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Dear Minister,

I am pleased to present the report and draft recommendations arising from the review of the *Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools* policy.

The review attracted wide interest from principals, teachers, parents and members of the community, many of whom presented submissions to members of the review team. The Tasmanian Council of State School Parents and Friends Associations, the Australian Education Union (Tasmanian Branch), the Community and Public Sector Union and various community organisations also supported the review and provided submissions on behalf of their members.

The review indicated that there is strong support for the principle of inclusive education and that significant progress has been made in the implementation of the policy since 1995. At a practical level, the Steering Committee noted the concerns of a number of parents, teachers and service providers about aspects of the current application of the policy. This report attempts to address these concerns.

We hope that this report and its recommendations will support and enhance the practice of inclusive education in Tasmanian Government schools and colleges.

Ralph Spaulding
Chairperson
Review of the *Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools* policy

31 January 2000
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Chapter 1: Background

1 Background

Before assuming government in Tasmania in 1998, the Labor Party confirmed its support for the policy of including students with disabilities in regular schools, but identified several problems associated with this practice, particularly those relating to the resource and support needs for teachers, students and parents. For this reason, Labor’s Education Policy included the conduct of a comprehensive review of the 1995 policy, *Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools* (Inclusion Policy), to be undertaken in consultation with all stakeholders, including children with disabilities, parents, principals, teaching and support staff, and district offices.

During 1998, the Minister for Education (The Hon Paula Wriedt MHA) instituted this review of the policy’s implementation across all levels of the Department. At that time, the Minister suggested several additional reasons for undertaking such a review:

- There had been no formal evaluation of the policy since its introduction in 1995.
- Since that time, there had been an increasing trend for students with disabilities to enrol in regular schools, rather than in special schools. It was important to consider the budgetary implications of this trend and the procedures used to allocate funds to support the policy.
- It was an appropriate time to assess the Department’s policy and performance against the requirements of the Commonwealth *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*, which places requirements on the Department not to discriminate against students with disabilities in relation to the provision of educational services.
- Anecdotal evidence suggested differences in the way the policy was being implemented in some districts and there was therefore a need to establish a coherent state-wide picture of the current operation of the policy.

The Minister formally announced the conduct of the review and its Terms of Reference in November 1998. The Terms of Reference for the review were to investigate the implementation of the Inclusion Policy with reference to:

- systemic and school performance;
- outcomes for students with disabilities including:
  - access;
  - participation;
  - progress towards identified goals;
- resource management:
  - the mechanisms used to allocate special education funds;
Chapter 1: Background

– the management and use of available resources and support;
• professional development:
  – pre-service and in-service implications;
  – teachers’ beliefs and understanding in relation to the education of students with
disabilities in regular classrooms;
• policy review.

The review was expected to recommend changes to the policy, its implementation and its
management.

The review process was planned to begin in November 1998, with an interim report to be
completed by June 1999 and the final report and recommendations to be presented to the
Minister for Education in December 1999.

1.1 Management of the review

In order to promote objectivity and optimum involvement of key stakeholders, the
management of the review was organised in the following way:

• The Office for Educational Review (OER) undertook the overall management of the
review. A sum of $20,000 was allocated for the services of a consultant and the costs
of processing review data.

• The services of an external consultant with significant expertise in the education
and inclusion of students with disabilities was obtained, in order to provide
independent and objective advice for the conduct of the review. Professor Luanna
Meyer, Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Massey University in New Zealand, was appointed for
this purpose.

• A Steering Committee was appointed to develop an overall plan and timeline for the
conduct and management of the review, to endorse the methodology of the review, to
monitor its progress and to maintain contact with the external consultant
throughout the review process.

• A Reference Group representing key stakeholders was established to advise on and
monitor the general conduct of the review, and to provide a link with key
stakeholder groups. This group comprised representatives from a wide range of
professional and community organisations and associations.

The membership of the Steering Committee and the Reference Group is listed in
Appendix 1.
1.2 The conduct of the review

The review extended from February until December 1999 and was conducted in three stages.

1.2.1 Stage 1

The first stage included the launch of the review and a general community consultation period extending throughout term 1 of 1999. The conduct of the review was given media coverage on radio and in newspapers. The public community consultation and call for submissions was advertised in the three major daily newspapers on Saturday, 6 March 1999. To aid the consultation process and provide a framework for responses, a Community Consultation Questionnaire was prepared, although this was not restrictive and respondents were encouraged to submit any additional information that they wished to. This questionnaire is included in the protocol documents in Appendix 2.

All school communities were advised of the review, and provided with background papers and copies of the Community Consultation Questionnaire. They were requested to disseminate information about the review as widely as possible within their local communities.

During term 1, members of the Review Team also visited numbers of individual parents and a range of organisations, at their request.

Stage 1 also included a meeting with the external consultant. Professor Meyer visited Tasmania on 24 and 25 May 1999. She worked intensively with OER staff and members of the Steering Committee and spoke with Reference Group members before returning to New Zealand. She assisted with the development of plans for the Review Team’s school consultations and provided valuable advice about the methodology for and conduct of focus group discussions. Professor Meyer also discussed the forms of support and approaches needed to implement any policy on inclusion. She considered that the most important factor in the implementation of such a policy was to identify developmental stages and provide support for systems and schools to build their capacities to practise inclusion successfully. This thinking ultimately provided the basis for the development of indicators of inclusive practice used in the school visits (see Appendix 3).

It became evident during this first stage that respondents wished to discuss a broader interpretation of inclusion than had been originally intended. References were made to students with moderate to mild disabilities, and those with behaviour problems. In the light of this, the Review Team broadened the horizons of the review to include issues relating to these students, but without losing the focus of the review on students with significant disabilities.
1.2.2 Stage 2

Two major activities were undertaken in the second stage of the review.

In each of the State’s six education districts, an external consultant conducted a highly structured focus group discussion on four major issues relating to the implementation of the policy. The protocol for these discussions is included in Appendix 2. They covered four main areas: resources, educational programs, professional development, and identification of significant challenges to inclusion. The Review Team specified the composition of each focus group, but district superintendents chose the individuals who participated. In each district the group was made up of:

- two parents representing parent organisations within the district;
- one school-based special education teacher, preferably nominated by peers;
- two classroom teachers, preferably selected by a consultative process—one teaching a student on the Category A register and one who had no current responsibility for such a student;
- one principal;
- one member of the district support team;
- one school-based non-teaching staff member (eg a teacher aide); and
- a person nominated by the district superintendent.

The external consultant who facilitated these focus groups was an ex-teacher who had worked in various roles with the Department of Education.

As well, the Review Team began a series of school visits that continued throughout terms 2 and 3. Altogether the team visited over 50 schools throughout the State. Those schools that participated in formal interviews requested by the Review Team are listed in Appendix 3. In most cases, the principal and two teachers, one teaching a student with a disability and the other not currently responsible for such a student, discussed with the Review Team their perspectives of the school’s current response to the implementation and operation of the Inclusion Policy. To provide a consistent structure for these discussions, the Review Team prepared a developmental framework for inclusive education at the school and classroom level. Details of the development and use of these frameworks, and the findings, are provided in section 4.1.2. A full set of indicators of inclusive practice is provided in Appendix 3, together with response rates.
1.2.3 Stage 3

The third and final stage of the review included a number of further processes. The decision to undertake these was informed by initial data from the earlier consultations and the community submissions received.

Four public forums were conducted: one each in Hobart, Launceston, Devonport and St Helens. These were advertised in relevant local newspapers and through District Offices. The Review Team attended the meetings to present an update and initial findings from the early stages of the review, and then to invite comment.

Eight students with different categories of disability, who attended regular primary or high schools, were observed for one full school day. The external consultant who had conducted the focus groups also undertook these observations. The consultant developed a protocol for these sessions with the help of the Review Team (Appendix 2). As part of this observation, the consultant had discussions with students, including students with and without disabilities.

Members of the Review Team conducted semi-structured interviews separately with district superintendents, district support managers and state managers of specific disabilities. The protocol is included in Appendix 2. In addition, informal discussions were held with representatives of the Education Faculty at the University of Tasmania, the Department of Education’s Professional Development Services Branch and Equity Standards, and the Tasmanian Principals Institute.

A final consultation was held with Professor Luanna Meyer on Friday, 3 December 1999, to assist with analysis of data.

An interim report on the progress and preliminary findings of the review was presented to the Minister for Education in September 1999.
2 An historical overview of special education in Tasmania

Julianne Moss, Lecturer in Education at the University of Tasmania, prepared this account. The text has been edited slightly by the Review Team.

2.1 Introduction

The *Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools* policy (1995b) reflects educational thinking that has been advanced by the special education knowledge tradition to ensure students with disabilities gain access to education in the same learning environments as their peers. Historically, the medical and psychological professionals defined and developed education provision for students with disabilities. In the latter part of the twentieth century, the special educational tradition has evolved and has been instrumental in defining and constructing educational practices for students with disabilities.

The history of special education in Tasmania, while having its own unique qualities, mirrors events that have occurred in other Australian states and recent international policy development. The following brief historical account of special education practice in Tasmania is a broad overview of the evolution of schooling provisions for students with disabilities in the Tasmanian government system. By drawing attention to the curriculum history, policy and practice of this system, the account illustrates how exclusion of students with disabilities is a deep and longstanding practice of education.

The overview opens with an account of Tasmania as a penal settlement. This is followed by a description of events at the commencement of the twentieth century. This period from Federation to the First World War describes the earliest foundations of a system of schooling for students with disabilities. The years following World War Two (1945 to 1967) are described as the modernist period. The section that follows details the events of the 1970s and 1980s. This is an important period in Australian educational history, particularly notable for the focus on social justice issues. The final section covers the introduction of ‘integration’ and ‘inclusion’, mapping events during the mid-1980s through to the 1990s.
2.2 Penal history

Tasmania was the second penal colony established in Australia after New South Wales. The ruling colonial interests of the penal settlement dominated the early history of education. The first children to receive education were ‘the poor, the neglected, the orphaned and the incipiently criminal children’ (Phillips 1985, p.10). Although schools in Tasmania were assisted by the government from 1817, when Thomas Fitzgerald was given a subsidy for education on the condition that he admitted poor children free, the government did not take full responsibility for any school, other than those attached to the convict system, until 1839 (Sprod 1984, p.18). Education was viewed as having a moral benefit to the colony whose ‘adults were sunken too deeply in vice to be reclaimable’ (Phillips 1985, p.11). The King’s Orphan School (later to be known as the Queen’s Orphan School) was established by sectarian interests and opened in 1828. Poor children were admitted free (Barcan 1980, p.62). When the school moved to new premises at St John’s Park, New Town, up to 500 orphans at a time received basic education and residential care. On leaving, boys were apprenticed to a trade and girls entered domestic service (Griffiths 1983, p.1).

In 1833, the Colonial Office established the Point Puer school for juvenile prisoners, described as ‘an experiment in the reformation of child convicts’ (Austin 1972, p.1). The school was run by two good-conduct men from Port Arthur and reportedly had limited educational success:

In all, the majority of the boys made very little progress except for the few bright boys who learnt despite the system. Most progress was made with reading. In 1837 of the 99 illiterate boys who entered the institution 58 were taught to read and in 1868 the numbers were 160–114.

Hooper 1967, pp.19–20

In 1839, Governor Franklin established a Board of Education to fund and supervise the public day-schools of the colony. The system was non-sectarian, partly funded by the State and partly by the parents’ contributions. The system was centrally controlled, with local support encouraged, and intended for all of those who chose to avail themselves of the services, but particularly for the poor (Sprod 1984, p.18).

Thomas Arnold’s report on education in 1850 notes 500 children being maintained and instructed at the Queen’s Orphan School in New Town. The school was the only school in the State to have industrial training in its curriculum (Reeves 1935, p.53). In 1865, the Hobart Town Benevolent Society presented a petition requesting that the government ‘establish industrial schools and reformatories for the vagrant and neglected children who infested the city streets’ (Phillips 1985, p.54). In 1868, the Public Schools Bill was introduced. School attendance became compulsory for children between seven and twelve years who lived within one mile of public schools in certain ‘settled’ districts. The Act
provided some exemptions: children who could already read and write and those who were educated privately (Sprod 1984, p.20).

Tasmania was the first colony of the British Empire to have compulsory education. In 1885, a State Department of Education was established under the Education Act. The Act exempted children ‘whose health or some other unavoidable cause prevented attendance at school’ (Reeves 1935, p.78). These exemptions included children with physical and mental disabilities. The Act established a number of statutory functions including:

\[
\text{regulating the establishment, maintenance, and classification of state schools, kindergartens, training colleges for teachers, practising schools, manual training schools, domestic economy schools, night schools, continuation schools, technical schools and classes, schools for the blind, the deaf, the dumb and other defectives, truant schools and other such schools as the Minister recommends.}
\]

Reeves 1935, p.80

The Blind, Deaf and Dumb Institute, a benevolent institute, was founded in Hobart in 1887. In 1905, an amendment to the Education Act 1885 made compulsory the education of blind, deaf and mute children between the ages of seven and sixteen. The Education Department contributed to the tuition fees and board for education at the institute, and after 1925 took responsibility for the payment of teachers (Griffiths 1983, p.2).

2.3 The early twentieth century

In 1910, public interest in and debate about the education of ‘mentally deprived children’ increased. Rodwell cites the words of JT Mather as an early advocate of the maintenance of separate schooling systems. ‘[T]he segregation of these children provided them with a better education and lessened the burden on the rest of the class’ (Rodwell 1992, p.201). In 1916, the Directors of Education from all states met to discuss the needs of the ‘mentally handicapped’ (Ashman & Elkins 1990, p.27).

The inception and growth of the special education knowledge tradition in Tasmania is attributed to Henry Thomas Parker, the first psychologist of the Education Department, supervisor of special classes and lecturer at the local Teachers College. ‘Parker made a significant contribution to the establishment of psychological testing programs and the development of special education services in Tasmania’ (Griffiths 1981, p.18). A strong supporter of psychological testing, he cited the following as the reasons for the establishment of separate special classes:
1. The ordinary class should be freed from the influence of unusually dull children.
2. The curriculum should be modified for children who will not develop up to ordinary level.
3. The rate of progress should be lessened, and made proportionate to the natural rate of development in each individual case. (The class should therefore be ungraded.)
4. Teaching methods should be modified to meet the needs of exceptional children.
5. The class should be an observational class. In many cases long observation alone will enable the distinction to be drawn between (a) backwardness from accidental circumstances, such as negligence and its consequences; (b) dulness [sic]; and (c) moronity.

It will be observed that the purpose of placing dull children in special classes is not that they may receive special coaching to keep them level with normal children. Rather it is to provide for the admitted incurable dulness [sic] or defect that demands permanent special treatment. The idea is not to make normal citizens, but to exploit to the greatest social advantage the ability of each child by natural endowment. 

Parker 1920, p.116

In 1920, a Tasmanian Mental Deficiency Act was passed. This was followed in 1923 by the creation of the Mental Deficiency Board. An amendment to the Education Act in 1924 became the impetus for the establishment of the Girls’ Welfare School for ‘subnormal’ 14- to 16-year-olds. A Boys’ Welfare School opened in 1927 (Griffiths 1981, pp.22–23). The Education Act 1932 excluded education for children ‘unfit’ to attend school, and required their parents to provide efficient and sustainable education. Where this was not possible, the Minister could direct the removal of a child to an institution (Department of Education 1983, p.19). This power of the Minister and exclusion of students with disabilities from the school system remained unchanged until the Education Act was amended in 1984.

2.4 The modernist period

In 1946, there were two special schools and four welfare schools in Tasmania. The minimum school leaving age was raised to 16 in 1946. The ‘modern school’ system was established in the same year to cater for students who were unable to qualify for the High School through the examination system.

Phillips reports that the ‘modern school’ system was unsupported by public, teacher or student confidence (1985, p.301). In 1955, the Director of Education is cited as commenting, ‘[p]erhaps today we stand somewhere midway between the traditional secondary education designed for a selected few and the development of new secondary
education designed for all’ (Barcan 1980, p.298). Selective ability tests for high school entry ended in 1958.

The advent of the ‘modern school’ system and the aspiration to provide for all students failed to open access into the secondary school system for students with disabilities. During the period 1950–1965 there was an increase in the number of separate special schools. Talire, a school for ‘the mentally handicapped’, opened in 1950, the Girls’ Welfare School became the co-educational Dora Turner School in 1955, and the Royal Derwent Hospital School, run by the Retarded Children’s Welfare Association, opened in 1959. Its operation was transferred to the Education Department in 1961. The school was located in the grounds of the state-funded mental health services institution. Although it is not recorded in the history of the time, the school catered for only a selected few of the students who lived in the institution. It was not until the amendment of the Education Act in 1984 that these students received entitlement to a full-time education (Jacob 1986).

In 1967, there were 15 special schools operating in Tasmania (Department of Education 1967). During this period, separate special schools with a vocational orientation were viewed as the most appropriate educational placement for students with disabilities. Ted Hutchinson, a former principal of the Royal Derwent Hospital School, asserts:

> For so long our children were destined to a life of inactivity and boredom. It has at last been realised that they can provide a work force of people who enjoy completing the monotonous tasks that other people find irksome. Our children, when trained for their tasks, can assimilate in their own factories and know they are taking their place in society. By being accepted by the community as workers, personal happiness and a sense of dignity must ensue.

*Hutchinson 1971, p.77*

Education in the late modern period continued to affirm the dominant academic monopoly and the wider public resistance to the idea of the comprehensive school system. Johnson (1971), reviewing the academic monopoly in the high school system in the same year as Hutchinson wrote his comments, highlights the public opposition to the comprehensive school system:

> Significantly the most vocal opposition came from the former pupils or parents of former pupils of selective high schools. Similar opposition might be expected from parents who will see the reduction of academic courses entailed in the preceding proposals as a threat to the amount of social prestige available to their children as a reward for their secondary schooling.

*Johnson 1971, p.6*
2.5 Integration of children with special needs

The early moves towards the integration rather than segregation of students with disabilities came through the specific-purpose funding to disadvantaged groups. As recommended by the 1973 Commonwealth Schools Commission report, *Schools in Australia* (Karmel Report), in that year $43.5 million was allocated for special education. The commission advised that there should be a move away from special classes and school placement to integration (Ashman & Elkins 1990, p.29).

The foreword to *Educational Facilities in Tasmania for Children with Special Needs* (Department of Education 1973) written by the Minister of the day, WA Neilson, reads ‘... the aim of the special education described in this brochure is the provision of “equality of opportunity”, that is, of the means by which each child may realise his potential to the full’. In planning for the education of ‘handicapped children’ the brochure states that the Department aims:

1. To enable as many children as possible to be educated with other children in a normal school; and
2. To provide adequate and effective special facilities for those who need them.  

*Department of Education 1973, p.4*

The 1977 Review of Secondary Education reflected the reluctance of the Tasmanian secondary system to move beyond separate and withdrawal provisions. The report noted that despite the Australia-wide consensus that special schools were inappropriate, the Tasmanian practice encompassed a variety of provisions. Where possible, children would be integrated ‘into normal teaching groups where they may share in ordinary social life’ (Department of Education 1977, p.154). The review ‘considered the kinds of programs most suited to the different groups of exceptional children to be found in secondary schools’: talented children, maladjusted children, slow learners, children with learning difficulties, children with physical and sensory disabilities and migrant children (p.156). Subsequent major reports of the 1980s, such as the Committee on Primary Education’s *Primary Education in Tasmania* (COPE) Report and the *White Paper on Tasmanian Schools and Colleges*, highlighted use of the term ‘integration’ and programs to support the ‘integrated child’. In 1983, *A Review of Special Education* (ROSE) was released. The report of this review stated that the ‘policy of the Education Department is that, whenever possible, children with special educational needs should be educated in ordinary schools’ (Department of Education 1983, p.39). In the same year, Dunn completed a Tasmanian study entitled ‘The integration of special children in ordinary schools’. In this study of ten students across a range of schools, Dunn noted two differing positions:
Some [teachers] felt it their duty to cater for needs of the special children in their care and took the trouble to alter the curriculum (including classroom management) to suit these children.

Dunn 1983, p.113

And

Others employed the extra resources available to the child and hoped that these resources would help the child to cope with the school as it was. When this did not work the child was transferred to a special school.

Dunn 1983, p.114

Commenting on the general impact of the policy, Dunn noted:

The responsiveness of schools should be encouraged by the Department if it places extra expectations of integration on the schools. Most of the help at the moment goes directly to the child. There was a feeling in the schools that the teachers of these children have not received the support needed to cope and to cope well. School-based, indeed classroom-based, inservice is an area where a hiatus is noted.

Dunn 1983, p.114

2.6 Inclusion and inclusive schooling in Tasmania

In 1991, the Department of Education released the framework for primary education in the 1990s titled Our Children: The Future. In this document, schools were asked to work towards implementing programs to meet the needs of all children. Following the implementation of major Department-wide restructuring, the provision of special education services to schools was transferred to each of the education districts. It was during this time that the earliest frameworks were being formulated for the State’s Equity in Schooling policy (Jacob 1994a) and for Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools. The draft document of the latter, authored by Jacob (1994b), was released largely unchanged in 1995 as the final policy statement (Department of Education 1995). During this period the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act 1992 and the Tasmanian Disability Services Act 1992 were proclaimed and the Salamanca Statement on principles, policy and practice in special needs education (UNESCO 1994) was published.

The objectives of the Disability Discrimination Act informed the Department’s policy development in the area of educating students with disabilities. The Act’s objectives are:

- to eliminate, as far as possible, discrimination against persons on the ground of disability in a number of areas, including education;
to ensure, as far as possible, that persons with disabilities have the same rights to equality before the law as the rest of the community; and

to promote recognition and acceptance within the community of the principle that persons with disabilities have the same fundamental rights as the rest of the community.

Section 22 of the Act deals specifically with discrimination in the area of education and makes it unlawful for an education authority to discriminate against a person on the ground of the person’s disability or a disability of any of the person’s associates:

• by refusing or failing to accept the person’s application for admission as a student; or
• in the terms or conditions on which it is prepared to admit the person as a student.

Such terms or conditions include denying the student access, or limiting the student’s access, to any benefit provided by the educational authority unless such action would impose ‘unjustifiable hardship’ on the educational authority. Tasmania’s Disability Services Act provides formal means whereby persons with disabilities and service providers for such persons can access support.

The Salamanca Statement is described by Ainscow as ‘arguably the most significant international document that has ever appeared in the special need field’ (1999, p.74). The Salamanca Statement, agreed upon by representatives of 92 governments and 25 international organisations in June 1994, endorses principles of inclusive education and proclaims that schools should accommodate all children regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions:

• every child has a fundamental right to education, and must be given the opportunity to achieve and maintain an acceptable level of learning,
• every child has unique learning characteristics, interests, abilities and learning needs,
• education systems should be designed and programs implemented to take into account the wide diversity of these characteristics and needs,
• those with special educational needs must have access to regular schools which should accommodate them within a child centred pedagogy capable of meeting these needs,
• regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all; moreover, they provide an effective education to the majority of children and improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of the entire education system.

UNESCO 1994, pp.viii–ix
2.7 Summary

In Tasmania, as in other Australian states, education for students with disabilities was concentrated within segregated schooling systems during the major part of the twentieth century. Opportunities for students with disabilities to access comprehensive systems of education are relatively recent trends. While efforts to move towards more integrated education structures are evident in the last 25 years of the education history of Tasmania, the idea of inclusive schooling is first recorded in the defining framework of the Inclusion Policy.

Recent developments include the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Act 1998. This Act specifies the prohibited forms of direct and indirect discrimination against persons on the grounds of a range of attributes, including disability, in a number of activities, including education and training. It remains to be seen what effect the implementation of this Act, including the appointment of an Anti-Discrimination Commissioner, will have on the practice of inclusive schooling.
3 Equity and inclusion in Tasmanian education

3.1 The Equity Policy

The Department’s *Equity in Schooling* policy (1995a) (Equity Policy) establishes the principles by which all students in Tasmanian Government schools should ‘have equitable access to the benefits of education irrespective of their sex, culture, linguistic background, race, location, socio-economic background or disability’. The policy affirms that schools and colleges ‘should focus especially on those groups of students who are known to gain significantly less from their education than the population as a whole’. It identifies six such groups of students, one of which is ‘students with disabilities and difficulties with learning’.

Essentially, the Equity Policy promotes a culture of schooling built on values of social justice and respect for individual rights. The policy affirms that such a culture should permeate all mainstream policies and practices in schools and colleges so that they are able to respond successfully to a diversity of children’s needs, backgrounds and capabilities. Schools are charged with the responsibility of minimising children’s disadvantage arising from personal circumstances, by adopting practices which:

- demonstrate that all people are of equal worth and have equal rights;
- allow students to gain knowledge and a sense of control over their circumstances, free from harassment, bias and discriminatory practices;
- ensure that the participation and performance of any equity target group of students approaches as closely as possible the levels of the student population as a whole;
- acknowledge the fact that some students need a greater share of resources than others in order to have the opportunity for equality of participation and outcomes.

The Equity Policy has been praised as a statement of the principles of equity and their application within schools. The specific goals of the policy have been important issues of concern at all levels of the Department during recent years. These relate to: all students’ access to schooling; their retention at school until the completion of Year 12; their participation in a full, relevant and challenging curriculum; their attainment of educational outcomes; and parent participation in decisions about their children’s education.
Evidence collected by the Review Team indicates, however, that teachers, principals and Department officers’ understanding of the concept of equity, and the practices adopted to promote this within schools, varies considerably. This evidence suggests that a primary and important task for the Department is to ensure that the beliefs and values which underpin the Equity Policy, and the implications of such beliefs and values for planning and practice, are examined, understood and accepted by all members of the educational community.

3.2 The Inclusion Policy

The Inclusion Policy was developed in conjunction with the Equity Policy. In the main, the Inclusion Policy relates the principles and rationale of the Equity Policy to the implementation of strategies and practices designed to enhance educational opportunities for students with disabilities. Its underlying principle is that the placement of students with disabilities in regular schools ‘is the preferred educational option in Tasmania’, and that, to ‘the fullest extent possible, students with disabilities should be educated in the company of their age peers while also being provided with curriculum and support that effectively meets their needs’.

This principle is elaborated in the policy’s goals, which intend the following:

- Students with disabilities will attend a school setting which is as close as possible to the norms and patterns of schooling experienced by other students and one that provides the least possible restriction on their right to lead a normal life, while adequately catering for their special needs (Goal 1).

- Such students will be supported in compulsory, as well as pre- and post-compulsory education, with the effective provision and use of human and material resources (Goal 2).

- Educational services provided for these students will reflect the diverse needs and varying preferences of these students, with a variety of models of provision being utilised (Goal 3).

- These services will be provided in accordance with the principles and objectives of the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act and the Tasmanian Disability Services Act (Goal 4).

The policy identifies a number of strategies to achieve each of these goals and specifies the responsibilities of central and district special education committees, district superintendents, principals, teachers and parents in the implementation of the policy.
The Review Team noted several features of this policy that have impacted significantly on its implementation:

- The preferred option of placing students with disabilities in regular schools.

- Acknowledgment that because students with disabilities ‘have a degree of physical, sensory, intellectual or psychological impairment which causes a serious restriction in the way that the student is able to function at school’ the practice of inclusion in regular schools places an ‘emphasis on how schools can change in order to meet the needs of students with disabilities’.

- Acknowledgment that despite the above, there will be circumstances and degrees of disabilities that will make necessary ‘access to a centre for specialist services catering for students with a particular sensory or physical disability, to a regular school which has a specialist unit or facility, or to a special school’.

- Recognition of the need to rationalise resources so ‘there can be a concentration of specialist facilities and expertise in a nominated school(s) which caters for a small group of students who have a similar need’.

- Affirmation that the government school system will continue to have a range of school and special school settings and services.

- A need for special educational provision in each district to reflect the planning, preferences and priorities of the district community, including school staff and parents.

- The division of special education services into those which are ‘specialist’ (Category A) and those which are ‘generalist’ (Category B), and the definitions of these two categories, as found in Appendix III of the policy.

- Emphasis on responsibilities for the implementation of the policy being directed to officers, teachers and parents working within districts, and a lesser emphasis on central responsibility for the policy, apart from the central Special Education Committee’s responsibilities for financial and other resource provision.

While data collected during the review confirmed support for the concept of inclusive schooling on the grounds of social justice, the method of implementing the policy was an issue of debate. The range of attitudes and practices noted by the Review Team reflected, in some instances, a degree of uncertainty about what inclusion of students with disabilities in regular schools meant in practice.

Many submissions from parents and teachers and several from district consultation processes supported the policy’s clear intention that a range of options for the schooling
of children with disabilities should be available. The need to maintain this range of options was supported strongly in the formal submissions to the review, particularly those from the Australian Education Union (Tasmanian Branch) and the Tasmanian Council of State School Parents and Friends Associations Inc. Parents, in particular, commended this range of alternatives and noted that some of the options, as outlined in the policy, were no longer available in their local district. Some of these parents, together with a number of teachers and principals, expressed the view that there was a ‘politically correct’ version of inclusion being espoused by some administrators and that decisions being made on such a basis were restricting choice and flexibility. The Review Team gained the impression that there were varying agendas and points of view operating which appeared to confuse some basic and important principles.

Exploration of this matter became one of the central concerns of the Review Team and posed a number of questions:

- Is inclusive education a ‘monolithic concept’ or are there ‘multiple versions of inclusion’? (Dyson 1999, p.49)
- Does the provision of a range of schooling options negate the principle of inclusive education?
- To what extent should the policy’s affirmation of the preferred option to place students with disabilities in regular schools become a ‘fait accompli’?
- How ready is the system to embrace inclusion in all its forms?
- Does the Department of Education provide leadership, resources and professional learning, the extent and nature of which develop the system’s capacity to manage inclusive practice successfully?
- What is the nature and extent of teacher, parent and student support necessary for inclusion to be practised successfully?
- Are there aspects of the current management and operation of the policy that impede the consistency and coherence of its implementation?
- What performance indicators are available against which to report progress in the successful implementation of the policy?
- What are the long-term effects of the inclusion of students with disabilities on the learning outcomes for these students and for those students without disabilities?
- How does an education system achieve a balance between theoretical perfectionism and pragmatic realism?
The Review Team was struck by the fact that the challenges and opportunities relating to the effective practice of inclusive education are part of the larger challenge faced by any education system and its schools and educators. This is to develop those professional and administrative competencies that foster and support a culture of flexible, innovative, experimental and reflective thinking and practice in order to meet successfully the needs of all children and improve their educational outcomes and life chances.
4 Findings from the review

The findings are presented under headings provided by the Terms of Reference:

- System and school performance
- Outcomes for students with disabilities
- Resource management
- Professional development
- Policy review

4.1 System and school performance

4.1.1 System performance

No agreed performance indicators exist for determining the extent to which the policy has been met. As a result, the Review Team took the goals of the policy as the basis for both data collection and judgements about the effectiveness of the policy. The information is presented here under sub-headings relating to these goals.

Attendance at regular schools (Goal 1)

The policy states unequivocally that:

Placement of students with disabilities in regular schools is the preferred educational option in Tasmania. To the fullest extent possible, students with disabilities should be educated in the company of their age peers while also being provided with curriculum and support that effectively meet their needs.

_Inclusion Policy_

Longitudinal data of special school enrolments is available from 1984. Figure 1 shows the trend over time, based on August census figures.

Special school enrolment remained relatively constant in the ten years from 1984 to 1993, but clearly there was a shift from 1994 onwards. This can be attributed to the impact of the policy, which was developed and in draft form in 1994, and approved and
published in 1995. The downward trend has continued with some relatively small variations.

Figure 1: Special school enrolments over time (Head Count)
*1999 figures are based on February figures

As a consequence, more students on the Category A register are now attending regular schools. The trends in enrolment over time are summarised in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Enrolment of students on the Category A register in different types of school

The numbers presented in Figure 2 are the best estimates based on the February counts that are used to determine funding to schools. They suggest that there is an upward
trend to enrol students in regular schools, with a consequent drop in enrolment in special schools. This drop appears to be greater for students in special schools who are not on the Category A register.

In this respect the system appears to have met the goal.

Support for a range of student abilities and needs (Goal 2)

In order to meet the range of different abilities and needs, special education provision in Tasmania is divided into specialist (Category A) and generalist services. Students on the Category A register are those with the highest levels of need. They are placed on the register according to a set of criteria available for each type of identified disability. These are vision impairment, deaf and hearing impairment, autism, and intellectual, physical, psychiatric and multiple disabilities. A specialist committee comprising personnel from within the Department of Education moderates placement on each register. Schools are required to nominate students via District Support Services, and to supply the necessary documentation as laid down in the criteria.

There was criticism of the Category A register from various sources, including schools and parents. Many responses, including submissions from the Australian Education Union and the Tasmanian Council of State Schools Parents and Friends Associations, expressed concern that some groups were apparently automatically placed on the register while other children with very high needs missed out. Many students who had very high needs did not fall into categories applicable to the register, such as those who are socially and emotionally disturbed. Several comments were also received about the growing number of students on the register.

It proved difficult to obtain reliable figures for students on the Category A register prior to 1997. Figures for 1997 onwards, presented in Figure 2 above, suggest that there is an upward trend in the total number of students being identified on the Category A register. When these figures are examined more closely, however, they reveal some interesting differences.

The numbers of students in the categories of vision and hearing impaired, and psychiatric disabilities, have remained relatively constant over time. However, other categories, in particular autism, have increased since 1997. Figure 3 shows the trends for the four categories of disability that appear to have moved upwards.
Autism showed a large increase between 1998 and 1999. This can probably be attributed to improved facilities for and access to diagnosis in Tasmania. The upward trends in other categories may also reflect schools’ and districts’ increasing skill at preparing credible submissions, rather than a genuine increase in incidence.

The Departmental document *Support Materials for the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools* predicts the likely incidence of particular disabilities in Tasmania. The prediction is made on the basis of incidence data from the USA, assuming that the distribution of particular disabilities is similar in Tasmania. While recognising the limitations of this, it is useful to compare the predicted incidence with the actual incidence as a percentage of the total school population in 1999. These figures are shown in Table 1.

### Table 1: Actual and predicted incidence of particular disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Disability</th>
<th>Actual incidence</th>
<th>Predicted incidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind/Visual impairment</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical disability</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple disability</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual disability</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the very small numbers involved, the actual rates are very close to those predicted, with the exception of intellectual disability. Since, in addition to these
categories, the Category A register also includes autism and psychiatric disability, these actual figures suggest that the Category A register recognises a wider range of disabilities and a greater number of children with severe levels of need than may reasonably have been expected from the predicted rates.

In this sense it would seem that the second goal of the policy is being met.

**Coordination of support**

The second goal of the policy also states:

> Students ... will be supported ... with the effective provision and use of human and material resources.

*Inclusion Policy*

The provision of these resources is dealt with under the heading of resource management. However, criticism of the system’s performance in relation to coordinating resources from outside the Department seems to be more appropriately dealt with here. Support for students with disabilities, whether in a separate or included setting, requires a range of human and material resources. Various people and organisations provide these, and respondents identified managing and coordinating the range of support needed as a significant challenge.

> Availability of resources is not the problem. Coordination of these resources is!

*Written comment: Community Consultation*

One major concern commented on in many areas was the difficulty of coordinating support from professionals outside the Department, such as occupational and physical therapists. The recent reorganisation of the Department of Health and Human Services seems also to have disrupted services to a significant degree. Comments were received about the length of time taken to get a response, inordinate delays in getting repairs to equipment, or new equipment, such as wheelchairs, where the child had outgrown the current model. All of these difficulties have an impact on the educational outcomes for students.

Other comments about non-education professionals concerned their perceived lack of understanding of the school context. Often their suggestions or recommendations could not be implemented in a school setting. In some areas of the State there is little support available for students with disabilities outside the education system. Conversely, some of these outside professionals expressed concerned about the nature of the curriculum presented to students with disabilities, and the physical conditions in which this was delivered.
At the system level, there is some evidence of differences between districts, both in administration of the policy and in allocation of district support. Parents and teachers alike commented on this matter. The variations were confirmed by interviews with district superintendents and district support managers. It is possible that in districts where support is devolved to schools through additional staffing, teachers did not recognise this as district support. It also raises the issue, however, of how district support staff are being used in schools. If these staff are simply treated as additional staff in the school, and used, in effect, to reduce class size or to work with particular school-based programs, any expertise that they have may not be available to teachers with students with disabilities in their class.

Principals were generally more positive about District Support Services than were teachers. During some school visits, principals praised the level of support provided by District Support Services while teachers in the same school indicated that they never saw any support from district support staff. These comments surprised many district superintendents and district support managers. These senior staff all believed sincerely that support teachers were working effectively in schools alongside teachers.

It seems that in terms of coordinating the support available to students with disabilities, and providing effective support from a range of providers across the State, there are some problems still to be overcome.

**Variety of provision (Goal 3)**

While asserting the preferred position of the Department, the policy clearly states that a range of provision will be available.

> Educational services ... will reflect the diverse needs and varying preferences ... with a variety of models of provision being utilised.

*Inclusion Policy*

There are various interpretations of what this means in practice. Some districts, for example, stated categorically that they did not want a special school and their aim was full inclusion in the regular classroom for every child. Others maintained a special school. Some districts used their support school as a flexible form of special education provision. Some parents of students with disabilities reported concern that the special school option might be removed.

In general, District Support Services were creative about their management of resources, recognising also that there were a number of children who did not fit the Category A criteria but who had very high support needs. They endeavoured to cater for these in a variety of ways according to models developed within each district.
Parents and schools often saw value in dual enrolment between special and regular schools. Anecdotal evidence suggested that this was an increasing trend and this was borne out by the figures obtained about dual enrolment between special and regular schools. This information is summarised in Figure 4.

**Figure 4: Dual enrolments between special and regular schools**

The graph shows the numbers of students dual-enrolled in both a special and a regular school over the past five years, and the trendline associated with this. There is no doubt that parents expressed clear reasons for wanting this option. The regular school was the preferred option for social reasons—acceptance by peers and the modelling of appropriate behaviour. The special school was seen as catering for the learning needs of the student, particularly ‘life skills’. Regular schools also supported this trend, though at times the feeling was that it provided them with some respite rather than meeting the educational needs of the student concerned.

There were some reported difficulties, however. In high schools, students had difficulty with maintaining progress in general curriculum areas, and timetabling arrangements sometimes meant that students missed classes that it might have been appropriate for them to undertake, such as cooking or art. There were also incidences of ‘territorialism’ where one principal or the other refused to be flexible about the days that the child attended so that the student could not always participate in a particular activity, such as school excursions.

There were challenges, too, for some of the students involved in dual enrolments. These students had to adjust to two physical and social school environments, a greater number of supervising adults and, occasionally, two educational programs that lacked coordination.
Dual enrolments do create some bureaucratic difficulties related to funding. Because of the different funding arrangements for students on the Category A register in special and regular schools, transferring aide time, for example, is not possible, although recognition of dual enrolment is made by a pro rata allocation of the School Resource Package (SRP).

It should also be noted that there is probably more sharing of students in reality, particularly between regular schools and district support schools. Most districts reported that they used the support school as a centre where students could spend some of their time, as a temporary respite both for schools and the students concerned, or to implement some specialised and personalised programs.

Dual enrolment provision is not widely available to parents of students without disabilities. Increasingly, though, regular schools are using it for students who have difficulty with the normal school setting. Often the enrolment is with the Tasmanian Open Learning Service School (TOLSS), rather than a special school. If this practice is to continue, there is a case to be made for improving the program and communication between the two schools.

It would seem that a range of schooling provision is still available to parents, as required by the policy. On the other hand, this is uncoordinated and varies from district to district. The system may appear to have met this goal at one level, but the inconsistent nature of the provision leads to the conclusion that this is not uniform across the State.

**Relationship with relevant legislation (Goal 4)**

In response to the Commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act, the Department of Education developed and published a *Disability Service Plan* in 1996. The plan uses the very broad definition of disability that appears in the Disability Discrimination Act, rather than that applied to the Inclusion Policy. It identifies barriers to equal opportunity, strategies to overcome these and responsibilities for implementing these strategies under the headings of access and participation, staff knowledge and skills, and improved communication processes.

In the context of this review, it is unfair to judge the performance of the Department against the *Disability Service Plan*. However, it is noticeable that many of the barriers identified in the plan are difficulties mentioned by various respondents during the course of the review.

At present, it is clearly the Department’s intention to provide educational services to students with disabilities in accordance with the principles and objectives of the relevant legislation. Over a period of time the identified barriers are likely to be reduced or removed if the *Disability Service Plan* is fully implemented. In the short term, however, it is probable that some students may continue to experience barriers to full access and
participation in all aspects of education because of the difficulty of fully implementing strategies to overcome these in a large, wholly devolved system.

Since the policy was written, the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Act has been proclaimed. This Act also has implications for education, and any update of the *Disability Service Plan* should consider these.

### 4.1.2 School performance

As with system performance, no indicators of performance were available for schools. For the purpose of making judgements about the overall performance of schools within the system, rather than about individual schools, a set of indicators was developed for schools and classrooms (Appendix 3). These indicators of inclusive practice were based in part on work from the USA: the *New York Partnership for Statewide Systems Change 2000* (Price, Wood & Giugno 1998; Meyer, Price, Giugno, Gurian & Black 1997). The indicators required principals and teachers to rate current practice against a set of four statements. Principals used statements pertaining to work within the school and teachers used classroom indicators. These indicators included enrolment and transition, student outcomes and curriculum. Table 2 shows the numbers of responses overall, although not every respondent completed all indicators.

#### Table 2: Responses to school and classroom self-rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School type</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher of a student with a disability</th>
<th>Teacher of students without disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To provide consistency with the system-level reporting, results from these self-ratings are reported against the goals of the policy. Detailed results against each indicator are provided in Appendix 3.

**Attendance at regular schools (Goal 1)**

At the school level, three indicators related to this goal. These addressed enrolment, student class placement and transition between schools.
Of the 22 principals who completed the enrolment indicator, 45.5% (10/22) indicated that they enrolled all students, including those with disabilities, from within the school’s catchment area. Only 13.5% (3/22) indicated that the school had only limited capacity to enrol students with disabilities. These were all primary schools, although the small numbers do not allow reliable comparison between types of school. When transition processes were considered, however, nearly one-third of the principals responding (6/19 or 31.6%) indicated that no processes existed to support the transition of students between schools. A further 42.1% (8/19) indicated that some processes existed and that enrolment of students with special needs was supported on an individual basis. Only 15.8% (3/19) said that the transition processes between schools recognised the needs of equity groups in relation to coordination and maintenance of support. In contrast, in-school processes to place students into classes appeared to be consultative and to take account of students’ needs and parents’ wishes, with 85.7% (18/21) indicating agreement with the top two categories.

At the classroom level there were some differences in the responses between those teachers with students on the Category A register and those who were not teaching students with disabilities. Nearly 40% of classroom teachers with students on the Category A register (9/23, 39.1%) reported that classroom teachers actively supported transition processes, while only 18.8% (3/16) of classroom teachers without students on the Category A register reported this level of involvement.

The second classroom indicator relating to Goal 1 of the policy was concerned with social interaction. This was designed to address the ways in which students with and without disabilities were encouraged to interact with each other. Slightly more teachers of students without disabilities (9/19, 47.4%) rated themselves at the highest level than did teachers with students on the Category A register (12/28, 42.9%). At the other end of the scale, only one teacher of students with disabilities suggested that opportunities for social interactions were limited (1/28, 3.6%) compared with 10.5% (2/19) of teachers of students without disabilities. These results may suggest that teachers of students on the Category A register try to encourage more social interaction in their classrooms, but also recognise the difficulties of achieving this successfully for all children.

In general, in terms of enrolment, class placement and social interactions within schools for students with disabilities, school respondents rated themselves relatively highly. There appears, though, to be a need for some improved processes of transition between schools.

**Support for a range of student abilities and needs (Goal 2)**

The indicators relating to this goal at the school level were those concerning the allocation and management of resources and support within the school. There were no classroom indicators specifically addressing this goal.
The largest proportion of principals (10/22, 45.5%) reported that in their schools a coordinator undertook the management of special education. Only one respondent (1/22, 4.6%) reported active discussion about equity matters, which involved parents and members of the community, and supported the integration of special education into regular classrooms. Just over one-third of schools (9/24, 37.5%) included a special allocation for inclusion and contributed to this from the School Resource Package. Nearly 40% of principals (8/21, 38.1%) said that the school coordinator and district support staff worked as a team with all staff, parents and outside agencies to develop skills to meet the needs of all students.

There appear to be some contradictions here. While principals did not report involving parents and other interested groups in management processes, leaving that to a coordinator, they believed that support was coordinated as a team approach involving coordinators and district staff working with other people to ensure that all students’ needs were met. A likely interpretation is that the day-to-day operation of special education is passed to a coordinator. Resources are allocated by a process agreed to by all staff, and some parents may be involved in this process, such as those on the School Council. This resource allocation is underpinned by the ethos of the school. Special education, in general, still seems to be seen as a specific program within the school, rather than part of a wider, ongoing discussion about equity issues. The nature of the resource allocation often reinforced this separatist view.

**Variety of provision (Goal 3)**

The majority of indicators relating to Goal 3 were at the classroom level. These addressed planning, teaching, curriculum, student learning outcomes and behaviour management. Planning was generally done by individual teachers for their own classes (11/29, 37.9% of teachers of students on the Category A register; 10/20, 50% of other teachers) but for both groups of teachers about one-fifth reported that planning was undertaken by flexible groups of teachers and teacher aides. Nearly 50% of all teachers (13/27, 48.2% teachers of students on the Category A register; 9/19, 47.4% other teachers) reported using diverse approaches to teaching in order to cater for a wide range of needs. Similarly, around half of all teachers provide a curriculum that allows all students, including those with disabilities, to address appropriate academic, social and cultural outcomes (14/26, 53.9% of teachers of students on the Category A register; 9/19, 47.7% of other teachers).

A majority of teachers of students on the Category A register (11/25, 44.0%) said that learning outcomes were based on developmental continua and agreed social outcomes, and that Individual Education Plans (IEPs) reflected this basis. Of other teachers, just under half (8/18, 44.4%) said that learning outcomes were general with a focus on key learning areas and some social outcomes, although almost as many teachers in this group (7/18, 38.9%) rated themselves at the highest level of the scale. Over half of the
principals (12/23, 52.2%) stated that IEPs existed for particular students, were developed by teachers and district support staff, and regularly updated.

No teacher in either group saw behaviour management as solely the responsibility of senior staff. However, more teachers of students without disabilities (11/21, 52.4%) rated themselves in the highest level where management of students was based on agreed rules and school guidelines, and high standards were expected from all students, regardless of background or disability. Teachers of students on the Category A register (12/29, 41.4%) were more likely than other teachers (6/21, 28.6%) to modify expected standards of behaviour for some groups of students, and were less likely to expect high standards of some particular groups. This may reflect the real difficulties for some teachers of managing disabilities that manifest in behaviour problems, such as autism.

On these self-rating scales, then, teachers in general said that they did provide a program that catered for diversity and utilised a variety of models of provision. There is, however, considerable work to do before that is true for all teachers, in particular in the areas of collaborative planning.

Relationship with relevant legislation (Goal 4)

The Disability Service Plan, formulated as a response to the Disability Discrimination Act, has several outcomes that relate to professional development and improving communication with parents of students with disabilities. Indicators relating to these aspects were identified as being appropriate, therefore, in addressing Goal 4 at the school level.

In schools, 54.6% (12/22) of principals indicated that all parents receive reports as required under the Reporting to Parents policy (1996b), and that parents are welcome to visit the school at any time. A further 31.8% (7/22) said that in addition, parents of children who have an IEP receive a report on outcomes related to this. Teachers, however, rated themselves higher. Over 50% of all teachers (14/26 or 53.9% of teachers of students on the Category A register; 10/20 or 50% of other teachers) reported that parents frequently received reports and that teachers contacted parents personally on any matter of concern. It would seem that in relation to reporting at least, teachers go beyond the minimum expected contact.

Just over one-third of all principals rated their school in the highest level for Assisted School Self Review (ASSR) processes, where parents, students and staff were actively involved in the process and the needs of equity groups were expressly addressed. Only 13.6% (3/22) said that a limited group of parents and staff were involved and that attention was paid only to the needs of the majority of students.

However, in nearly half of all schools (11/23, 47.8%), the professional learning plan was based on the needs of individual groups of teachers. Only one of the 23 principals
responding (4.4%) reported that the school professional learning plan was coordinated and expressly addressed issues relating to inclusive practice. Further information about professional development is provided in the professional development section (starting on page 62).

Finally, principals were asked about crisis management plans. Unexpected events are likely where there are students with disabilities and this indicator was included as one way of estimating schools’ preparedness to cope with unanticipated matters. All principals could talk about particular strategies that they had in place, including plans to deal with particular students’ health care or action to take in case of fire, for example. However, in general these strategies were discrete and designed to address individual problems, rather than being part of an overall comprehensive plan. Only 10% (2/20) of principals reported that they had a crisis management plan that was regularly updated, and that school staff were trained to cope with the unexpected. Nearly two-thirds of all schools (13/20, 65%) reported that they had no crisis management plan.

Schools do appear to be trying to involve parents and the wider school community, and keep all parents informed about their child’s progress. In areas of professional learning and crisis management, however, there is still work needed to develop professional learning plans that include equity issues. The ASSR process has the potential to inform planning in this area if steps are taken to explicitly consider the needs of equity groups, including those of students with disabilities.

### 4.2 Outcomes for students with disabilities

#### 4.2.1 Access and participation

In order to achieve appropriate outcomes, students with disabilities need both to be able to access educational facilities and to be able to participate fully in educational experiences. In order to do this, modifications may need to be made both to physical resources, such as buildings, and to educational programs, such as extra-curriculum activities. Questions in the Community Consultation Questionnaire addressed these issues and the results are reported here.

As schools are upgraded through ongoing major works programs, appropriate access for people with disabilities is included in the plans. In this way, eventually all schools will have the capacity to enrol students with physical disabilities without the need for major reconstruction work. While major physical alterations to ensure access to buildings, such as ramps and lifts, were carried out at no cost to the school, there were cases where there were delays in the work being undertaken or completed. This created short-term complications for schools and students. Sometimes the work was done inadequately or on the basis of poor advice, so that the modification was not effective. For example, toilets
were installed that did not have enough room for aides to lift the child, or ramps that did not conform to specifications. In these cases, the school generally had to carry any additional costs of improvement, at least in the short term.

Responses to questions on the Community Consultation Questionnaire about access and participation were obtained on a 5-point scale, where 1 was ‘excellent’ and 5 was ‘very poor’. An index of support was calculated for each response by calculating a weighted mean of all results. The scale runs from 1 to 5, and the lower the result, the better the rating for that particular response. The responses are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Support indices for access and participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Support Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom support</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical access</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional services</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the curriculum</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through the social environment</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the physical environment</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although physical access received a relatively high weighting, this was not reflected in the rating given to participation in the physical environment. Information gathered during school visits suggests that safe play areas, in particular fenced areas, are a need, as is appropriate and adequate supervision at recess and lunch times. In many schools, children with disabilities are effectively forced to socialise with each other because only one adult is available to supervise during non-classroom time. The point was made several times that even this low level of supervision was possible only at the expense of classroom time.

Some issues also arose concerning difficulties of physical access to specialist facilities in high schools, such as technology classrooms or science laboratories. Some of this may be due to timetabling constraints—classes with students with some level of physical disability may be allocated to a teaching space where access is restricted, even when another space could be made available. There are reasons why these kinds of decisions are made that relate to access to appropriate facilities by other students as well—for example, updated technology facilities that do have wheelchair access may be allocated to senior classes preferentially because of the better facilities for Tasmanian Certificate of Education (TCE) courses. Schools need to be aware of possible consequences when they make timetabling decisions. It should also be noted that not every student, disabled or non-disabled, is always able to undertake every course.

The lowest rating was given to access to additional services. This was supported by comments received during school visits and public meetings. Respondents commented
upon the inadequacy of some specialist resources, both from within and outside the Department. These included speech pathology, physical and occupational therapy and, increasingly, juvenile mental health specialists. Comments about such inadequacies came from all parts of the State, but particularly from the north-west of the State.

Responses from the Community Consultation Questionnaire about how well students’ needs were met in regard to some specialist services were treated in the same way as those questions about access and participation. A rating of 1 indicated that students were catered for ‘excellently’ and 5 indicated ‘very inadequately’. Results are summarised in Table 4.

**Table 4: Level of specialist support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Support index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational therapy</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance support</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech pathology</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher assistant support in classrooms</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different providers in each of the State’s three regions provide physiotherapy or occupational therapy services. While this is to some extent out of the area of responsibility of the education service, inadequate provision can have an impact on the educational outcomes for students with disabilities. In recognition of this fact, some funding is made available through the special education budget to organisations to supply physiotherapy and consultancy services, particularly in the north and north-west of the State. It seems, however, that this remains a problematic area. It is unclear whether limited access to some of the services results from poor coordination of existing services or a lack of personnel. This matter warrants further investigation.

Of those services provided through the Department of Education, speech pathology was mentioned most often as being inadequate. The speech pathologists themselves recognise the difficulties, and, through their professional association, have attempted to attract young speech pathologists to the State. This, however, is not a sustainable long-term solution since it relies on the goodwill of a small professional association. New graduates who do come from interstate tend to stay for a few years only. This is not a new problem and it has been raised in several reviews of support services over recent years.

**4.2.2 Progress towards identified goals**

Goals for each student with a disability may be different. Thus, Individual Education Plans for these students become very important. In this section, information is included
under the heading of IEPs because of their significance in the funding process. The main goals identified for students with disabilities included social and learning outcomes, and findings related to these two categories are also included.

**Individual Education Plans**

Teachers and principals mentioned Individual Education Plans in a majority of cases. There were, however, considerable differences in both the quality and use of these. At one extreme, documents were prepared and used by parents, classroom teachers, teacher aides and support staff, including non-educational staff; at the other, one-page outlines were kept in the file. Sometimes the Plans were revised and updated frequently; sometimes they were produced as part of the funding submission process and not otherwise used.

The use of Individual Education Plans appeared to vary from district to district. In some districts, preparation of the Individual Education Plan was seen as the role of the support teacher, and other stakeholders had only a limited input. Support services did not emphasise the use of an Individual Education Plan in some districts, and here teachers or principals rarely mentioned them. In others, Individual Education Plans were clearly part of the culture of the district and all teachers recognised their importance. This did not, however, guarantee that they were used.

In two districts, Individual Education Plans appeared particularly effective. In one of these districts, several schools mentioned that support staff were emphasising a shift to outcomes-based Individual Education Plans, and they were in the process of redrafting IEPs accordingly. In these two districts, IEPs were frequently updated through consultation with all parties and were very impressive in their scope, covering a range of social, personal and academic goals appropriate to the child concerned. At the other extreme, in one district, IEPs appeared to be a relatively new innovation with comments from schools such as ‘... IEP does exist for [the] Cat A student now but as yet is not widely distributed’.

In general, the community responses made little mention of Individual Education Plans. Where they were mentioned it was in relation only to the annual funding process, rather than as working documents where all people concerned with the child’s progress and welfare had a continuing interest. A number of parents expressed frustration with teachers and support staff who did not recognise their expertise about their own child and the nature of the disability, thereby suggesting that they had not been involved with the Individual Education Plan process.
Social outcomes

All teachers, both of students with disabilities and others, when asked about outcomes for students with disabilities commented about the social outcomes. Comments such as: ‘… well accepted by the kids’; ‘Other students accept the child very well’; ‘Students ... interact quite freely with her’; ‘... greeted by other kids in the playground’, and so on, were commonplace. This was true at all levels of schooling—primary, high and college.

This, however, did not happen accidentally. Teachers positively reinforced this, modelled it and developed strategies to help other children deal with sometimes inappropriate behaviour from the child with a disability. In one primary school, for example, a student with disabilities was sometimes unthinkingly rough and the teacher had deliberately built into her program coping and support strategies:


*Interview with a primary teacher*

Many teachers and principals commented about the good effects on the general school population of having students with disabilities in the school. The acceptance and understanding that this generated was universally regarded as one very positive outcome. This was particularly noticeable with students who had moved through the school with their peer group.

> As inclusion is made earlier in schools other students are more readily accepting to these students as they have grown with them.

*Written comment from a teacher*

One school principal commented on findings from the Assisted School Self Review process about inclusion.

> Parent Surveys indicated that a very high proportion of parents considered that the Inclusion Program was most successful. The major finding of the Committee was that Inclusion was an important and highly successful program at — P. S. and was clearly acknowledged as such by the school community as well as the [D]epartment.

*Written comment from a primary principal*

There were other perceptions as well. Several respondents commented about the exclusion of students with disabilities from social circles in high schools. While this was not always the case, it is probably true to say that students with major communication problems, through physical disability, and students with severe intellectual disabilities, were more isolated in high schools. In primary schools, students with intellectual disabilities were able to socialise with much younger children. This was not so in high schools, and sometimes these students appeared to be very lonely.
Responses from parents gathered through community consultation indicated both positive and negative outcomes for their children. A common theme was the variation from year to year as the child moved through the system with different teachers. There seemed to be no difference between primary and high school experiences—good and bad outcomes were reported in both settings.

Some parents described the regular school setting as providing the appropriate role modelling, while others talked of the isolation that their child experienced. Some strongly advocated special settings because of the more appropriate curriculum and access to therapy services, while others talked about the inappropriate behaviour learned by their child from other children with disabilities.

Similar mixed references to social outcomes for children with disabilities who were included in regular schools came from district focus groups. One group suggested that children with disabilities could be very isolated and that the situation could be regarded as regressive. This group considered that there was a possible benefit in grouping students with similar disabilities together, citing the Claremont project as a successful program. However a contradictory view emerged later in the discussion when the importance of local community support was recognised.

Another group regarded the social outcomes for students with disabilities as very successful, with many friendships being developed. A third group referred to the growing understanding and improved attitudes of teachers, students and the wider community, which reinforced similar comments received from schools.

**Learning outcomes**

This area was not well addressed by teachers and was virtually ignored by principals. There were some references to KILOs and KINOs (Key Intended Literacy/Numeracy Outcomes) and most teachers could describe accurately what children with disabilities in their classes could do.

Where specific learning outcomes were addressed for students with disabilities, they usually focused on specific communication skills, such as using compics (icon-based computer commands) or computer use. At the other extreme were schools where no allowance had been made for the student’s disability and learning outcomes were expressed in the same terms as those for non-disabled students. Because of the generally slower rate of progress for children with disabilities, this reporting often did not show any significant change over the year. Teachers generally did not appear to be using other sources for possible appropriate learning outcomes, such as ‘Towards Level 1’ outcomes of the national profiles. These outcomes were specially developed for use with students with disabilities.
Older students undertaking Tasmanian Certificate of Education (TCE) courses met the same criteria as other students, and did so successfully in many instances. Where exams were required, usually for top-level courses, appropriate modifications were made to the examination process to allow students with specific disabilities to participate. At the other end of the intellectual range, students with disabilities were successfully undertaking TCE subjects at an appropriate level.

There were difficulties, however. In one college, for example, the following comment exemplified the views of many teachers working with students with disabilities in regular schools.

[There are] too few subjects that offer enough practical opportunities for students, or a reluctance by teachers to modify teaching programmes or learning materials to cater for the students’ needs.

*Written comment from a college teacher*

It was noticeable that very few parents mentioned learning outcomes for students with disabilities. This was true of all community settings—questionnaire responses, submissions and public meetings. In general, learning outcomes were mentioned only in relation to children of normal intelligence with physical or sensory disabilities. In one district discussion, the need for realistic expectations was emphasised with a ‘... focus on remediation to bring them up to the level we expect’. Another district felt that the educational outcomes for children with disabilities were taking longer to develop than social outcomes.

Clearly, while students with disabilities are being located in regular schools, identification of appropriate and equitable learning outcomes, and the regular monitoring of these, still have some way to go. One of the strategies of the *Disability Service Plan* was to provide professional development in transition planning and Individual Education Plan development. There are reported difficulties in that the responsibility for professional development has been devolved to schools, and if schools do not see this as a priority they will not provide the necessary resources to support professional learning. This is an area that has the potential to be affected by possible accountability requirements through ASSR and Equity Standards.

### 4.3 Resource Management

Support for students with special needs, including those with identified disabilities, is provided through a complex web of services delivered by a number of government agencies, private providers and community organisations. While funding is clearly an issue, other aspects of resource management are also important. These include human resources, time management, and access to and use of appropriate equipment and technology.
4.3.1 The mechanisms used to allocate special education funds

Although the Inclusion Policy itself does not specifically address the issue of resources, other than to specify responsibilities for allocating them, the Equity Policy is very clear about this. One principle on which the Equity Policy is based is:

Some students need a greater share of resources than others in order to have the opportunity for equality of outcomes and participation. This has implications for the setting of priorities.

Equity Policy

In recognition of this, funding for special education is provided in addition to general funding to schools allocated through the School Resource Package (SRP). For SRP purposes, all students, including those with disabilities, are funded according to a set of principles. Supplementary funding is provided in accordance with the underlying philosophy of the Equity Policy.

Support for students with disabilities is provided through State and Commonwealth government funding. It forms part of a general allocation of funds for special education that covers all special education needs. In 1999, total funding from all sources to special education in Tasmania, excluding salaries and capital works, was $6,287,120.

Funding allocations take three main forms:

- Funding directly to special schools and regular schools relating directly to individual students, eg Category A funding allocations;
- Funding for support services, at state and district level, relating directly to the needs of individual or groups of students, eg funding for students with hearing and vision impairment; and
- Funding for support services relating to delivery of general services supporting special education, eg funding for speech pathology and guidance officer services.

Prior to 1997, there was ‘quarantined’ funding from Commonwealth sources to non-government organisations for specific services to all school sectors. The Catholic and Independent sectors also supported this component. In 1997, changes to Commonwealth funding arrangements meant that this component was no longer explicitly tagged in the funds that came into the State for special education. In recognition of the services provided by non-government organisations, the State government continues to allocate funds to these organisations. In 1999, this amounted to $200,000, a relatively small component of the budget.
For the past two years, there has been a shortfall between the cost of requested support for students on the Category A register and the funding available. This shortfall has been met by all services taking some budgetary cuts, including ‘cashing in’ some teacher time to provide teacher aides. Some of this is managed through strategies such as not replacing staff who are on long service leave, for example. This, inevitably, puts additional pressure on remaining staff.

Students on the Category A register

Students are placed on the Category A register according to a process described in section 4.1.1. The register has become a de facto means of obtaining funding, and has thus assumed a greater importance than was probably intended when it was devised.

The Inclusion Policy states:

Special education resources will be prioritised according to the level of need of students, with those who have the most severe level of need having highest priority.

Inclusion Policy

For students with disabilities in regular schools, allocations are made to individual students on the Category A register through an annual submission process. Schools that have students on the Category A register make requests for support for individual students through District Support Services. All districts indicated that they used a process to moderate these requests, which are based on individual education plans and assessment reports of the child concerned. The requests are then forwarded to the central Special Education Committee that allocates available funds. These funds, expressed in terms of teacher aide hours, are ‘tied’ to an individual student. They are disbursed to the school via the School Resource Package.

Students on the Category A register in special schools are funded differently. These students are funded according to a formula, rather than by a submission-based process, with a notional number of teacher-aide hours being allocated based on an identified level of disability.

The central Special Education Committee moderates the whole process to ensure that these students’ needs are met equitably across the system, and the resources are prioritised according to the level of need. Allocations are based on the moderated submissions from the districts. Those involved with the process described it as transparent, equitable and needs-based. However, other respondents saw it differently.

They reported the process as being clumsy, opaque and discriminatory, not based on real needs and far too time-consuming. These observations were found within all types of response. Comments about the ‘squeaky wheel’ were received from teachers and principals, who believed that there was money available and that those who made the
most noise were most likely to get additional funding. Many people, including parents, also suggested that the process led to ‘dishonesty’ by not acknowledging progress made by students for fear of aide time being reduced. Several voluntary submissions to the review included extensive documents that had been prepared to support funding requests, but which respondents believed had been ignored.

The annual nature of the process was also of concern. The feeling was usually that the high support needs of this relatively small group of students did not change greatly from year to year. One district group suggested that this process should only be undertaken at transition points such as from early special education to kindergarten, primary to high school and high school to college.

Another issue was the lack of flexibility. In 1999, approximately $27,000 was kept aside for contingencies. Even with this contingency money, however, there was limited access to additional support during the year, even if circumstances changed. In addition, while the allocated resource could be ‘cashed in’ to provide less teacher aide time and more access to other facilities, in practice this is rarely done. Rather, many schools buy in additional aide time to cover times such as recess and lunch that are not included in the aide time allocated. In some schools, because of the ‘continuing service’ conditions for many teacher aides, there is no flexibility to decrease aide time.

Several respondents indicated that the cost of supporting a student with very high needs in a regular school was higher than in a special school, and that more funding should be provided as a result. The estimated figures for 1999 suggest that regular schools do receive more funding per full-time equivalent (FTE) ($6318) for students on the Category A register than do special schools ($6265), where there are some small economies of scale.

**Students who are hearing or vision impaired**

Funding for students who are hearing or vision impaired is managed somewhat differently from that for other disabilities. These students are mostly supported centrally by means of the State Support Service, through state coordinators who manage the provision of services for these children.

Most of the funding for deaf students goes to three regional centres. Provision for students within these centres takes different forms according to their needs. Profoundly deaf children attending schools within the centres are provided with a world-class bilingual facility in which they are taught in Auslan as their first language. Most of the budget, therefore, goes to provide interpreters who attend classes and translate proceedings. This work is intense and interpreters generally work in 20-minute shifts. There are also bilingual teachers and some innovative team-teaching situations in which two teachers teach the class, one of whom uses Auslan. In this situation both hearing and deaf children receive some instruction in Auslan, translated by an interpreter. This
approach explicitly recognises and endorses deaf culture. It has been recognised as best practice, and deaf students taught in this environment achieve generally as well as their age peers, despite English being their second language.

Teachers of the deaf and interpreters or teacher aides serve children attending schools outside the centres. A separate allocation is made in the special education budget to fund some professional development for these people.

A State Support Service also exists for students with vision impairment. Students, however, generally attend their neighbourhood schools and are supported by specialist teachers, teacher aides and four ‘interpreters’ who undertake the process of Braille transcription.

Very few comments were made about students supported in this way. Most school responses implied that since their needs were met they did not create any more management problems than non-disabled students. Certainly, the deaf and vision-impaired students who were part of the classroom observation study appeared to be fully part of their respective high schools, with a range of friends. Parents of these students who responded to the community questionnaire, or who attended public forums, indicated that they were satisfied with their child’s education.

In general, these students with hearing or vision impairment do not require high levels of aide time, and there are some economies of scale in the cluster arrangements. The cost of providing for vision-impaired and hearing-impaired students in 1999 was around $5634 per FTE, somewhat lower than for other high-needs students. This may, however, be higher if travel and professional development are included, since these items are provided through another part of the special education budget.

**Early Special Education**

Very young children identified as having a significant disability or some level of developmental delay may attend early special education centres from the time they are born or first diagnosed. This is in recognition of the fact that the earlier intervention occurs, the better the likely outcome. There are four early special-education centres throughout the State providing a service to children and their families in a variety of ways, including therapy sessions, counselling and home visits. In 1999, a total of 301 individual children (108.7 FTEs) and their families were supported in this way. The cost of this support in 1999 was approximately $1475 per FTE.

Parents, who appreciated the holistic approach taken, universally praised this service. Particular support is provided during the kindergarten year, when children are moving out of the ambit of Early Special Education and into schooling, both in special and regular schools. Only some of these children have high support needs and move onto the Category A register.
Chapter 4: Findings from the review

**Funding to District Support Services**

In addition to funding that goes directly to schools for students on the Category A register, resources are provided to each of the State’s six education districts. This is intended to provide support for those students who have generalised special education needs, designated in the policy as Category B, although this terminology has not been in use by central staff for some time. This resource is in the form of a staffing allocation. In addition, districts receive funding for behaviour management, and a variety of other small amounts intended for specific purposes. In 1999, funding allocated to Category B students was estimated at $580 per FTE, based on the official numbers reported to the Commonwealth for funding purposes.

This funding is managed within each district according to the discrete models developed locally. How this happens depends on the underpinning philosophy of each support service. In some districts the support is devolved to schools, in others it is centralised. Some districts aim for ‘multi-skilling’ with guidance officers, social workers, support teachers and speech pathologists all undertaking some generalised tasks, as well as their specialist roles. In some districts, schools nominate the services that they want. This can create problems if, during the year, a school needs to access specialist advice that they did not nominate at the start of the year.

This local diversity created confusion for parents, particularly when they lived close to district boundaries and saw children in a neighbouring district receiving apparently different levels of support. It was also an issue if they moved into a different district. Several respondents referred to children receiving direct funding from one district but not from another when they moved.

**Overall funding allocation**

District Support Service managers were concerned that funds allocated directly to districts had been reduced to address the shortfall in Category A funding. In fact, district funding has remained at much the same levels since 1993, while funding for students on the Category A register has increased markedly. The increase in funding to these Category A students is largely a result of the ‘3-Streams’ Award that affected teacher aide salaries, rather than an increase in support time.

Figure 5 shows total funding to students on the Category A register in regular and special schools, and funding to districts for Category B students. It does not include funding for vision-impaired and hearing-impaired students. In addition to this, there is district funding for speech pathology, for the purchase of some materials and for professional development.
Over time there has been only a slight drop in funding to districts for Category B students. However, it would be fair to say that this does cause some difficulties for districts in meeting local needs. One question that cannot be answered is whether the local and responsive nature of district support has created an awareness of, and thus increased demand for, the range of services provided. This demand cannot be met with current levels of funding. One rural school principal pointed out that there had always been ‘included’ children in country schools because of the difficulty of access to special schools in isolated areas. These children are now receiving some support, whereas before they did not.

For Commonwealth reporting purposes, a number of students are identified as requiring generalised special education support—Category B. While this categorisation has been discontinued for practical purposes, the nominal allocation per FTE does provide a useful benchmark for considering funding over time.

There has been a small cut in funding for Category B purposes from $662 per FTE in 1996 to $580 per FTE in 1999. However, over the same period a sum of $350,000 per year has been allocated to the districts for behaviour management programs, and it would be a reasonable assumption that at least some of the students requiring generalised special education support also needed support for behaviour management difficulties.

Figure 6 shows time-series data, where these could be obtained, of the funding allocation per FTE of students designated Category A in regular and special schools, Category B students, and students who are either vision or hearing impaired. This suggests that funding allocations to students on the Category A register in regular schools has increased over time, to be very close to the levels of funding for similar students in special schools. The drop in funding to vision-impaired and hearing-impaired students in
1999 reflects the across-the-board cuts that were made to deal with the funding shortfall in that year.

**Figure 6: Funding allocations over time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cat A Reg</td>
<td>3236.31</td>
<td>5357.12</td>
<td>6044.78</td>
<td>6318.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat A Spec</td>
<td>6294.25</td>
<td>6019.27</td>
<td>6265.64</td>
<td>6255.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat B</td>
<td>662.04</td>
<td>585.90</td>
<td>585.26</td>
<td>580.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI/HI</td>
<td>5520.17</td>
<td>5439.23</td>
<td>6078.71</td>
<td>5634.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.2 Management of resources

In addition to funding issues, many respondents raised matters relating to the use of the resources provided. Much of the additional resource is provided as teacher aide time. Many comments were received about human resources, such as teacher aides, but also support teachers, speech pathologists and other professionals. This may have been because people are most immediately recognised as the source of support, whereas equipment, for example, is somewhat taken for granted.

**Human resources**

Human resources were clearly seen as the most important factor in supporting children with disabilities in regular schools. Dealing with a student with a disability requires input from many different people, depending upon the unique needs of the child. For the most disabled students there could be a large team made up of teachers, teacher aides and other support staff from the Department, together with health care professionals, therapy providers, parents, advocates and even, in some instances, legal advisers. This creates difficulties for schools, parents and the students themselves. Interacting with so many people and managing the various relationships involved is exhausting and time consuming. One parent wrote:

> It is great that students with disabilities now cannot be discriminated against on grounds of their disability—thank you!! However, I found the sheer workload of keeping my child in the school was overwhelming. Though I appreciated the
involvement of all concerned, it was exhausting coordinating it all. Meetings with teachers, physios, OTs, speech, principals, aides etc were necessary and informative to all concerned about the child—but oh the drain. I felt like I was holding down a part-time job just keeping the child at school.

*Parent comment: Community Consultation*

Similar comments were received from teachers.

**Principals and senior staff:** Some principals reported that they had refused to take a Category A child unless full aide time was provided. At least one district implicitly supported this stance by supplementing the centrally allocated time. In this district the Support Service Manager reported that schools got what they requested in terms of support. It should be noted that principals have no right to refuse entry to the school if the child lives within the school catchment, but can refuse entry, as with any other child, under certain limited circumstances, if the child is ‘out-of-area’. There were few instances of blatant refusal, but parents reported a range of subtle pressures that led them to enrol their child elsewhere. This has led to a situation where some schools are being recognised as having expertise in the education of students with disabilities and have relatively large numbers of students on the Category A register. Sometimes parents moved house into the catchment areas of these schools so that their child could attend.

All of these findings tend to underscore the importance of the principal and senior staff in the school management of inclusion. Their management style, day-to-day encouragement and organisational support for teachers who had high-needs students in their classes were commented on by teachers, teacher aides and parents.

**Coordinators:** Many schools appointed a coordinator, usually a senior staff-member, to oversee the management of special education, including the needs of students on the Category A register. In others, the principal managed this. The role of the coordinator varied, however. In some schools this was very much a ‘hands-on’ role while in others it was little more than name only. In small schools the role was usually combined with another responsibility, often literacy. In high schools the role was often part of a group of responsibilities held by a senior staff member, such as an AST3.

Where the coordinator took an active leadership role, this relieved the classroom teacher of much administrative responsibility such as organising case conferences, for example. The coordinator could also ‘broker’ visits by non-education professionals, liaise with outside organisations for funds and equipment and provide a bridge between teachers of students on the Category A register and other staff in the school.

**Teachers:** The attitude and skill of the classroom teacher was of paramount importance. Many parent submissions commented on the ‘roller coaster’ as their child progressed through school from teacher to teacher. Some teachers were prepared to discuss every aspect of the child’s progress; others preferred to work independently. In at
least three instances a social worker outside the Department provided case management. This was usually in complex situations, where provision of support involved a wide range of different professionals for students with very high needs, and communication between parents and teachers was difficult. Teachers and parents usually welcomed this intervention.

Some teachers went to extraordinary lengths to research the particular disability and implement an appropriate program. Many reported how inadequate they felt to provide for the child’s total needs. A frequent comment was that it was difficult to access basic information about a particular disability and thus teachers felt unprepared and apprehensive about the challenge of having a child with a disability in their class. In some instances, a teacher new to the school taught students with disabilities. Sometimes this was because of the grade structure of the school, but occasionally there was some evidence that this was deliberate, because the child was particularly difficult to manage. This placed the new teacher under additional pressure, adjusting to the culture of a new school as well as dealing with a child with particularly specialised needs. In one case, where the grade structure in a small school made it inevitable that a new teacher would take the class, a first-year teacher was teaching a child with a disability. The school had been very supportive and the teacher had coped very well. However, had the school been forthcoming about the fact that there would be a child on the Category A register in the class, this teacher indicated that he would probably not have taken the job.

Some teacher aides commented about the lack of involvement they felt with the classroom teacher. These aides reported that teachers did not consult with them, did not seek their advice or try to collaborate, even though the aide spent most time with the child concerned. Others described their feelings of unease and inadequacy at being left alone with only an outline of the classroom program and being expected to modify that to suit the child concerned.

**Teacher aides:** All respondents regarded the presence of a teacher aide as essential. There were, however, issues about the nature and use of teacher aides. Good teacher aides were highly valued by teachers and parents. They played an important role in implementing many programs, including physiotherapy, speech pathology and modified classroom programs. Many teacher aides reported that they spent considerable amounts of their own, unpaid, time preparing modified materials or recording the child’s progress. They also liaised with parents, were involved in case conferences and contributed to students’ Individual Education Plans.

This was not always the reality. Some teachers talked about teacher aides who had not chosen to work with students who were disabled, and who found it difficult to cope. These people often left the classroom for ‘time out’ or a cup of coffee, leaving the student with whom they were working. Others wanted only to ‘mother’ their students instead of encouraging their independence. Some teachers were inhibited by their teacher aide,
while others left all the day-to-day management and decisions about the student’s program to the aide.

**Other professionals:** Many teachers commented that one aspect of teaching a Category A student was the number of people who came into the class. This was a cause of stress for many teachers. Principals reported that they often had to act as gatekeeper to protect teachers and children from undue pressure. A kindergarten teacher, for example, recounted how she looked round her room one day and saw 12 adults—parent help, kindergarten aide, aides for two students on the Category A register, and various therapists and support staff observing the two identified children. Managing all the various relationships became a challenge, and in some instances impacted on the teacher’s ability to teach effectively.

**Material resources**

Issues relating to the supply and use of equipment and technology to allow students with disabilities to access schools and the curriculum were mentioned by all kinds of respondent. Some aspects, such as the extent of physical access to buildings, are reported on under the section relating to outcomes. However, issues of management of these resources are appropriately dealt with here. Transport is also included in this section. It is a significant component of the budget and was commented upon particularly by respondents in rural areas.

**Specialised equipment:** Some students need specialised equipment to allow them to access education. This includes special seating, toilet seats, exercise equipment or communication devices. The equipment is supplied through the Equipment and Technology Library. This organisation, through a series of historical accidents, comes under the aegis of the Cerebral Palsy Association. It is independent of the association and pays rent to the organisation for the use of its premises.

The Equipment and Technology Library is funded through a collection of annual grants from the Commonwealth and the State government departments responsible for education and health. The annual nature of the funding means that there is no certainty from year to year that the level of service will be maintained. The service exists to provide equipment and specialised technology to those students having the highest level of need for the purpose of accessing and participating in education. Where necessary, this includes duplicate equipment, such as seating or toilet aids, for use by the child both at home and at school. The equipment is returned to the library for cleaning and maintenance.

Over a period of time, the library has built up an extensive range of specialist equipment. This is prescribed for each child by a physio- or occupational therapist. The library staff stated that once they receive the request, they can generally meet needs within a fortnight. There have been ongoing concerns about the service, however, from
within the Department of Education. These relate to which children access the service and how they do it. At present, equipment and technology access is interpreted by library staff as being for those students on the Category A register. This has caused tensions, since the names on the register are not provided to the Equipment Library because of privacy principles. There has been a move by the Department to make agreed criteria the basis for provision of service, but library staff expressed reservations about this model.

Several schools had made equipment to meet the needs of a particular child. Whether this was because they did not know about the Library, or whether they just felt that they had the skills to produce whatever was needed, was unclear. Library staff require a prescription before they issue equipment. However, getting the prescription may take some time because of the difficulty of accessing appropriate professionals. This leads to frustration among all parties. While the current system of accessing equipment though a prescription by an appropriate professional appears somewhat bureaucratic, it does have the advantage that a trained professional has ordered the equipment and, presumably, oversees its use. This may not, however, always be so.

An issue for the Library staff was the lack of understanding by school personnel of the importance of correctly using some of the equipment. For example, some young children with physical disabilities sit on standard classroom seating because the teacher believes that to have the child seated in a special chair singles that student out. As a result, the child has to concentrate so hard on sitting that there is little attention left for learning. Sometimes lifting equipment is unused in schools because it requires two aides to manage it effectively. This was borne out by comments from health and safety officers within the Department. There are issues here relating to potential workers compensation claims.

**Technology:** In general, there was little comment from schools or parents about specialised equipment. Information technology (IT), however, was a different matter. This is more complex in that the responsibility to provide standard hardware lies with the Department of Education. There is a coordinator within the State Support Service whose role is to assess and recommend particular technology. Where this is specialised ‘add-ons’ such as switches or intelli-keys, the Equipment Library supplies these as well as specialised software programs. Several schools reported that they had software but not the appropriate computer, for example. Others said that they had an appropriate set-up but did not know how to use this effectively. There were also issues of maintenance of computers and specialised extension equipment, such as switches.

An additional $100,000 has been made available for students with disabilities through the Department’s IT initiatives. Many schools commented on the promise of this additional technology but few seemed to have actually obtained it. Some parents also commented that their children had been assessed as having, for example, ‘good mouse skills’ or the potential to benefit from technology, but that they had not received
additional computer time. These parents also appeared to expect a personal computer for their child.

Schools were also rather uncertain about their responsibilities in relation to access to computers for students with disabilities. Some seemed to believe that students with disabilities should have a ‘personal’ computer rather than access to the classroom computer. There are issues about computer access for all students, especially if the child with a disability needs to spend a considerable amount of time working with technology and this prevents access to a classroom computer for other students. However, in general terms, students with disabilities have much the same levels of access as students without disabilities. Guidelines for computer use, especially where the hardware has been supplied through the special education budget, might help to clarify this.

Students with vision impairment have access to some specialised technology through Royal Guide Dogs. This organisation is funded to provide this service in the same way that other non-government bodies are funded. Access to the necessary technology is coordinated through the appropriate State Support Service personnel. Few comments were received about this service, other than that it ceased when the student left Year 12, even if that student was moving on to further study.

**Wheelchairs:** The Health Department, through the Community Equipment Scheme, supplies wheelchairs. Wheelchairs create difficulties for schools. Repairs and replacements to the chairs can take a long time. This presents problems for teachers if the teacher cannot take the child outside, for example, because the wheelchair is so unreliable. One coordinator gave the example of a child with spina bifida waiting 18 months for a new wheelchair. Other submissions suggested that even with special provisions, parts of the school, such as the canteen, were not accessible, or that access to practical subjects, such as cooking or science, can be restricted. This impacts on a child's education if it prevents access to learning and social experiences. There were also issues about fire drills, minor damage and access to outside areas, such as ovals.

**Transport:** Transport assistance is provided for students with disabilities according to a set of guidelines available in all schools. In 1999, this had a budget allocation of $465,500. The guidelines clearly state that the prime responsibility for transporting a child with disabilities to and from school lies with the parents, as with all other students. The assistance is to enable access to educational facilities where the parents do not have the capacity to transport their child.

Bus operators reported that some aspects of transport were problematic. There is a contractual obligation for bus operators to provide modified transport where necessary. While some operators had, at their own expense, modified buses for wheelchairs, for example, or fitted seat belts, others, particularly in rural areas, said that this was too expensive. As a result, some children in rural areas were being transported by taxi at considerable cost. These costs were not only financial, but also social. In some places,
there was some resentment in local communities that the taxi was for the exclusive use of one child, while another two or three children had to wait for a school bus to make a diversion off a major route, or had to be transported to the nearest pick-up point. Parents saw this as an inefficient use of funds, rather than resenting the transport of the child with a disability.

Provision of appropriate travel training programs is explicitly included in the guidelines, and parents are actively encouraged to be involved in these. Schools recognised the importance of programs of this type but were unable to implement them in many instances. This inability stemmed from a number of causes, including a belief that removal of a child with disabilities from the general classroom to undertake this kind of program was discriminatory. If travel training is appropriately included in a student’s Individual Education Plan, then consideration needs to be made as to how this will be implemented.

**Time management**

Submissions from several sources suggested that there were issues about time management at all levels of the system, including in schools. Comments from state coordinators, district support staff, teachers and parents indicated that there was too little time to undertake all the necessary work.

**Support services**: All support staff, whether from State or District Services, described how busy they were. Travelling was an issue for many people, particularly in some of the larger and more dispersed districts. Various strategies had been put in place to cut down both the time spent travelling and the travel budget, including allocating days and schools to particular staff, travelling in groups and ‘blocking in’ visits to particular localities. Complaints were received from schools in some districts that district support staff could not be in schools early in the morning because they didn’t leave their base until after 9.00am and had to return by 4.00pm. Some schools also pointed out that while they had, for example, 0.2 support staff allocated to work in the school, if the District Support Service called a staff meeting or an in-house professional development meeting, then the school staff lost some time.

**Schools**: In schools, the need for and importance of time for program planning with teacher aides was a strong theme. High schools were mentioned particularly in this regard as so many teachers are involved, but this was also an issue for primary teachers. Teachers, whether of students with disabilities or not, were most likely to mention time as the most-needed resource, rather than other resources such as finance or equipment. Many teachers related how they planned on the run and particularly mentioned the lack of time to plan with the aide. This lack of planning time ultimately impacts on the quality of programs delivered to students with disabilities, since there is insufficient time to develop appropriate modified programs, and to ensure that the teacher and the
aide are taking a consistent approach. Other issues included finding the time to meet with the range of people involved in the education of a student with disabilities.

**Timetabling:** A teacher, the special education coordinator, or, in some schools, the bursar, was responsible for timetabling teacher aides to classes. This was a major task in large schools. Many schools attempted to cluster students receiving aide time into classes so that they could maximise the use of teacher aide time. Often this meant that they could cover a class with aide time for the full school day, but the disadvantage was that students with disabilities tended to be grouped together regardless of their needs, and other classes got little aide time.

Timetabling teacher aides is a nightmare. [We] try to place children together. Classes with no Category A’s get little additional support.

*Interview with primary principal*

In other schools, students receiving aide support were withdrawn from classes to work alone with the aide. In some instances the student had a special room—in one case with the name on the door—where most of the in-school time was spent. Few students were in this situation, but where this did occur it is questionable whether the school or the students, both disabled and non-disabled, gained any benefit from inclusion.

### 4.3.3 School management of resources

**Financial matters**

There were a number of other management issues for schools. One was the budget, which could be significant. A financial officer, usually the bursar or administrative assistant, managed this. Because of the range of sources of financial support—through the School Resource Package, from district support, from in-school funding from levies and, occasionally, community organisation input—this was often managed in a special budget line. This, however, did not reflect other forms of support such as therapy provision and equipment loans that come ‘in kind’. The complexity of the range of funding sources did create difficulties for some administrative assistants.

The inclusion of some students also created additional outgoings for schools that had to be managed. These included transport arrangements, such as taxis where a bus was not available, and improvements and ongoing minor repairs caused by wheelchair damage. Many of these requirements were met by the central special education budget, but sometimes the school was required to carry the expense for a considerable period. Some children had specialised physical needs, for example by requiring catheterisation. Often teacher aides undertook this, but some schools had decided that they would not expect a teacher aide to do medical procedures. In these schools a district nurse came in regularly
to catheterise children and, in at least one school, the school paid for this service. Often the bursar was responsible for organising these matters.

Management of teacher aide time

The bursar or administrative assistant was often responsible for managing teacher aides’ time on a day-to-day basis. This included adjustments to hours, arranging relief, changes to working arrangements to accommodate changing needs, and so on. This caused considerable workloads for many of them. There were also employment issues where aides were allocated for small amounts of time, such as two hours for toileting. This kind of support had to be added to some other employment of the teacher aide since it was unrealistic to employ someone in this way. Thus, a bursar could be responsible for putting together packages of small amounts of allocated teacher-aide time to create a reasonable and workable employment situation.

When students receiving aide time support were absent, through ill health for example, this created another dilemma. Aides are only paid for hours actually worked, so that the school either had to ‘carry’ the absence and continue to employ the aide, or the aide did not work and lost pay. Some schools creatively came to an arrangement with their aides to ‘bank’ time if the particular child was absent. The school continued to pay the aide but used the hours later at mutually convenient times. One school had allowed the aide to work with the child at home when the child was unable to attend school, but discontinued this practice because the aide was in effect being a baby sitter while the parent was at work. Several schools reported using teacher aides at home. This raises issues about legal liability and workers’ compensation.

Sometimes a child who had allocated aide time support was hospitalised for a relatively long period. In this instance the aide remained in the school and the school used the time for other purposes. While this was useful to schools, it could create short-term difficulties, particularly where the period of hospitalisation was unknown.

When an aide was absent for some reason, the bursar sometimes had the responsibility of obtaining relief. This was very problematic, particularly in isolated areas and at short notice. Many schools employed several aides for shorter periods of time and organised relief by extending the hours of another aide when necessary. Having to adjust hours for these staff created an additional workload for bursars.

Line management of teacher aides

Despite a clear statement in the teacher aide position description that teacher aides are responsible to a teacher, the bursar was sometimes regarded as the line manager for teacher aides. Matters to be dealt with included general working conditions and the various personal matters that can arise on a daily basis. They could include, for example,
conflict resolution between the aide and a teacher, counselling when an aide was upset by the reactions of the student or parent, and legal issues, especially where the aide was expected to administer medication or toilet a child. While bursars generally coped well with these additional pressures, they reported that they had not had any professional development to deal with these matters.

For teacher aides, this separation between the line management and operational management could be confusing. Their actual work was organised by the teacher but any changes to working arrangements had to go through the bursar. This entailed some negotiation and coordination, particularly where the aide worked in a number of classes with different children. Line management of teacher aides was another role that was taken by the coordinator in some schools.

Organisational changes

Some schools recognised the demands on teachers of teaching a child with high needs. They made a variety of arrangements, including reduced class size and additional non-contact time for planning and meetings with support staff. In a few instances they also supplemented aide time by small amounts to allow for some planning time with the aide concerned. Generally these kinds of decision were taken in a collaborative way with the whole staff involved, since a smaller class size, for example, required an adjustment to other teachers’ loads. At the other extreme, however, were schools that simply left the teacher concerned to get on with it, providing little additional support or recognition of the pressures.

4.4 Professional Development

This was a major concern for all respondents in all parts of the State. Findings are reported under the kinds of professional development offered for teachers, both pre- and in-service, and teacher aides. Comment is also made in relation to support materials provided by the Department.

4.4.1 Pre-service and in-service implications

Pre-service

Many respondents commented that teaching students with disabilities should form part of pre-service training for teachers. There are two routes into the teaching profession through the University of Tasmania. One is a four-year Bachelor of Education course, or Bachelor of Human Movement for those wishing to specialise in physical education. The other is a two-year post-graduate Bachelor of Teaching degree. The BEd degree covers
early childhood and primary education. An elective unit in special education is available, and all students do have some lectures on special education. Similar provision applies to the Human Movement course, which equips students to teach in all sectors. Some issues relating to special education are addressed in the BTeach degree as part of the professional studies units. All these degrees aim to produce well-rounded teachers who have some understanding of the issues and an orientation to inclusive practice, rather than special education teachers.

No pre-service course can equip new teachers fully for every challenge that they will meet in the early years of their career. Nor can it ensure that every pre-service teacher spends time in a classroom, or even in a school, that has a student with severe disabilities, although this is desirable. To ask a teacher of a child on the Category A register to undertake the additional workload of student-teacher supervision is asking a great deal of that teacher’s professionalism. In one instance where this did occur, the student teacher happened to be the teacher aide working with the child. The teacher and the aide simply swapped roles for the period of the practicum. However, this was an unusual situation in very particular circumstances.

The one first-year-out teacher who was teaching a student with disabilities was handling the situation very well with appropriate support from the school. This was a one-off situation, but it suggested that the initial training had achieved its aim of an inclusive orientation. The school, however, had provided considerable practical support and access to professional learning opportunities.

**University based in-service**

Units on special education are offered as part of the BEd In-Service and at Masters level. There are no specialist units on working with vision or hearing impairments. There is a post-graduate counselling qualification available though the Faculty of Education. All Guidance Officers have a degree in Psychology as well as teaching qualifications. These are the main routes in Tasmania to developing professional qualifications in special education. Information from the University of Tasmania indicated that the special education units have always had sufficient enrolments to run when they have been offered.

**Tasmanian Principals Institute**

The Tasmanian Principals Institute was established as a joint venture between the Department of Education and the University of Tasmania to develop and enhance the competence of Tasmanian principals. It is situated in the University of Tasmania in Launceston and 1999 was its first full year of operation. It oversees the accreditation of principals and runs courses for current and aspiring principals.
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The Principals Competency Profile, developed in collaboration with principals around the State, provides a basis for the professional learning and development of Tasmanian school principals. There are six units of competence: Educational Leadership, Planning and Accountability, Interpersonal Relations, Cultural and Ethical Leadership, Political Leadership and Personal Effectiveness. Three common threads interlink these: Contextual Sensitivity, Equity, and Community Relations. In one way or another each of these elements, both competencies and linking threads, pertain to inclusive practice in schools.

The Institute’s professional learning opportunities are based largely on demand. To date demands have been largely functional, such as budget and financial management and developing a portfolio of professional learning. The way in which the underpinning ideas of equity are reflected in these kinds of sessions is not clear—although the culture of the school will be reflected in the kinds of budget decisions that are made, for example.

**Individual professional learning plans**

Within the Department, the responsibility for accessing professional development has been largely devolved to schools. There are still some professional development programs offered centrally, but these tend to be special-purpose programs, focusing on literacy and numeracy. Principals are responsible for ensuring that all staff have an individual professional learning plan and this is reflected in the Competency Profile through the valuing of personal and professional learning and ensuring that professional development programs match school priorities and personal needs of staff.

In general, principals were supportive of opportunities for teachers to access appropriate opportunities for professional learning about inclusion. However, teachers reported widely that professional development sessions they attended did not meet their needs, or were helpful only in a general way, but not with the particular child whom they taught.

**General professional development**

At the school level, there was some reported professional development. This tended to take the form of an information session about, for example, autism, at a staff meeting. Some schools also made arrangements for teachers to visit teachers in other schools who were teaching a child with a similar disability, or to attend particular seminars or conferences organised by interest groups outside the Department of Education. These activities, however, often appeared to be reactive or opportunist rather than part of an intention to build capacity in the school to further its inclusive practice.
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4.4.2 Teacher aide training

The importance of teacher aide training was recognised by all respondents throughout the State.

Prior to 1999, certificated teacher aide training was the responsibility of first the Tasmanian Educational Consortium (TECL) and later the Professional Development Services Branch in the Department of Education. Staff Development also ran some general training for teacher aides during this period. In 1995, a series of competency-based curricula, developed by the Consortium, were nationally accredited according to recognised principles, using the local accreditation process through the Tasmanian State Training Authority (TASTA), under the umbrella of the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA). These were aimed at teacher aides and covered literacy and inclusion support. The three accredited modules pertaining to inclusion were titled *Social Justice and Inclusive Education, Introduction to Disabilities and Supporting Students with Disabilities in the Classroom*. These modules are current until 13/12/2000, after which date they will either cease to be accredited or will need to be re-accredited under the national standards framework agreed to from 1998 onwards. Re-accreditation would involve determining a set of competency-based standards for teacher aides, since these do not currently exist.

These modules were delivered to teacher aides as part of a process that would ultimately lead to either Certificate 2 or 4. Responsibility for teacher aide training transferred to the Department of Education’s Staff Development at the start of 1999. This group wishes to revise the training under the new standards framework and has not run the existing modules because of this.

In 1999, instead, Staff Development organised five one-off workshops for teacher aides. They were developed and run by a facilitator from the Catholic Education Office. Approximately 130 teacher aides attended at five different venues around the State, including Smithton. This begs the question as to why an outside contractor was used to provide non-accredited training when accredited modules and trained personnel were available within the Department.

A number of people commented about the lack of teacher aide training and made references to the previous training courses. One district provided a 10-session structured program for all new teacher aides, run in after-school time. New teacher aides were paid to attend, but a number of other aides, and a few teachers, did so in their own time. Several other districts ran one-off sessions on particular topics, including back care or health and safety issues.

Some teacher aides are responsible for undertaking therapy sessions with students on the Category A register, including speech therapy and physiotherapy. Training for these sorts of tasks tended to be on-the-job. In one instance, one aide taught another aide how
to do the muscle stretching needed by the child. Both people commented that they were uncomfortable about this, since neither had any medical training or knowledge, but felt that they had no choice.

At best, training for teacher aides is inconsistent and uncoordinated; at worst it doesn't exist at all. There was considerable support for improved training for teacher aides that included the role and responsibilities of the teacher aide, working collaboratively with teachers, and information about different disabilities.

### 4.4.3 Support materials

Some support materials have been produced for both the Equity Policy and the Inclusion Policy. These materials provide background information and discussion starters for professional development sessions. They also include some sections about providing a multi-layered curriculum. These materials were developed before the shift towards an outcomes-based curriculum. They tend to focus on teachers' actions rather than intended outcomes, such as KILOs and KINOs (Key Intended Literacy/Numeracy Outcomes). Some support materials do not appear to link with other curriculum materials such as the *K–8 Mathematics Guidelines*. As such, they are probably of limited use to many teachers because they do not reflect current practice. There was little evidence of their use in schools.

There also appeared to be a dearth of material for parents. Many parents reported not knowing what to expect when their child enrolled in a regular school. Some specialised information handouts were available through state coordinators. Although people who knew it was available could access this relatively easily, it did not appear to be distributed generally.

### 4.5 Policy review

In general there was strong in-principle support for the policy from all groups of respondents. Comments received related mainly to its operation and are dealt with in earlier sections.

Respondents to the Community Consultation Questionnaire were specifically asked about their familiarity with the policy and related matters. Responses to these questions are summarised in Table 3 below.
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Table 3: Responses to questions about the policy and related matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am familiar with:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>% Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>% No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The policy</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relevant legislation</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School enrolment procedures</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grievance procedure</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The situation outside Tasmania</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since a copy of the policy was sent with each questionnaire, the high percentage familiar with the policy is not surprising. The relatively low proportion of people familiar with school enrolment procedures is somewhat surprising, since the majority of respondents to this questionnaire were parents (of students with and without disabilities), or teachers.

Many respondents indicated in comments that they did not know about the grievance procedure, and this is borne out by the low percentage claiming familiarity with it. This process was developed with the cooperation of the Australian Education Union, but does not appear to have been effectively publicised by either the Union or the Department.

Comments about the policy itself were mixed, ranging from:

- Comprehensive, devoid of jargon and easy to understand by all involved.
  
  Comment from parent of a child without a disability:
  
  Community Consultation

  to:

- If it was put in more simple words it would be easier to understand.

  Comment from a parent of a child with a significant disability:
  
  Community Consultation

There were a number of comments suggesting that the policy was too idealistic, and the reality was somewhat different. Often these comments were related to ones about resourcing.

Some respondents questioned the effectiveness of the policy on equity grounds. For example, these two comments were received from teachers in different parts of the State:
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My concern is that stating inclusion as a preferred option is a blanket statement that doesn’t allow for the opportunity to access individual needs and appropriate educational provision.

My concern is that ‘preferred option’ is too broad to provide for the needs of all children and their individual varied needs and levels of functioning.

Written comments from teachers of students with disabilities:
Community Consultation

Several focus groups also commented on this apparent lack of flexibility. Related to these concerns was a questioning by some respondents about the effects on educational outcomes for non-disabled children. Some people took a cost/benefit view—acknowledging the positives but questioning the cost of these in terms of the overall educational outcomes for all children. This was not an isolated view but was a strong sub-theme among a large minority of responses from teachers, parents of disabled and non-disabled children, and other professionals, and it was received from the full range of data collection processes.

4.6 Beliefs and understanding

The beliefs and understanding of all people involved with the practice of inclusion has an impact on how they implement the policy. Beliefs and understanding are thus central to inclusion as it is practised and experienced in reality. In order to recognise the different views, and to place these in perspective, it is useful to consider some of the theoretical positions that have been identified in the area of special education.

As indicated in Chapter 2, it is only relatively recently that the education of students with disabilities has been considered to be part of mainstream education. This has been a gradual development with increasing integration of students with varying degrees of disability over a period of many years. More recently the focus has become ‘inclusive education’, defined as the outcome of attempting to provide for all students, including students who have disabilities, in regular schools. While this has been happening worldwide, it has not been without its critics, both within and outside special education.

Perspectives on inclusion

Dyson (1999) summarises a number of different perspectives on inclusion. These he separates into two dimensions: rationale, which addresses rights and ethics, and efficacy perspectives; and realisation, which includes political and pragmatic perspectives. The arguments for each of these perspectives will be briefly summarised in order to provide a framework for considering the different beliefs and understandings uncovered by the review.
One justification for inclusion is the right of all children to an education. This must take place in a setting in which particular groups of children are not excluded. This perspective derives from a view of education as the ‘means of achieving a more just and equitable society’, as stated in the Equity Policy. Education is seen as the driver of social change and removal of the stigma associated with separatist provision is essential to bring this about. This argument provides a rationale for inclusion from a rights and ethics perspective.

The effectiveness of special education is the basis for the efficacy perspective. Inclusive schools are seen as being more effective and cost-efficient, and as providing more social benefits. Separatist education can only be justified if it provides something distinctive. Various international studies of special education provision do not appear to support the notion that students in special education settings do better than similar students in included settings, and thus the additional cost of separatist settings cannot be justified. The efficacy perspective thus provides a practical rationale for inclusion.

When inclusion is realised, it comes about within a political reality. Segregated education has its own vested interests and it is necessary to undertake a ‘struggle’ to overcome these. This may require direct action, in which individuals and groups identify the barriers and overcome them within their own particular situation. Alternatively, it may take the form of attacking the ideas and assumptions that underpin segregated education. This is the political dimension of the realisation dimension.

The pragmatic perspective is less concerned with overcoming oppressive forces and more concerned with identifying factors and characteristics of inclusive schooling. It is based on the assumption that inclusive schools and systems have clearly identifiable practices and orientations that delineate them from non-inclusive situations. Inclusion is realised through taking the right kind of action at all levels of the system.

Thus, Dyson is suggesting that there are two dimensions to inclusive education: rationale and realisation. Within each of these dimensions there are two perspectives. Within the rationale dimension these are the human rights and ethics perspective, and the effectiveness perspective. Similarly, he suggests that the realisation and implementation of inclusion involve two perspectives—the political and the pragmatic.

All of these different views for justifying and realising inclusion provide a framework for considering the range of beliefs and values that were manifested by different groups of people during the review. Although the views of individuals within each of the following groups did not necessarily conform completely, the overall group views seemed to be consistent with one or other of the perspectives Dyson describes.

**Central staff:** At the centre of the Department of Education is a small group of people responsible for policy, planning and evaluation, located in, or close to, central office. The group includes State Support Service coordinators, and the managers and directors responsible for different areas of special education and equity. These people have
considerable expertise and experience in working with students with disabilities. Many of them come from a special education background, and have worked in a variety of situations in different parts of the Department of Education. They have substantial responsibility for the policy, both in regard to developing and implementing it.

As a group they have a strong focus on human rights, although it was not always clear whether this came from the notion of a fully participatory democracy or the social justice perspective of the right to access the benefits of society. This core belief colours their approach to the policy, and how this is implemented. Repeatedly in discussions, they emphasised the right of all children to attend their neighbourhood school, and this overrode all other considerations. They strongly believe that with appropriate support, all teachers can deal with children with disabilities in the regular classroom. In realising the policy, documents published by the centre sometimes have a sense of the political perspective—the Disability Service Plan, for example, identifies barriers to inclusion, and the support materials for the Equity Policy include an article about teaching social activism.

This group works within, and has responsibility for maintaining, the complex web of links between the various funding bodies, agencies and organisations that implement education for children with special needs, including those with disabilities. The organisational structures set up by the central staff affect the implementation of the policy through the flow of resources. In this way the interpretation of the policy by this key group can have a powerful influence over what happens at the classroom level. This view appeared to lead to a form of inclusion that saw students with disabilities as true equals in the existing settings, with modifications to the environment only so far as these were needed to allow access to facilities and the curriculum.

**District staff:** At the district level are the various support personnel who are involved in supporting teachers to implement the policy. Although many of these people expressed views consistent with the rights and ethics perspective, many also talked about the effectiveness of inclusive schooling. Those districts that explicitly did not want to maintain a special school often justified this stance on efficacy grounds—regular schools educate children more effectively and it is expensive to maintain a segregated facility.

The districts aimed to realise inclusion through improving the skills of teachers to plan for and teach a range of students. This was essentially a pragmatic approach. It was brought about in a variety of ways ranging from total devolution of staff to schools, to support for individual teachers on a 1:1 basis. This view seemed to lead to a form of inclusion aimed at improving current systems of delivery, but within the existing frameworks.

**School-based staff:** School-based personnel include principals and senior staff, classroom and special education teachers, teacher aides and the various non-teaching
staff such as office workers and cleaners. All of these different people are affected by the implementation of the Inclusion Policy.

All these school-based groups had a strong sense of social justice. No one ever questioned the right of any child to an effective and worthwhile education. In this sense, their beliefs about inclusion came from the rights and ethics perspective. At times, however, school-based personnel questioned whether inclusion was always the right way to bring this about. Many of the school respondents questioned whether regular classroom settings were appropriate for all children at all times. This thinking did not only apply to students with disabilities. Sometimes teachers and principals were apparently questioning the fundamentals of education provision. Teachers, in high schools particularly, but also in primary schools, described a range of alternative provisions that they were making for many children who had difficulty within the ‘normal’ school setting. These arrangements came from a sincere belief that education for all people was important and, where this could not be undertaken in the regular classroom, that the school was responsible for providing alternatives. This pragmatic approach appeared to aim at a form of inclusive schooling that allowed all students to experience an appropriate and effective education, although this may look unlike current provision.

Parents: All parents want an appropriate, effective and worthwhile education that will allow each child to develop to full potential. This is essentially an efficacy perspective, but at issue is how this should come about. Parents’ reactions to the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular schools, and their perceptions of the success or otherwise of this practice, varied according to their experiences. Some parents of students with disabilities were grateful for the acceptance that their child received, and were strong advocates for inclusion for their own child. Others were equally committed to a separatist education, sometimes after a less than positive experience.

Parents sometimes seemed to view the realisation of their child’s education from a political perspective—they fought schools and the system, sometimes fiercely, to achieve the best outcomes for their own child. This led to a view of inclusion as being a useful strategy if it helped their child to become an accepted member of society, but not if it did not provide effectively for their own child’s needs.

Summary

The different views of some of the key groups involved in the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular schools thus led to different ‘inclusions’. In every case, the people concerned were sincere in their beliefs. The subtly different views, however, could explain some of the discord that was sometimes felt when the policy was being discussed. People at the centre of the Department, for example, produce professional development packages for teachers that justify inclusion through a rights and ethics perspective, and realise it through a political view of overcoming barriers and changing attitudes. Principals and teachers agree with the rights perspective but want pragmatic
approaches, rather than political ones, to realising the policy. The end result is professional development that teachers describe as philosophically based and which doesn’t help them. Teacher attitudes continue to be seen as a barrier to full inclusion. The dialogue between members of these different groups does not address these underlying issues and the end result is misunderstanding.

This may be compounded by the apparent insecurity of some school-based staff. They are unwilling to express their views to principals or support staff in case they are perceived as ‘politically incorrect’ or ‘not coping’.

Effective implementation of the policy will need an appreciation not only of the various perspectives on inclusion, but also of how these are manifested by different groups. This implies an inclusive organisation that respects and values diversity within its own personnel.
5 Recommendations

The following set of principal recommendations relate directly to the policy itself. Subsequent recommendations are presented under the headings provided by the Terms of Reference. A rationale is provided for each recommendation or group of recommendations.

5.1 Principal recommendations

Recommendation 1

That the Department of Education affirms the principles of the policy for *The Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools* (Inclusion Policy).

Recommendation 2

That the management and operation of the inclusion of students with disabilities, at both school and system level, is embedded in the broader concept of equity and not managed within the traditional frame of ‘Special Education’ and ‘Special Schooling’.

Rationale

There was strong support for the principle of inclusion from all types of respondent in all parts of the State. The social justice and human rights arguments were well understood and accepted. This understanding should be recognised and acknowledged. The notion of inclusive education is a more encompassing idea than that of ‘special’ education, which comes from a separatist tradition. For further information see ‘4.6 Beliefs and understanding’ on page 68 and ‘4.1.1 System performance’ on page 28.

Recommendation 3

That the Department of Education updates the Inclusion Policy in the light of this review and the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Act, and that the updated policy is made widely available in a variety of formats, including Braille, large-print and on the Internet.
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Rationale

Any implementation of the recommendations from this review will require some redrafting of the current policy to ensure that it is consistent with updated practice. Dissemination of the Inclusion Policy appeared to be limited, with many respondents knowing the title but only becoming familiar with the contents as a result of this review. A policy of such fundamental importance to people with disabilities, and those associated with them, deserves the widest possible audience. It should also be made available in a variety of formats, consistent with the Department’s espousal of inclusive education. For further information see ‘4.5 Policy review’ on page 66.

5.2 System and school performance

Recommendation 4

That the Department of Education investigates means of collecting and using accurate data about the enrolments of students with significant disabilities and their educational outcomes. This information should be collected and recorded systematically over time.

Rationale

It was difficult to obtain accurate figures about the enrolment of students with significant disabilities over time and in different kinds of school. Unless accurate figures are consistently maintained, it is not possible to make definitive quantifiable statements about the numbers of such students in the system, or their educational outcomes. Information collected should provide details about matters such as reasons for placement on the Category A register, school enrolments (including changes of school), and the level of support required by the student. This information could then be used for planning, provision of targeted professional learning programs and policy development. For further information see ‘Support for a range of student abilities and needs (Goal 2)’ on page 30.

Recommendation 5

That the membership and functions of the central Special Education Committee are revised and expanded.

Rational

At present the Central Special Education Committee has a limited membership and meets only to consider funding arrangements. The Disability Service Plan clearly states
that parents of students with disabilities should be involved with decision-making, including funding decisions. Expanding the membership of this committee to include umbrella organisations for students with physical, sensory or intellectual disabilities is one way in which the outcomes of this plan could be met. In addition, this committee could provide central leadership and vision in matters such as professional development and identifying best practice. For further information see ‘Students on the Category A register’ on page 48.

**Recommendation 6**

That the Department of Education, in consultation with schools and districts, develops procedures to ensure consistency of provision for students with disabilities in all parts of the State and processes to monitor the implementation and performance of these consistent practices, and that the Department reports on these annually.

**Rationale**

There was considerable evidence that parents and teachers perceived that the differences in the ways in which provision was made for students with disabilities in different districts were inequitable and confusing. This was particularly so when a teacher or student transferred into another district. Although district support services should be locally responsive, there is a need to ensure that levels of provision are similar in each district, and that decisions about the support provided are made on consistent grounds. Monitoring and reporting on practice in a coherent and open manner will improve accountability at district and system level. For further information see ‘Funding to District Support Services’ on page 51 and ‘Individual Education Plans’ on page 43.

**Recommendation 7**

That the Department of Education works with service providers from other government agencies, and with the community and private sector, in order to develop protocols and standing arrangements for delivering a range of services to students with disabilities.

**Rationale**

Different providers are involved in service delivery to students with disabilities. Arrangements for service delivery are somewhat informal, and can create difficulties if there is some dispute about a service or its provision. Clear guidelines about the nature and extent of the different responsibilities are needed at chief executive officer level, in order to establish the principles of agreement. In addition, a series of working guidelines should be developed at implementation level to ensure equity of service provision.
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Difficulties were reported when non-education professionals were involved in the provision of services to students with disabilities. Sometimes these difficulties were organisational, sometimes operational. This recommendation is intended to improve communications on a day-to-day basis through formal arrangements, rather than the less structured situations that exist currently. Non-government providers may need some form of independent management board or council to take responsibility for all budget and policy matters. This should include representatives of the Department of Education, teachers, parents, the umbrella organisation and the manager of each service. Where other government agencies are involved, liaison should be at the local implementation level, guided by a memorandum of understanding or heads of agency agreement. For further information see ‘Material resources’ on page 56 and ‘Coordination of support’ on page 32.

Recommendation 8

That the current Disability Service Plan is reviewed and updated, and that improved strategies for monitoring progress against the outcomes of this plan are developed. The outcomes of this monitoring process should be reported in the Department’s Annual Report.

Rationale

The Disability Service Plan provides a useful framework for the continuing development of strategies to support the equity and inclusion policies. It needs to be updated in the light of the recommendations from this review and the Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Act. In addition, with changes in organisational structures within the Department of Education, lines of responsibility for monitoring progress have become lost. Organisational arrangements are needed to ensure that monitoring is ongoing, regardless of changes to personnel and lines of communication.

The current plan includes the annual reporting requirement, but no clear statement about progress towards achievement of the outcomes could be found in published documents. For further information see ‘Relationship with relevant legislation (Goal 4)’ on page 35.

Recommendation 9

That the Department of Education develops a set of indicators of inclusive practice at system, district, school and classroom level in order to provide a consistent basis for ongoing monitoring of system performance. These indicators should be scaled and validated through empirical, independent research.
Rationale

No detailed performance indicators exist against which to measure progress towards the goals of either the Equity Policy or the Inclusion Policy at any level of the Department. At present, the only published indicator is the number of students enrolled in special schools. This is simplistic in that it does not provide information about the quality of provision in either special or regular schools, nor does it provide information about the performance of the districts or central office in relation to the goals. This indicator could be linked to other recommendations in this section. For more information see ‘4.1.1 System performance’ on page 28 and ‘4.1.2 School performance’ on page 36.

Recommendation 10

That the equity component of the Assisted School Self Review (ASSR) process is more clearly defined, and a framework for data collection and reporting at the school level is established.

Rationale

Schools are required to address issues relating to equity groups in their ASSR process. Information collected from schools’ Partnership Agreements and Annual Reports indicates that not all schools address this area in depth. Few principals reported confidently about their equity outcomes from ASSR. The review of the ASSR process being undertaken during 2000 should provide the opportunity to reconsider the position of equity groups in school review processes. For further information see ‘4.1.6 School performance’ on page 36 and ‘Social outcomes’ on page 44.

Recommendation 11

That special schools are reconceptualised as ‘Centres for Inclusive Education’ and become an integral part of District Support Services, in order to provide a specialist service that supports both the Equity Policy and the Inclusion Policy.

Recommendation 12

That the practice of formal dual enrolment ceases, and is replaced by flexible arrangements where regular schools take responsibility for the educational programs of students with disabilities.
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Recommendation 13

That part of the role of the Centres for Inclusive Education is to provide full-time schooling for those students on the Category A register with very high support needs, if requested by parents.

Rationale

Staff in special schools have expertise that is not always recognised. This expertise should be further developed and acknowledged as valuable. It is possible to envisage such centres, for example, providing courses in Braille, Spalding Literacy, Behaviour Management, Management of Autistic Students in the Regular Classroom and so on. These could be for teachers or students, as appropriate.

There was strong support by parents and teachers for dual enrolment. Educationally, however, the reasons were less sound and there was some evidence that this practice was uncoordinated and poorly managed. While there could be benefits in having access to some specialist services that it is more efficient to cluster in one location, this needs to have clear educational intentions and to be managed and coordinated by the principal educational provider. Flexible arrangements within District Support Services should allow the needs of all students to be met.

A very small group of students, usually with multiple disabilities combined with serious health problems, may be better served in a setting where specialist therapy and medical provision is available. This is acknowledged and supported. Full-time schooling in such a setting may be for short periods of time, such as providing respite for the child and the regular school, or for extended periods. In general, long-term, full-time enrolment at such a centre should be restricted to those students who have extreme disabilities, and if the parents of these children so wish. For more information see ‘Variety of provision’ on page 33.

Recommendation 14

That clear and consistent processes for the enrolment and transition of students at different stages of schooling are developed and applied state-wide. These processes should be widely published and accessible to all interested parties, including parents and students.

Recommendation 15

That the Department of Education revises the Grievance Procedure for the Resolution of Grievances on Placement for Students with Disabilities and disseminates the revised
version to schools, parents of all students with disabilities and all other interested parties. The revision should allow for more balanced representation of parents, students and non-educational professionals at the grievance meeting.

**Rationale**

Parents had concerns about enrolment and transition and were uninformed about what to expect at each stage of schooling. Enrolment procedures did not appear to be well understood by parents or schools, and there was little evidence of the enrolment checklist being used.

Procedures to manage transition processes were not well documented and rarely published. Many schools reported no consistent practice when a student transferred from school to school. The success of transitions for students with disabilities appeared to hinge on the work of individuals, rather than being based on clear procedures.

The grievance procedure was not well known and rarely used. Publication of this process appears to have been left to the Australian Education Union, rather than being accepted as a responsibility of the Department of Education. It is a bureaucratic process and, as such, may intimidate some parents and teachers. The process could be made less formal and should also involve the students themselves, where appropriate. Processes such as those used by the Health Complaints Commissioner may provide appropriate models.

These revised procedures for enrolment and transition, and the resolution of grievances, should be part of any revision of the Inclusion Policy. For more information see ‘Attendance at regular schools’ on page 36 and ‘4.5 Policy review’ on page 66.

### 5.3 Outcomes

**Recommendation 16**

That the Department of Education develops a standardised pro-forma for Individual Education Plans for students with disabilities, and mandates their use according to clearly articulated procedures. Increased emphasis should be given to addressing, monitoring and reporting the learning outcomes of students with disabilities. Student outcomes, as detailed in Individual Education Plans, should be reported annually at school and system level.
Recommendation 17

That existing curriculum documents and guidelines are used to develop appropriate learning outcomes for students with disabilities, and that these form the basis of learning outcomes in Individual Education Plans (IEPs).

Rationale

The use of IEPs varied across the State. Where they were most effective, they were developed using collaborative processes between parents, teachers, teacher aides, support staff and other service providers. The presence of effective and useful IEPs is essential for the ongoing monitoring of progress towards goals of students with disabilities.

At present there is little emphasis on the educational outcomes for these students. Some suitable learning outcomes have been developed, such as the ‘Towards Level 1’ outcomes in the national profiles, or the Early Number Framework from Count Me In Too. Where appropriate, these should be the basis on which to build IEP goals for learning. For further information see ‘Individual Education Plans’ on page 43 and ‘Learning outcomes’ on page 45.

Recommendation 18

That class placement with age peers is affirmed as the preferred option for students with disabilities, with emphasis on the identification of appropriate and equitable learning and social outcomes. Whole-school programs and practices should be identified that include students with disabilities in the full range of school activities and provide effective social outcomes for all students.

Rationale

There was some evidence that students with disabilities, especially those with intellectual disabilities, were not always promoted with their age peers. While schools had reasons for doing this, the practice led to difficulties later, particularly at puberty. If appropriate social and learning outcomes are identified, students can be successfully educated in the company of their age peers. Evidence gathered by the review supported this view. For further information see ‘Social outcomes’ on page 44 and ‘Learning outcomes’ on page 45.
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**Recommendation 19**

That the longitudinal study of students with disabilities in regular schools is continued with a focus on the practices that lead to effective social and learning outcomes, and that an annual report of the progress of this study is published.

**Rationale**

Examples of ‘best practice’ in inclusive schooling are needed at a whole-school level, together with identification of those factors that lead to effective social and learning outcomes for all students, but particularly those with disabilities. Several different methods of identifying best practice could be used, including the current longitudinal study of selected students. An annual report of the findings from this study could provide some insights for schools into the most effective ways of managing students with disabilities in regular schools. For more information see ‘4.2.1 Access and participation’ on page 40, ‘Social outcomes’ on page 44, and ‘Learning outcomes’ on page 45.

**5.4 Resource management**

**Recommendation 20**

That the education budget recognises and addresses the funding shortfall that has occurred in the last two years.

**Rationale**

Although it is recognised that demand is likely always to exceed the resource available, there is little doubt that the funding shortfall in the past two years has created increasing difficulties for schools and support services. Recognition of this shortfall and additional provision in the budget would go some way towards improving services for students with disabilities.

**Recommendation 21**

That the Department of Education establishes, publishes and distributes widely standard procedures and criteria against which to consider submissions for inclusion on the Category A register and to identify the support needs of students with disabilities.
Recommendation 22

That the practice of allocating resources to individual children is discontinued, and replaced by a school-based allocation, in recognition that schools are the most appropriate agents for deciding how resources are best used to meet the needs of students with disabilities. The present method of allocating resources in terms of nominal teacher aide hours should be discontinued, and replaced with additional funding in the School Resource Package (SRP).

Recommendation 23

That schools are expected to continue to contribute resources from the SRP to support specialist program provision for students with disabilities, in recognition of the fact that these students are important and valued members of the school community.

Rationale

Resourcing individual students led to situations, in some instances, where students with severe levels of disability were not regarded as ‘included’ because they did not attract funding. Not labelling students as ‘included’ is a desirable outcome, but the present practice of identifying individuals and allocating funds to some students has led to an ‘exclusive’ category of identified students included in regular schools. The Category A register provides a useful means for identifying levels of need of individual students, but the resource is more appropriately allocated to the school than to the individual student. These resources can be managed and allocated internally by the school according to its planned program of education delivery. The practice of a nominal allocation of teacher-aide hours has led to a situation where parents and teachers have an expectation that this is the only appropriate support. This denies other innovative approaches that schools may want to implement.

All students in schools are part of the school community. Some students require a greater level of support to participate fully in the life of the school. The needs of that small group of students requiring very high support are explicitly recognised through additional funding, and schools should have control over this. In this way, an individual student’s needs can be met responsively and flexibly at the local level. Schools should also recognise the contribution that students with disabilities make to the school, by using SRP funding appropriately to support these students. For further information please see ‘Overall funding allocation’ on page 51, ‘Support for a range of student abilities and needs (Goal 2)’ on page 30, ‘Students on the Category A register’ on page 48, and ‘4.3.1 The mechanisms used to allocate special education funds’ on page 47.
**Recommendation 24**

That the Department of Education replaces the annual funding submission for every student with a review of progress at appropriate intervals, acknowledging that the needs of each student may be different. Procedures for the identification of needs, appropriateness of funding arrangements and allocation of resources should involve collaborative decision-making processes that include parent and community representation of students with disabilities. This parent and community representation should be established at all levels of decision-making—system, district and school.

**Rationale**

The current process by which students are placed on the Category A register and then receive funding is not well understood by parents or teachers. The district moderation process for funding appears to be somewhat arbitrary and the central moderation process essentially ranks students according to the needs stated by the districts, rather than being tested against a set of outside standards or criteria.

The establishment and publication of criteria, both for placement on the Category A register and to determine support needs, would help to make the process more open and understood by parents and other stakeholders. One strategy identified in the *Disability Service Plan* is to include parents of students with disabilities and representatives of community groups in decision-making, including funding allocation. This involvement would also improve the transparency of the process, and ensure wider community understanding.

The frequency of having to make a submission for funding was very widely criticised. The process is time-consuming and many students with severe disabilities progress at a very slow rate, so that little growth may be seen annually. Replacing the annual review with a major review at appropriate intervals, or when there is a change in circumstances warranting a review, would allow a reappraisal of each student’s needs as the school context changed. In addition, certainty of funding to the school from year to year would allow longer-term planning, and more flexibility of resource use, than is currently the case. For more information see ‘Students on the Category A register’ on page 48.

**Recommendation 25**

That the Department of Education investigates ways in which improved support can be provided to students who are classified with intellectual and learning disabilities, including dyslexia, and autism and psychiatric disabilities.
Rationale

The incidence of severe intellectual disability and autism appears to be increasing. Comments were also received about students who appeared to be severely disturbed, but who had no diagnosis of disability, or additional support. There is a lack of juvenile psychiatric facilities in the State for diagnosis and treatment. Learning disabilities, including dyslexia, are expressly recognised by the Disability Discrimination Act. However, there is little explicit support for students with these kinds of difficulties, and schools reported that these disabilities were the most difficult to manage in the classroom.

Many of these disabilities lead to disruptive behaviour that cannot be adequately addressed by the usual kinds of behaviour management strategies. Improved diagnosis and specialist support could help to reduce some incidences of disruptive behaviour and improve outcomes for students with these kinds of disability. For further information see page ‘Support for a range of student abilities and needs (Goal 2)’ on page 30.

Recommendation 26

That the provision of services for early special education, vision and hearing impairment continues to be coordinated by a State Support Service.

Recommendation 27

That the Department of Education increases support for students with autism within the government school system and provides this support more pro-actively.

Recommendation 28

That the role of all coordinators within the State Support Service is clarified, and that they work increasingly with District Support Services to provide planned professional development at all levels of the Department.

Rationale

The State Support Service was widely regarded as effective by parents and teachers. The clustering of students with specialised needs also appeared to be cost effective. However, in some instances, notably with autism, the coordinator was only able to work in a district if the local support service chose to use this facility. Since the people occupying these positions have specialised knowledge and expertise, it is a wasted resource not to allow this knowledge to be used pro-actively, to build capacity for inclusive education in
the system. State Support Coordinators should be working with professional development providers such as the University of Tasmania and the Tasmanian Principals Institute, in order to further understanding of these low-incidence disabilities, and their impact on students’ educational outcomes. For more information see ‘Students who are hearing or vision impaired’ on page 49, ‘Early special education’ on page 50 and ‘Support for a range of student abilities and needs (Goal 2)’ on page 30.

**Recommendation 29**

That the role of District Support Services is refined and clarified, with a focus on providing specialist support, such as psychological testing and advice, speech pathology and social work, and that support teachers in District Support Services have clearly defined roles and responsibilities for the provision of specialised support for students with high needs, including behaviour management and specialised curriculum development.

**Recommendation 30**

That a special position description is developed for support teachers, focusing on their role in the provision of specialised classroom support to students with high needs. This position description should expect high levels of experience and expertise in specialised areas of curriculum provision and classroom management. These positions should be filled on a contract or secondment basis.

**Recommendation 31**

That the Department of Education investigates flexible employment conditions for all support staff, including support teachers, using appropriate consultative methods with all stakeholders.

**Rationale**

District Support Services are intended to be a source of specialist support to schools and teachers. In general, schools understood and appreciated the work of guidance officers, social workers and speech pathologists. However, schools reported that it was sometimes difficult to obtain timely support, or that frequent changes of personnel meant that provision was inconsistent. This was particularly the case with speech pathologists.

The role of support teachers, in contrast, was almost invisible in some districts, and classroom teachers sometimes criticised the kind of advice given. All support services described being very busy and unable to service all needs. Some improved efficiencies
could be achieved by more flexible employment conditions including using some school holidays for support staff meetings, planning and professional development. This time could also be used to provide parent support, as speech pathologists already do for example.

This change of conditions would ensure that there is constant refreshment of support staff, and a flow of expertise back into schools as support teachers move back into the school setting following completion of contracts. For more information see ‘Funding to District Support Services’ on page 51, ‘Coordination of support’ on page 32 and ‘Time management’ on page 59.

**Recommendation 32**

That schools recognise the conditions of employment of teacher aides, as laid down in the position description.

**Recommendation 33**

That schools do not allow teacher aides to undertake learning programs with students in a student’s home.

**Rationale**

Teacher aides were widely regarded as a valuable resource. However, often these aides were confused about their responsibilities to the teacher and their line management. These matters are clearly defined in the teacher-aide position description and, where necessary, principals should ensure that these conditions are adhered to. In particular, clear lines of responsibility are needed between teacher aides and teachers. Teachers should direct program planning, classroom teaching, assessment and reporting, using the expertise of teacher aides where appropriate. In addition, allowing teacher aides to undertake their regular work in students’ homes is placing them in an untenable position.

Time for planning with the classroom teacher would improve program delivery and outcomes for the student concerned. This was frequently commented upon throughout the review. For more information see ‘4.3.3 School management of resources’ on page 60.

**Recommendation 34**

That schools provide effective leadership for teachers who are teaching students with disabilities by appointing coordinators to provide practical support. Such support could
include release time for teachers to attend case conferences, reduced playground duty load or some reduction in class size, as well as organisational support such as timetabling of teacher aides and liaising with District Support Services.

**Rationale**

In schools where students with disabilities were successfully working in regular classrooms, these strategies were commonplace. Senior staff would take the class while the teacher, and often the teacher aide as well, attended case conferences, for example. These schools also supported relief teachers by always ensuring full aide coverage for the period of time that the relief teacher was in the school. Appointing a coordinator who took a ‘hands-on’ leadership role, rather than a purely organisational role, provided tangible, and appreciated, leadership. For further information see ‘Human resources’ on page 53.

**Recommendation 35**

That the Department of Education collects data on workers’ compensation and stress leave arising from the implementation of the Inclusion Policy for at least two years.

**Rationale**

Although there was considerable rhetoric about teacher stress as a result of inclusion, it was difficult to find hard evidence because the reasons for stress leave are generally kept confidential. There did appear to be some evidence of claims for back or other injuries. Unless consistent data are collected and maintained, the real effect of this policy on teachers and teacher aides will remain unknown. For more information see ‘Material resources’ on page 56.

**5.5 Professional learning and development**

**Recommendation 36**

That the Department of Education liaises with the University of Tasmania to develop a compulsory unit of work for pre-service teachers about teaching students with disabilities in regular classrooms.
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**Recommendation 37**

That the Department of Education liaises with the University of Tasmania to ensure that all pre-service teachers have the opportunity to work with a student with a disability or high support needs in a regular classroom during their course, and that this is appropriately assessed and credited.

**Rationale**

As students with disabilities increasingly move into regular schools, all teachers are likely to teach such a student at some stage in their career. Even if teachers never have such a student in their classroom, they will have responsibility for students with disabilities in less formal situations such as when on playground duty, at sports carnivals or special events. There is value in all teachers having at least some experience of this nature during their training. This should be recognised by both the Department of Education and the University of Tasmania. Compulsory courses of this nature are often a requirement interstate. For further information see ‘Pre-service’ on page 62.

**Recommendation 38**

That the Department of Education develops a program of accredited professional learning for teachers.

**Rationale**

There is a shortage of teachers in Tasmania having expertise about the education of students with disabilities, and in particular having specialist knowledge about specific disabilities such as vision impairment. Since these disabilities are of low incidence there are few opportunities to develop expertise.

There are a number of institutions providing appropriate courses through open learning and this may be one strategy worth investigating further. Where appropriate, study leave or travel could be negotiated under particular conditions. For more information see ‘General professional development’ on page 64 and ‘University based in-service’ on page 63.

**Recommendation 39**

That all Individual Professional Learning Plans (IPLPs), as coordinated by principals, contain elements that develop the recognition of students’ diverse learning needs, and the capacity for successful management of these.
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Rationale

If equity issues are to be addressed adequately in schools, an essential element is the development of teachers’ skills to recognise and understand diversity. For further information see ‘Individual professional learning plans’ on page 64.

Recommendation 40

That the Department of Education sets up a system of mentors or advocates for teachers and teacher aides of students with disabilities, and provides opportunities for regular networking. In addition, in each education district, support staff should work with parents of students with disabilities in an advocacy role.

Rationale

Many teachers and teacher aides of students with disabilities reported feeling isolated and uncertain about how well they were managing. A frequent comment was that they felt under-valued for the work they were doing. The provision of professional networks and mentoring would help to foster a culture of progress and improvement, and facilitate sharing of good practice.

The involvement of parents in a child’s education is a recognised factor in successful educational outcomes. Some parents reported that they found dealing with the school very stressful and some of this stress was caused by a lack of knowledge about the education system and its workings. Provision of parent advocates in each district would help to bridge that gap, and ultimately improve educational outcomes for the students concerned. Advocacy expertise already exists in social workers and guidance officers, and should be developed in other support staff where needed. For more information see ‘Human resources’ on page 53.

Recommendation 41

That the Department of Education provides useful and easily accessible teaching materials for teachers and teacher aides of students with disabilities. This material should include both basic information about specific disabilities and practical, workable suggestions for use in the classroom. Classroom material should be linked explicitly to current curriculum guidelines, and cover all learning areas. Parents and organisations having expertise in particular disabilities should be consulted in the preparation of these resources. Materials should be available in a variety of forms, including the Internet.
Rationale

Teachers were not using existing materials. Many teachers did not realise that materials were available. The materials themselves are often in the form of case studies and descriptions of practice that may not be easily transferable to a different context or learning area. For example, teachers reported needing explicit guidelines for teaching a visual subject such as mathematics to children with vision impairment, or involving students with physical disabilities in practical subjects such as technology or art. Parents and organisations have practical expertise that can be utilised to make the resources relevant, current and useful. For further information see ‘4.4.3 Support materials’ on page 66.

Recommendation 42

That the Department of Education works with the Tasmanian Principals Institute and the Department’s Professional Learning Services Branch to develop professional learning programs that address the leadership qualities required to enable a school to build capacity for inclusive practice. These programs should include both theory and practice of inclusive education in all its forms. Parents and organisations having expertise in particular disabilities should be consulted in the preparation of these programs.

Rationale

The attitude and orientation of the principal and senior staff are crucial to the success of any program of inclusive education. In some schools, equity issues did not appear to be well understood by senior staff, and good practice seemed to come about fortuitously rather than in a planned and systematic way.

Any program of teacher development is likely to have limited success unless programs addressing leadership issues in equity accompany it. Existing structures and organisations would seem the most appropriate way of providing this. The use of practical expertise from parents and organisations would ensure that information presented was relevant, current and practical. For more information see ‘Tasmanian Principals Institute’ on page 63.

Recommendation 43

That the Department of Education develops an accredited, competency-based system of teacher aide training. Courses developed should build on the content of existing courses, but should be reworked to include a set of competency-based standards for assessment purposes. These courses should be provided at no cost to all new teacher aides.
Rationale

Teacher aide training was inconsistent and of uneven quality. Many respondents commented about its importance, given the role of teacher aides in supporting students with disabilities. In addition, there are health and safety issues, such as back care, which are also addressed inconsistently. The use of an existing national framework for the provision of accreditation would ensure quality control and transferable qualifications for this group of people. For further information see ‘4.4.2 Teacher aide training’ on page 65.
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Community Consultation Questionnaire

**REVIEW OF THE POLICY:**

*INCLUSION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN REGULAR SCHOOLS*

If you wish to make a confidential and private submission please phone:

Ralph Spaulding  
Assistant Secretary (Review)  
Office for Educational Review  
Department of Education  
Phone: 6233 7192

Feel free to supply any additional information, including copies of documents, when you return this questionnaire.

Name and contact details (optional):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
BACKGROUND INFORMATION
1. Which suburb do you live in? _________________________________________
2. Which education district are you in (if known)? _________________________

Tick as many boxes as appropriate:

3. I am interested in Inclusion as a:

   3.1 Parent
       3.1.1 with a child having a significant disability ☐
       3.1.2 with a child with no significant disability ☐

   3.2 Teacher
       3.2.1 of a child with a significant disability in a regular classroom ☐
       3.2.2 not currently teaching any children with significant disabilities ☐
       3.2.3 in a special school ☐

   3.3 Health professional
       3.3.1 doctor ☐
       3.3.2 provider of therapy services ☐
       3.3.3 other (please specify)________________________________________☐

   3.4 Member of an interested organisation ☐
       3.4.1 Name of organisation________________________________________

   3.5 Student
       3.5.1 Grade ________________________☐

   3.6 Other (please specify)____________________________________________☐

4. What do you know about inclusion?

   I am familiar with:

   4.1 the policy. ☐
   4.2 the relevant legislation. ☐
   4.3 school enrolment procedures. ☐
4.4 the grievance procedure

4.5 the situation outside Tasmania.

5. Please comment on the policy (A copy is provided with this package for your information.)

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

For the following questions 6-12 tick the box that best indicates your view.

6. How good is access to educational resources for students with significant disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very inadequate</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Classroom support

6.2 Physical access

6.3 Additional services

6.4 Comment

7. How well do you think that students with significant disabilities are able to participate in regular schooling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1 Through the curriculum

7.2 Through the social environment

7.3 In the physical environment

7.4 Comment
8. How well do you think students with significant disabilities in regular schools are catered for in regard to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very inadequate</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Physical access to buildings</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>Physical access to toilets</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>Physical access to showers</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>Computers for lessons</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Specialised equipment such as chairs, desks etc</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>Access to practical classes eg Home economics, science, phys ed</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Physiotherapy</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>Occupational therapy</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Guidance support</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>Speech pathology support</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>Teacher assistant support in classrooms</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>___________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. How well do you think the transition between schools (eg grade 6 to grade 7, special school to regular school, grade 10 to college), of students with disabilities is handled in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very successfully</th>
<th>Very poorly</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Enrolment procedures</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Choice of school</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Needs assessment of the student</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Information provided to teachers</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 Information provided to parents</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 Information provided to students</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.7 Comment

10. How good is access to information about post-school options for students with disabilities in regular schools in regard to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very inadequate</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Vocational education</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Careers counselling</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3 Independent living options</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4 Leisure options</td>
<td>☐1 ☐2 ☐3 ☐4 ☐5</td>
<td>☐0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.5 Comment
11. This question is about the interaction of parents of students with significant disabilities and particular groups of people in an educational setting.

These people are: | Very supportive | Not at all supportive | Don’t know |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1 Principals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 Teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3 School staff other than teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4 Students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5 District Office staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.6 District Support Service staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.7 Central Office staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.8 Comment

12. This question is about the interaction of students with significant disabilities and particular groups of people in an educational setting.

These people are: | Very supportive | Not at all supportive | Don’t know |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1 Principals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 Teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 School staff other than teachers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 Students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 District Office staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6 District Support Service staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7 Central Office staff</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12.8 Comment
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13  I have used the grievance procedure that is in place for included students:

Yes ☐  1  No ☐  0

13.1 If no, did you know that a grievance procedure was available?

Yes ☐  1  No ☐  0

13.2 If yes, please comment on your experience ______________________

______________________________________________________________

Any other comments
Discussion with District Superintendents and District Support Service Managers

1. How is the concept of equity practised in your district?

2. How do you promote and foster equity in your schools?

3. What do you see as the PD needs of principals, teachers and support staff in relation to equity and inclusion?

4. In some districts there is a discrepancy between principals’ and teachers’ views of the help given by support services. Could you comment on this?

5. What is your wish list in relation to Inclusion and Equity?
Protocol for Focus Group Discussion

Purpose of the focus group discussions (to be shared with each group)

This discussion is part of a major review of the Inclusion of Students with Disabilities in Regular Schools policy. Altogether eight focus group discussions will be held in all parts of the state.

These will form part of the data collection for the review.

Practicalities (to be discussed with the District Superintendent)

1. Each group will consist of:
   - two parents representing parent organisations within the district;
   - one special education teacher who is school-based, preferably nominated by her/his peers;
   - two classroom teachers (preferably selected by a consultative process) - one teaching a Category A students and one who currently has no responsibility for such a student;
   - one principal;
   - one member of the district support team;
   - one school-based non-teaching staff member (eg teacher aide, school admin officer etc);
   - a person nominated by the District Superintendent.

2. The room used should allow all people to be seated comfortably, and work undisturbed for the period of the discussion.

3. If possible there should be some refreshments - tea and coffee, water etc

4. All group members should be able to see the paper being used to record ideas, or an electronic whiteboard used.

5. The discussion is confidential and participants and the facilitator cannot discuss any details about anything that comes up. No person will be identified in any final report.

During the discussion, try to define which ideas are common to the majority of the group and which ideas only some members hold.
The discussion

Phase 1  Familiarisation  Approx. 10 minutes

- Who are we?

Introduction of group members; setting the tone of the discussion; confidentiality issues.

- Why are we here?

Purpose of the discussion. Emphasis that the discussion is to clarify opinions, and may not necessarily lead to a consensus.

Phase 2  The operation of the group  Approximately 5 minutes

- What will we do?

Set the ground rules—all views will be accepted and the task of the group is to clarify these rules not to reach a group view.

- Recording the information

Establish how the information will be recorded and edited as the discussion proceeds. Emphasise again that individuals will NOT be identified but that the views expressed are all important and valued.

Phase 3  The discussion

This part of the discussion needs to be recorded. Use butcher’s paper or a whiteboard to collect the individual comments. At the end of the discussion, recap that everyone is happy that his or her views are represented.

Anyone who does not wish to talk about a particular issue may put their thoughts on paper and give them to the facilitator at the end of the discussion.

Before putting the questions clarify the parameters of the review. Say:

The focus of this review is the inclusion of students with disabilities - often referred to as Category A students. We recognise that there are many other students who have high educational needs but who do not have Category A funding. Issues relating to these students can be raised but this must be within the parameters of the review, in other words, within the context of educating students with disabilities in regular schools.

Allow a little time for brief discussion here.
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Allow about 15 minutes for discussion of each question. For each question the process is:

Pose the question, gather the views of ALL participants. Ensure that EVERYONE has a chance to say something but KEEP THE DISCUSSION FOCUSED.

Say:

The questions that follow are the most important part of the discussion. They cover the main issues that have been identified during the review process so far. For each question I will allow about 15 minutes for discussion and will provide everybody with the chance to respond. You may ask anybody a question to help clarify what they are saying, and may disagree, but the point of the discussion is NOT to reach consensus or to debate the issues, but to obtain a range of views.

There will be time at the end of each question to consider what you have said and change anything that has been recorded.

Put the questions to the participants.

1. Resources

Based upon the assumption that our existing resource is reasonable by international standards and that additional funding is unlikely, how could resources be better organised?

What resources do you regard as most critical/helpful?

2. Educational Programs

What are the challenges in meeting all children’s educational needs in inclusive programs

How well have we met these challenges to date?

3. Professional Development

What do you see as the most significant obstacles confronting you that must be overcome to build capacity in your school/district for quality inclusive programs?

What kinds of PD are you doing/planning to overcome these obstacles?
4. Challenges

What seem to be the most significant challenges to inclusion, and what approaches seem most beneficial to meeting those challenges?

Phase 4  Debriefing  About 10 minutes

Use the last ten minutes or so to recap the discussion. Ensure that everyone feels that their views have been registered. Remind people of the confidentiality of the discussion. Thank participants for their help.

After the discussion, complete the Response Sheet and return that and the responses from participants to OER.
Framework for Seven-Hour Observation of a Student with Disabilities in a Regular School

The purpose of the observation is to provide an overall picture of the school day as experienced by the student. The intention is to describe events exactly as they occur both inside and outside the classroom. All additional material which may be useful to this observation, such as Individual Education Plans and student’s work, will be attached with permission from the school and the teacher. A “reality picture” will be obtained from the viewpoint of the observer, about the student’s school environment, and in some way, about the practice of Inclusion in this environment.

The following questions are a focus for the observation.

Who works with the student?

Where do they work?

What programmes are planned and who developed the programme?

How does the student respond to the learning programme?

How does the student respond to peers and others?

How do the teacher and teacher aide interact with the student?

Are teaching approaches adapted to cater for differences between learners?

What opportunities are there for social interaction both inside and outside the classroom?

What opinions are expressed which may reflect the practice of Inclusion in the school?

In addition to these questions the study is using the 5 Capabilities as outlined in the document *Our Children The Future* as a basis for observation of the Learning Programme.
Protocol for Seven-Hour Observation of a Student with Disabilities in a Regular School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PM.</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>TEACHER/TEACHER AIDE PLAN IEP OR EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>CONTEXT STRUCTURE: MATERIALS, PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOMES: PROCESS OBSERVED FIVE CAPABILITIES</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS: TEACHING APPROACH, STUDENT BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.00-1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00-2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PM.</th>
<th>CONTENT TEACHER/TEACHER AIDE PLAN, IEP OR EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>CONTEXT STRUCTURE: MATERIALS, PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOMES: PROCESS OBSERVED FIVE CAPABILITIES</th>
<th>OBSERVATIONS: TEACHING APPROACH, STUDENT BEHAVIOUR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:** Opportunity to review learning programme, consult others.
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Schools visited as part of the Review Process

The following schools were visited by members of the review team, using the Indicators of Inclusive Practice as a framework for the interviews. Members of the review team also visited 14 other schools in response to invitations. Data from these invitational visits were collected in an unstructured way, rather than using the structured processes undertaken with the schools listed below.

Arthur District:

Burnie High School, Burnie, Queenstown, Strahan, Table Cape and West Somerset Primary Schools.

Barrington District:

The Don College, Devonport and Ulverstone High Schools, Latrobe and Ulverstone Primary Schools.

Bowen District:

 Clarence and Rose Bay High Schools, Campania, Sorell and Tasman District High Schools, Dodges Ferry Primary School.

Derwent District:

Bridgewater and Cosgrove High Schools, Oatlands District High School, Brent Street, Bridgewater, and Springfield Gardens Primary Schools. A special visit was also made to the Claremont Cluster.

Esk District:

Riverside and Scottsdale High Schools, St Helens and St Marys District High Schools, Invermay, Ringarooma and Scottsdale Primary Schools.

Hartz District:

Hobart College, Huonville and Taroona High Schools, Bowen Road, Huonville, and Kingston Primary Schools, Hazelwood Special School.
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Tasmania

Department of Education
Office for Educational Review

Developmental Framework for Inclusive Education in Tasmanian Schools: School-Level Indicators

Instructions:

Please read each indicator carefully. Indicate your self-rating by ticking the box underneath the appropriate descriptor. If you have any comments include these in the space provided.
1. **Management of Special Education within the school**

The school’s special education committee, with the active involvement of the principal, provides an active forum for discussion about all issues relating to equity and inclusive education. It involves parents and other interested parties in its discussions. Special education provision is fully integrated into mainstream classrooms and is a resource for all teachers.

A special education committee, supported by the principal, reports regularly to staff about special education matters within the school and the district, including the progress of particular students and groups of students within the school. Specialist teachers work mainly in classrooms with occasional withdrawal for specific purposes.

A special education coordinator manages special education programs within the school. All teachers are informed about the work of the specialist teachers with particular students. Specialist teachers sometimes work in classrooms as well as through withdrawal.

Special education in the school is managed by a specialist teacher with the help of teacher aides and focuses on withdrawal and remediation.

| n = 22 | 4.6% | 40.9% | 45.6% | 9.1% |

**Comment**
| 2. | Allocation of support resources | Allocation of support resources, including materials, equipment and personnel, within the school is based on an open, agreed and understood process, based on the needs of all students identified through a school-wide needs-assessment process. School staff, district support staff, parents and students are involved. The school budget includes a specific allocation for inclusion, and supports equity issues through the School Resource Package. | Allocation of support resources within the school, including materials, equipment and personnel, is based on a flexible process agreed by all staff and the district support services, based on the stated needs of individual students. Parents of selected students may be involved in the process. The school budget includes a specific allocation for inclusion, and where necessary makes additional provision through the School Resource Package. | Allocation of support resources within the school, including materials equipment and personnel, is based on a process agreed by senior staff which is communicated to all staff in the school. District support services are involved in the process, particularly relating to the allocation of personnel. | Allocation of support resources within the school, including materials, equipment and personnel, is decided by senior staff based on practical considerations relating to deployment and availability of staff within the school, and the school budget. |

| n = 24 | 16.7% | 37.5% | 29.2% | 16.7% |

Comment
### Appendix 3: Schools visited and indicators used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.</th>
<th><strong>Coordination of Support</strong></th>
<th>The school coordinator and district support staff work as a team with all school staff, parents and outside agencies to develop the skills and behaviours to meet the needs of all students in the school, including liaison with non-education agencies. Plans and programs for individuals and groups of students are regularly reviewed and updated.</th>
<th>The school coordinator and district support staff work as a team with all school staff and parents to develop the skills and behaviours to meet the needs of students in equity groups identified by the school. Plans and programs for individual students are well documented and available.</th>
<th>The school coordinator identifies the needs of students in some equity groups and liaises with professional support staff from within the district to provide for these.</th>
<th>The school relies on professional support staff, from within the district to work in the school to meet identified needs of some students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **n** = 21 | 38.1% | 23.8% | 28.6% | 9.5% | **Comment**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional learning</th>
<th>(A coordinated professional learning plan exists for the whole school, describing activities for the year, designed to address school, student and curriculum needs established through a needs assessment process. The plan explicitly addresses issues relating to inclusive practice within and outside the classroom.)</th>
<th>(A professional learning plan exists for all school staff, including non-teaching staff and principals, which addresses some identified school needs and the needs expressed by individuals in relation to inclusive practice within the classroom.)</th>
<th>(A professional learning plan exists for school teaching staff, based on needs of individual groups of teachers. The plan addresses areas of classroom practice including teaching and assessment methods.)</th>
<th>(No professional learning plan exists for the whole school.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><strong>Professional learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>A professional learning plan exists for all school staff, including non-teaching staff and principals, which addresses some identified school needs and the needs expressed by individuals in relation to inclusive practice within the classroom.</td>
<td>A professional learning plan exists for school teaching staff, based on needs of individual groups of teachers. The plan addresses areas of classroom practice including teaching and assessment methods.</td>
<td>No professional learning plan exists for the whole school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
## 5. ASSR processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school’s ASSR process addresses the agreed areas with special attention to the needs of all equity groups. All parents, students and staff are informed and parents, students and staff are actively involved in the process, together with members of interested parties from outside the school.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s ASSR process addresses the agreed areas with special attention to the needs of some specific equity groups represented in the school. All parents and staff are informed and parents, students and staff are involved in the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s ASSR process addresses the agreed areas. Some parents and staff are informed and many are involved in the process. Attention is paid to the needs of the majority of students only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school’s ASSR process addresses the agreed areas. A limited group of parents and staff is involved in the process. Attention is paid to the needs of the majority of students only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
### Appendix 3: Schools visited and indicators used

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td>The school enrolls all students from within its own area. Enrolment processes consider the needs of all students, including those with significant disabilities. These processes are well documented and publicly available.</td>
<td>The school has capability to enrol students with significant disabilities, including clear processes for consultation with teachers and parents, together with district support staff. These are documented within the school, and available on request.</td>
<td>The school is developing capability to enrol students with significant disabilities, including clear processes for consultation with teachers within the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong> = 22</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
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| 7. | **Student class placement** | Consultation processes exist to identify student, parent and staff needs in relation to class placements. These processes take place well in advance and include discussions with parents and advocates at times of mutual agreement. These are part of a wider needs-assessment process used as part of the school’s planning cycle. | Some individual student needs are considered, and all parents are consulted about class placements. Staff have input into the process. Wherever possible, the needs of all students are accommodated when students are placed in classes. Case conferences may be held to discuss particular needs and parents may be invited to attend. | Some parents and staff are consulted about the organisation of classes and placement of students within the administrative constraints of the school. Case conferences happen occasionally for specific purposes within the school. | Students are placed in classes for administrative reasons. Staff and parents have little input into the process. |

| n = 21 | 42.9% | 42.9% | 4.8% | 9.5% |

**Comment**
### Appendix 3: Schools visited and indicators used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th>Outcomes for Students</th>
<th>All teachers develop programs detailing intended outcomes for all students. Individual Education Plans exist for particular students that link to all programs. IEPs are developed by all involved staff and parents and are regularly reviewed and updated. All students are supported to participate in mainstream assessment processes.</th>
<th>Individual Education Plans exist for particular students detailing intended outcomes. Teachers and District Support Staff developed these. They are regularly reviewed and updated. Students in most equity groups participate in mainstream assessment programs.</th>
<th>Individual Education Plans exist for particular students detailing intended outcomes. Teachers initiated these and developed them collaboratively with District Support Staff. Students in some equity groups participate in mainstream assessment programs.</th>
<th>Individual Education Plans exist for particular students. District Support Staff initiated these and played a major role in their development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
9. Reporting to Parents

All parents frequently receive reports from all teachers including information about the social and academic progress of their child. Parents of children who have IEPs receive a report based on the individual outcomes detailed in the IEP of that child. Teachers contact parents personally, including making home visits, on any matter of concern and to report good progress.

All parents receive reports as required by the Reporting to Parents Policy. All parents are welcome to contact the school at any time for information about their child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n = 22</th>
<th>13.6%</th>
<th>31.8%</th>
<th>54.6%</th>
<th>0.0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10.</th>
<th>Enrolment and Transition</th>
<th>Processes to support enrolment and transition of all students between any schools are documented and followed by all schools. These recognise the needs of all equity groups, especially in relation to coordination and maintenance of support.</th>
<th>Processes to support enrolment and transition of all students between schools within the district are documented and followed by the schools concerned. These recognise the needs of some equity groups, especially in relation to coordination and maintenance of support from within the district.</th>
<th>Some processes exist to support enrolment and transition of most students between associated schools within the district. Enrolment and transition for students with special needs is supported on an individual basis.</th>
<th>No processes exist to support enrolment and transition of students between schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 19</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment
### 11. Crisis management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A school crisis management plan is updated and revised regularly. School staff are trained and available for medical and behavioural emergencies, or crisis situations, at all times, and this training is regularly updated.</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A school crisis management plan exists and is available to all staff but is not reviewed on a regular basis. All school staff are trained and available for medical and behavioural emergencies, or crisis situations.</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school crisis management plan exists. Most school staff are trained and available for medical and behavioural emergencies, or crisis situations.</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No school crisis management plan exists. Crises are met as they arise by whatever staff are available.</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 20*
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Tasmania
Department of Education
Office for Educational Review

**Developmental Framework for Inclusive Education in Tasmanian Schools: Classroom Indicators**

**Instructions:**

Please read each indicator carefully. Indicate your self-rating by ticking the box underneath the appropriate descriptor. If you have any comments include these in the space provided.
### Planning for Student Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers of student with disabilities n=29</th>
<th>Teachers of students without disabilities n=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**

Flexible groups of teachers and teacher aides plan collaboratively, taking into account the IEPs and special needs of equity groups. Planning groups are responsive to the needs of all students and appropriate learning outcomes, including KILOs, KINOs and other student learning outcomes.

Teams of teachers have regular planning sessions to develop programs having clear learning outcomes for most students, including KILOs, KINOs or school-determined outcomes. Teacher aide work with students with special needs is included in this planning.

Teams of teachers plan together occasionally to address KILOs and KINOs or school-determined student learning outcomes. Where appropriate they direct the work of teacher aides in relation to students with special needs.

Individual teachers plan programs for their own class(es). Teacher aides are provided with a program outline for students with special needs and deliver programs for these students based on these outlines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.</th>
<th><strong>Social Interaction</strong></th>
<th>Activities within and outside the classroom are planned to encourage social interaction between all students, including those with significant disabilities. Students voluntarily include students with significant disabilities in their social groups.</th>
<th>Activities within and outside the classroom allow social interaction between all students, including those with significant disabilities, most of the time. Students are encouraged to include students with significant disabilities in their social groups.</th>
<th>Students with significant disabilities work with a teacher aide anywhere within the classroom most of the time. A teacher aide, both inside and outside the classroom, generally mediates the communication of students with significant disabilities with other students.</th>
<th>Students with significant disabilities have their own base within the classroom or are withdrawn to another room where they can work with teacher aides on individual programs. Other students rarely interact with students with significant disabilities inside or outside the classroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers of student with disabilities n=28</strong></td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers of students without disabilities n=19</strong></td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
### 3. Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Teachers of student with disabilities n=27</th>
<th>Teachers of students without disabilities n=19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diverse approaches to teaching are planned in order to meet the needs of all students. Students are encouraged to contribute ideas which foster inclusive practice.</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse approaches to teaching are consistently evident to meet the needs of some equity groups. Students often contribute ideas about approaches to topics.</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse approaches to teaching at some times recognise the needs of some equity groups. Students sometimes contribute ideas about approaches to topics.</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching caters for the majority of students and does not recognise the needs of equity groups.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
### Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers of students</th>
<th>Teachers of students</th>
<th>Teachers of students</th>
<th>Teachers of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with disabilities</td>
<td>without disabilities</td>
<td>with disabilities</td>
<td>without disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=26</td>
<td>n=19</td>
<td>n=26</td>
<td>n=19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.</th>
<th><strong>Student learning outcomes</strong></th>
<th>Student learning outcomes are clearly expressed for all students. They incorporate outcomes defined on IEPs for those students who have them, and include appropriate developmental academic, social and behavioural outcomes. Students and parents are informed about the expected outcomes.</th>
<th>Student learning outcomes are based on developmental continua in key learning areas and on agreed social outcomes. Assessment methods may be modified for some students. IEPs reflect the students’ development and agreed social outcomes.</th>
<th>Student learning outcomes are general and focus on key learning areas and some social outcomes. Assessment criteria may be modified for some students.</th>
<th>Student learning outcomes are general and focus only on key learning areas. Outcomes and assessment are the same for all students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of student with disabilities n=25</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of students without disabilities n=18</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.</th>
<th><strong>Behaviour management</strong></th>
<th>Behaviour management in the classroom is based on class-agreed ‘rules’ and school guidelines. These are flexible but expect high standards of social behaviour from all students, regardless of background or any disability.</th>
<th>Behaviour management in the classroom is based on class-agreed ‘rules’ and school guidelines. Expected standards of behaviour may be modified for some groups of students, and high standards are not always expected of students from particular equity groups.</th>
<th>Behaviour management in the classroom is governed by school-agreed rules. Special behaviour contracts may be negotiated with particular students.</th>
<th>Behaviour management is generally the responsibility of senior staff. There is no flexibility to manage the behaviour of students with special needs in different ways.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of student with disabilities n=29</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers of students without disabilities n=21</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
### 7. Reporting to parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers of students with disabilities n=26</th>
<th>Teachers of students without disabilities n=20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comment

All parents frequently receive reports from all teachers including information about the social and academic progress of their child. Parents of children who have IEPs receive a report based on the individual needs of that child. Teachers contact parents personally on any matter of concern and to report good progress.

All parents receive reports as required by the Reporting to Parents Policy. These are the same for all students. All parents can contact the school at any time for information about their child.

All parents receive reports as required by the Reporting to Parents Policy. These are the same for all students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8.</th>
<th><strong>Enrolment and transition</strong></th>
<th>Classroom teachers are actively involved in supporting the enrolment and transition of all students between classes and schools, especially those students in equity groups. This involvement includes discussion with parents, teachers in other schools, teacher aides and support staff from within and outside the district about appropriate processes to manage the enrolment and transition for students with special needs.</th>
<th>Classroom teachers are involved in enrolment and transition processes through documentation of student progress and in-school discussion. The special education coordinator, with the advice of classroom teachers, supports enrolment and transition of students with special needs.</th>
<th>Classroom teachers have limited involvement in enrolment and transition processes for students in their class. The special education coordinator supports enrolment and transition of students with special needs.</th>
<th>Classroom teachers are not involved in supporting enrolment and transition processes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers of student with disabilities n=23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers of students without disabilities n=16</strong></td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment**
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Response Rates to Community Consultation Questionnaire

There were 274 responses to the Community Consultation Questionnaire. The response rates are presented here as counts, not percentages. Where percentage figures are referred to in the text, they have been calculated as a percentage of those people responding to that question, since not all people made a response to every question.

Many people in section 3 indicated that they had more than one interest in inclusion.

The following were transcribed and analysed using the organisations visited by the Review Team, were transcribed and analysed using the computer software Nvivo v1.0.1 (Qualitative Solutions and Research, La Trobe University, Melbourne, 1999):

- Questions requiring written responses.
- A large number of additional voluntary submissions.
- Records of discussions and interviews with 16 organisations.

(The questions requiring written responses have not been included below.)

3.1 Parent

| 3.1.1 with a child having a significant disability | 107 |
| 3.1.2 with a child with no significant disability | 63 |

3.2 Teacher

| 3.2.1 of a child with a significant disability in a regular classroom | 69 |
| 3.2.2 not currently teaching any children with significant disabilities | 37 |
| 3.2.3 in a special school | 9 |

3.3 Health professional

| 3.3.1 doctor | 3 |
| 3.3.2 provider of therapy services | 6 |
| 3.3.3 other | 10 |
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3.4 Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>Member of an interested organisation</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I am familiar with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>the policy</th>
<th>196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>the relevant legislation</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>school enrolment procedures</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>the grievance procedure</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>the situation outside Tasmania</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. How good is access to educational resources for students with significant disabilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1 Classroom support</th>
<th>1 Excellent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very inadequate</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6.2 Physical access   | 21          | 63 | 68 | 29 | 22                 | 71         |

| 6.3 Additional services | 9 | 30 | 46 | 51 | 54 | 84 |

7. How well do you think that students with significant disabilities are able to participate in regular schooling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.1 Through the curriculum</th>
<th>1 Very well</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very little</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 7.2 Through the social environment | 25 | 58 | 70 | 29 | 45 | 47 |

| 7.3 In the physical environment | 12 | 39 | 79 | 46 | 38 | 60 |
8. How well do you think students with significant disabilities in regular schools are catered for in regard to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Excellent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very inadequate</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1 Physical access to buildings</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.2 Physical access to toilets</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3 Physical access to showers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 Computers for lessons</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Specialised equipment such as chairs, desks etc</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 Access to practical classes eg Home economics, science, phys ed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 Physiotherapy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.8 Occupational therapy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9 Guidance support</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.10 Speech pathology support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.11 Teacher assistant support in classrooms</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.12 Transport</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. How well do you think the transition between schools (eg grade 6 to grade 7, special school to regular school, grade 10 to college), of students with disabilities is handled in terms of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Very successfully</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very poorly</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 Enrolment procedures</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Choice of school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Needs assessment of the student</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 Information provided to teachers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.5 Information provided to parents</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6 Information provided to students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How good is access to information about post-school options for students with disabilities in regular schools in regard to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Excellent</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Very inadequate</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Vocational education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Careers counselling</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3 Independent living options</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4 Leisure options</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Schools visited and indicators used

11. This question is about the interaction of parents of students with significant disabilities and particular groups of people in an educational setting.

11.1 Principals 102 72 39 5 6 50
11.2 Teachers 98 90 36 5 3 42
11.3 School staff other than teachers 78 75 50 13 2 56
11.4 Students 41 73 69 22 11 58
11.5 District Office staff 38 28 40 19 14 135
11.6 District Support Service staff 49 46 34 16 18 113
11.7 Central Office staff 26 10 23 19 21 175

12. This question is about the interaction of students with significant disabilities and particular groups of people in an educational setting.

12.1 Principals 105 75 31 9 5 49
12.2 Teachers 105 90 26 10 1 42
12.3 School staff other than teachers 84 85 42 9 3 51
12.4 Students 53 75 60 21 13 52
12.5 District Office staff 28 18 25 27 18 158
12.6 District Support Service staff 40 37 33 16 19 129
12.7 Central Office staff 16 10 20 19 24 185
### 13. Grievances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I have used the grievance procedure that is in place for included students</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>If no, did you know that a grievance procedure was available?</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>