FINDING A WAY THROUGH THE MAZE

EDUCATIONAL PROVISION FOR CANADIANS WITH DISABILITIES:

A SCAN OF USE OF CRUCIAL TERMS AS USED IN THE CANADIAN LITERATURE

Background Paper # 2 for Regional Meetings

Gary Bunch & Kevin Finnegan
York University

1

The General Picture

The overall education system developed in Canada for learners with disabilities is referred to as special education. In 1995 British Columbia defined this group as "Students with special needs have disabilities of an intellectual, physical, sensory, emotional or behavioural nature or have a learning disability or have exceptional gifts and talents" (BC Special Education Branch cited by Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 5). Education of Canadians with disabilities, since Confederation in 1867, has been the responsibility of each provincial or territorial government. There has been no direct federal presence at the elementary and secondary levels, though there is joint presence at other levels of education. Beyond varying responsibility for the development of education across Canada, the federal government does have other responsibilities. Through the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms embedded in the Constitution Act of 1982, the federal government assumed a greater role than previously. Equality rights applying to education may be found in section 15(1) of the Charter.

> *Every individual is equal before and under the law and has a right to the equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, sex, age, or mental or physical disability.*

By and large, equality rights for Canadians with disabilities have translated into a right to education in each provincial/territorial jurisdiction. The structure under which this right is guaranteed is that of special education. However, the structure of special education is somewhat more complex than realized by most.All Canadian provinces and territories, in the past, created dedicated education systems (special schools, special classes, full-time or part-time integration) in parallel to the regular education system for typical students. Most Canadians refer to this alternate system as special education.

Complexity enters into the situation due to change in the system. Initially, there were special schools. Then change came and special classes were developed. Change continued and integration became part of the special education system. The common element of this developmental pattern was reliance on segregated environments when considered appropriate by educators. The most recent change has been the advent of the concept, philosophy, and practice of inclusive education. Inclusive education was conceived of as a break with the common reliance on the alternate placements of special education. Advocates of inclusion look to the regular education system, regular education teachers, and the education curriculum for appropriate education for Canadians with disabilities. Under inclusive philosophy and practice, no student should be placed in any of the alternate settings of the special education model. The regular classroom, except under the most necessary instances, is the educational home of all learners *"regardless of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age, or mental or physical disability"*.

Naturally, this change, this new way of looking at education for learners with disabilities occasioned controversy and confusion for many educational decision-makers, teachers, parents, and others. As time has passed since the introduction of the term "inclusive education" in 1988, it has become apparent that, in Canada, part of the confusion results from the manner in which terminology describing special and inclusive education is being used. Even the fact that both approaches to education are referred to generically as "special education" adds to the confusion. The recent report Not Enough : Canadian Research into Inclusive Education (Bunch & Persaud, 2003), outlining the findings of a national consultation into strengthening research into inclusive education indicated

wide-spread support for regular class placement of students with disabilities in community schools with age-appropriate peers. Of the 165 Canadian organizations contributing to the consultation only one dissented from the view that persons with disabilities should be educated in regular classrooms in the company of typical peers. There was greater difference in whether these organizations believed that all students could or could not be educated together in the regular classrooms of community schools.

Groups favouring inclusion tended to use terms such as "include; inclusion; all students; every student; children's rights", etc. Those favouring placement of some learners with disabilities in more specialized settings tended to use terms such as "alternative setting; in keeping with the philosophy of inclusive education; to the greatest possible extent; the needs of some children can be better met in centralized education programs; degree of integration should change as the children's needs change; inclusion as a goal" and "continuum of services".

Bunch, Persaud, and representatives of various of the organizations participating in the national consultation are not the only ones aware of a definitional problem existing around education of Canadians with disabilities. Winzer (1999) notes, that even among those favouring the inclusive approach, confusion exists. "Proponents of the various kinds of inclusion do not agree on definitions .... Inclusion means different things to different people who want different things from it" (p. 39). More recently Bunch and Valeo (2000, p. 179) stated:

> *Problematics abound when one attempts to examine inclusion of students with disabilities. For instance, the very terms we use to refer to placement of these students within education are confusing. Three terms in particular are key to the present discussion. These are: a) inclusive or inclusion, b) integration, and c) mainstream. Though these terms have different meanings, they often are used interchangeably in the literature, by educators, and by others.*

That similar concern is felt in French Canada, as well as in English Canada, may be found in a recent chapter by Dore, Wagner, Dore, and Brunet. Dore et al. find that "the concept of mainstreaming seems too vague" (p. 187) and note that " A new perspective accompanied by a different terminology has thus appeared. The term inclusion ... dramatically challenges not only the policies and organization of special education, but also the concept of mainstreaming" (p. 187).

It was recognition of such differences in use of crucial terms which signalled definitional confusion among decision-makers and resultant need for clarity which led to this study of crucial terms employed in description of the special education and inclusive education models.

This project, *Finding a Way Through the Maze*, focuses on clarification of terminology associated with special education and terminology associated with inclusive education. Clarity of "crucial terms" will contribute to lessening of confusion. The following sections report on how crucial terms are used in Canadian literature on education of learners with disabilities. A companion report and analysis of how Canadian persons with disabilities, educators, governments, parents, and national and community organizations understand the same crucial terms complements this scan of Canadian literature.

In the following discussion, a brief description is given of traditional special education. This is followed by a description of inclusive education. These two "scene-setting" sections are followed by discussion of each crucial term as it is dealt with in Canadian literature on education for persons with disabilities.

Special Education

Winzer (1997) defines special education as *"The process of designing, programming, and instruction for an individual who is exceptional* (p. 24). In Winzer's view, special education has moved beyond its close identification *"with the school system and with school-aged children and their teachers.... It now includes infants and preschoolers, as well as adolescents and young adults"* (p. 24).

Special education in Canada can be traced to the mid-1800s when special schools were established for groups such as those who were blind or deaf. By the beginning of the twentieth century, segregated classes were established for students with a range of disabling conditions. After the Second World War special education services (special schools, special classes) increased dramatically and remained the core of the special education model to the 1960s. Beginning at that time, integration became a component of the model. Over the past 40 years the number of special schools in Canada has decreased. Special classes and full-time or part-time integration have increased and now form the core of the special education system.

In 1999 Weber and Bennett described various settings through which special education services were delivered in Ontario. Though they did not discuss special schools, a number of these remain as alternate settings under the special education model for various groups of learners. Weber and Bennett did note the following alternate placements.

> ➤ Regular class with direct service to students or teachers
> ➤ Regular class with indirect service to students or teachers
> ➤ Regular class with withdrawal assistance
> ➤ Part-time Regular and Self-Contained class
> ➤ Full-time Self-Contained Class

Andrews and Lupart (2000) noted that school systems typically followed a five-step process for placement of students with disabilities in a special education setting. They describe a process beginning with identification of students with special needs, and ending with placement in special classes, or with part-time placement in or outside of the regular class system. Their five-step process looked like this.

Referral →Testing →Labelling → Placement → Programming

Weber and Bennett (1999) provide a schematic of what they term the Range of Settings (Cascade) Model.

Winzer (1999), too, offers a cascade model of services, one which is more complete than that of Weber and Bennett. It is interesting to note that Winzer's model equates integration and inclusion, thereby suggesting that inclusion is simply a part of the special education model. This is a contentious suggestion for many advocates of inclusion who would argue that the term "inclusion" is being mis-used.

The special education model remains the dominant model in Canada. Most provincial ministries of education continue to hold to it, though recent emphasis on integration options has characterized practice. A number of provinces have described their position as embracing a philosophy of inclusion while continuing to place some students with disabilities in the full range of placements of the special education model. A variety of definitions for special education are

4

available, in addition to those noted in the above discussion. A web resource defines the full system of special education as "*A mandated program organized through [provincial] and local educational agencies that ensures and provides appropriate educational opportunities for students qualifying under categories of disabilities*" (Master Teacher, 2004). Though Master Teacher is a U. S. resource, the definition fits the Canadian scene.

A second web site defines special education as:

Direct instructional activities or special learning experiences designed primarily for students identified as having exceptionalities in one or more aspects of the cognitive process or as being underachievers in relation to general level or model of their overall abilities. Such services usually are directed at students with the following conditions: physically handicapped; emotionally handicapped; culturally different, including compensatory education; mentally retarded; and students with learning disabilities. Programs for the mentally gifted and talented are also included in some special education programs.

The same site offers a much simpler definition:

Instruction specifically designed to meet the unique needs of a student with a disability, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction in hospitals and institutions.

Inclusive Education

Bunch and Persaud (2003) state "Inclusive education is generally taken to refer to placement of persons with disabilities in regular educational environments to best meet their academic and social needs" (p. 4). They tie this definition to the philosophy of inclusion for all Canadians articulated by the Government of Canada in publication such as *Equal Citizenship for Canadians: The Will to Act* (Federal Task Force on Disability Issues, 1996).

Bunch and Persaud believe that the principle of inclusiveness implied in Canadian citizenship gives the Government of Canada a base for its approach to today's requirements [for persons with disabilities]. The federal government can - and should - promote the equality commitments contained in the national instruments that underpin full citizenship. It also supports programs and policies that help all Canadians participate effectively in the economic and social mainstream. Canadians have a right to expect inclusiveness, equality and the opportunity to achieve equal outcomes, no matter where they live.

However, the above is a general statement of how an inclusive education might be seen to flow from the present position of the Canadian government on disability and equality rights in general. Other Canadian writers have attempted to elaborate and make clear what inclusive education for Canadians with disabilities means and what they see as its promise. The discussion is rife with challenge to educators as they attempt to understand the implications of inclusive education, and as they attempt to be as inclusive as possible without moving too far from the security of the familiar special education cascade of services.

Winzer (1997) offers a definition of inclusion citing Bratlinger, and also, citing various authorities, notes that the advent of inclusion as an alternative approach for education of persons with disabilities has been met with the resistance commonly accompanying change.

> *In the broadest sense, inclusion applies to cultural, social, linguistic, racial, gender, and physical and mental differences. Within special education, inclusion is today's hot issue.' The inclusion of students classified as disabled in mainstream schools and classrooms has been the dominant discourse among special educators during this decade.* (Brantlinger).

Obiakor, Algozzine, & Ford (1993) note that inclusion is associated with a growing concern about the quality and delivery of special education in contemporary schools. The effects of the excellence in education movement stimulated professionals to question seriously the appropriateness of classifying and placing some students in special education classrooms for the majority of their educational experiences

> *Inclusion defies easy interpretation. At an essential level, it describes a merger between general education and special education. On another level, it is concerned where children sit - where they are placed. On a more philosophical level, the issue is how children can be treated equitably within the school system.* (p. 92).

In a second publication Winzer (1999) goes on to compare inclusion, mainstreaming, the least restrictive environment, and integration.

> *Inclusion or inclusive schooling implies subtle but real differences from mainstreaming, the least restrictive environment, and integration. Advocates of inclusive schooling argue that the social-cultural realities of mainstreaming and integration are that one group is viewed as the 'mainstream' and the other is not; hence, one group must 'push in' to the activities and settings occupied by the other (Salisbury, 1996). Under the principles of inclusion, children do not push into the mainstream because the underlying supposition in inclusive*

programming is that all children would be based in the classrooms they would attend if they did not have a disability. (p. 39)

Following this rather academic and complex examination of inclusive education and what it means, it may be of value to note succinct definitions offered by a number of Canadian writers.

> *Inclusion: Term used to describe a professional belief that students with disabilities should be integrated into general education classrooms whether or not they can meet traditional curricular standards and should be full members of those classrooms. (Friend, Bursuck, and Hutchinson,* 1998, p. 454)

This review of definitions is not the place to extend into discussion of implications of the definitions noted. That is more properly sited in the responses of questionnaire participants in this study and reported in the companion report on those responses. However, it should be noted that Hutchinson of Queen's University was the Canadian contributor to revision of an American text by Friend and Bursuck through addition of material on the Canadian situation. That Hutchinson seems to accept a United States definition of inclusion may suggest that the same definition fits both nations. Of interest, beyond a possible internationally acceptable definition, is that the term "integration" is employed as part of the definition of "inclusion". Such intermingling of terms, in itself, has implication. Are the terms integration and inclusion synonymous? Do they have different import? Integration is a term used to describe certain placements in the special education model. If inclusion is a model of education for persons with disabilities distinctly different than the special education model, and rooted in a separate philosophy as Winzer suggests, can the term integration be employed when discussing inclusion?

There seems to be no doubt regarding whether some Canadian authorities regard the terms inclusion and integration as synonymous. Weber and Bennett (1999) in their 4th edition of the popular text *Special Education in Ontario Schools*, equate integration and inclusion. Though they point to the absence of the term inclusion from Ontario educational legislation as their rationale for such equating of terminology in their text, doing so certainly may be contributing to the confusion around terminology, as least as far as Ontario goes. That such a dynamic may be real is suggested by Weber and Bennett's recognition that, though integration is the preferred term in Ontario Ministry of Education policy, the term integration "has other contexts for some people [and] many educators and parents prefer the term 'inclusion'" (p. 17).

Webber and Bennett then go on to coin the term "full integration" as a synonym for inclusion. Whatever the local validity for their rationale for such a strategy, the apparent subsuming of inclusive education simply as a variant of integration as defined under the Ontario Ministry's official publications is questionable, particularly in the national context. In this context, such strategies add to confusion, rather than to clarity.

Other authorities are more definite that inclusion is not attached in any way to the special education model, that it is a term indicating a different approach to education for students with disabilities. Andrews and Lupart, professors at the University of Calgary, are among the most prolific writers on inclusive education in the nation. They state:

> *Inclusive education means that all children have the right to be educated in their community schools and that classroom teachers have the ultimate authority and responsibility for educating them* (Andrews and Lupart, 2000, p. 14)

Bunch, now associated with the Marsha Forest Centre of Toronto, researches and writes on inclusive education. He views inclusion in regular classes of community schools as the right of a

student and her/his family. *"Choice of placement in a regular classroom, if such is desired, is advanced as an issue of human rights and natural social justice"* (Bunch, 1994). He defines inclusive education in a text co-written with Valeo (1997).

> *[Inclusion means that] all children, regardless of degree of disability ... attend their community schools in classes with their neighbourhood peers.... guidelines for inclusive practice [are] parental involvement, positive learning outcomes, opportunities for friendships, positive learning for regular students, collaboration, and curricular modifications.* (p.. 3)

Academics are not the only people with deep interest in education and disability. An important group is that of parents and their advocates. One such group is the New Brunswick Association for Community Living. NBACL published *Achieving Inclusion: A Parent Guide to Inclusive Education in New Brunswick* (2000). It is the belief of NBACL that high quality education can best be achieved in an inclusive setting where children with disabilities spend their days in neighbourhood schools in regular classes with students their own age. NBACL defines the key features of inclusive education as:

> ➢ *The unconditional acceptance of all children into the regular classes and the life of the school.*
> ➢ *Children receive as much support as necessary to be successfully included in neighbourhood schools in regular classes.*
> ➢ *A commitment to talking parents seriously, and especially the parents' dreams and goals β their child's future.*
> ➢ *A commitment to looking at all children for what they can do, rather than what they cannot do.*
> ➢ *Accepting and understanding that children do not need to have the same educational goals to be able to learn together in regular classrooms.*
> ➢ *Strong leadership from school principals to be able to learn together in regular classrooms.*
> ➢ *Schools are restructured in ways that focus on individual achievement and student learning.*
> ➢ *Teachers and other educators look at their roles in different ways.*
> ➢ *A commitment to providing children with and without disabilities opportunities to develop friendships.*

Lastly, we go to a text in the U. K. for a final piece of information on the Canadian meaing of inclusive education. Thomas and Vaughn (2004) in a new work on inclusive education note:

> *The question has often been asked "When did the word <u>inclusion</u> first start being used in favour of integration or the earlier mainstreaming"? In July 1988 a group of 14 people from North America who were concerned about the slow progress of integration in education brainstormed around a table at Frontier College, Toronto, Canada, and came p*
with the concept of <u>inclusion</u> to fomally describe better the process of placing children with disabilities in the mainstream. This group included educators, writers, parents, and disabled adults who had first-hand experience of segregated education.   (89)

The Present Project

Education for Canadians with disabilities, and for all those in the regular school systems of the nation, is in flux. The dominant approach for those with disabilities is the special education model with its range of alternate settings. The newer approach, inclusive education, is gaining strength across Canada. New Brunswick, Yukon, NorthWest Territories, and Nunavut, plus a number of school systems in various provinces, have developed policies of inclusion which move away from the special education model.

There will be a continuing discussion on whether special education and inclusive education are variants of the same approach to education of persons with disabilities, or whether they are distinctly different approaches. This discussion is not a focus for the present project.

The focus of the project is clarification of terminology which presently is being used in confusing manner in Canada. It may be that certain terms are associated more with either special education or with inclusive education. It is possible that some are associated with both.

It would be of value, while the larger discussion of which approach of the two will last more vigorously into the future in Canada continues, if that discussion were not impeded by confusion of terminology.

We hope the lexicon of recommended terms to be published at the conclusion of this project helps to reduce confusion in use of terminology in Canada. It is not in the interest of any group or any individual concerned with education for learners with disabilities for confusion to continue.

Discussion of Individual Crucial Terms

The terms Special Education and Inclusive Education, as perhaps central to this entire project, have been discussed in some detail and various points of view of Canadian commentators noted. The following and final section of the literature scan looks at the remaining terms considered crucial by a panel of Canadians with considerable knowledge around education and disability in Canada.

Definitions and statements around each term from various Canadian sources, and in a few instances from beyond Canada, are provided. No attempt has been made to interpret what the various writers say, or to point to certain definitions and statements as stronger or weaker than others. We felt that to lead the reader in the direction of some "preferred" definition would not serve the purpose of this project.

Alternative Placement

- ➤ Many jurisdictions in Canada have used variations of the Range-of –Setting Model as their philosophical basis for arranging special education placements. The distinguishing feature of this model, often called "Cascade" is that a range of different settings is available on a formal, more or less permanent basis. An important philosophical principle inherent in the model is that as much as possible, exceptional students be placed in the regular classroom, and that alternative placements always be regarded as temporary. It is important to recognize that most systems which have integration as the underpinning philosophy, nevertheless do make at least minimal use of alternative settings (Weber, 19, p. 28)
- ➤ Proponents of absolute integration contend that the mere availability of a spectrum of services is offensive. The very existence of alternative settings, they say, can make it fail for the simple reason that it does not have to work. Supporters of a range of settings, meanwhile, point to the fact that even those jurisdictions committed to integration have had to make special accommodations in some cases that amount to a form of segregated placement (Weber, 1994, p. 21)
- ➤ Although the right to an "appropriate" placement may mean a regular class for some, for others it may be necessary to maintain a continuum of [alternate] services (Andrews and Lupart, 2000, p. 70)

Cascade/Continuum of Services

➢ Many experts in the field recommend that in order to provide appropriate education for students who are exceptional a cascade, or continuum of services is necessary. Settings on the cascade involve a series of options that move from contrived to more natural arrangements. Within a cascade of services, the wider the pyramid, the more children are encompassed; throughout are increasingly restrictive environments, with the point of the triangle generally considered to be the most restrictive because it denotes children on home-bound instruction, who have little opportunity for social interaction with their peers (Winzer, 1999, p. 19)

➢ The distinguishing feature of this model is that a range of different settings for exceptional students is available on a formal, more or less permanent basis. The settings or learning environments are progressively more specialized, and students therefore, if it is deemed necessary and beneficial, may be "administratively" placed in these alternate settings on a short or longer term basis. Important philosophical principles of the model are that students always be placed in the most enabling environment, and that no restricted placement ever be considered as permanent (Weber & Bennett, 1998, p. 40)

Collaboration

➤ A style of interaction professionals choose to use in order to accomplish a goal they share, often stressed in inclusive schools (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 451)

➤ Collaboration and Consultation: Ideally, when children with disabilities are in regular classrooms, teachers receive support in the form of training, help, and consultation from special education teachers and other professionals, instructional aides and so on (Winzer, 1999, p. 22)

➤ Friend, Bursuck, and Hutchinson describe the characteristics of collaboration as follows:

> Collaboration is voluntary
> Collaboration is based on parity
> Collaboration requires a shared goal
> Collaboration includes shared responsibility for key decisions
> Collaboration includes shared accountability for outcomes
> Collaboration is based on shared resources
> (Friend, Bursuck, Hutchinson, 1998, pp. 70-71)

➤ Any mutual effort by teachers to plan, implement, or evaluate programs for a student or students with exceptional learning needs (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 548)

➤ Collaborative problem-solving to promote inclusive education is typically carried out between teachers and other support professionals who get together to solve specific problems, usually concerning a student or group of students focussing on classroom-based interventions to increase the students' chances of success. The relationship in collaborative problem-solving is based on mutually defined goals and a common framework, involves shared authority for idea generation, mutual accountability for success, and the sharing of resources and rewards (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 234)

➤ Consultation and collaboration are vehicles for the educational reform and renewal process under way in inclusive schools and school systems. In order to succeed as mediums of change and growth, collaboration and consultation must occur in a professional climate in which several essential characteristics are valued and encouraged. These include: a) parity among the participants, b) voluntary participation, c) mutual goals, d) common resources, e) shared responsibilities, f) shared accountability, g) cooperative values, and h) shared expertise (Andrews, 1996, p. 39)

➤ Collaborate: To work, plan, and problem solve with other staff members or professionals in a cooperative manner, sharing responsibilities while utilizing the individual strengths of each person (Master Teacher, 2004)

Congregated Class

Note: Congregated class is a newer term. It has not moved into the Canadian literature to any degree, though a number of school systems make use of the term in daily practice.

> ➤ Proponents of the congregated class model argue that a totally separated (but not isolated) environment can offer a much more enriched experience where students are challenged by interchange with others like themselves, by special teachers, by an atmosphere of intellectual ferment, and by the exclusivity where elevated goals will pertain (Weber & Bennett, 1998 p. 89 – with regard to giftedness)

Curriculum Adaptation/Modification
Note: The terms adaptation and modification are often seen as having different meanings in the literature. In addition, a third term, accommodation appears in the literature.

➤ Adapted education program: For an exceptional student, a program based on ongoing assessment with specific goals and approaches that meet the student's needs (Friend, Bursuck, & Henderson, 1998, p. 450)

➤ Adapted Education Program: Education program for a student with special needs means a program based on the results of ongoing assessment and evaluation, and includes an individualized program plan (IPP) with specific goals and objectives and recommendations for educational services that meet student needs (Alberta Education, 1996, p. 1)

➤ Good teachers adapt materials, teaching techniques, and activities to the particular needs of their students. They build curricula, use concrete techniques, generalize skills, apply learning at the appropriate level, and begin instruction at children's tolerance level. They provide individual and small group instruction, evaluate programs carefully by means of various evaluative techniques, and keep careful records (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 24)

➤ Adaptive instruction requires regular and special teachers to respond and adapt innovatively and collaboratively to the unique learning needs of all students. Adaptive instruction assumes that each teacher will identify and provide a wide range of instructional supports to effectively master the learning and behavioural objectives (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 17)

➤ Adaptations are changes to the regular curriculum that retain the same outcomes as those for normally developing children. Adaptations refer to how teachers modify planned instruction beyond their routine adaptations in light of difficulty (Winzer, 1999. p. 66)

➤ Adaptation: A change in what students do or a reshaping of the materials students use. Adaptations are essentially the same as modifications, but can specifically refer to the materials and equipment students use to aid in learning. Enlarging the print on a worksheet and audiotaping a textbook are examples (Master Teacher, 2004)

➤ Curriculum Modifications: Decades of special class teaching of children with exceptional learning needs has yielded a wealth of highly effective techniques and procedures known to be helpful in supporting the learning of those students. The special education teacher has been exposed to a variety of them in teacher preparation and is the likely colleague team member to assist regular educators to make a variety of relatively minor, though highly effective, alterations in the regular classroom (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 221)

➤ Modifying curriculum means that the content and concepts of the program or course have been significantly simplified to allow for student success. This will usually happen when it is clear that a child is having a lot of difficulty that cannot be dealt with in other ways (for example, by making accommodations or changing teaching techniques). Remember that making accommodations for your child does not mean that his or her curriculum is being modified. Modifications occur only when the subject content is changed and simplified (New Brunswick Association for Community Living, 19, pp.89-90)

➤ Modified Curricular Expectations: Individualized expectations, different from those of other students, set for exceptional students on the basis of goals and objectives summarized in the IEP (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998. p. 456)

➤ Modification: A change in what students do or a reshaping of the materials students use. Reducing the number of questions students must answer at the end of a textbook chapter,

allowing a student to answer aloud instead of writing an answer, and allowing the student to do an activity that is different from what the other students are doing are all examples of modifications (Master Teacher, 2004)

➤ An accommodation is a minor change that assists a child's functioning in the environment. For example, an FM system for a child with a hearing impairment; seating close to the teacher for a child with a behavioural disability (Winzer, 1999, p. 66)

➤ Accommodation: An adjustment made to an environment, situation, or supplies for individual differences. Moving desks to make wider spaces between them is an accommodation that could be made for a student in a wheelchair (Master Teacher, 2004)

Facilitator

> Facilitator: In inclusive schools, inclusion specialists are responsible for providing some student instruction, problem solving with teachers, and coordinating the services the student receives. As schools become more inclusive, this role is likely to increase in prominence. In an interview study conducted in the Toronto area, Beveridge found that support facilitators played an important role in schools and classrooms that were commended for a high level of inclusion of exceptional learners. (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 40)

> An important change necessitated by the "new wind" of inclusion is the evolution of a new professional role. The special education teacher takes on new responsibilities characterized by collaboratively consulting with *all* teachers, related service providers, and parents. This new role also includes coordinating services for students who are members of regular classrooms. Quite simply, this new role is to provide and coordinate the supports that enable the successful inclusion of students with disabilities (Tashie, et al., 1993)

> Inclusion Facilitator: A school staff person who assists regular and special education teachers include students with disabilities into regular classrooms and within the regular education curriculum. This person often has a background in special education and may be a resource to general educators on matters pertaining to special education, environmental and curricular modifications [and educational legislation and regulations] (Google, 2004)

Full Inclusion

> For students with disabilities, full inclusion means that a) the students are educated for all or most of the day in ordinary classrooms with their peers, b) the educational program is adapted for their social and academic needs, and c) the students and teachers receive the assistance they need to succeed. Full inclusion never means placing a student with challenging needs in an ordinary classroom without adaptations or supports (Lusthaus, E., & Lusthaus, C., 1996, p. 214))

> Inclusive education means that everyone is welcomed and valued in their neighbourhood school. To be included in your community school means that you have the same opportunities as every other child in the school, you have a variety of choices available to you, and you can be in the same classes as your peers (Andrews, 1996, p. 46)

> Full inclusion is the integration of students with disabilities in the general education classrooms at all times regardless of the nature or severity of the disability (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 5)

> This term is primarily used to refer to the belief that instructional practices and technical supports are presently available to accommodate all students in the schools and classrooms they would otherwise attend if not disabled. Proponents of full inclusion tend to encourage that special education services generally can be delivered in the form of training or technical assistance to "regular" class teachers (Rogers, 1993, p. 1)

Full inclusion, in the educational sense argues that all students must have the opportunity to be enrolled in the regular classroom of the neighbourhood school with age appropriate peers, or to attend the same school as their brothers or sisters. Inclusion in the regular classroom requires that both regular students and those with some type of challenge receive appropriate educational programs that are geared to their capabilities and needs, as well as any support and assistance they and/or their teachers need to be successful in the mainstream. Conversely, full inclusion does not suggest that any student with special needs should be enrolled in a regular classroom unless that classroom is welcoming, unless an individualized program designed to address learning needs and styles is put in place, and unless the specialist support personnel, services, and materials necessary to support inclusion are available as and when needed (Bunch, 1994, p. 150)

Full inclusion means the education of all students with identified disabilities in the schools and classrooms they would attend if not disabled, via collaboration by general and specialist educators to bring support services to the students. Those promoting full inclusion insist that the general classroom is appropriate for every child, regardless of degree or type of disability. A cascade or continuum of services is no longer necessary and regular class teachers, with appropriate support and collaboration, can teach all children (Winzer, 1999, p. 39)

Functional/Authentic/Dynamic Assessment

Note: These three assessment approaches are similar in that all focus on assessment of students in real-life settings doing meaningful activities. No recourse is made to standardized tests. However, they all have different ways of accomplishing the assessment task.

➢ Functional Assessment is used for children with more severe disabilities. It stresses the assessment of specific observable behaviours that form the mode of the current and future existence of the child. It is based on direct collection of performance data; the identification of factors that affect performance, such as those under teacher control; the presentation and examination of repeated teaching trials; and close assessment to assess the success of teaching. It is related to Authentic Assessment (Winzer, 1999, p. 60)

➢ Authentic Assessment begins with a vision of intellectual achievement rather than a set of assessment procedures. Authentic Assessment supports classroom instruction; is multidimensional; assesses conceptual understanding, problem solving, application, and interpretation; and reflects local values and standards. Authenticity refers to the extent to which a test, performance, or product used in an assessment bears a relationship to its real-world referent (Andrews and Lupart, 2000, p. 354)

➢ Authentic Assessment supports classroom instruction; includes students in the assessment process; is multidimensional, assesses conceptual understanding, problem solving, application, and interpretation; and reflects local values and standards. One of the most common authentic assessment strategies is the portfolio, a collection of work assembled over the school year by the student in collaboration with the teacher (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, pp. 247-250)

➢ Based on the premise that traditional types of assessment fail to measure a student's performance in an authentic way, this type of assessment focuses on forming a complete "realistic" picture of what a child can or cannot do. Authentic assessment allows for a collection of data based on real situations in which students can be engaged in an interactive way during which they can access help from teachers and peers alike. The focus is on allowing students to translate information that is taught in a classroom situation, and apply this knowledge in a problem-solving way (Weber & Bennett, 1999, p. 158)

➢ Assessments that mirror reading and writing in the real world. Authentic assessments ask students to perform real life activities, such as reading a newspaper, maps or books they use in the community, writing actual articles for publication about meaningful topics and to participate in other authentic tasks such as keeping journals, writing letters to the editor about real world issues, etc. The significant difference in authentic assessment is that both the subject material and the assessment tasks are as close to naturally occurring events and activities are as natural as possible; Authentic assessment values the individual's thought processes which go into the task as much as the finished product itself. Application: Assessing by requiring students to assemble a portfolio of their work to demonstrate their progress (Google, 2004)

➢ Dynamic Assessment: Feuerstein and his colleagues propose an alternative that is most exciting, conceptually, for special education. Generally critical of traditional assessment procedures for its habit of assessing a student statistically, i.e. at a single point in time, with all the drawbacks, Feuerstein argues for dynamic assessment. In essence, this is a teach-test-teach model that stipulates the subject first needs to be assessed to reveal needs; then it

directs the examiner to interact constantly with the subject, teaching him the content and concepts that were first assessed in an attempt to address the needs; and third to re-assess to see if the subject has learned and to identify what strategies were most successful in the process (Weber & Bennett 1999, pp. 159-160)

➢ Dynamic assessment is an interventionist approach to assessment that is directly opposite to the one-tester, one-child, norm-referenced approaches. A child is not asked to do something and marked right or wrong. Rather a "teach-test-teach" format is used. This process determines the amount and type of intervention that brings about change in a child, measures the amount of change that can be produced in a guided teaching and learning situation, and may identify obstacles that may be hindering a child's performance (Winzer 1999, p. 63)

Inclusion

➤ Efforts to being about basic structural changes in the fundamental operating mode of special education and to improve educational practice are encompassed under a concept and practice variously termed inclusion, inclusive schooling, and inclusive education. (Winzer & Mazurek, 1998, pp. 93-94)

➤ The hottest debate in special education today is about inclusion. There are many definitions and versions of inclusion, but essentially, it means that all children will be placed in the classrooms they would attend if they did not have a disability. There are subtle but real differences between inclusion and the older terms that it has displaced, mainstreaming, least restrictive environment, integration. In inclusive programs, the diverse needs of all children are accommodated to the maximum extent possible within the general classroom (Winzer, 1997, p. 28)

➤ Inclusion is what happens when we consider the needs and dignity of an individual with disabilities or special needs to live within the community. Inclusion promotes mutual benefits for both the community and the individual (Toronto Parks & Recreation, Adapted and Integrated Services, 2004)

➤ Inclusion: Term to describe a professional belief that students with disabilities should be integrated into general education classrooms whether or not they can meet traditional curriculum standards and should be full members of those classrooms (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 454)

➤ It is the general classroom that provides the child who is exceptional with the least restrictive environment and the opportunity for maximum interaction with normally developing peers. When a child is included in the regular classroom, the regular class teacher holds primary responsibility for that child and must ensure appropriate program and curriculum modifications are made. The class teacher also works with a number of professionals to tailor education to the needs of the individual child (Winzer, 1999, pp. 14-20)

➤ As early as 1989, a group of Canadian researchers wrote that inclusion or inclusive education represents the belief or philosophy that students with disabilities should be integrated into regular education classrooms, regardless of whether they can meet regular curriculum standards. Advocates of inclusive education believe that if students cannot meet traditional academic expectations, then those expectations should be changed (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 6)

➤ Inclusion: An educational philosophy aimed at "normalizing" special services for which students qualify. Inclusion involves an attempt to provide more of these special services by providing additional aids and support inside the regular classroom, rather than by pulling students out for isolated instruction. Inclusion involves the extension of general education curricula and goals to students receiving special services. Finally, inclusion involves shared responsibility, problem solving, and mutual support among all the staff members who provide services to students (Master Teacher, 2004).

➤ Inclusion is based on the firm belief, based on experience, that all children have value and can best learn in regular classrooms alongside children their own age. Inclusion is not just for some children. Children who have disabilities described as "severe" can also learn and participate successfully in regular classrooms and neighbourhood schools. Inclusion is also not something that a child must be ready for. All children are at ALL TIMES ready to attend

regular schools. Their participation is not something that must be earned. Meaningful inclusion, where students with disabilities receive needed support in regular classes, enables children to gain self-confidence, a positive self image, social behaviours, academic and other skills, and to feel valued as persons and to be accepted by society (New Brunswick Association for Community Living, pp. 1, 13)

➢ Inclusive education embraces the concepts of normalization, integration, and mainstreaming (Andrews, 1996, p. 5)

➢ Inclusion, or inclusive schooling implies subtle but real differences from mainstreaming, the least restrictive environment, and integration. Advocates of inclusive schooling argue that the social-cultural realities of mainstreaming and inclusion are that one group is viewed as the "mainstream" and one group is not; hence one group must "push in" to the activities and settings occupied by the other. Under the principles of inclusion, children do not push into the mainstream because the underlying supposition in inclusive programs is that all children will be based in the classrooms they would attend if they did not have a disability (Winzer, 1999, p. 39)

Inclusive Philosophy

> In the main, Manitoba educators have adopted a philosophy of inclusion as the foundation for delivery of special education. The most common delivery model is grounded in inclusive philosophy coupled with a continuum of programming and supports. First choice programming for students with exceptionalities is in regular education classrooms in neighbourhood public schools with their same age peers (Manitoba Education and Training, 1998, p. 16)

> Inclusive philosophy transcends the idea of physical location, and incorporates basic values that promote participation, friendship, and social interaction (p. 106-107)

> The practice of placing exceptional students in regular school environments falls under the philosophy of inclusion. While some school programs adhere to a broad interpretation of integration, integrating students to the maximum extent possible with general education students, others have a more restrictive interpretation in which students with exceptionalities are placed in general education for a part of the day.

Integration

> Integration: A situation where there is equal opportunity for a minority group or individual to join the majority. Basically, integration is a concept based on fairness. This does not mean everyone must be treated the same; it means every person has access to the same opportunities (Toronto Parks & Recreation, 2004)

> Integration: Full participation of exceptional students in regular education classes (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 552)

> Weber and Bennett (1999) do not specifically define integration. A reading of their discussion of integration and the Range of Settings (Cascade) Model suggests that integration generally refers to placement of students with disabilities in regular classrooms. This can mean full-time in the regular classroom with various levels of support, including withdrawal assistance, to variable shared time between a regular class and a self-contained class.

> [Integration] can be thought of as placing children with disabilities in regular classrooms only when they can meet traditional academic expectations, or where these expectations are not relevant (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 6)

> In the 1950s and 1960s, integration was the common term used to refer to the education of students with exceptionalities in regular classrooms. Mainstreaming, often used as a synonym for integration, emerged in special education in the 1970s (Winzer, 1999, p. 38).

> Two major characteristics defined mainstreaming. First, it usually applied only to some children, most especially those with mild disabilities. Second, the target population generally consisted of students identified as needing special education services and often moving from special classes into regular classrooms (Friend, Bursuck, and Hutchinson, 1998, p. 38)

Mainstreaming

> ➤ Mainstreaming, often used as a synonym for integration, emerged in special education in the 1970s. As a process mainstreaming provided services along a continuum so that a range of variable services allowed pupils to be integrated in the manner best suited to their individual needs. It demanded individual programming, cooperative planning, as well as the range of educational options and support services. (Winzer, 1999. p. 3)

> ➤ Mainstreaming refers to the practice of teaching exceptional pupils in the regular classroom for more than 50 % of the school day. For this chapter, the terms mainstreamed and integrated will be used interchangeably (Duquette, 1996, p. 149)

> ➤ Mainstreaming or integration implies delivery of sufficient resource support services based on recognized educational needs (Andrews & Lupart, 2000, p. 13)

> ➤ Inclusive education is a relatively new term, replacing such terms as mainstreaming from the 1970s and integration from the 1980s (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 16)

> ➤ The basic goal of mainstreaming was the provision of free, appropriate education in the most suitable setting for all youngsters with exceptionalities. Philosophically, mainstreaming focused on the integration of children with exceptionalities with their non-disabled peers within the context of the regular neighbourhood school. As a process, mainstreaming provided services along a continuum so that a range of available services allowed students to be integrated in the manner best suited to their needs. It demanded individual programming, co-operative planning, as well as the range of educational options and support services.

Resource Room

➤ Classroom to which students come for less than 50 % of the school day to receive special education, often for 30 to 60 minutes per day (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998. p. 458)

➤ Today, resource rooms stand at the point between self-contained and regular classrooms. Pupils receive part of their education in the regular classroom and part of it in the resource room (Winzer, 1999, p. 22)

➤ A student may be withdrawn to a resource room where a different instructor, who works in close concert with the regular teacher, will deliver the modified learning experience called the IEP. Significant in this arrangement is that the student remains a regular member of the regular class (Weber & Bennett, 1999, p. 38)

➤ A special education service model in which students can be assigned for a certain amount of time (one hour a day, 30 minutes on Tuesday and Thursday, etc.) or come from other classes when support or instruction is needed (Master Teacher, 2004).

➤ Often a special education teacher carries out intensive instruction on basic skills and learning strategies. This approach assumes that basic skills and learning strategies are prerequisites for successful general education experiences. Unfortunately, research indicates that such skills taught in pullout programs often do not transfer to the general education classroom (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 31)

➤ A room separate from the regular classroom in which children with disabilities can receive specialized assistance to reinforce and supplement the regular class instruction. The amount of time students spend each day in the resource room varies according to individual needs, and the remainder of the day is spent in his or her regular classroom (Google Search, 2004).

Resource Teacher
- ➢ Special education teacher who provides direct services to students with disabilities either in a special education or general education classroom and who also meets to problem solve with teachers. Resource teachers often work with students with high incidence disabilities (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 458)
- ➢ Resource teachers design, alter, and present instruction across a number of curriculum areas, and address elements that facilitate students' success in the regular environment. They may provide support in academic learning of both the core and remedial curricula, and training in social and communication skills that will help the student to interact better in the regular classroom (Winzer, 1999, p. 22)
- ➢ Resource teachers are usually responsible for managing and coordinating the services a student receives, including the writing, implementation of the student's individual education plan (IEP). They may also provide direct instruction to exceptional students (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 40)

Segregation

- ➤ To separate, keep apart. Segregation is usually associated with exclusion from a group, generally for mutual benefit, and rarely involves choice. It separates and isolates (Toronto Parks and Recreation, 2004)
- ➤ In order to give a specific kind of learning experience, it may be deemed appropriate to place an exceptional student in a special setting full-time (Weber & Bennett, 1999, p. 39)
- ➤ The segregation of students identified as having different needs. Students with mental handicaps are congregated in a special class or separate building (Google Search, 2004).

Special Class

> ➤ Segregated or self-contained classroom: a classroom for special education students in which the students receive the vast majority (if not all) of their educational programming; this type of programming does not include, or at least minimizes, interactions with nonhandicapped peers (Stanovich and Jordan, 1995, p. 307)
> ➤ Most exceptional students had received much of their education in segregated settings with other exceptional students. They participated in small classes with different, less academic, curricula (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 6)
> ➤ Special classrooms are staffed by specially trained teachers and are located within the regular school, children with disabilities are brought together for instruction and social interplay (Winzer, 1999).
> ➤ Special class (also refereed to as self-contained class): An educational setting outside of the general education classroom where students with similar exceptional learning needs receive special education and related services from a trained special education teacher (Google Search).

Standardized Assessment

➤ Standardized achievement tests can inform teachers how students' level of academic ability compares to other students their age. This is a norm-referenced comparison. Standardized intelligence tests can provide valuable information about a child's problem-solving abilities, verbal reasoning, abstract visual-spatial abilities, and mathematical reasoning (Andrews & Lupart, 2000. p. 357)

➤ The assessment of needs will usually be more detailed and may even be supported with school-administered standardized test results

➤ A common source of information for making educational decisions is the standardized achievement test. These tests are designed to measure academic progress, or what the students have learned in the curriculum. Standardized achievement tests are norm-referenced. In a norm-referenced test, the performance of one student is compared to the average performance of other students who are the same age and grade level (Friend, Bursuck, & Hutchinson, 1998, p. 244)

➤ Psycho-educational assessment relies heavily on testing. Tests are defined as controlled structured procedures that attempt to elicit particular responses that the child might not demonstrate spontaneously. Many tests are standardized – they use standard materials, administrative procedures, scoring processes, and score interpretation. The purpose of standardization is to ensure that all children taking the test receive essentially the same experience, are expected to perform the same tasks with the same set of materials, receive the same amount of assistance from the evaluator, and are evaluated to a standard set of criteria (Winzer, 1999, p. 61)

Alberta Education. (1996). *Partners during changing times: An information booklet for parents of children with special needs*. Edmonton, Alberta: Author.

Andrews, J. (1996). *Teaching students with diverse needs: Elementary classrooms*. Toronto: Nelson Canada.

Andrews, J. & Lupart, J. (2000). *The inclusive classroom: Educating exceptional children*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson.

Bunch, G. (1994). An interpretation of full inclusion. *American Annals of the Deaf, 139*, 150-152.

Bunch, G. & Persaud, N. (2003). *Not enough: Canadian research into inclusive education*. Toronto, ON: Roeher Institute.

Bunch, G., & Valeo, A. (2003). Educational inclusion of children with disabilities. In Roeher Institute, *International scan of issues: Children with disabilities and their families, pp. 178-197*.

Bunch, G., & Valeo, A. (1997). *Inclusion: Recent research*. Toronto: Inclusion Press.

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, Part 1 of the Constitution Act, 1982 (U. K.), c. 11.

Dore, R., Wagner, S., Dore, I., & Brunet, J-P. (2002). From mainstreaming to inclusion: A transformation of service delivery. In R. L. Schalock, P. C. Baker, & M. D. Croser (Eds.), *Embarking on a new century: Mental retardation at the end of the 20th century* (pp. 185 - 201). Washington, DC: AAMR.

Duquette, C. (1996). Behaviour and procedures of secondary teachers in integrated classrooms. In J. Andrews (Ed.), *Teaching students with diverse abilities: Secondary classrooms*, 145-156. Toronto: Nelson Canada.

Friend, M., Bursuck, W. D., & Hutchinson. N. L. (1998). *Including exceptional students: A practical guide for classroom teachers*, Canadian Edition. Scarborough, ON: Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Human Resources Development Canada. (1996). *Equal citizenship for Canadians: The will to act*. Ottawa: Author.

Lusthaus, E., & Lusthaus, C. (1996). Teachers, parents, and students in inclusive education: Working together throughout the high school years. In J. Andrews (Ed.), *Teaching students with diverse abilities: Secondary classrooms*, 145-156. Toronto: Nelson Canada.

Manitoba Education and Training. (1998). *The Manitoba Special Education Review*. Winnipeg: Author.

New Brunswick Association for Community Living. (2000). *Achieving inclusion: A parent guide to inclusive education in New Brunswick*. Fredericton, NB: Author.

Obiakor, F. E., Algozzine, B., & Ford, B. (1993). Educational reform and service delivery to African-Canadian students. In S. B. Garcia (Ed.), *Addressing cultural and linguistic diversity in special education*, pp. 1-9. Reston, Va: Council for Exceptional Children.

Rogers, J. (1993). The inclusive revolution. *Research Bulletin*. Centre for Evaluation, Development, and Research, Phi Delta Kappa, No. 11, 1-6.

Thomas, G., & Vaughn, M. (2004). *Inclusive education: Readings and reflections*. Maidenhead, Berkshire, England: Open University Press.

Stanovich, P., & Jordan, A. (1995). Integrated education: A resource guide for including students with special needs in the regular classroom. Toronto: Federation of Women Teachers'

Association of Ontario.

Taishe, C., Shapiro-Barnard, S., Dillon, A. D., Schuh, M., Jorgenson, C., & Nesbit, J. (1993). *The role of the inclusion facilitator.* Concord, NH; University of New Hampshire.

Weber, K., & Bennett, S. (1999). *Special Education in Ontario Schools* (5th Ed.). Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Winzer, M. (1999). Children with exceptionalities in Canadian classrooms (5th Ed.). Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Winzer, M. (1997). *Special education in early childhood: An inclusive approach.* Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada.

Winzer, M., & Masurek, K. (1998). *Special education in multicultural contexts.* Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.

Google Search: http://www.google.ca/search?hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&01=defmore&q=define:Inclusion&Fa...

Master Teacher: http://www.masterteacher.com/freeresource/glossary-inclusion.cfm