

Barometer of Inclusive Education in Selected European Countries

2020 Summary Report



A report by the European Association of Service providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD)

Acknowledgements

This is a report by the European Association for Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities' (EASPD) Member Forum on Education.

Authors:

Prof. Mag. Dr. Wolfgang Plaute, Pädagogischen Hochschule Salzburg

Rachel Vaughan, EASPD

EASPD wishes to thank the following national experts, without who this report would not have been possible:

Prof. Dr. Andrea Holzinger, PH Steiermark, Austria

Dr. Angel Belzunegui Eraso, Catalonia

Alexandré Ploye, France

Prof. Dr. Carmen Dorrance, Germany

Dr. Csilla Nagyné Schiffer, Hungary

Elke Struyf, Belgium

Johanna Leino, Finland

Matthias Gubler, Switzerland

Miguel Valles, Portugal

Mirela Juka, Albania

Dr Romain Lanners, Switzerland

Ruth Jörgensdottir Rauterberg, Iceland

Silvestro Plumari, Italy

Valerija Bužan, Slovenia

Prof. Mag. Dr. Wolfgang Plaute, Austria

Zela Koka, Albania

EASPD also wishes to thank the members of the P2i project and Prof. Dr. Carmen Dorrance for their contributions to this report.



Contents

Acknowledgements	2
List of Tables and Figures	4
PART I Concept and Methodology of The Barometer of Inclusive Education.....	5
Concept and Methodology.....	5
1.1 Normative Basis: Declaration of Salamanca and UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD)	6
1.2 Progressive implementation with a maximum of all available resources	7
1.3 Conceptual Idea and Structure of the Barometer assessment	7
PART II Barometer Results.....	9
2.1 Assessment Part A: Statutory Legislation and Prescriptions.....	12
2.2 Assessment Part B: Practice of Inclusive Education.....	15
Assessment Part C: Progress towards Inclusive Education	22
Part D: Overall assessment of participating countries	24
PART III: The Impact of COVID-19 on the transition towards inclusive education	26
PART IV Conclusion: Summary	33
References	36
Annex I: National Responses to Peter, Paul, Rose and Mary	37
Annex II: Barometer Questionnaire.....	50



List of Tables and Figures

Figure 1: Percentage of learners with an official decision of SEN, based on the enrolled school population (%).....	10
Figure 2: the percentage of learners with an official decision of SEN in inclusive education, based on the population of learners with an official decision of SEN (%)	11
Table 1: By statutory legislation, inclusive education at primary level is free.....	12
Table 2: By statutory legislation, persons with disabilities have access to secondary inclusive education like	13
Table 3: By statutory legislation, it is assured that persons with disabilities have access vocational to lifelong	13
Table 4: By statutory legislation, it is assured that the training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of.....	14
Table 5: By statutory legislation, representatives of children with disabilities, their parents effectively participate in the decision-making	14
Table 6: Assessment of statutory legislation and prescriptions in each country.....	15
Table 7: % of children with SEN NOT in regular settings at pre-school level.....	16
Table 8: % of children with SEN NOT in regular settings at primary school level.....	16
Table 9: % of children with SEN NOT in regular settings at secondary school level.....	17
Table 10: Indirect costs of inclusive education for children with SEN which fall on the responsibility of parents.....	18
Table 11: Development of accommodation of architectural conditions	18
Table 12: Development of accommodation of classroom size	19
Table 13: Training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of inclusive education.....	20
Table 14: Has teacher training become more oriented to inclusive education since 2010?...	20
Table 15: Development of monitoring systems on inclusive education	21
Table 16: Assessment of practice of inclusive education in your country	22
Table 17: Progression of Inclusive education	22
Table 18: Expected percentage of persons with SEN not included in 2025.....	23

PART I Concept and Methodology of The Barometer of Inclusive Education

Concept and Methodology

The right of all learners, to have access to a high-quality inclusive education, is one that is widely acknowledged in a number of international human rights frameworks. In particular, the UNESCO Salamanca Statement of 1994 and UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of 2006 (UN CRPD) both strongly endorse the right persons with disabilities have to inclusive education. In the European Union, all 28 Member States have signed the UN CRPD since its adoption, committing themselves to implement the necessary changes at all levels to achieve inclusive education. Despite this commitment, there is no single country in Europe, or across the world, who can boast truly inclusive education systems for all learners at all levels.

As a result, with this report, the European Association for Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities' (EASPD) Member Forum on Education aim to contribute to national and European implementation processes of inclusive education for persons with special educational needs (SEN). The 2020 edition of the report builds of the work of the European project 'Pathways to Inclusion' (P2i) which was implemented between 2009-2012. Together the project partners and Members of EASPD's Member Forum on Education hope to raise awareness of the rights of pupils with disabilities and to develop ways to ensure they can benefit from high-quality education in an inclusive setting, where special needs are taken into consideration and pupils do not face discrimination arising from their disability.

The following 'Barometer Assessment of Inclusive Policies and Practice to Inclusive education' is the result of comprehensive research into inclusive education at a national level in 13 European countries. It summarises a wide range of information and knowledge regarding inclusive education, including the latest policy developments in the field as well a comprehensive picture of their implementation in each country.

This Barometer report is of interest to anyone who is involved in education at any level including persons with disabilities, families, teachers, policymakers and service providers. The report aims to provide an 'information based rating' on inclusive education of persons with disabilities and/or special educational needs (SEN) in participating European countries to identify tendencies and produce information that is relevant for policymakers and other stakeholders to promote the implementation process of inclusive education. In addition, the authors of this report hope that it can contribute to the establishment of a comprehensive data collection process that monitors the development of inclusive education across Europe from a longitudinal perspective.

In the following chapter, we will first describe the normative basis and conceptual assumptions of the barometer assessment. Then we will present the methodology and the instrument.



1.1 Normative Basis: Declaration of Salamanca and UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD)

The right to inclusive education has been recognised in a number of international human rights treaties, notably the Statement of Salamanca¹ (1994) and United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities² (2006). With the Statement of Salamanca³ (1994) inclusive education becomes an official but non-binding objective of the international community framed within a human rights perspective. The Statement clearly states that regular schools:

*“are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes ... building an **inclusive** and achieving education for all” (Art. 2, Statement of Salamanca);*

and stresses that schools should:

*‘ **include** all children regardless of individual differences or difficulties, (and) adopt as a matter of law or policy the principle of **inclusive education**’” (Art. 3, Statement of Salamanca).*

The Salamanca Statement was a first step for increased international efforts to develop inclusive educational systems wherever possible.

Adopted in 2006 (13th of December), the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UN CRPD)⁴ states the right for inclusive education as one of the central dimensions of human rights of persons with disabilities. Outlined in Art. 24 of the Convention, it commits States Parties to

*“recognize [ing] the right of persons with disabilities to education. With a view to realizing this right without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunity, States Parties shall ensure an **inclusive education** system at all levels and lifelong learning...”*

While primarily focusing on primary and secondary school education, Art. 24 also states that all levels of education must be included and policies must also refer to pre-school, tertiary and forms of lifelong education.

The prescriptions of Art. 24 UN CRPD are systematically taken as the normative basis in this barometer assessment and interpreted as criteria for the assessment of the existing situation regarding legislation, given practice and transformation developments.

¹ as a result of the UNESCO-World Conference On Special Needs Education in Salamanca, Spain, in 1994, see: http://www.unesco.de/fileadmin/medien/Dokumente/Bildung/Salamanca_Declaration.pdf, 02-06-2011

² <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>, 02-06-2011

³ as a result of the UNESCO-World Conference On Special Needs Education in Salamanca, Spain, in 1994, see: http://www.unesco.de/fileadmin/medien/Dokumente/Bildung/Salamanca_Declaration.pdf, 02-06-2011

⁴ <http://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtml>, 02-06-2011



1.2 Progressive implementation with a maximum of all available resources

It is important to note that education in international law is seen as a part of overall economic, social and cultural rights. As long as institutional practices are not directly discriminative, the UN CRPD does not demand an immediate change, but a progressive overcoming of segregating systems that are rooted in educational traditions of a certain state.⁵ Nevertheless, Article 4 of the UN CRPD says that states have “to take appropriate measures” and “with a maximum of all available resources” to fulfil the inclusive clauses of the Convention. To monitor the progress of signatories, a monitoring system was agreed upon to track the progress of State parties. States that have ratified the Optional Protocol of the Convention have to report to the UN every two years on the present position and progress towards full implementation.

1.3 Conceptual Idea and Structure of the Barometer assessment

Orientation to the Open Method of Coordination (OMC)

Whether or to what extent inclusive education of children with disabilities is implemented depends on the political will and the educational policies of governments and other political actors. Laws, structures and procedures have to be changed, resources have to be provided or shifted, conflicts have to be solved etc. In European politics, it has become apparent that systematic comparison and reporting between member states according to agreed criteria can produce public and political attention. The ‘Open Method of Coordination’ (OMC) aims to create political dynamics and to develop a mutual learning process involving the scrutiny of specific policies, programs or institutional arrangements presented as acceptable practices in the national strategic reports. It is a political framework

“for national strategy development, as well as for coordinating policies between EU countries on issues relating to poverty and social exclusion, health care and long-term care as well as pensions. The Open Method of Coordination is a voluntary process for political cooperation based on agreeing on [common objectives](#) and [common indicators](#), which shows how progress towards these goals can be measured” (European Commission 2011⁶).

Relating to this, the concept of a ‘European Barometer on Inclusive Education’ has been developed and used to assess and compare different national situations.

Assessment methodology

The barometer instrument conceptually follows the idea of an ‘informed rating’ on inclusive education of persons with disabilities and/or special educational needs (SEN) in participating European countries. The

⁵ Gewerkschaft für Erziehung und Wissenschaft (GEW 2008: 34)

⁶ See: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=753&langId=en, 02-06.2011>



objective is to use available data to identify tendencies and produce information that is relevant for policymakers and other stakeholders to promote the implementation process of inclusive education.⁷ The report provides a shadow report of the situation of inclusive education at a national or regional level alongside official data that is made available at a European Level ⁸

Questionnaires were developed that address the national level in each country. The barometer assessment is structured in three parts:

- ‘Statutory Legislation and prescriptions’ (A),
- ‘Situation in practice’ (B) and
- ‘Progression of Implementation’ (C).

These three parts are covered by a questionnaire initially developed by the University of Siegen with the input of the partners of the P2i consortium. For this report, the questionnaire was further developed by Dr Wolfgang Plaute of Pädagogische Hochschule Salzburg, in consultation with EASPD’s Member Forum on Education.

For each country featured in this report, the questionnaire has been completed by a ‘national expert.’ This expert has been identified by a member of EASPD’s Member Forum on Education who works in the respective country. Each national expert is professional with at least five years’ experience in the field of inclusion and working independently from their national government. While completing their questionnaire, the experts were asked to involve other national experts in their research process and to identify main references and comments. Data sources were official government reports, official statistics, scientific studies or other sources such as the Special Needs Report of the European Agency for Special Educational Needs. As a result, their answers serve a reflection of the state of inclusive education in their country or region, based on their experiences and expertise in the field.

The assessment model is based on a differentiated analysis of available data on inclusive education. It proved to be a useful tool, based on valid and accepted methodologies. Its results are to create or endorse debates within the participating countries on better implementation of inclusive education more than to come to clear diagnosis and prescriptions.

Selected Countries

The education systems of thirteen European countries are assessed in this report. This report was completed with the support of professionals, working in the field of education who volunteered their time

⁷ The P2i-project was inspired by the Germany Inklusionsbarometer presented by SOVD in 2010, see: http://www.sovd.de/fileadmin/downloads/pdf/sonstiges/neu_-_Landkarte_Inklusion.pdf, 02-06-2011

⁸ In particular the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education reports on data concerning education for students with SEN. See: <https://www.european-agency.org/resources/publications/european-agency-statistics-inclusive-education-2018-dataset-cross-country>



and expertise to complete the barometer questionnaire. Eight of these countries were also subject to assessment in the 2012 P2i edition of the barometer report: Austria; Belgium (Flemish region); Finland; France; Germany; Hungary; Portugal and Slovenia. For these eight countries, it is already possible to track their progress against the initial assessment. It is intended that the progress of these countries, and the five others that have been included for the first time in this edition, will continued to be monitored by future updates of this report using the same assessment procedure. It is important to note that this assessment and forecast for the future was done prior to the outbreak on the Coronavirus pandemic, but the impact of the virus will be address later in this report.

PART II Barometer Results

The below graphs illustrate the differences throughout EU member states in percentage of learners who are formally identified as having a special educational need and have an official decision of SEN as well as the proportion of learners with SEN currently taught in inclusive settings. This data has been taken from the 2018 Dataset Cross-Country Report produced by the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (EASNIE).⁹ EASNIE's definition for an 'inclusive setting' refers to all education in which a pupil is enrolled in mainstream classes alongside their peers for at least 80% of the school week, in comparison to the whole enrolled school population.

⁹ European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2020. European Agency Statistics on Inclusive Education: 2018 Dataset Cross-Country Report. (J. Ramberg, A. Lénárt, and A. Watkins, eds.). Odense, Denmark






Figure 1: Percentage of learners with an official decision of SEN, based on the enrolled school population (%).

This indicator has been calculated as follows: $\frac{\text{The number of learners with an official decision of SEN}}{\text{The number of learners who are enrolled in all formal educational settings}} \times 100$.

For all countries, the operational definition of an official decision has been applied to the data collection. However, some countries can be identified as marked 'outliers', as they have different types of official definitions that correspond with the EASIE operational definition of an official decision of SEN, i.e. Iceland (15.34%), Lithuania (13.48%), Slovakia (15.07%) and UK (Scotland) (25.12%).






Figure 2: the percentage of learners with an official decision of SEN in inclusive education, based on the population of learners with an official decision of SEN (%) This indicator has been calculated as follows: The number of learners with an official decision of SEN who are educated in mainstream classes for at least 80% of the time / The number of learners with an official decision of SEN x 100.



The figure displays a more positive outlook on the current state of inclusive education, although large variances in results across Europe should be noted. However, despite what the statistics show, the fact is that inclusive education is as of yet not the reality for most learners with disabilities. In light of this, the following report will cast a light on the reality on the ground through an analysis of the current statutory legislation on inclusive education in Europe and an evaluation on how practical implementation has advanced.

2.1 Assessment Part A: Statutory Legislation and Prescriptions

In all European countries education is a highly regulated sector of society. Statutory legislation and prescriptions structure the educational system and provide a framework for the practice and development of inclusive education. This framework rules the allocation of resources, the environment under which schools and other educational facilities work, their conceptual orientation, teacher training and many other institutional preconditions that can be favourable or hindering for inclusive education.

In Part A of the questionnaire (with 16 questions) the national experts were asked to assess the legal basis for inclusive education in their countries. In all assessed countries there is consistency across different laws on national and regional/federal state level for the right to inclusive education. The right to access free inclusive education at a primary level is enshrined in the statutory legislation of all countries (Table 1).




Table 1: By statutory legislation, inclusive education at primary level is free.

For some countries, however, as learners progress through the school system the same rights and equal access cannot be assured and equal access to inclusive secondary and tertiary education is not supported by statutory legislation (Table 2 and 3). It should be noted that, in reality, higher and tertiary education



often depends on the preliminary secondary education trajectory or admission requirements. As a result this the situation of inclusion of learners with SEN is more problematic then presented in the Table.




Table 2: By statutory legislation, persons with disabilities have access to secondary inclusive education like




Table 3: By statutory legislation, it is assured that persons with disabilities have access vocational to lifelong

Despite generally upholding the right to equal access to inclusive education, in many of the countries surveyed, current statutory legislation does not facilitate the accommodation of the individual learner’s support needs. This suggests that while at a legislative level, access to education is ensured, supporting legislation in the field of education do not conform with the goals and aims of inclusive education, limiting its realisation.



In particular, the adaption of classroom size, changes in the architectural conditions of the school and availability of adaptive technology cannot be guaranteed via the statutory legislation in many of the countries surveyed. Almost half of the countries' legislative frameworks do not assure that teacher training is oriented to the requirements of inclusive education (Table 4), nor does it ensure that qualified teachers are able to implement inclusive education in schools once they are employed. Instead, training on inclusive education is often provided as an optional specialised module or course.




Table 4: By statutory legislation, it is assured that the training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of

In the majority of countries, the participation of key stakeholders, including the representatives of children with disabilities and their parents in decision-making processes is enshrined in statutory legislation (Table 5). The scope of this participation can differ from country to country; however, with Portugal offering the most opportunities for the participation of parents and other key stakeholders.



Table 5: By statutory legislation, representatives of children with disabilities, their parents effectively participate in the decision-making



The following table (6) shows how the national experts assessed statutory legislation and prescriptions in their countries. The scale represents the percentage of positive answers for the questions of Part A:




Table 6: Assessment of statutory legislation and prescriptions in each country

2.2 Assessment Part B: Practice of Inclusive Education

In Part B of the questionnaire (with 31 questions), the national experts were asked to assess the practice of inclusive education in their countries. Following from the first P2i reports, results show that even though there seem to be positive changes towards a less segregating school system in all participating countries, inclusive education is not yet a high priority in every country and the practice the state of inclusive education does not yet reflect the legislative framework present in each country.

Education of children with special education needs in mainstream settings

In most countries, the percentage of pupils with disabilities or other special educational needs excluded from regular education is still very high measured against the expectations of the UN CRPD. The percentage of segregation as reported by the national experts varies considerably between participating countries (Table 7-9). In a reflection of the current statutory legislation, the progress made towards inclusive



education at each level of the education systems is viewed less positively the further along the education system learners progress.




Table 7: Percentage of children with SEN NOT in regular settings at pre-school level ¹⁰




Table 8: Percentage of children with SEN NOT in regular settings at primary school level

¹⁰ In Iceland 95% of children aged 3-6 years attend preschools. All children attend regular inclusive preschools and there are not statistics on how many of the children that do not attend preschool have SEN. There are no special settings for preschool children with SEN in Iceland. Children who do not attend preschool at that age are at home, this is at the decision of the parents.







Table 9: Percentage of children with SEN NOT in regular settings at secondary school level

The inclusion of learners in mainstream settings is also dependant on the type of special educational need, or disability they have. At a post-secondary/tertiary level, learners with intellectual disabilities are deemed to have the least amount of opportunities and are most excluded across all countries. This group is followed by learners who have sensory impairments and learners with physical disabilities having relativity more opportunities.

Involvement of parents

Based on the assessments of our national experts, across all country's parents are rarely expected to cover the direct costs incurred by the education of their children in mainstream settings. In some countries, however, the indirect costs that are a result of the inclusion of their children in mainstream education settings can be higher and fall on the responsibility to cover these costs falls on parents (Table 10).



Very high

High

Low

Very low



Table 10: Indirect costs of inclusive education for children with SEN which fall on the responsibility of parents

In general, if parents articulate a preference that their children are educated in inclusive settings, this preference is followed, this situation represents a marked improvement since 2010.

Measures to support the inclusion of children with disabilities in the classroom

Following the assessment of the national experts, it appears that the implementation of measures to support the inclusion of children with disabilities since 2010 is mixed. Efforts to accommodate staff to support learning activities have made progress, as has the accommodation of functional assistance and care provision. However, the use of adaptive technology in schools is mixed, with the uptake of this technology slow since 2010. The accommodation of architectural conditions (Table 11) and classroom size has seen the least progress (Table 12).




Table 11: Development of accommodation of architectural conditions




Table 12: Development of accommodation of classroom size

Teacher training

In practice, the training of teachers is not oriented to the requirements of inclusive education (Table 13). This trend largely reflects the statutory legislation of these countries to accommodate the requirements of inclusive education in teacher training. Despite this trend overall, the development of teacher training toward inclusive education since 2010 was viewed positively by national experts (Tables 14). The increased availability of appropriate staff who are able to respect and meet an individual’s support requirements in inclusive settings has also increased, however many experts highlighted that a lack of resources often prevent these teachers from better meeting the needs of students. In Austria it was noted that while the training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of inclusive education in a good way, compulsory trainings for School Assistants is not yet in place. This suggests that differences may remain in the training of teachers compared to other staff working in schools, suggesting that further desegregated data on this is needed.




Table 13: Training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of inclusive education




Table 14: Has teacher training become more oriented to inclusive education since 2010?

Monitoring of the development of inclusive education

The development of data collection processes and monitoring of the inclusion of students with SEN in mainstream education settings is mixed across Europe (Table 15). These monitoring systems range from self-assessment of schools to the collection of data via local and national authorities or independent bodies. In the writing of this report, however, the lack of recent data on the state of inclusive education in each Member State was highlighted, suggesting that current data collection and monitoring process are not comprehensive enough to track the inclusion of learners with disabilities in mainstream education settings.



With the financial support of the European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation “EaSI” (2014-2020)

It should be noted that for each country, the definition of what constitutes a special education need differs, impacting on the number of students who need to be monitored from country to country. Furthermore, the formal identification of a child’s special education need usually requires a formal diagnose from a medical professional, further perpetrating the medical model of disability. Portugal and Finland are the only countries of those surveyed to have moved away from requiring a medical assessment to diagnose special education need. In Finland there is no official requirement for a medical assessment to diagnose SEN and support must be provided when the need arises – however, in many cases there will be a diagnosis.




Table 15: Development of monitoring systems on inclusive education

Move towards inclusive education

The following table (16) shows how the national experts assessed the situation of the practical implementation of inclusive educations in their countries. Overall, the reality of inclusive education in practice is varied across Europe. Looking forward, it is expected that education systems will continue to become more inclusive, but at a slower rate.




Table 16: Assessment of practice of inclusive education in your country

Assessment Part C: Progress towards Inclusive Education

In Part C of the questionnaire, each national expert was asked to assess the development and progression of inclusive education in their countries. Almost all experts viewed the progression of inclusive education to be slow (Table 17).




Table 17: Progression of Inclusive education



Encouragingly, despite this less positive view on the progression of inclusive education, most experts also expected that by 2025, less learners with SEN will be excluded from mainstream education systems (Table 18).




Table 18: Expected percentage of persons with SEN not included in 2025

Part D: Overall assessment of participating countries

The below table summarizes the overall assessment and barometer score for each participating country.

For children with disabilities phases of transitions contain high risks of exclusion because their support arrangement must be adapted or changed. To address these issues within this report the partners have built upon the p2i-project's 'Peter, Paul and Mary-Instrument' to ask national experts to comment on the expected learning careers of four different learner profiles:

- Peter, is a 5-year-old, with spastic tetraplegia. He is limited in his mobility and needs a wheelchair. He depends on supported communication. His IQ is below 70 and he profoundly depends on assistance.
- Paul, who is 5 years old and is a slow learner with language development disorder. Paul comes from a family with a socially disadvantaged background. He expresses dissocial behavior (verbal and physical aggressions, uncontrolled shouting, physical restlessness).
- Mary, who is 5 years old with Down-Syndrome. She has severe cognitive impairments and needs support in many activities in daily life.
- Rose, who is 5 years old with Autism-Spectrum-Disorder. She doesn't communicate verbally at all. She moves around in class frequently and shows self-harming behavior.

The table includes a summary of each profiles learning path, from primary school through to post-secondary education. Experts also commented on if they expected the learning path of a student with the same profile as Peter, Paul, Mary or Rose would be the same in 5 years. To find the full the breakdown of each learning path of each student for every country, please consult Annex 1.



	Situation of statutory legislation	Situation in practice in Inclusive education	It can be expected in 2025 the percentage of persons with disabilities that are not including (B20)	Would you expect an inclusive learning path for this learner throughout his education				Will their learning path look different in 5 years? Peter, Paul, Mary & Rose (1 point per YES)	Barometer Score 2020
				Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose		
Not inclusive (0 points)									
Partly inclusive (1 point)									
Inclusive (5 points)									
(1) Finland			Forecast 2025					No	23
Finland 2012*			Forecast 2015					No	
(1) Austria			Forecast 2025					No	23
Austria 2012*			Forecast 2015					No	
(3) Switzerland			Forecast 2025					Yes	22
								No	
								Yes	
(4) Albania			Forecast 2025					No	20
								Yes	
								Yes	
(5) Italy (Lombardy)			Forecast 2025					No	19
								No	
								No	
(5) Spain (Catalonia)			Forecast 2025					No	19
								No	
								Yes	
(7) Iceland			Forecast 2025					Yes	17
								Yes	
								Yes	
(8) Portugal			Forecast 2025					No	15
Portugal 2012*			Forecast 2015					No	
(9) France			n.a.					No	11
France 2012*			Forecast 2015					No	
(10) Belgium (Flemish)			Forecast 2025					No	10
Belgium 2012*			Forecast 2015					Yes	
(10) Slovenia			Forecast 2025					Yes	10
Slovenia 2012*			Forecast 2015					No	
(12) Hungary			Forecast 2025					No	7
Hungary 2012*			Forecast 2015					No	
(13) Germany			Forecast 2025					No	5



PART III: The Impact of COVID-19 on the transition towards inclusive education

The responses to the questionnaire were completed prior to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. During the outbreak of COVID-19, a key measure implemented by governments across Europe has been the closure of schools, forcing students to temporarily continue their education from home. This closure of schools has impacted the education for all students but has had particular consequences on the access of students with disabilities had to education and their access to education in mainstream schools. Furthermore, the quality of education, and the availability and quality of support to children with disabilities and families was also undermined. To better understand the state of inclusive education following the COVID-19 pandemic across Europe, each national expert has been asked to provide an update on the education of learners with disabilities and the impact on of COVID-19 on the transition towards inclusive education in their country.

Albania

Data attained from Government sources only reveals the number of children with disabilities in the education system but leaves out the quality of education being provided to them. In Albania there is a lack of comprehensive quality education which has led to a regression in children's knowledge, leading to an urgent need for other support services. The lack of appropriate didactic materials, teaching assistants, or other services in education are an obstacle to their academic development.

The closure of schools due to the pandemic brought new challenges and problems and deepened this problem, especially for children with disabilities. Attending online classes became impossible due to several factors such as lack of technology (smartphone, internet), lack of an assistant teacher, lack of time and expertise from parents. According to a publication on the difficulties of online learning, it is stated that an important point raised by parents is the inability in explaining to their children this new method of learning. Despite videos on YouTube, the explanations broadcast on RTSH, the national media, or the explanation of the teachers, it remains a challenge for parents. Although, there is the desire and constant efforts, the need for further explanation and assistance was crucial. In the case of children with sensory or concentration problems, online learning was impossible.

COVID-19 has found teachers, parents, and children unprepared as all parties were not trained or had the opportunity to use this type of virtual learning previously.

The situation and difficulties created as an impact of the pandemic has meant that many children either did not attend school at all or did so partly and were left behind in the lessons. Through a questionnaire for parents who are part of the Pro Pak center at Down Syndrome Albania, results suggest that: out of 12 children of school age, 6 of them could not attend online education because they did not have internet or smartphones, 5 had attended but felt it was not effective and 1 had followed with the help of an assistant teacher.



The impact of COVID-19 on the education of children with disabilities in Albania has been mostly negative. The pandemic has been accompanied by a lack of support for persons with disabilities and will have a long-term impact in the education of children with disabilities.

Belgium (Flanders)

While reviewing the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on students with disabilities and on the evolution towards inclusive education, we can provide the following:

Following the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic the Flemish government drew up guidelines for schools to guarantee the maximum education (and care) of pupils with special educational needs, both in terms of the provision in schools and the support. These guidelines are included in the security scripts developed during the crisis.¹¹

The COVID-19 pandemic and the measures that accompany it, especially the first period of lockdown, have caused a learning delay among students. This is quite problematic for vulnerable students, including students with SEN.

In Flanders a lockdown in response to the COVID-19 pandemic forces the closure of schools from 18th March 2020 before they gradually opened again for some students in May and June 2020. Primary schools have not been closed since the lockdown in March 2020. Students could continue to attend classes at school and support for students with SEN had to be provided in the classroom. In secondary education, part-time lessons at school and part-time distance learning were used. Support could be tailored to this. In principle, support must have always continued. Nevertheless, there are signs that support for pupils with SEN was sometimes compromised or was interpreted differently because support staff must limit the number of schools where they will provide support due to safety measures.

Consultation between all parties involved, including parents, which is important to properly monitor the learning process of students with SEN, is under pressure because physical consultation with external parties and parents is kept to a minimum. As a result of the measures, there is also a greater distance between professionals and parents, which is disadvantageous for the supervision of students with SOB.

Generally, in Flanders the COVID-19 crisis has had an impact on the progress of policy development regarding education for pupils with special educational needs. The government expects that the number of pupils for whom support is requested or for whom a switch to special education is being considered, will increase. Within the framework of the 'Relance plan', projects will be set up to strengthen education and to deal with the adverse consequences of the crisis.

¹¹ Vorming, h. (2020). Uitgangspunten en pandemische niveaus of fasen. Retrieved 11 March 2021, from <https://onderwijs.vlaanderen.be/nl/uitgangspunten-en-pandemische-niveaus-of-fasen#draaiboeken-pandemiescenario>



Finland

The University of Jyväskylä together with Finnish Institute of Educational Research and Neurospectrum Oy conducted a survey which aimed to investigate parents' experiences of distance learning during spring 2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The aim of the survey was to focus on those parents that have a child with intensified or special support needs. The online survey was conducted at the end of the spring semester during 4th -7th June 2020. During the height of the virus in spring 2020, schools in Finland started distance learning. However, schools stayed open and offered contact teaching for those students who have special educational needs. This decision was made to ensure the appropriate support was provided to students with special needs. It was then agreed upon between schools and parents if the parents still wanted their child to study at home. If this was the case, teaching and support was then offered remotely. The preliminary results suggest that there were variations between different schools in terms of the support and teaching offered from schools and teachers. For the families that have children with special support needs, spring 2020 was difficult in terms of their overall wellbeing. On the other hand, some parents stated that distance learning eased the difficulties that their child was experiencing at school (e.g. neuropsychiatric difficulties). There is a need to develop the systems to offer distance learning since these kind of flexible teaching methods can support for instance, students who are in a danger to drop out and/or disengage from school.

Germany

During the COVID-19 crisis, there has been temporary openings of regular and special schools. For many children and parents, this means relief on the one hand, but those children who cannot be exposed to the risk of returning to their schools due to their physical or mental impairment this period has been difficult. This has had consequences for the pupils concerned.

41% of parents surveyed say that their child coped poorly with the limitations. The lack of contact with peers and familiar caregivers, as well as daycare and school closures, are cited as particularly stressful. 66% of the parents say that their children suffer from the daycare and school closures.¹²

More than 46% of the affected families surveyed feel overwhelmed because not only schools and kindergartens are eliminated, but also any support measures such as therapy and care services have been suspended.¹³ The affected parents have had to replace all of this in addition to household tasks and a job which has left parents overloaded. For 55% of the respondents, conflicts within the family have increased.

"Parents feel left alone in this exceptional situation and suffer physically and psychologically from the lack of prospects. Mothers are particularly affected by the multiple burdens. But for fathers, too, home office

¹² News4Teachers. (2020). Inklusion liegt in der Coronakrise brach – Schulöffnungen ändern daran wenig. Retrieved 11 March 2021, from <https://www.news4teachers.de/2020/05/inklusion-liegt-in-der-coronakrise-brach-schuloeffnungen-aendern-daran-praktisch-nichts/>

¹³ Ibid.



and caring for their impaired children are often difficult to reconcile," says R. Schmolze-Krahn, board member of the Inclusion Technology Lab Berlin.

Fear of Covid 19 remains high. While some of the respondents see the opening of schools as a first step towards relieving their situation, 46% worry about the health of their impaired children. The participants' answers suggest that this concern depends on the type and severity of the disease. 41% of the respondents also state that they are worried about falling ill with Corona themselves and being the (only) caregiver and caretaker.

Without the necessary expertise, parents are faced with the challenge of providing special needs education for their impaired children and adequately teaching the content. 40% of parents would like more support here through digital learning opportunities," says Dorothea Kugelmeier, a researcher at the Fraunhofer Institute for Applied Information Technology FIT.¹⁴

In principle, most families with children with disabilities are open to digital technology. More than 60% of children and young people use interactive digital devices such as smartphones or tablets, and the use of the devices increased during the pandemic. Devices are mainly used to pass time (66%), but also for learning (47%).¹⁵ However, the results must be viewed in a different way. While some of the children and young people benefit from digital learning opportunities and home schooling, the experiences of other parents show that these very learning opportunities are not suitable for some impaired children to make developmental and learning progress.

Many of the respondents point out that care and support by third parties is associated with costs that they cannot bear themselves. They therefore demand corresponding financial support from the state or the responsible agencies. At the same time, there is a need for information about and support in applying for appropriate care and support services.³

Hungary

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a new educational situation in the spring of 2020 in Hungary. Traditional contact-based education was replaced by online education, though it came attached with problems. Some children did not have adequate IT tools for online education, but schools, support centres and NGOs provided equipment through loans and donations. Parents were teaching their children at home, who received assignments from teachers on a daily or weekly basis. Parents of children with special educational needs received mainly individual online counselling from special education providers, but in many cases they have completely lost contact with the families. The quality of inclusive education varied largely, pupils with social disadvantages and children with multiple disabilities being the most disadvantaged.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Ibid.



Since September 2020, children are again present in elementary schools, except for a few weeks off in case of local virus conditions. Since November, secondary schools have been teaching online, yet again. Numerous digital curricula have been designed during the coronavirus pandemic period, and significant number of software and learning platforms have become available.

Iceland

In February 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic reached Iceland and had severe consequences for society and daily life. In mid-March 2020 an assembly ban was imposed, which also affected all levels of the educational system. Daily school routines changed, teaching in school buildings was limited and some schools were closed. Almost overnight, education and teaching became mostly remote.¹⁶

Research conducted during and after the first outbreak indicates that students with high support needs did not always receive sufficient services and support to participate in learning and social interaction. Learning, communication and participation through an online medium did not prove accessible to all students. The findings also suggest that isolation increased among students who had experienced marginalization before the pandemic. It can be stated that the COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted social inequities and disproportionately affected certain groups of children, like children with SEN. So, in some way, the pandemic lead to a relapse concerning inclusion and decreasing participation of children with SEN. On the other hand, there were also positive examples of children participating more taking an increased part in mainstream activities with other children. Children who used to attend special training programs within mainstream school spent more time with their classmates. Classes were often split in smaller groups and more teachers/personell were needed. That meant that a lot of personel formerly in charge of special training, was assigned to smaller inclusive groups where their expertise often became of great use.²

Iceland was successful in fighting the first outbreak and in May and June 2020 and as a result, the school day was almost back to normal for children at compulsory school level (age 6-15). Schooling began and started normally after the summer vacation in August and September. However, another outbreak occurred in October and as the infection counts were rising, the school programme was limited again from mid-October until the 11th of January, when normal school life could be resumed;

It can be said that when school was restricted for the second time, people had learned a lot from the first experience. Services for children with SEN were much better and more consistent than the first lockdown. Research shows that the impact of the pandemic has resulted in increased cooperation within schools and professionals in education, resulting in innovation and development that can contribute to further progress.

1. For further information visit: <https://netla.hi.is/ser-rit/>

2. Rauterberg, R., & Sverrisdóttir, A. (2020). Reynsla og upplifun þroskaþjálfara í grunnskóla af áhrifum COVID-19 faraldursins á þjónustu við nemendur. Retrieved 11 March 2021, from <https://ojs.hi.is/netla/article/view/3324>



Italy:

In Italy, data from the Italian National Institute of Statistics' (ISTAT) 2020 Annual Report showed that distance learning has significantly lowered participation levels in education between April and June 2020, with over **23% of pupils with disabilities not taking part in classes**.

Some reasons that made it difficult for pupils with disabilities to participate in distance learning include:

- The severity of their support need or health condition disease (27%);
- The difficulty of family members to collaborate (20%);
- The socio-economic hardship (17%).
- For a smaller, but not negligible number of children, the reason for exclusion is due to the difficulty in adapting the Individual Education Plan (IEP) in distance learning (6%);
- The lack of technological tools (6%); and
- The lack of specific teaching aids (3%).

There are also some issues of a technical and organizational nature, these combined with the lack of adequate tools and support and inadequate interaction have made participation in Distance Learning (DAD) more difficult for children with disabilities. Especially in the presence of serious pathologies, or if belonging to those of lower socio-economic backgrounds. These complex problems have either hindered or completely interrupted the didactic path undertaken by many teachers. It has prevented the achievement of 'socialisation' which is of one of the objectives that an inclusive school sets itself even before learning.

Portugal

In Portugal key frailties in the education systems were identified due to the COVID-19 emergency status and the closing of schools. Some legislation in (Dec. Lei n. º 10-A/2020) March 2020 was published, identifying the most vulnerable students and measures to be activated by schools. These measures identified children in households with economic difficulties (measures included providing them with meals) and children with high support needs that were integrated in specialised support units (multiple disabilities and severe autism) if their presence in school would be considered "indispensable". Schools received some children with SEN but, since their parents realised they were the only child in the entire school and there were no activities provided for them, slowly they decided to have remote support from their homes. In most cases, no teachers were present in schools and only non-pedagogical auxiliary personnel were accompanying children with high support needs, and not necessarily those who already knew the child.

The planning by schools for providing the best support was extremely poor and there was some pressure being put by schools on parents to remain in their homes and not bringing their children to school.



Children who eventually stayed home got very less contact from schools and some students left altogether without the acknowledgement of schools, who detected this early pattern of children leaving much later. Resource Centers for Inclusion (RCI) were not effectively activated to continue to support students and their families at a distance. Some managed to provide this support by asking schools if they would allow this support. Even with this request, some schools denied the support offered.

In February 2021, a new emergency status was declared, and schools closed again. This time, a new decree (Dec. Lei n. ° 3-D/2021) was clearer and included special measures to students with high support needs (those who have additional support measures) to be supported in support learning center selected inside a cluster of schools. A very specific target was directed to RCI to continue to provide “therapeutic support” in schools to students, encompassing them with special schools and rehabilitation services. According to Law 54/2018, the role of the RCI is to provide support to teachers and to increase the inclusion level of a school. This new role of providing rehabilitation services to children that did not benefit from them before is unsuitable on an inclusive education view. Schools are using these services provided by RCI as a complement to schedules given to teachers and other personnel to “take care” of this very small group of children.

COVID-19 brought into reality the reluctance and unwillingness of schools to provide the best care possible to students with high support needs and the inability to use their partners for inclusive education (like the RCI). Mainstream public schools developed a set of rotational support, independently of the needs of the student, where the teacher could be replaced by other non-pedagogical personnel and a therapist or a psychologist could replace them.

This administrative solution to demonstrate that all students have the presence of an adult in the room, independently of the objective of this presence, is extremely harmful for the construction of an inclusive school. Something that a Special School could never offer to their children or to parents without an expressive demonstration of discontentment. COVID-19 demonstrated that an inclusive culture is not yet a reality in Portuguese schools and the partnership between the school and the RCI is not yet fully understood by schools nor the Ministry of Education.

Switzerland

In Switzerland there was only a short shutdown of schools in spring 2020. This was a result of a strong effort to keep schools running. As a result, the impact of COVID-19 on inclusive education has been limited.



PART IV Conclusion: Summary

The assessment on the situation and perspectives of inclusive education for persons with special educational needs (SEN) conducted in 13 European countries can be summarised as follows:

Increasing awareness

There are clear indicators that in all participating countries there has been an increase of awareness both of the educational potential and the citizen's rights dimension of inclusive education for children with SEN. This is reflected in positive statements towards inclusive education formulated by governments, parents' organisations, teacher unions and other relevant public actors. It is also reflected in legal developments for support of inclusive education concerning education and school laws.

Significance of categorisation and diagnostic procedures

The implementation quality of measures to support the inclusion of children with disabilities since 2010 is mixed. Efforts to accommodate staff to support learning activities have made progress, as has the accommodation of functional assistance and care services. However, the use of adaptive technology in schools has been inconsistent, with slow progress in its implementation since 2010. In terms of building adaptations, only 7 out of 13 countries report progress, while 6 out of 13 report little or no progress (see Table 11). The least progress has been made in terms of classroom size (Table 12). The least progress was made in adapting the size of classrooms. 5 countries have made progress, 8 have made little or no progress.

Increasing inclusiveness and increasing segregation ('progress by addition')

Three of the participating countries rate the implementation of inclusive education at all age levels as positive, this is Finland, Switzerland and Italy. At pre-school level, all children with SEN in Finland, Portugal and Spain attend inclusive institutions, while in France (5%), Hungary (18%) and Iceland (5%) the proportion of children with SEN in segregated pre-school institutions can be described as quite positive compared to the other countries. At the primary school level, almost all children with SEN in Iceland and Portugal attend inclusive educational institutions, closely followed by Finland. A particularly high proportion of children with SEN attending separate schools is found in Belgium and Germany. At secondary level, Portugal is one of the countries with inclusive education for almost all children with SEN, while most other countries still need to take action. A general increase in inclusive education has not necessarily led to a general decrease of children with SEN in special schools or other segregating institutions. On the contrary, especially in countries with a traditional special education system, the number of children and young people in special schools has also increased. Thus, a pattern of reform can be discerned that follows the principle of "progress through addition" rather than "progress through (structural) change". More children are included in the SEN systems, with the result that those with greater support needs are still largely excluded from inclusive education.



Lack of resources preventing inclusive education

The assessment results show that in most countries there are still very basic barriers to inclusive education that need to be overcome. In some countries, the majority of mainstream school buildings do not meet accessibility standards. In addition, auxiliary transport is often only provided to special schools. There are also often problems with adapting equipment. Deficits are also noted with regard to the availability of functional assistance and care services, even though there are also many positive developments in some participating countries.

Assessment procedures in development

In many partner countries, the process for inclusive education has also led to a critique of conceptual changes in assessment procedures. Whereas traditionally assessment procedures served to stigmatise persons with SEN and place them in special institutions, new concepts are oriented towards the needs of each individual person in their socio-ecological context and strive to create educational arrangements in inclusive settings that identify needs, supports and conditions for an individual plan.

Conceptual aspects and teaching models

The evaluation results show that there have been developments of inclusive education teaching models in all countries. These included the inclusion of special education staff to support inclusive teaching in mainstream schools to prevent segregation among children at risk of segregation. Decisions by school authorities to reduce class sizes in inclusive settings were handled very restrictively in some participating countries. (What does this mean exactly?) Due to demographic changes in some countries, especially with decreasing populations in rural areas, classrooms in pre-primary and primary schools have become smaller, creating more favourable conditions for inclusive education.

Availability of adaptive and communicative technology in inclusive education.

Assessment results of the questionnaire show that in all countries adaptive technology is not completely restricted to special schools and is also available in inclusive settings. This is also reported for alternative and augmentative communication technology. Nevertheless, even though new models of mutual support between special competence centres and mainstream schools have been developed, very often knowledge, competence and creativity to apply, adapt and use technological means is still difficult to find in inclusive education.

Teacher training without (sufficient) inclusive orientation



In many partner countries, the training of teachers is not oriented to the requirements of inclusive education. This trend largely reflects the statutory legislation of these countries to accommodate the requirements of inclusive education in teacher training. This trend does appear to be changing however and the development of teacher training toward inclusive education since 2010 was viewed positively by national experts.

Monitoring of progress in inclusive education

Whereas in some partner countries, there are several statutory or official institutions that systematically monitor the progress of inclusive education and regularly publish data, in other countries there is no systematic monitoring of the number of pupils with special education needs in mainstream schools or other educational settings. The paucity and variability of data collection seriously impairs effective monitoring as required under Art. 24 of the UN CRPD.

Progression towards inclusive education

At the beginning of the project, all partners believed that the trend towards more inclusion would continue and perhaps even accelerate. However, as the project continued, concerns grew as to whether this positive development could be sustained under the pressure of economic crises and the Covid19 pandemic.



References

European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2020. European Agency Statistics on Inclusive Education: 2018 Dataset Cross-Country Report. (J. Ramberg, A. Lénárt, and A. Watkins, eds.). Odense, Denmark

European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, (2018) European Agency Statistics on Inclusive Education: 2016 Dataset Cross-Country Report.

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

United Nations (1994). The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education. Available at: http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/SALAMA_E.PDF

United Nations (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Available at: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>



Annex I: National Responses to Peter, Paul, Rose and Mary

For children with disabilities phases of transitions contain high risks of exclusion because their support arrangement must be adapted or changed. To address these issues the p2i-project has developed the so-called ‘Peter, Paul and Mary-Instrument’ for understanding the entire span of the learning careers. The Instrument asked the National experts to outline what they would expect the typical learning career of each of the following children would be in their children:

- Peter is a 5-year-old child who is tetrapastic with limited mobility and requires a wheelchair. His IQ is below 70 and he requires assistance and supported communication.
- Paul is a 5-year-old child who is a slow learner and has a language development disorder. He comes from a socially disadvantaged family and has dis social behaviour (expresses dissocial behaviour (verbal and physical aggressions, uncontrolled shouting, physical restlessness).
- Mary is a 5-year-old child with down syndrome and severe cognitive impairment. She requires support in many activities in her daily life.
- Rose is a 5-year-old child who has autism spectrum disorder and doesn’t communicate verbally at all. She is constantly moving around in class and has self-harming tendencies.

The following section details the responses of each country to the situation of every child individually.



1. Finland

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				



2. Austria

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				



3. Switzerland

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

4. Albania

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

5. Italy

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

6. Spain

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

7. Iceland

Situation	Peter*	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

8. Portugal

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

9. France

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				



10. Belgium (Flanders)

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

11. Slovenia

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

12. Germany

Situation	Peter	Paul	Mary	Rose
No school visit				
Transition to school				
Mainstream primary school				
Special education school at primary level				
Transition to secondary school				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)				
Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)				
Post-secondary/tertiary education				
Vocational training				
Learning in non school settings (please specify)				

Annex II: Barometer Questionnaire



2. Expert

* Which country do you come from ?

If you can answer for a special part of your country only, please tell us the region!

Please provide some information to your role as expert in the field of inclusion!

- Teacher
- Headteacher
- School administrator
- Researcher
- Other (please specify)

How many years of experience do you have in the field of disability?

0 Years 60

3. Part A

Part A - Statutory Legislation and Prescriptions

A1 Consistency for the right to inclusive education

There is consistency across different laws on national and regional/federal state level for the right to inclusive education (e.g. education law, antidiscrimination law, disability laws, children's rights law, etc.).

Yes

No

References & Comments

A2 Free primary inclusive education

By statutory legislation, primary inclusive education is free.

Yes

No

References & Comments

A3 Participation in decision making on inclusive education

By statutory legislation, children with disabilities resp. their parents effectively participate in the decision-making on inclusive education.

Yes

No

References & Comments

A4 Equal access to secondary inclusive education

By statutory legislation, persons with disabilities have access to secondary inclusive education like others in their community.

Yes

No

References & Comments

A5 Equal access to tertiary education

By statutory legislation, it is assured that persons with disabilities have access vocational to lifelong learning without discrimination and on an equal basis with others.

Yes

No

References & Comments

A6 Categorization and assessment

The procedures of assessment special educational needs support inclusive education.

Yes

No

References & Comments

A7 Equal access to schools in community

By statutory legislation, it is assured that persons with disabilities have access to the schools in their community on an equal basis with others.

Yes

No

References & Comments

A8 Accommodation of the individual's requirements

By statutory legislation, it is assured that the following conditions are accommodated to individual's requirements.

Yes	No
Accommodation of the architectural conditions	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accommodation of the staff to support the learning process	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accommodation of the classroom size	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accommodation of adaptive technology	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accommodation of functional assistance and care provision	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accommodation of educational measures (i.e. individual curricula, didactical adaptations, teaching methods, testing)	
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

A9 Training of teachers and staff

By statutory legislation, it is assured that the training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of inclusive education (inclusive teaching methods, incorporation of disability awareness, the use of appropriate augmentative and alternative modes, means and formats of communication, educational techniques and materials to support persons with disabilities).

Yes

No

References & Comments

4. Part B

Part B - Development and actual Situation in Practice

B1a Priority of inclusive education in pre-schools (age 3 - 5/6)

What percentage of children with disabilities or SEN are NOT in regular pre-schools or child care services today?

0 Percentage 100

Where are they?

B1b Development of inclusive education in pre-schools

Percentage of children with disabilities or SEN NOT in regular (mainstream) pre-schools or child-care services on preschool level

2010

2015

B1c This development can be assessed as


bad rather bad positive very positive

References & Comments

B2a Priority of inclusive education on primary-school level

What percentage of children with disabilities or SEN are NOT in regular (mainstream) primary schools today?

0 Percentage 100



Where are they?

B2b Development of inclusive education in mainstream primary schools


Percentage of children with disabilities or SEN NOT in regular primary schools

2010

2015

B2c This development can be assessed as

bad rather bad positive very positive




References & Comments

B3a Priority of inclusive education in secondary-schools

What percentage of children with disabilities or SEN are NOT in regular (mainstream) secondary schools?

0 Prozent 100



Where are they?

B3b Development of inclusive education in mainstream secondary-schools

Percentage of children NOT in regular secondary schools

2010

2015

B3c This development can be assessed as

bad rather bad positive very positive

References & Comments

B4a Priority of inclusive education in post-secondary/tertiary-schools

How would you describe the possibilities for students with different impairments in post-secondary or tertiary programmes at universities or colleges today?

bad rather bad positive very positive

Students with physical impairments

Comments:

Students with sensory impairments

Comments:

Students with intellectual impairments

Comments:

B4b How would you describe the development at tertiary level in the last 10 years?

bad rather bad positive very positive

References & Comments

B5 In practice, inclusive education of children with SEN in primary schools is for their parents related with different costs

How high are these costs?

	very high	high	low	very low
direct costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
indirect costs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

References & Comments

B6a Participation of parents in decision making on inclusive education

In decision making processes today, if parents articulate a preference for inclusive education, it is followed.

never	sometimes	often	always	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B6b Development of participation in decision making on inclusive education

In decision making processes, if persons with disabilities/their advocates (parents) articulate a preference for inclusive education it is followed. The development since 2010 can be assessed as

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B7a Assessment procedures support inclusive education

The practiced procedures of assessment of special educational needs support inclusive education.

no	rather not	rather yes	yes	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B7b Development of inclusive orientation of assessment procedures

Since 2010 there has been a development of assessment procedures of special educational needs to support inclusive education

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B8a Equal access to schools incommunity

Today persons with disabilities or SEN have access to the schools in their community on an equal basis with others.

none	some	most	all	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B8b Development of equal access to community schools

How do you assess the development of the possibilities persons with disabilities or SEN to have access to the schools in their community on an equal basis with others since 2010?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B9a Accommodation of the individual's access requirements

In practice, the following conditions in schools are accommodated to individual requirements of persons with SEN

	no	rather no	rather yes	yes
Architectual conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff to support learning activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classroom size	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adaptive technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<input type="radio"/> Functional assistance and care provision	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Educational measures (i.e. individual curricula, didactical adaption, teaching methods, testing)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B9b Development of accommodation of the individuals requirements

How do you assess the development of the following conditions in regular schools to realize accessibility for persons with SEN since 2010?

	no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
Architectural conditions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Staff to support the learning process	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classroom size	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adaptive technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<input type="radio"/> Functionakl assistance and care provision	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Educational measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

References & Comments

B10a Training of teachers and staff

Training of teachers is oriented to the requirements of inclusive education (inclusive teaching methods, incorporation of disability awareness, the use of appropriate augmentative and alternative modes, means and formats of communication, educational techniques and materials to support persons with disabilities).

no	rather no	rather yes	yes	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B10b Development of teacher training

Has teacher training become more oriented to inclusive education since 2010?

no	rather not	rather yes	yes	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B11 Employment of qualified teachers

In practice qualified teachers and staff are employed to provide effective inclusive education.

no	rather no	rather yes	yes	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B12 Development of accommodation of staff to the individual's learning requirements

How do you assess the development of availability of appropriate staff in respect to individual's requirements for learning of persons with SEN in inclusive settings since 2010?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B12 General comments on practice of inclusive education in your country today

B13 Make a 'barometer assessment' to 'Practice of inclusive education in your country' based on the information above!

In practice inclusive education in my country can be assessed today as ...

Not realised at all	Only little realised	Partely realised	Realised
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

B14 Development of legal consistency and framework for inclusive education

Since 2010 developments of consistency in relevant sectors have taken place to favour inclusive education

no initiatives	very few initiatives	some changes	important changes	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B15 Development of equal access to vocational training

How do you assess the development of equal access of persons with SEN to vocational training since 2010?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B16 Development of equal access to life-long learning

How do you assess the development of equal access of persons with SEN to life-long learning services since 2010?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B17 Development of monitoring systems on inclusive education

How do you assess the development of the monitoring systems on inclusive education?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B18 Development of activities of professional associations to promote inclusive education

How do you assess the development of commitment and activities of professional associations (like associations of special teachers, special schools, teacher unions) to promote inclusive education?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B19 Development of measures for awareness raising of governments to promote inclusive education

How do you assess the development of measures for awareness raising of governments to promote inclusive education?

no development	very little	rather positive	very positive	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B20 Perspectives on progression

It can be expected that by 2025 the percentage of persons with SEN that are not included in regular schools


higher than 2020	the same	lower	much lower than 2020	N/A
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

References & Comments

B21 General comments on progression of inclusive education in your country

B22 Make a 'barometer assessment' to 'Progression of inclusive education in your country' based on the information above!

Progression of inclusive education can be assessed as ...



5. Part C - Peter

Peter



Peter, 5 years, tetraspastic. He is limited in his mobility and needs a wheel chair. He depends on supported communication. His IQ is below 70 and he profoundly depends on assistance.

What would the expected typical learning career of Peter in your country look like (check all your expectations - age may vary in different countries)?

(please tick all your expectations)

- No school visit
- Transition to school
- Mainstream primary school
- Special education school at primary level
- Transition to secondary school
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Post-secondary/tertiary education
- Vocational training
- Learning in non school settings (please specify)

Would his learning career in five years be different from today?

Yes

No

How would it look like?

6. Part C - Paul

Paul



Paul, 5 years old, slow learner with language development disorder. Paul comes from a family with a socially disadvantaged background. He expresses dissocial behavior (verbal and physical aggressions, uncontrolled shouting, physical restlessness).

What would the expected typical learning career of Paul in your country look like (check all your expectations - age may vary in different countries)?

(please tick all your expectations)

- No school visit
- Transition to school
- Mainstream primary school
- Special education school at primary level
- Transition to secondary school
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Post-secondary/tertiary education
- Vocational training
- Learning in non school settings (please specify)

Would his learning career in five years be different from today?

Yes

No

How would it look like?

7. Part C - Mary

Mary



Mary, 5 years old, Down-Syndrom. She has severe cognitive impairments and needs support in many activities in daily life.

What would the expected typical learning career of Mary in your country look like (check all your expectations - age may vary in different countries)?

(please tick all your expectations)

- No school visit
- Transition to school
- Mainstream primary school
- Special education school at primary level
- Transition to secondary school
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Post-secondary/tertiary education
- Vocational training
- Learning in non school settings (please specify)

Would her learning career in five years be different from today?

Yes

No

How would it look like?

8. Part C - Rose

Rose



Rose, 5 years old, Autism-Spectrum-Disorder. She doesn't communicate verbally at all. She is moving around in class all the time, shows self-harming behavior.

What would the expected typical learning career of Rose in your country look like (check all your expectations - age may vary in different countries)?

(please tick all your expectations)

- No school visit
- Transition to school
- Mainstream primary school
- Special education school at primary level
- Transition to secondary school
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Special education school at secondary I level (age untill ~15)
- Mainstream secondary school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Special education school at secondary II level (age above ~15)
- Post-secondary/tertiary education
- Vocational training
- Learning in non school settings (please specify)

Would her learning career in five years be different from today?

Yes

No

How would it look like?

EASPD is the European Association of Service providers for Persons with Disabilities. We are a European not-for-profit organisation representing over 17,000 social services and disability organisations across Europe. The main objective of EASPD is to promote equal opportunities for people with disabilities through effective and high-quality service systems.



This publication has been produced with the financial support of the European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation "EaSI" (2014-2020). The information contained in this publication does not necessarily reflect the official position of the European Commission.

Copyright © EASPD 2020 All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system without the prior permission of the copyright owners