pacific, and other regions. Yet the difficulties (e.g. definitions, provision of appropriate educational services, effective pedagogy and teacher training) still constitute serious obstacles to MDG achievement in many countries.

Non-formal education: considerations of education as a right must look beyond just primary education, and even the formal education sector. `School is not synonymous with education. A child's rights to, in and through education extend well beyond the walls of the school building. Children can go to school and not necessarily get an education. They are also educated in settings other than school, such as in the family, peer groups, organizations, the local community, and both local and national media contexts. Some values and skills can only be learned within the close-knit, long-lasting relationships of a family where children belong regardless of how they behave. For example, this is where children learn how to solve or live with conflicts between people they need and love and who love them. Some other skills can only be gained in relationships with peers'[lxxi]. These are important principles, fundamental to family and community existence and social infrastructures. Thus outreach to NGOs and other community organizations and leaders will be important especially in peri-urban or remoter rural areas (which often develop informal systems of community service paralleling `normal' functioning of governments in the social sectors).

iii)   Financial and Pedagogical Resources It is clear that additional financial resources will be necessary to ensure inclusive and full EFA attainment.   The EFA Global Monitoring Report in 2002 pointed out the difficulties remaining for many countries in reaching EFA goals.   Estimations contained in the report of the affordability of universal primary education (UPE) however do not explicitly consider (or cost out) alternatives for meeting the basic learning needs of people with disabilities. In Chapter 4, which draws on World Bank cost simulations for accomplishing EFA targets, some limited provisions are made for orphan support, and for other `vulnerable' children e.g. in crisis conditions. The required level of aid flows to achieve EFA by 2015 is estimated at about US$5.5 billion annually, but with caveats that the empirical databases and methods used to come up with these estimates have several shortcomings. One of those shortcomings (not stated in the report) is in neglecting the comprehensive implications of education for all. Further study is thus necessary to fully elaborate realistic costs of meeting basic learning needs for all those with disabilities, also fully reflecting gender differences in requirements.

Such cost analyses can foster and provide legitimacy for pragmatic national plans which should direct national action.   These plans can identify the various demographics of people with disabilities, steps to be taken, and resources needed to accommodate education systems to the specific needs of people with disabilities.

A recent evaluation undertaken by the National Foundation of Educational Research, UK, will be finalised by the end of 2004. The evaluation looks into UNESCO efforts in the field of Inclusive Education over a period of 5 years, starting from 1996. A preliminary report indicates that UNESCO's materials have been of considerable importance in training teachers and school managers in inclusive approaches to education. Among these are: 1) Understanding and responding to Children's needs in Inclusive Classrooms. A Guide for teachers. UNESCO, 2003. 2) Open File on Inclusive Education. Support Materials for Managers and Administrators. UNESCO, 2001. 3) Special Needs in the Classroom. Teacher Education Resource Pack. UNESCO, 1993. 4) Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education, A challenge and a vision. Conceptual Paper. UNESCO, 2003. 5) The UNESCO Bangkok Toolkit for Creating An Inclusive Learning Friendly Environment. 2003.

The UNESCO/BANGKOK Toolkit[lxxii] provides one comprehensive approach to pedagogical practice, and building organizational and professional capacity in this direction, stressing that `Inclusion is really about practical changes that we can make so that children with diverse backgrounds and abilities, as well as all other children, can succeed in our classrooms and schools. These changes will not merely benefit the children we often single out as children with special needs, but all children and their parents, all teachers and school administrators, and everyone from the community who works with the school' (Bangkok Toolkit, Book 1) It is a major contribution of this method and approach that it addresses the system, not just the parts of the system, i.e. education ministries, school administrators, teachers, learners, families and communities all have responsibilities for making inclusion work. The teacher should not bear the sole responsibility for learner-friendly and inclusive pedagogy, although s/he will serve a crucial role. Furthermore, there is still not

enough recognition in the international education/disability literature yet of the differences between genders, different needs/expectations of males and females with disability in school, and the interactivity (positive or negative) of disability and gender of learner with gender of teacher and how it affects learning. In many African countries, men with disabilities dominate the leadership of their organizations, further marginalizing women with disabilities[lxxiii].

iv)   Cross professional co-operation.   Dealing with disability as an EFA priority needs not only intersectoral collaboration (e.g. between health and education ministries) but also much broader interaction and information exchange among professional communities (educational, medical, and psychological). Even though supported by international donor resources, research relevant to disability policy and educational practice must be conducted as far as possible by competent local investigators who are knowledgeable about cultural settings in which data are gathered, and who are familiar with constituencies and communities where results of their studies will have meaning and impact. Above all, persons with disabilities need to be involved in all aspects of policy determination, outcome measurement, and feedback and corrective mechanisms[lxxiv]. Attitudes must be open and mutually exploratory.

Some countries already have national disability policies which provide a framework for interagency collaboration in special measures particularly for women and girls with disabilities[lxxv]. National EFA plans should take explicitly into consideration children and adults with disabilities, and should be articulated with these national disability policy structures where they exist, with the necessary legal bulwarking provided to ensure accountability.

v)   Special considerations: women and girls with disabilities, and HIV/AIDS. Along with its role in the development of the current generation of learners, EFA has a responsibility to all future mothers and children by passing on useful basic information and knowledge that may contribute to their health and wellbeing, as well as help to reduce the incidence of preventable disabilities. Basic educational content should be more strongly emphasized within cultural bounds and sensitivities around birth spacing, and perinatal health and nutrition of both mother and infant, vaccination, dealing with failure-to-thrive threats such as anaemia, iodine deficiency, worm burdens and also physical and psychological impacts of conflict, mines, and natural disasters. Girls and women with disabilities often suffer from double discrimination, when unless their disability prevents conception, in their crucial role as future mothers they and their (sometimes unborn) children may be consequently at much higher risk. This is especially true of disabled women with HIV/AIDS.

Literacy rates among persons with disabilities tend to be low, so there is less likelihood that written communications about HIV/AIDS will be understood. Furthermore, women with disabilities who are sexually active may be particularly vulnerable. `Extreme poverty and social sanctions against marrying a disabled person mean that they are likely to become involved in a series of unstable relationships. Disabled individuals ....around the world are more likely to be victims of sexual abuse than their non-disabled peers..... in cultures in which it is believed that HIV-positive individuals can rid themselves of the virus by having sex with virgins, there has been a significant rise in rape of disabled children and adults. Assumed to

be virgin, they are specifically targeted. In some countries, parents of intellectually disabled children now report rape as the leading concern for their children's current and future well-being'[lxxvi].

Preliminary results from a joint study by the World Bank and Yale University have shown that HIV/AIDS remains almost unrecognized as a problem among disabled populations worldwide, and that women with disability and disabled adolescents are particularly at risk[lxxvii]. While these are serious concerns, they reflect sensitive cultural and social dimensions which are intimate and private, and discussion will probably encounter taboos. EFA however, in facing issues of disability cannot afford to ignore the realities of these types of vulnerability, or education's role in alleviating their impact.

vi)   Monitoring the EFA process: The fact that there is a need for a Flagship emphasis is itself an indicator of the low profile of disabled persons' access to basic education as an issue in the run-up to the Dakar Forum. Annual EFA meetings included disability organizations only in 2002 for first time[lxxviii]. So the need to expand outreach and engagement of persons with disabilities at all levels of the EFA effort is paramount, and the extent to which this can be achieved globally, through concrete proposals to assist the same process at regional and national levels, will be a major (if only preliminary) indicator of success. If the Convention is finalized in the September meeting this year (which seems at present unlikely), it will legitimize and give additional credibility to these efforts. In addition, networking will be important with other key EFA-related programs, such as the World Bank Fast Track Initiative, and other current or proposed initiatives. Active collaboration should be pursued with other EFA Flagships (especially UN Girls Education Initiative; FRESH; Network for Education in Emergencies; and Literacy). Disability issues must be placed firmly on the agenda of all EFA work, and that includes all Flagships.

The three EFA Global Monitoring Reports so far lack any detailed information on access of persons with disabilities to basic education, adaptation of educational system process to accommodate to their needs, completion, or effectiveness in terms of livelihood outcomes. The focus of the WGSI on indicators can guide the process of data collection and analysis, both in national accounts (e.g. censuses) and special surveys to build better knowledge bases for EFA policy. The selection will be critical of adequate measures of progress towards the MDGs as they relate to access for persons with disabilities. Again, the conclusions on whether Article 6 on Statistics of the International Convention stands or not as a separate article (or is folded into another article or an Annex) will be instructive, since it will reflect the degree of global commitment to the development of a clear, and unambiguous empirical foundation for policy in this field.

Ultimately however, it will be in empirical evidence of ways in which countries are fostering the improvement of access to, completion of, and quality in educational services for persons with disabilities over the longer term that the EFA Flagship will determine its effectiveness. In the short term, a focus on analysis of factors leading to good practice, by region and country, can yield useful examples as options for modeling and adaptation by interested partners. While supporting some kind of `clearinghouse' function for global knowledge sharing of good practice is an important option for consideration by the Flagship (see next section), there are some

exemplary cases for modeling, and adaptation and/or further study in several regions (see Annex 4)

The Flagship can perform a useful role in broadening awareness of all these initiatives, and bringing together the work of the Global Partnership of the World Bank, and the efforts of other international agencies and organizations, especially the international NGOs, into a common framework and action-oriented approach towards greater inclusiveness and eventual EFA achievement. The next section of this paper presents the foundations for such a framework, and immediate and longer term steps to be taken by the Flagship group.

A continuous action plan for the Flagship based on the above will be worked out by the Secretariat in collaboration with the Steering Committee.

3. <u>FRAMEWORK FOR FLAGSHIP ACTION</u>

The evidence presented in the Flagship concept note makes it clear that, in the regions where EFA achievement is most threatened by lack of quality education for persons with disabilities, there are already efforts underway, and much to build on....but these are for the most part disparate initiatives, and need strong and concerted global encouragement and support, as well as more systematic, overall monitoring and information sharing. The following suggested action framework takes into account issues raised in the concept note, and work already in progress, in meeting the basic learning needs of people with disabilities. It is important that Flagship efforts be commensurate with the catalytic charge as a multi-partner support mechanism for implementation of the Dakar commitments, and be practically innovative without being over-ambitious. It is foreseen that the Flagship will continue until 2015 on the understanding that sufficient funding is made available for the secretariat to continue its current role.

The following organizations/agencies have committed themselves to the Flagship by being members of its Steering Committee: 7 disability organizations (Disabled Peoples' International, Inclusion International, Rehabilitation International, World Blind Union, World Federation of the Deaf, World Federation of the Deaf Blind, World Network of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry), 1 bilateral donor (Finnish Agency for Development Aid (formerly Finida), 3 Ministries of education (Uganda, Laos, Jordan), 4 multilateral donors/agencies (World Bank, OECD, UNICEF, WHO). The function of the Steering Committee is still under consideration. The Steering Committee has met for the first time in Kampala in November 2003. The flagship aims at bringing together views and perspectives from interested partners – both organizations and individuals – within the field.

The Flagship can establish small working groups at either global or regional and national levels and TORs must be completed for each. Working groups can be regionally or nationally located; - they do not have to be global. Some working arrangement of sponsorship, technical assistance or other form of Flagship association should be clearly specified.

The proposed Framework for action covers global, as well as regional/national activities, and specifies some practical steps to be taken at each level. Resource mobilization will be necessary, together with prioritization/budgeting of activities.

The understanding of disability encompasses the complexity in all its (visible and non-visible) forms and types, reflects the social, rather than the medical model of disability[lxxix].   The understanding of disability is rooted in cultural, social, political, legal and economic factors as well as in biology'[lxxx]. Disability may involve physical, intellectual or sensory impairment, medical conditions or mental illness, and may be more or less visible to others. Disability and functioning can be viewed as outcomes of interactions between diseases, impairments, disorders and injuries on one hand, and contextual factors concerning environment and personal factors on the other. In these terms therefore, disability encompasses impairment, activity limitations and participation restrictions. (See concept note)

The understanding of inclusion must be complex enough to emphasize the importance enough to emphasize the importance of mainstreaming persons with disabilities (physical, social and/or emotional) wherever possible into general education, but leaving open the possibility of personal choice (acknowledging WFD, WBU and WFDB concerns[lxxxi]), and options for special assistance and facilities for those who need it. A working definition of inclusion is presented in the UNESCO Conceptual Paper "Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education. A Challenge and a Vision" (2003). "Inclusion is seen as a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education. It involves changes and modifications in content, approaches, structures and strategies, with a common vision which covers all children of the appropriate age range and a conviction that it is the responsibility of the regular system to educate all children." (See concept note)

The scope of the *Flagship focus* must go beyond just children to include all of the EFA target group of young people, adolescents, and adults in need of basic education.

i)　　　Global level actions

- **Resource mobilization:** *Resource mobilization* from donor, as well as private sources must be a priority, and a five year plan and work schedule developed and implemented; the visibility and energies given to the Convention activities, as well as the worldwide EFA/MDG commitments provide a unique window of opportunity for engaging national and international interests through resource partnering and collaborative programming; this should form the backbone of a Flagship resource mobilization effort; The Ministry of Education and Research in Norway has sponsored Secretariat funding for three years (2003-2005). Funding for the next period must be determined, as must be sponsorship for planned programmatic activities.[3]

- **Global/regional/national/local networking and advocacy** for awareness-raising of the needs and capabilities of persons with disabilities, and knowledge development; especially to stimulate national action in activating a principle of Dakar to move the locus of EFA policy and programmatic decisionmaking from the international arena (perceived as driven by donor agendas) to regional/national levels, but with strong international consensus; these objectives can be achieved through multiple approaches (e.g. Agency

---

[3] Funding for the next period must be determined, as must be sponsorship for planned programmatic activities. One possible option, a **Consultative Trust Fund for Disability and Development** with World Bank as trustee, has been proposed that could finance programs and activities agreed by a few donors using pooled funds in consultation with developing countries, NGOs and other stakeholders. World Bank trusteeship would eliminate the need for new bureaucracy. The trust fund would finance programs and activities specified in a formal, legally binding trust fund agreement. The World Bank (meaning in practical terms the Advisor for Disability and Development) would be responsible for the execution of the agreed programs and activities and could be held accountable for results. The World Bank's use of the pooled funds would be subject to annual endorsement by the donors, who could choose not to replenish the trust fund, and to review by other stakeholders See World Bank concept paper (GPDD conceptual draft) page 2

and NGO activities, regional/national WGs), some of which are already underway; _two practical steps_ can however be undertaken:

i) _development of a website_ with information, as well as opportunities for participatory interaction with interested communities; **use of the internet** to bring disabled persons together and to create open dialogues, sharing experiences and knowledge; the internet is now known in most cultures and available as a natural and relatively low cost source of _information and networking_, and should be used to inform and make public the strength of the approach that no human potential must be left undeveloped; the importance can be stressed of finding suitable role models – through sharing of personal experience from all over the world, including the identification and reference to television programs on the issue[lxxxii];

the Flagship should initiate _regional, moderated e-discussions_ on these topics[lxxxiii], and can provide a global summary for input into a forthcoming EFA Monitoring Report; while there are extraordinary exceptions[lxxxiv], there is still not enough being done to enhance accessibility to information, especially through new communication technologies, as a basic human right for _all_ people (e.g. in rural and remote areas, and in poorer countries); the Flagship can help promote this aspect of information access and sharing.
  and
ii) appointment of an _international Flagship `Goodwill Ambassador' `champion'_ for outreach and resource mobilization[lxxxv]. Discussions are underway concerning both of these initiatives, and they are important priorities for immediate action.

- **Inter-Agency Cooperation** (at international, regional and country levels): the Flagship should encourage _liaison, networking and collaborative efforts_ between sectors, and between private sector, civil society CSO/NGOs and public sector/Government; some possible examples could include Memorandums of Agreement with private sector interests[lxxxvi] at international and regional levels, and a _global clearinghouse function_ housed through the website, where knowledge sharing and research can be promoted. Furthermore, the Flagship could **facilitate inter-agency cooperation** by identifying a concrete 'annual action activities' (as indicated in the Action Plan) to be focused on and further elaborated during Flagship meetings. For example, technical support for developing training modules for **health and social workers** providing exposure to inclusive approaches to education and learning; this kind of intersectoral cooperation (through for example, community learning centers) will be essential if EFA goals are to be met, and articulation between diagnostic and support treatment services and education systems must be encouraged, both in the realm of learning disabilities and in the determination of special education needs[lxxxvii];

- **Improved statistics/data:** Advocacy and support for **data collection processes, indicators and descriptive and analytical statistics** on educational access, process and outcomes for persons with disabilities; the _ad hoc working group_ has already begun work on this activity[lxxxviii], which should remain a high priority for this Flagship; practical basic indicators should be explored and agreed upon, such as disability indicators, numbers of disabled persons in and out of school by age cohort, disabled dropouts, frequency of

exclusion etc... in particular the exploratory work in country education surveys of the UNESCO Institute of Statistics[lxxxix] should be considered by this working group. The Flagship should work to make the educational situation for persons with disabilities visible through the EFA monitoring reports.

ii)   Regional/national level actions

- It is crucial that **national EFA plans include provisions for education for disabled persons**; this must be a main and immediate concern of this Flagship, with considerations of the issues presented in Section 2; there should be resources earmarked for support through regional workshops for Ministries of Education, and e-networking to encourage prompt initiation of inclusion in national plans of detailed strategies/initiatives in a few selected countries, with explicit ties to MDG achievement[xc], and methods for accountability and measurement of progress clearly stated; these should then serve as *regional models* for consideration and adaptation by other countries without delay; emphasis in national plans should be on strengthening of national alliances of disability groups, and policies and procedures that are facilitating local action, and above all, engagement of persons with disabilities themselves in all of these processes, as managers, education system administrators, and above all, as teachers;

  It has been observed that the activities foreseen in this section follow what already has been planned by UNESCO as part of its bi-annual plan for EFA. The idea of the Flagship is that the activities should be complementary to what other partners involved in EFA are doing. Moreover, considering UNESCOs role in the Flagship, it is suggested that the Flagship concentrate on other activities and that assistance to UNESCO in executing its program is offered as part of our ongoing co-operation.

- Technical support should be considered for pilot **training initiatives** for educational administrators and teachers (both pre-service and in-service at post-secondary and normal institutional levels, as well as in international educational training/research institutions, perhaps such as UNESCO/IIEP) on inclusive (high quality) education for children and adults with disabilities; persons with disabilities should be included in the design and conduct of workshops, as well as involvement ultimately as teachers themselves; training sessions should expand understanding of visible and less visible disabilities among educational communities in general; they should be piloted in promising sites/institutions in less developed countries, with explicit research components to permit thorough assessment prior to recommendations for adaptation and generalizability. The Flagship should promote networks between universities that offer study programs in quality education for persons with disabilities and inclusive education.

- **Awareness raising** activities should be facilitated through the use of materials such as a multimedia tool kit to be elaborated for both policymakers and journalists based on policy guidelines developed by

UNESCO. In addition, **introductory orientation workshops** supported nationally for parents, teachers and community leaders to promote inclusive education and changing of attitudes should be facilitated by the awareness raising kit. Additional activities will include the elaboration of a **multi-media tool kit** based on curriculum differentiation material for students and teachers and television awareness raising campaigns.

- A second aspect will focus on sharpening the collective knowledge base on the **economics of disability and development**; the case needs to be more strongly made for EFA achievement, in that costs to society of ignoring educational opportunities for persons with disabilities are prohibitive in terms of lost opportunity and human resources; contributing to personal and national development can be made in several ways, some of which are economic.

- Strategies and targets for **hiring persons with disabilities** in Ministries of Education, disability organisations and in education institutions, as well as lobbying for representation of disability organisations in the Ministries (through ad hoc or liaison positions) are needed to raise awareness and improve efforts in terms of studies, data and the need to instructively inform social and economic policy;

- **case studies** toward identification of *good practices* (and also evidence of what does **not** work) in inclusive education (collection of cases and dissemination of good examples) Some studies are already proposed (e.g. World Bank ten country survey, and Price 2004); other relevant initiatives should be specified as part of a possible clearinghouse function discussed above, gaps noted, and priority areas yet uncovered can be considered for Flagship technical support; ideally these and other studies should be at least partly nationally funded and carried out by national research institutions; the Flagship may, or may not commission these studies entirely or directly (owing to resource constraints) but should explore ways to contribute by co-funding, stimulating national action, and providing review, and technical and substantive association of the Flagship name and imprimatur where appropriate;

- **policy studies** could also be considered as a similar option by the Flagship for countries or regions to discover and document *existing laws, policies and procedures* for basic education for all persons with disabilities; this will address the fundamental data needs for improved information on the status of persons with disabilities, accentuate the need to deal nationally with access and other issues, and will serve the purpose of providing information on model legislation and procedures where they already exist ;

- **use of the internet** to bring disabled persons together and to create open dialogues, sharing experiences and knowledge; the internet is now known in most cultures and available as a natural and relatively low cost source of *information and networking*, and should be used to inform and make public the strength of the approach that no human potential must be left undeveloped; the importance can be stressed of finding suitable role

models – through sharing of personal experience from all over the world, including the identification and reference to television programs on the issue[xci]; the Flagship should initiate *regional, moderated e-discussions* on these topics[xcii], and can provide a global summary for input into a forthcoming EFA Monitoring Report; while there are extraordinary exceptions[xciii], there is still not enough being done to enhance accessibility to information, especially through new communication technologies, as a basic human right for *all* people (e.g. in rural and remote areas, and in poorer countries); the Flagship can help promote this aspect of information access and sharing.

The above are preliminary actions, which can be selectively prioritized, and formed into a cohesive multi-year action plan for Flagship consideration. The purpose of these Flagship activities will not be to form a further bureaucratic layer in EFA efforts, but primarily to serve as advocate and catalyst to regional, national and most importantly, community-level engagement in ensuring EFA goals are met for children and adults with disabilities.

ANNEX 1: ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ANNEX 2. REFERENCES

The Advocacy Institute. Students with Learning Disabilities: A Nat ional Review. Burke, Virginia. September 2003.

Al-Thani H.   Report of the Special Rapporteur on Disability to the 42nd Session of the Commission for Social Development. February 2004.

Brighouse M. School Choice and Social Justice, Oxford University Press, Oxford. 2000.

Cerralli G., Ben Jemaa S., Breda V. Handicap et Education en Tunisie
Banque Mondiale / Disability Group pour le Ministère de l'Education et l'UNICEF. January 2004.

Cohen C. P., Erickson M., Flekkøy M. G., and Hart S. Open File: Children's Rights in Education.   Prospects, Vol. XXIX, no. 2, (Issue Number 110) June 1999.

Colclough C., and Packer S. et al. EFA Global Monitoring Report. UNESCO 2002.

Connecticut State Department of Education. Guidelines for Identifying Children with Learning Disabilities. Second Edition. 1999.

Connecticut State Department of Education. A Parent's Guide to Special Education in Connecticut.

Dalen, M., Wormnaes, S.. The relationship between disability, gender and education in the Norwegian context. Background Paper prepared for the EFA Global Monitoring Report for 2003/4. UNESCO. 2003.

Deng, L. B. Education in southern Sudan: War, Status and Challenges of achieving Education for All goals. Background paper for EFA Global Monitoring Report 2003/4. UNESCO. 2003

Dennis C. Truck Pushers, Grain Pickers and Grandmothers: `Street Children and Some Gender and Age Aspects of Vulnerability in Tamale, Northern Ghana. Gender Aspects of Aging. Gender Awareness Information and Networking System (GAINS). UN International Institute for the Training of Women. 1997.

Department for International Development. Towards Responsive Schools Supporting Better Schooling for Disadvantaged Children - Education Research Paper No. 38, 2000.

Dudzik P. and McLeod D. Including the Most Vulnerable: Social Funds and People with Disabilities. Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0023; World Bank. September 2000

EFA Flagship The Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion. Steering Committee Meeting. Kampala, Uganda. Nov. 14-15 2003

EFA Flagship The Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion. Ad Hoc Working Group on Statistics and Indicators. Terms of Reference. 2003

Elwan A. Poverty and Disability: A Survey of the Literature. Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 9932. World Bank. December 1999

Enabling Education Network. Enable Progamme. Kwa-Zulu Natal, RSA. 2001

Erb S. and Harriss-White B. *Outcast from Social Welfare: Adult disability and Incapacity in Rural South India* Bangalore, Books for Change 2002,

Evans, P., Bronheim, S., Bynner, J., Klasen, S., Magrab, P. and Ranson, S**.** "Social exclusion and students with special educational needs*"*, in A. Kahn and S. Kamerman (eds.), Beyond Child Poverty: The Social Exclusion of Children, The Institute for Child and Family Policy at Columbia University, New York. (2002),

Ferreira W.B. Public Policies*:* Inclusive Education in Brazil, Diagnosis of current situation and challenges for the future. World Bank 2003.

Groce N.E. Adolescents and Youth with Disability: Issues and Challenges. World Bank. September 2003

Groce N.E. HIV/AIDS and People with Disability. The Lancet. Vol 361. April 2003. pp 1401-1402.

Harriss-White B. Destitution in India. Paper for the Conference on Inequality, Poverty and Human Well-being. Helsinki, Finland, 30-31 May 2003.

Heinicke-Motsch K., Sygall S. (Eds.) Building an Inclusive Development Community: A Manual on Including People with Disabilities in International Development Programs. Mobility International USA, 2004

Hoogeveen, J., "Census-Based Welfare Estimates for Small Populations: Poverty and Disability in Uganda," Working Paper, September 2003

Imrie R. Disability and the City: International Perspectives. London. Chapman. 1996. Jones H., Parker, K.J. and Reed R. Water Supply and Sanitation Access and Use by Physically Disabled People. A Literature Review. Water, Engineering and Development Centre, Loughborough University, Leicestershire, UK. Sep. 2002.

Kowsmann P. IMF-World Bank Meeting Marked By Doubt About Millennium Goals. *U.N. Wire. Monday, April 26, 2004*

Kolucki B. Including Children with Disabilities in South Africa: a Look at Services & Resources. *One in Ten.* Children with Disabilities in Africa. Rehabilitation International and UNICEF. Volume 25. 2004.

Kristensen, K., Kristensen K., and Onen N. Inclusive Education: the Case in Uganda.

One in Ten. Children with Disabilities in Africa. Rehabilitation International and UNICEF. Volume 25. 2004.

Lawrence J.E.S. Education for Tolerance. A New Urgency. Unpublished Concept Note for Human Development Network, World Bank, Washington DC 2003.

Lutulala Mumpasi, B. Nogondo A. Pistadenge, S. <u>Education demand in Democratic Republic of the Congo</u>. 2003. Background Paper prepared for the EFA Global Monitoring Report for 2003/4. UNESCO. 2003

Magrab, P. "Training professionals to work in inclusive settings*"*, in OECD, *Inclusive Education at Work*: *Including Students with Disabilities in Mainstream Schools*, Paris. 1999.

Masakhwe P. W.   Kenya's National Disability Conference. A Turning Point for Disabled People? *One in Ten.* Children with Disabilities in Africa. Rehabilitation International and UNICEF. Volume 25. 2004.

McLaughlin M. Note on Status on the J.P. Kennedy, Jr. Foundation Project in Bosnia July 2000

McLeod, D. Community-Based Social Services: Practical Advice Based upon Lessons from Outside the World Bank. Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0327; December 2003

Metts, Robert l. Disability Issues, Trends and Recommendations for the World Bank. February, 2000.

National Science Foundation. Division of Human Resource Development. Directorate for Education and Human Resources. Research in Disabilities Education Program 2004.

Ncube A.   Promoting Differently Abled Women and Girls in Namibia. *One in Ten.* Children with Disabilities in Africa. Rehabilitation International and UNICEF. Volume 25. 2004.

Nordstrom K. Report from the Fourth Meeting of the Working Group on Education for All Held at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris 22-23 July 2003

OECD. Transforming Disability into Ability: Policies to Promote Work and Income Security for Disabled People. 2004(a).

OECD: Equity in Education: Students with Disabilities, Learning Difficulties and Disadvantages. May 2004(b)

OECD. Society at a Glance. Social Indicators 2002.

OECD Education Policy Analysis, Diversity, Inclusion and Equity: Insights from Special Needs Provision, OECD. Paris. 2003

Opdal L. R., Wormnaes S., & Habayeb A.   Teachers' Opionions about Inclusion: a pilot study in a Palestinian context. International Journal of Disability Development & Education. Volume 48 Issue 2. June 2001.

Peters S. J., Inclusive Education: Achieving Education for All by Including those with Disabilities and Special Education Needs. Prepared for the Disability Group. The World Bank, April 30, 2003

Pinto P.E., and Sahur N. Working with People with Disabilities: an Indian Perspective. Center for International Rehabilitation Research Information and Exchange. 2001.

Price P. Draft proposal on pilot projects to document examples of good practice in selected countries, and develop guidelines. January 2004.

Powers E.T. Children's Health and Maternal Work Activity: Static and Dynamic Estimates under Alternative Disability Definitions. Institute of Government and Public Affairs. University of Illinois. May 2001.

Rousso H. Education for All: A Gender and Disability Perspective. Background Paper prepared for the World Bank, and EFA Global Monitoring Report for 2003/4. UNESCO. 2003.

Save the Children. On the Road to Education for All. Lessons Learnt from Inclusive Education in Vietnam. Project activities during 1991-2002 supported by Save the Children, Sweden. Stockholm Environment Institute. 2002.

Secretariat Brief. UNESCO The Flagship on Education for All and the Right to education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion. Information from the Flagship-secretariat about The Flagship. Progress report for the period March 7 - November 1 2003.

Sen A. Poverty Re-examined, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1992

Stough L.M. Teaching Special Education in Costa Rica. Using a Learning Strategy in an Inclusive Classroom. Teaching Exceptional Children, *Vol. 34,No. 5, pp. 34-39* 2002.

Taunyane, L and Hirschowitz, R A. National Household Survey of Health Inequalities in South Africa. Community Agency for Social Enquiry (CASE): South Africa. 1995.

Thurlow M. L., Sinclair M.F., and Johnson D.R. Students with Disabilities who Drop Out of School—Implications for Policy and Practice. NCSET Issue Brief. June 2002 • Vol. 1, Issue 2.

UNDP An international children's fund. *UNDP FOCUS.* March 2004.

UNESCO. EFA 2000 Assessment. Paris 2000.

UNESCO. Open File on Inclusive Education. 2001.

UNESCO. Including the Excluded: Meeting Diversity in Education; Example from Romania. Paris, 2001,

UNESCO. First Steps: Stories on Inclusion In Early Childhood Education. Case studies from 13 countries. Paris. 2002

UNESCO. Toolkit for Creating Inclusive, Learning-Friendly Environments. Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. Bangkok, Thailand 2003.

UNESCO Conceptual Paper "Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education. A Challenge and a Vision" . Paris 2003.

UNESCO Bangkok Declaration on Education. June 2004.

UNICEF. Inclusive Education Initiatives for Children with Disabilities. Lessons from the East Asia and Pacific Region. (2003)

UNICEF: "Special Classrooms for Children with Disabilities" An Overview of the Community-Based Project for Children with Disabilities in Bosnia-Herzegovina. Background Document 2004.

UNICEF: Program Guidance: Children with Disabilities – Ending Discrimination and Promoting Full Development. Unpublished Working Draft. April 2004.

United Nations. Final Report to the Standing Committee on Nutrition by the Commission on the Nutrition Challenges of the 21st Century -- Ending Malnutrition by 2020: an Agenda for Change in the Millennium.1999.

United Nations Development Program. Disability and Development. *Focus.* March 2004.

United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. Focus on Ability, Celebrate Diversity: Highlights of the Asian and Pacific Decade of Disabled Persons, 1993-2002. Social Policy Paper No. 13, ST/ESCAP/2291.   2003

United Nations General Assembly. Report of the Working Group to the Ad HocCommittee on a Comprehensive and Integral International Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities. [A/AC.265/2004/WG.1] New York January 2004

United Nations. Report of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission for Social Development on Monitoring the Implementation of the Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities on his third mandate, 2000-2002. [E/CN.5/2002/4]. New York 2002.

.World Bank Note on Possible GPDD (Global Partnership for Disability and Development) Programs. 2004

World Bank DEC Concept Note for Disability and Development. Research Paper.
March 23, 2004.

World Bank. The impact of disability on schooling attainment: results from five
countries. Proposal 2004.

World Health Organization. Future Trends and Challenges in Rehabilitation
Social and Economic Factors. December 2003.

Yeo R., and Moore K. Including Disabled People in Poverty Reduction Work:
`Nothing about us, without us'. World Development 2003, Vol 31, No 3, pp 571-590

Yuster A.   Program Guidance: Children with Disabilities – Ending Discrimination and
Promoting Full Development. UNICEF Disability Guidance Note [Preliminary Draft].
March 3, 2004

ANNEX 3. Relevant international instruments:

The Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities was adopted by the General Assembly in 1993 as a guide for Member States in developing national plans and policies for disabled persons. Monitoring is to be conducted through periodic reports submitted to the Commission for Social Development by the Special Rapporteur on Disability. A supplement has been proposed to deal with several issues not adequately covered in the original version, and is currently under consideration[xciv].

The UNESCO Salamanca statement (June 1994) endorses the approach of inclusive schools through implementation of a number of practical and strategic changes, the guiding principle for which is that ordinary schools should accommodate all children, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions. This agreement among more than 90 nations symbolizes an important commitment to the concept of inclusion, where appropriate consideration is given to children with disabilities in mainstream educational programs. While this does not in any way detract from the conditional services mode (i.e. matching the needs of each child) stipulated in CRC Article 23, nor place children into classrooms or pedagogies which are completely unsuited to their learning (e.g. no specialized aids or teacher capacities or expertise for children who are not sighted, deaf or deaf/blind) it implies new standards of adaptabilities and accommodation for educational systems. The 1998 International Conference on Children's Rights in Education in Copenhagen carried forward these concepts of respect and support for children's rights and the full development of children through education, and the to the origination of the Open File[xcvxcvi].

General Assembly Resolution 56/168 of 19 December 2001 established an Ad Hoc Committee to develop a new international convention on the rights and dignity of persons with disabilities, which met for its third session, from 24 May - 4 June 2004 to begin negotiations on a draft text to be formally revised and presented in August/September 2004. Article 17 will reaffirm the right to education of all persons (including children) with disabilities, and is expected to specify two important dimensions of implementation: a) the right of individual choice as to engagement in inclusive and accessible educational programs; and b) distinction between general education and special education as appropriate for the needs of each person with disabilities. Intensive discussions around these issues have brought out more grounds for consensus[xcvii], while also reducing major differences. There is broad agreement on the principles of access for all to a diverse educational system that meets basic learning needs (including early childhood and preschool), individualized learning plans in appropriate educational settings, and location of such opportunities in communities where people live. Differences arise in practice and modes of delivery, such as the preference for `mainstreaming' on equal footing for all students, and the extent of options (including languages) to be made available to children and adults with disabilities[xcviii].

The draft Article 6 addresses statistics and data collection on disabilities and on the `effective enjoyment of human rights by persons with disabilities'. Here there are major disagreements[xcix]. While some see international commitment to comparable data as essential to monitoring and assessment of progress, others assert the right to privacy and warn against possible misuse of statistical information. According to this perspective, resources directed towards survey data collection should be better spent on persons with disabilities. This is clearly an area where privacy must be respected, but without reliable data on enrollment dropout rates and completion of children with disabilities, how will governments (or the people they serve) know how the EFA and MDG goals are being met?

Relevant initiatives underway include the Washington Group on Disability Measurement established by the UN Statistical Commission in 2001[c] , and the Ad Hoc Working Group on Statistics and Indicators of the EFA Flagship on Disability. In addition, the World Bank, UNESCO and UNICEF all have work in progress (both individually and collaboratively) regarding education and disability. The World Bank's Global Partnership on Disability and Development is exploring ways in which cooperative programming can be optimized using existing institutional structures and frameworks, and engaging more direct involvement of NGO/CSOs and persons with disabilities. UNESCO's focus is jointly on EFA followup and related special education initiatives. Specifically, the UNESCO Institute for Statistics is responsible for the collection and dissemination of key data and indicators being used in the global EFA Assessment[ci]. UNICEF's current organisational priorities include girls' education, integrated early childhood development, delivery of essential health services and improved protection of children from violence,

abuse, exploitation and discrimination. All of these efforts are germane to the work of the EFA Flagship on Disability.

Annex 4. Some illustrative examples of recent and current initiatives:

In LAC, Brazil has made considerable strides in providing ramp access in schools, and is currently experimenting with new curricula and aids to parents with children who have disabilities. Census data questions on persons with disabilities have been under review, and initiatives are contemplated for developing improved surveys and data-gathering for indicators on disabled access to, and completion/success in education. Civil society in Brazil is also engaged in building institutional capacity for resources to help those with disabilities[cii]. In addition, the Brazil census identified a high rate of visual disability in children[ciii], which could conceivably be corrected by giving children glasses. Recently, Costa Rica, which has one of the most comprehensive systems of public education services in the region for persons with disabilities, has been re-assessing its approaches. In addition to expanding its special education efforts nationwide, it has inaugurated a new National Resource Center providing in-service training to both general and special educators in modifications to pedagogical techniques and to provide support for parents with children with disabilities[civ].

In the EECIS region, following the breakup of the former Yugoslavia, large institutions which had been used to house children with disabilities had become financially insupportable, and with UNICEF assistance, Bosnia & Herzegovina developed a plan for education of children with disabilities. Model classrooms for children with mental retardation were initiated, and a national advocacy movement started. Workshops followed, and several new sites have been added[cv]. In the Arab States/North Africa Region, Tunisia in 1990 launched the Institut de Promotion des Handicapés, and the Program d'Action Sociale Scolaire designed to reduce the risk of school failure by screening the school population for disabilities and providing additional support to students with disabilities. Tunis has had a policy of inclusion in general education where possible for children with disabilities, but progress has been limited for many children. Now with the assistance of UNICEF and the World Bank, a benchmark study has been undertaken, and specific cases of good practice identified for broader generalization throughout the country[cvi].

The rights of persons with disabilities have been at the forefront of initiatives throughout the African region since announcement of the Decade. There have been special attempts to extend the reach of public information campaigns through new applications of information and communications technologies (ICTs) For example, `the needs of children who are disabled continue to be addressed in several unique and practical ways in South Africa′[cvii] through interesting and innovative collaboration between civil society and the media. In Kwazulu-Natal, one of the poorest provinces, the Training and Resources in Early Education (TREE) project initiated a watershed approach (later adopted nationwide) to provision of simple, low-cost materials and training to all those caring for children, including those with disabilities[cviii]. TREE has recognized the importance of (and made operational) effective contacts with private sector organizations, and has engaged Citibank in its `Edutainer′ ideas. The Edutainer `is a 40ft shipping container converted into an aesthetically pleasing pre-school classroom. The units are equipped with the necessary educational materials including books, toys and furniture′[cix]. The design and implementation of an attractive website is a key element in outreach and awareness building for this program. The Early Learning Resource Unit (ELRU)[cx] is another South African example of addressing disability and bias directly through inclusive approaches to pedagogy, with explicit focus on teacher training and appropriate materials. The Sunshine Center is another, separate initiative which focuses on home-based educational interventions in the Johannesburg area for children with disabilities, and is the first of its kind in the country, communicating information for parent through community and national radio. Other interesting examples, including new initiatives with the SA Broadcasting Corporation, are outlined by Barbara Kolucki in her article, all of which illustrate the strength and potential of community collaboration with media in early childhood education, providing parents and other caregivers with the antecedents for future educational progress for children with disabilities.

As Africa News stated in January 2004: `It′s time to deliver to kids with disabilities!′, and there have been concerted attempts to do this throughout the Sub-Saharan region. In January 2004, the first National Conference on the African Decade of Persons with Disabilities in Kenya brought important constituencies together for the first time at the national level to share experience and prepare strategies for the future. Delegates recommended training for disabled persons in effective use of the media, parliamentary engagement in raising awareness, official recognition of sign and tactile languages, and improved data sources for information on people with

disabilities[cxi]. Several countries including Tanzania, and DRC (as well as Cap Verde and Algeria) have specific legislation on education for children with disabilities.

It may seem counter-intuitive that one of the poorest regions of the world is beginning to resort so effectively to ICTs in expansion of social services, but this is due to a number of factors, such as the technological and investment `engine' of the Republic of South Africa, and the `leapfrog' capacity of Southern Africa to enjoy the fruits of ICTs with little or none of the heavy upfront investment. However it remains the fact that ICTs are a potent tool, and are being used more and more to further the cause. The Uganda National Institute of Special Education[cxii] has been operating since 1991 to train teachers in inclusive and special needs education, and received legal status and parliamentary recognition as an educational institution in 1996. The Institute is involved in research, community service, and development of educational materials and adaptive devices appropriate for learners with special needs. Not only does it make a graphic design/illustration & desktop publishing facility available, but it offers also a variety of distance learning opportunities (three year diploma, one year certificate) which are open to teachers, parents social workers, community development personnel, health workers, care givers, and law enforcement personnel. Uganda has also employed media successfully to advocate for the needs of persons with disabilities and spread awareness of educational opportunities[cxiii].

The Asia and Pacific Region has more than 400 million people with disabilities, and in many ways been a leader in both championing the cause, and pioneering approaches towards more inclusive education. The second Decade of Disabled Persons started in 2003, and the recent Biwako Millennium Framework for Action: Towards an Inclusive, Barrier-free and Rights-based Society for Persons with Disabilities in Asia and the Pacific) (BMF) has identified early detection, early intervention and education as the third of seven priority areas for action. The Framework addresses critical issues in EFA achievement, and MDG modifications including children with disabilities, targets and actions for achieving them[cxiv].

The extensive UNESCO toolkit for creating inclusive, learning-friendly environments (ILFE) builds on experience globally (examples are included from countries outside the region such as Lesotho, Kenya, and Colombia) but also from ten countries in the region[cxv]. Focusing on children, its goal is to help practitioners in `increasing school attendance and completion rates; eliminating bias within schools, national education systems and curricula; and eliminating the social and cultural discrimination that limits the demand for schooling for children with diverse backgrounds and abilities'[cxvi]. The Toolkit consists of six booklets comprising a set of resource materials reflecting successful application in a variety of settings, including both formal and non-formal learning environments. An ILFE ` welcomes nurtures and educates all children regardless of their gender, physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other characteristics. They may be disabled or gifted children, street or working children, children of remote or nomadic peoples, children from linguistic, ethnic or cultural minorities, children affected by HIV/AIDS, or children from other disadvantaged or marginalized areas or groups'.

Two characteristics of the Toolkit seem exemplary, and especially germane to the future focus of the Flagship. The first is the signal effort to center the process of learning on the learner him/herself, and bring a supportive cluster of community, family, and approbative social support in innovative ways to the arena of educational enterprise. The second is in the careful and practical way that disability is placed into a positive atmosphere of mutual inclusiveness, ideally to the advantage of all concerned. The definitions are instructive. `'*Children with disabilities*' include those children with physical, sensory or intellectual disabilities, and who are oftentimes marginalized. They are children who were born with a physical or psychological disability, or have acquired impairment because of illness, accidents or other causes. Impairments may mean that children will experience difficulty seeing, hearing, moving and using their limbs and bodies, and they may learn more slowly and in different ways from other children. In many countries, not all children who are identified as disabled are also identified as having special educational needs, and vice versa. These two groups, therefore, are not identical. Children with disabilities are capable of learning and have the same right to attend school as any other child but they are very often excluded from school altogether in many countries of the Asia-Pacific region. '*Students with special learning or education needs*' means children who require special attention to help them with their learning. In most countries, this attention is delivered in either special or ordinary schools or classrooms. Many countries label different groups of students as 'having special educational needs' which sets them apart from regular students. When this term appears in the Toolkit, therefore, it acknowledges the existence of this labelling

practice. However, it does **NOT** assume that there is any actual educational difference between students with special learning or education needs and regular students.'

The practical accommodations exhibited in the Toolkit, and the cases and examples on which they are built provide useful instances of good practice. Its pragmatic purpose, positive and encouraging tone, and user-friendly style, and offer much that can be helpful to other countries and regions.

ENDNOTES

[i] This work was supported by the World Bank Disability and Development Team, and drafts prepared in consultation with them and with several other people whose comments and guidance are gratefully appreciated and noted in the Acknowledgements section.

[ii] See for example OECD (May 2004 (b), Peters (2003), McLeod (2003), Elwan (1999).

[iii] Convention on the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities: for the draft presented to the May-June session of the Ad Hoc Committee, see Annex 1 to the Report of the Working Group A/AC.265/2004/WG.1.

[iv] Formidable challenges lie ahead if we are to come close to meeting the goals..." Kofi Annan. UN Secretary General - University of Westminster - London, UK -2002. 8th June.

[v] Kowsman 2004.

[vi] http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for_all/background/jomtien_declaration.shtml

[vii] http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for_all/background/amman_affirmation.shtml

[viii] See for example the African Decade of Persons with Disabilities, and the Bangkok Declaration

[ix] Lawrence J.E.S. Education for Tolerance. A New Urgency. Unpublished Concept Note for Human Development Network, World Bank, Washington DC 2003.

[x] Focusing Resources on Effective School Health. World Bank, WHO, UNICEF, & UNESCO Program.

[xi] A partnership of developing countries and donors created to help low-income countries achieve EFA.

[xii] It is important to note at the outset that in the English language at least, no descriptive term (`disabled persons', `persons with disabilities') presently has a consensus of approval in the international community, and most have some strong disapproval from one or more constituencies. Psychological literature abounds with developmental problems associated with labeling or stereotyping, and it is crucial to move beyond these inhibitors, and especially to avoid stigmatization. This paper respects the diversity of all kinds of disabilities, and recognizes the inadequacy of language as a reflection of the embryonic state of knowledge and information in this field. The two terms above are used interchangeably since they appear throughout the literature in these forms, but the purpose of the paper mandates a focus not on terminology, but on how education can be more tolerant and adaptive to individual differences in learners needs.

[xiii] Education for All: Including Children with Disabilities. Education Notes. The World Bank August 2003.

[xiv] Powers 2001.

[xv] Elwan 1999.

[xvi] DFID 2000.

[xvii] Elwan 1999

[xviii] Yeo and Moore 2003.

[xix] See The National Center on Secondary Education and Transition (NCSET) Dropout & Graduation. April 27th, 2004 at http://www.ncset.org/topics/dropout/default.asp?topic=0

[xx] See Graduation & Dropout Rates by Disability. Chapter 4 in 24th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA. US Department of Education. 2002.

[xxi] Thurlow et al 2002

[xxii] Imrie 1996

[xxiii] Both Aristotle (Treatise on Government) and Plato (Republic) emphasized perfection of physical form and athletic prowess and supremacy as developmental goals. Aristotle urged that Greek law decree children with imperfections unacceptable for parenting. The Spartan principle of exposure and disposal of `deformed' children was reiterated in Plato's Republic.

[xxiv] See the British Film Institute website at http://www.bfi.org.uk/education/resources/teaching/disability/thinking/

[xxv] Pinto and Sahur 2001.

[xxvi] Yeo and Moore 2003. p 573

[xxvii] Dennis 1997

[xxviii] Cited in WHO 2003

[xxix] Harris-White 2003

[xxx] Taunyane and Hirschowitz 1995

[xxxi] OECD 2004(a)

[xxxii] UNESCO EFA 2000 Assessment

xxxiii Elwan 1999

xxxiv OECD Society at a Glance 2002.

xxxv `The past ten years have seen the steady progress of disability as a central focus of human rights'. Al-Thani H. February 2004.

xxxvi This was followed by the UN Decade of Disabled Persons from 1983 to 1992.

xxxvii See http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/enable/dissre01.htm

xxxviii Report from Nordic Flagship Meeting at UNESCO General Conference UNESCO 2001

xxxix   * The Inter-agency Initiative Devoted to Early Childhood Development;
    * Literacy in the Framework of the United Nations Decade;
    * United Nations Girl's Education Initiative (UNGEI);
    * The Initiative on Education in Emergency Situations;
    * The Inter-agency Initiative FRESH (Focusing Resources for Effective School Health);
    * The Inter-agency Initiative on AIDS, Schools and Education;
    * Teachers and quality of education;
    * The Flagship on EFA and the Right to education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion
    * Education for Rural People

xl Grateful acknowledgement is given to Jerry Mindes and Phyllis Magrab for these details.

xli This included representatives of Finland's Foreign Ministry, the OECD, Georgetown University's Child Development Centre, the Commonwealth Secretariat, UNESCO, Rehabilitation International, Inclusion International, USAID, DANIDA, the Niko Maki Institute of Finland, the World Blind Union, the World Federation of the Deaf, and other leading disability organizations from developing nations.

xlii SC members are:

xliii The full title is `The Flagship on Education for All and the Right to Education for Persons with Disabilities: Towards Inclusion'.

xliv See http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/know_sharing/flagship_initiatives/disability.shtml

xlv the ICF presents a framework which encompasses the complex multifaceted interaction between health conditions and personal and environmental factors that determine the extent of disablement in any given situation. Not all constituencies have yet agreed on, or accepted ICF, for instance WBU.

xlvi Report of the Working Group to the Ad Hoc Committee. A/AC.265/2004/WG1. Footnote 12.

xlvii Rousso 2003.

xlviii For educational policy purposes, the OECD, which over the last ten years has developed a data base on students with disabilities in OECD countries, offers classification of students in receipt of additional resources in the three broad cross-national categories: `disabilities', `difficulties' and `disadvantages', described as follows: . `those in the "disabilities" category have clear organic bases for their difficulties. Those in the "difficulties" category have learning and behaviour difficulties which do not appear to be due to either a clear organic basis or social disadvantage. Those in the "disadvantages" category receive additional educational resources due to aspects of their social and/or language background' See http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/27/30/26527517.pdf

xlix I am grateful to Lawrence Carter for his vivid explanation of this insight.

l World Bank DEC Concept Note for Disability and Development. Research Paper. March 23, 2004.

li Steering Committee Meeting Minutes. November 14-15 2003 Kampala, Uganda, and pers.comm WFDB 2004.

lii UNDP Focus March 2004

liii see for example Deng 2003, Lutulala Mumpasi 2003.

liv For statistics from the UN Disability Database, see http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/default.htm

lv Cambodia, India, Jamaica, Indonesia, Romania.

lvi Connecticut State Department of Education 1999.

lvii 19th Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act. 1998.

lviii Nordic Flagship Luncheon report

lix `Recently completed OECD research on disability policies in 20 member countries found that none of them has a particularly successful policy for disabled people.... in most countries, people who enter disability-related programs remain beneficiaries until retirement. On average, only 1% of benefit recipients find a job each year'. OECD 2004(a).

lx Dakar Framework 2000

lxi See http://www.bu.edu/disability/resources/techlinks.htm

lxii Magrab 1999.

lxiii OECD. Transforming Disability into Ability: Policis to Promote Work and Income Security for Disabled People. 2004(a)

lxiv Sen, 1992

lxv see Early Childhood: Research and Practice at http://ecrp.uiuc.edu/

lxvi See www.eenet.org.uk and UNESCO 2002.

lxvii See Stubbs S. Early Childhood Education/Care Issues in Relation to Disability: Some examples from East Africa. Save the Children UK. 1994.

lxviii The Enabling Education Network. The Enable Programme. 2001

lxix State of Connecticut 2003.

lxx OECD 2003.

lxxi Cohen et al 1999

lxxii Toolkit for Creating An Inclusive Learning Friendly Environment, UNESCO Bangkok. 2003.

lxxiii Ncube 2004

lxxiv See Building an Inclusive Development Community. MIUSA. 2004

lxxv Ncube 2004

lxxvi Groce 2004

lxxvii Children with Disabilities in Africa. *One in Ten.* Vol 25 p 8. 2004.

lxxviii `Persons with disabilities, or disadvantaged groups were not targeted in any of the reports, which proves that when it comes to educational situations, [they] are still forgotten, marginalised and invisible to governments, civil society and among donors and NGOs'. Nordstrom. Flagship Meeting Report 2003.

lxxix Report of the Working Group to the Ad Hoc Committee. A/AC.265/2004/WG1. Footnote 12.

lxxx Rousso 2003.

lxxxi Steering Committee Meeting Minutes. November 14-15 2003 Kampala, Uganda, and pers.comm WFDB 2004.

lxxxii see communications between Ko-Chih Tung and Penelope Price on proposals for a study to generate good-practice guidelines on inclusive education strategy with examples drawn from Thailand and other countries (perhaps Samoa, Laos and Cambodia) that have initiated inclusive education policies. Price 2004.

lxxxiii The World Bank has experimented with these techniques in the LAC region.

lxxxiv A friend of the author of this paper, paralyzed with MS, is able now to communicate (occasionally) by email through moving a cursor and selecting letters remotely with her cheek.

lxxxv During the initial Jomtien preparations for WCEFA, a High Level Steering Group of internationally notable figures was identified and worked solely, and effectively to publicize and provide outreach.

lxxxvi See for example UNDP collaboration with CISCO and NETAID

lxxxvii one priority of the FRESH Flagship initiative (Health-related school policies) addresses the positive psycho-social environment necessary for learner-friendly schools,

lxxxviii TOR for EFA Ad Hoc Working Group on Statistics 2003

lxxxix The Survey of Primary Schools being conducted in 14 countries.

xc USAID has stipulated `disability friendliness' as a condition for Millennium Challenge Grants.

xci see communications between Ko-Chih Tung and Penelope Price on proposals for a study to generate good-practice guidelines on inclusive education strategy with examples drawn from Thailand and other countries (perhaps Samoa, Laos and Cambodia) that have initiated inclusive education policies. Price 2004.

xcii The World Bank has experimented with these techniques in the LAC region.

xciii A friend of the author of this paper, paralyzed with MS, is able now to communicate (occasionally) by email through moving a cursor and selecting letters remotely with her cheek.

xciv Al-Thani H. February 2004

xcv UNESCO Open File on Inclusive Education 2001.

xcvi Cohen et al 1999

xcvii See Ad Hoc Committee Daily Summary Volume 4 #5 (May 28 2004) for details of country, agency, and NGO/CSO comments on the draft of Article 17 presented by the Working Group.

xcviii Morocco's intervention for example (ibid p 15) suggests wording to ensure that `education of persons with disabilities in the general education system should be the rule, and the provision of specialist education services the exception'.

xcix Ibid (Footnote 23, page 12).

c Now operating in several; countries through three working groups. See http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/citygroup.htm

ci although as yet, none of the 19 metadata tables address disability indicators directly.

cii Tiflolibros – Global: Based in Buenos Aires, this non-profit organisation has developed a digital library for visually impaired Spanish speakers. Created by a group of blind persons in their 20s who wanted to exchange digital books in order to widen their access to culture and education, Tiflolibros has grown to include more than 7,000 books available to more than 900 members. Members' participation is central to the maintenance and expansion of the library. http://www.comminit.com/pdskdv122003/sld-9201.html

ciii See Ferreira 2003

civ Stough 2002

[cv] McLaughlin 2000

[cvi] Ceralli et al 2004.

[cvii] Kolucki 2004.

[cviii] http://www.tree-ecd.co.za/

[cix] see http://www.citigroup.com/citigroup/press/2003/030327c.htm

[cx] http://www.elru.co.za/features.asp

[cxi] Masakhwe 2004

[cxii] See http://www.unise.ac.ug/profile.html

[cxiii] [cxiii] Speaking Up On Disability – Uganda In 2001, the National Union of Disabled Persons of Uganda, along with Leonard Cheshire International, Radio for Development, and Action on Disability and Development, initiated a radio-based public education campaign to increase awareness of disability issues. Thirty 30-minute programs were produced and broadcast on Radio Uganda in an effort to create a regional channel for education and lobbying around disability rights. Listening clubs enabled disabled and non-disabled people to discuss the broadcasts together, to the end of changing attitudes, influencing policy, and building confidence. http://www.comminit.com/pdskdv102002/sld-6431.html

[cxiv] http://www.unescap.org/esid/psis/disability/

[cxv] Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam.

[cxvi] Introduction to Toolkit by Sheldon Shaeffer, UNESCO Regional Director, Bangkok.