

BUILDING AN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEM

Possibilities of cooperation with the Directorate for Inclusive Education of the Department of Education and Teacher Training Institutions in South Africa

Report from a second visit to South Africa, 15-26 March 2004

Örjan Bäckman

Rolf Helldin

**Stockholm Institute of Education, Department of Human Development,
Learning and Special Education**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sweden together with Finland has agreed to a three-year 2003/04-2005/06 support to the Department of Education of South Africa to implement the first phase of White Paper 6: Building an Inclusive Education and Training System. The Swedish grant amounts to SEK 20 000 000. Within the budget there are funds set aside for cooperation with Finland for capacity building and with Sweden for university linkages.

The Stockholm Institute of Education (Teacher Education University) was identified to look into the possibilities of cooperation with the Directorate for Inclusive Education in the Department of Education and Teacher Training Institutions in South Africa. A first visit was made in October 2003, and a report was presented to the South African Department of Education, DoE. The DoE was of the opinion that there was a need to follow up the report and draw up the framework for the cooperation. The DoE also suggested that the Stockholm Institute of Education should visit South Africa at the same time as a team of Finnish consultants.

According to the **Terms of Reference** the task was focused on:

Discuss with officials in the DoE responsible for teacher education, issues related to teacher training in inclusive education,

Visit Universities with teacher education, recommended by the Directorate for Inclusive Education at DoE, with the objective to identify areas of mutual common courses with regard to inclusive education,

Have joint discussions and planning between the partners involved, South Africa, Finland and Sweden,

Reach an understanding on what is expected from the Stockholm Institute of Education and on methods of implementation.

The Swedish team has consisted of Dr. Örjan Bäckman and Dr. Rolf Helldin. The assignment was carried out in three weeks, including the visit to South Africa, March 15-26 2004.

The first report (October 2003) focused on interpretation and analysis of White Paper 6 and other documents in order to assess the possibility of South African-Swedish cooperation in the field of teacher training. The close liaison between the South African policy and the Swedish understanding and practice of "inclusive education" was noted.

The problematic gap between policy and practice, often caused by the fear of losing privileges belonging to an old, segregated system, was described. In line with this both hesitation and frustration with regard to the policy of inclusion could be seen. This also referred to discussions with university people.

The great need for training of staff in inclusive education at all levels was observed. Four main areas of training were listed: basic teacher training programmes, specialised training programmes, in-service teacher training and in-service training of decision makers and administrators.

The much valuable ongoing South African research in inclusive education not attracting enough attention was noted. A recommendation was made to universities to undertake a thorough survey of research knowledge in inclusive education, in order to encourage dissemination of research findings.

This time the Swedish team attended, together with Mrs Minna Saulio and Mr Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland, provincial meetings in Limpopo (Polokwane), Western Cape (Cape Town), Gauteng (Johannesburg) and Northern Cape (Kimberley). Provincial directors of inclusive education, colleagues from other departments, university teacher trainers and researchers, other providers of training and members of NGOs (DEAFSA) participated. Representatives from Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal were present in Cape Town, and representatives from North West and Mpumalanga joined in Kimberley. The meetings covered all provinces except for the Free State.

In connection with the provincial meetings, the Swedish and the Finnish partners had both informal and formal discussions. The discussions dealt with the present and the future framework for the cooperation, in order to clarify responsibilities referring to "ministry linkages" and "university linkages". Both teams underlined the importance of regular meetings for updating each other. It was also found necessary to "draw the line" between the work efforts of the two countries in consideration of the expectations from South Africa.

Some observations and comments

It was emphasized in meetings that old institutions should be used as "vehicles" for the transformation. This approach brings about both possibilities and problems. The old "specialised knowledge" must be protected and utilised. However, this knowledge is more or less charged with elements of the medical approach to children "with" barriers to learning as indicated in WP 6. The "resistance" noted among "specialists" should be met by intensive training aiming at understanding their new roles in inclusive education. "Non-specialists", i.e. regular teachers in schools, must be involved in the transformation at an early stage.

Lack of existing resources for training of staff in inclusive education at universities was a main discussion topic in meetings. Available resources were not utilised and coordinated in a proper way. It is necessary to avoid duplication of already existing knowledge areas. It is also important to get a clear picture of positions and experiences of universities and of different provinces. University representatives argued for formal networking as a tool for providing effective training of staff in inclusive education. Proposals from the discussions were:

- record positive and informative examples of inclusive education and use a holistic approach
- build upon existing experiences and resources in order to strengthen what is successful
- investigate the staff requirements to be able to give courses in inclusive education to different sectors

The introduction of a new curriculum is much dependent on effective information at different levels, especially on the practical implementation. Additional information on basic knowledge of the roles of Full-Service Schools, Special Schools/Resource Centres, and District Based Support Teams will be disseminated. Many participants at the meetings still seem to lack this knowledge.

III

When selecting Human Resource Development Service providers, certain criteria must be considered, such as geographical distribution, infrastructure, type of barriers, local organisation, attitudes etc. Flexibility is a key concept when developing manuals for "field-testing" and manuals for "human resource development".

The involvement of parents and NGOs is crucial to avoid conflicts and to promote democracy. The "mainstreaming principle" is still questioned by both parents and teachers. Some teachers have "fears" of not being able to meet the demands of parents who would like to send their disabled children to the nearest school as a result of advocacy campaigns. Children must be allowed to start school. Schools should not wait for the inclusive education system to be fully established before initiatives are taken

Specific regards must be paid to the views of NGOs. Only representatives of DEAFSA participated in the meetings. The organisation strongly argued for a fast development of a South African sign language. The present situation with limited access to education activities due to lack of trained interpreters was confirmed and discussed. Other NGOs (visually impaired, intellectual disabled, multiple disabled etc.) must also be listened to in order to avoid segregation and isolation of disability groups.

The establishment and sustainability of local organisations for the inclusive education transformation was finally discussed at all the meetings. The main issues to address in committees will be: resource mapping (who is doing what?), structure (how do we coordinate?), staff training needs (how and at what levels?). Some conclusions made by the participants at the meetings are listed below:

-PCCIE/alternative Committees should be the coordinating body with direct links to NCCIE and to educational management and to other related management sectors of the Province. All levels of decision-making authorities must be represented.

-Links should be established to parents' bodies, Teacher Unions, Universities/Teacher Training Institutions, NGOs and others.

The "terms of reference" for the committees were suggested as follows:

- to drive the process by the assistance of educational staff of different categories
- to address Human Resource Development needs
- to further run advocacy campaigns in nodal areas for sustainability
- to develop staff training programmes together with relevant Universities
- to share experiences of good practice and to address the challenges and outcomes of research under the umbrella of inclusive education
- to accentuate lifelong learning and adult education
- to encourage creativity activities of teachers in inclusive education
- to support the power of self- governed initiatives of teachers
- to create conditions for networking
- to prioritise educational plans and activities at local levels
- to record and to report the results of work
- to initiate and to support evaluation

Conclusions: next involvements of the Stockholm Institute of Education

Suggestions are written in a concentrated form, action orientated, and closely linked to each other (reference to Appendix 5). The stages must follow in the order proposed in the model. The stages are also adapted to the Human Resource Development Plan.

The first stage refers to the appointment of Human Resource Service providers. The future cooperation will be built upon good knowledge of the specific capacity areas of selected providers. The Swedish partner could be involved in this process on a consultative basis. It is of utmost importance that the appointment procedure runs smoothly and is completed in due time.

The second stage could be characterised as a "mapping" of knowledge areas, staff capacity and experiences of service providers appointed. This means to establish a knowledge database on both relevant research and existing courses on inclusive education. A simple form was constructed by the Swedish team for assisting the mapping (reference to Appendix 4). The mapping is an important task of the second stage with regard to the initial cooperation. A planned Swedish initiative is to construct a "discussion over internet platform", in order to exchange ideas, to update each other on actions taken at different universities/teacher training institutions, and to disseminate information of relevant research in the field.

The third stage involves planning and designing of field-testing manuals. An overall course structure must be established for the selected "30-30-30 groups". Some of the leading principles of this work should be:

- basic needs of the target groups) must be matched with course contents and capacity of the service providers
- the design of manuals should take into account the different problems faced in provinces/districts
- different ways of giving the courses should be considered, i.e. pre-service and in-service courses, workshops/seminars in different places combined with distance learning etc.
- course participants' mother tongue must be taken into consideration when planning the courses

The fourth stage must include a "test period" of running a first course for a selected group of the "30-30-30". The selection of the "test group participants" should be based on a penetrating principle of "difference". The differences might include geographical distribution, type of barriers, levels of support, local organisation etc.

The fifth stage concentrates on the gradual distribution to and accomplishment of courses for all the "30-30-30". The field-tested course manual should now have reached the standard for considering the integration of contents and teaching methods into basic teacher training at different levels, specialised teacher training and in-service teacher training in South Africa.

The sixth stage completes the first three years of cooperation. Recommendations and decisions of inclusive education should now be possible to make for the nationwide goal of inclusive education.

Terms of reference

Listed below are areas for a prospective first phase institutional cooperation between the Department of Education of South Africa and the Stockholm Institute of Education. This might also form the basis of Terms of Reference for the cooperation in the next three years. The Swedish partner should have as its objects to participate in:

- the final appointment of qualified service providers at the request of the DOE
- the mapping of existing resources of selected service providers
- the establishment of two databases
 - a) a knowledge database on both relevant research and existing courses on inclusive education
 - b) a "discussion over internet platform"
- the planning/networking/designing of manuals for field-testing of relevant courses
- the conduct and accomplishment of the first period for field-testing manuals
- the review and improvement of the field-tested manuals/courses
- the gradual distribution to and accomplishment of courses for all the "30-30-30".
- the integration of contents and experience of proper teaching methods into basic teacher training, specialised teacher training and in-service teacher training
- the recommendations and decisions for nationwide goals of inclusive education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This was our second visit to South Africa in order to investigate the possibilities of cooperation with the Directorate for Inclusive Education of the Department of Education and Teacher Training Institutions in South Africa on Building an Inclusive Education and Training System.

Once more we wish to express our deep gratitude to all those (officials in the Directorate of Inclusive Education of the Department of Education in Pretoria and in Provinces visited, management staff and teachers in primary schools and special schools, university staff etc.) who have assisted us in sharing with us their knowledge, experiences and ideas, in advising us and in giving us valuable information and suggestions which highly facilitated our work. We met a lot of interest, dedication, kindness and generosity throughout our work. It is our hope that the main target group of this study: children who face barriers to learning in different aspects and the teaching staff and others who are going to support them will benefit from ideas and recommendations of this report.

Special thanks to Dr. Sigamoney M. Naicker, Director Inclusive Education, who made arrangements for our visit, welcomed us, and accompanied us to all meetings in the provinces and also formed a warm, creative and constructive discussion partner to us. Thanks also to all his staff members!

ABBREVIATIONS

DBST	District Based Support Team
DEAFSA	Deaf Organisation of South Africa
DOE	Department of Education
EC	Eastern Cape Province
Gaut	Gauteng Province
HRD	Human Resource Development
IE	Inclusive Education
KZN	KwaZulu Natal Province
Limp	Limpopo Province
Mpum	Mpumalanga Province
NC	Northern Cape Province
NCCIE	National Coordination Committee for Inclusive Education
NDOE	National Department of Education, Pretoria
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NW	North West Province
PCCIE	Provincial Coordination Committee for Inclusive Education
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SMT	School Management Team
WC	Western Cape Province
WP 6	White Paper 6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. COMMENTS TO OUR VISIT MARCH 15 - 26, 2004	2
2.1 Structure of attended meetings	2
2.2 Remarks on discussions at meetings	3
2.3 "The way forward"	7
3. PROPOSED INVOLVEMENT OF THE STOCKHOLM INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION IN THE FIRST IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ("UNIVERSITY LINKAGES")	9
3.1 Service providers: the South African intentions.	9
3.2 Conclusions: next involvements of the Stockholm Institute of Education	11

APPENDICES

- 1. Terms of reference**
- 2. Programme, Itinerary, Meetings, and Study Visits**
- 3. Lists of persons met**
- 4. University Mapping Form March 2004**
- 5. Summary of proposed involvement of the Stockholm Institute of Education in the First Implementation Phase ("university linkages")**
- 6. Document studied, and references**

1. INTRODUCTION

Our first report (October 2003) focused on interpretation and analysis of White Paper 6 and other documents in order to assess the possibility of South African-Swedish cooperation in the field of teacher training. We noticed the close liaison between the South African policy and the Swedish understanding and practice of "inclusive education".

Through discussions with the Directorate for Inclusive Education and with provinces/districts we also confirmed the strong relations between the two countries concerning ideology, policy and basic values in education at large.

We had many opportunities to visit schools and to discuss with teachers, educational administrative staff, and university representatives involved in inclusive education and research. We closely observed different barriers to learning out in schools. In our previous report we described the problematic gap between policy and practice, often caused by the fear of losing privileges belonging to an old, segregated system. In line with this we could see both hesitation and frustration with regard to the policy of inclusion. This also referred to our meetings with university people.

Frustration often fosters hesitation in the distribution of responsibilities. To avoid this at local levels, we underlined that it is necessary to adopt a clear picture of the structure of decision-makers. This issue must be treated carefully in order to avoid a "top-down" perspective. Every professional must be an active and dedicated person in the process. This is a democratic demand when training staff.

We found that a basic condition for a successful transformation will be effective distribution of necessary equipment/devices in order to overcome the problems of many children with barriers to learning. We also emphasized the importance of safe school transports in underprivileged areas and noted the vulnerability to burglary and thefts. Principals, teachers, students and parents experienced violence, both in schools and school environments. Problem areas, indicated above, must be seriously considered in order to introduce a democratic school system.

We observed a great need for training of staff in inclusive education at all levels. In our report we listed four main areas of training: basic teacher training programmes, specialised training programmes, in-service teacher training and in-service training of decision-makers/administrators. We made the following suggestions on contents:

- transferring theories into practical implementation
- training in communicative co-operation, planning and networking
- training in respecting different opinions
- training in reaching compromise solutions by democratic processes

To summarise:

The main objective of this training is to promote the ability to observe and respect ethical aspects of the transformation, in order to develop the capacity of teachers for establishing a positive school atmosphere and to choose and to use educational tools of advantage to all pupils/students.

We noted the much valuable ongoing South African research in inclusive education not attracting enough attention. We recommended that a thorough survey of research knowledge at universities in the field should be undertaken, in order to encourage dissemination of research findings.

Finally, the educational model explained in our previous report both in theory and practice, could be utilized as a basis when developing the structure of manuals for "field testing courses" according to WP 6. We will further elaborate on this below.

2. COMMENTS TO OUR VISIT MARCH 15-26, 2004

2.1 Structure of attended meetings

We attended, together with Mrs Minna Saulio and Mr Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland, provincial meetings in Limpopo (Polokwane), Western Cape (Cape Town), Gauteng (Johannesburg) and Northern Cape (Kimberley). Provincial directors of inclusive education, colleagues from other departments, university teacher trainers and researchers, other providers of training and members of NGOs (DEAFSA) participated.

In Limpopo we visited one Full-Service School and one Special School/Resource Centre (deaf and visually impaired children).

Representatives from Eastern Cape and KwaZulu Natal were present in Cape Town and representatives from North West and Mpumalanga joined us in Kimberley. The meetings covered all provinces except for the Free State.

The agenda of the meetings followed approximately the same structure:

- Opening and welcome
- Introduction of participants
- Developments regarding inclusive education
- Joint presentations of the Stockholm Institute of Education, Sweden and the National Board of Education, Finland
- Presentations from NGOs (DEAFSA)
- Human Resource Development plan
- Possibilities for future collaboration
- Designing the way forward

The meetings started with an overall presentation and discussion of the concept of inclusive education under the guidance of Dr. S. M. Naicker from the Directorate for Inclusive Education. The purpose of this introduction was to contrast the old paradigm of categorisation and diversification (traditions with reference to "special needs education") with the (new) paradigm of "inclusive education" and the major shift in ideology, according to WP6.

In connection with the provincial meetings, the Swedish and the Finnish partners had both informal and formal discussions. The discussions dealt with the present and the future framework for the cooperation, in order to clarify responsibilities referring to "ministry linkages" and "university linkages". Both teams underlined the importance of regular meetings for updating each other. It was also found necessary to "draw the line" between the work efforts of the two countries in consideration of the expectations from South Africa.

2.2 Remarks on discussions at meetings

Comments below are based on our selection of arguments, proposals and sensitive issues raised by participants in the different meetings. The selection and comments are related to possible co-operation in Human Resource Development between the Stockholm Institute of Education and the Directorate for Inclusive Education in the Department of Education of South Africa (see below, Chapter 3).

It was emphasised that old institutions should be used as "vehicles" for the transformation. According to our opinions this approach brings about both possibilities and problems. The old "specialised knowledge" must be protected and utilised. However, this knowledge is more or less charged with elements of the medical approach to children "with" barriers to learning as indicated in WP 6. The "resistance" noted among "specialists" should be met by intensive training aiming at understanding their new roles in inclusive education. "Non-specialists", i.e. regular teachers in schools, must be involved in the transformation at an early stage. In Italy, for instance, the whole process of inclusive education was channelled through regular teachers. Such a mixed involvement is necessary to open old discourses for new directions (Vislie, 2004).

With regard to utilisation of existing resources, it is said in the WP 6:

"Accordingly, we will evaluate carefully what resources we already have within the system and how these existing resources and capacities can be strengthened and transformed so that they can contribute to the building of an inclusive system". (p. 16).

It is obvious that this issue must be addressed. Lack of existing resources for training staff in inclusive education at universities was a main discussion topic in meetings: "We are burning out," said one university lecturer. We could understand that available resources were not utilised and coordinated in a proper way. Thus, it is necessary to avoid duplication of already existing knowledge areas. University and Technikon representatives argued for formal networking as a tool for providing effective training of staff in inclusive education. This is also a basic condition for achieving the future goal of an inclusive school system. Discussions could be summarised as follows:

- record positive and informative examples of inclusive education and use a holistic approach
- build upon already existing experiences and resources in order to strengthen what is successful
- investigate the staff requirements to be able to give courses in inclusive education to different sectors

This indicates the importance of giving opportunities to universities for working together in consideration of fair distribution of workload, in order to use limited financial resources in the most effective way. Cooperation on regular basis is a key concept both at national and local levels.

According to WP 6, a flexible Curriculum is central to accommodate diversity in educational institutions at all levels (WP 6, s. 31). Participants at the meetings we attended had the opinions that the introduction of a new curriculum is much dependent on effective information at different levels, especially on the practical implementation.

This information process is closely related to careful field-testing of classroom adaptations. We found it important that more information on basic knowledge of the roles of Full-Service Schools, Special Schools/Resource Centres, and District Based Support Teams will be disseminated. Many participants at the meetings still seem to lack this knowledge.

Barriers to learning are probably different in schools in different parts of the country. Initially, this demands the provision of basic, "rough", statistical information at least. Such information is needed for designing university courses in inclusive education and for the networking of human development service providers. Comparing and matching the knowledge areas of the universities in teacher training must go hand in hand with this process.

In the Curriculum Adaptation Guidelines of the Revised National Curriculum Statement (2004), examples of barriers to learning are listed (Chapter 1.2). Universities with teaching and research experience in say socio-economic barriers, disability etc. should be utilised as expertise in their respective areas and connected to relevant areas (the situation/development of Full-Service Schools, Special Schools/Resource Centres, DBSTs). Once more we would like to emphasise the importance to get a clear picture of positions and experiences of universities and of different provinces. This involves parallel, adequate research in order to move forward, including elements of impact studies for quality assurance.

When selecting Human Resource Development Service providers, certain criteria must be considered, such as geographical distribution, infrastructure, type of barriers, local organisation, attitudes etc. Flexibility is a key concept when developing manuals for "field-testing" and manuals for "human resource development". In the Draft National Strategy for Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support (2004) are said, "that a completely new approach is to be followed". Additionally, the need for flexibility is further underlined:

"...conceptual shifts will have a major impact on assessment procedures, the organisation of support services and the sites in which support is made available. *It will also influence the roles, responsibilities and utilisation of the staff providing support and ultimately the way in which teachers teach and schools are managed*" (ibid, p. 1, our italics).

The guiding principle when designing the manuals should be that the ideology contents and methods coincide with WP 6. (reference to Human Resource Development for the First Stage of Implementing Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education, 2004, p. 2).

We were given a positive example of "macro collaboration": four or more schools exchanged information and ideas of "inclusive education" in support of each other. In order to be able to utilise scarce resources in the most effective way, it is obvious that "...all persons cannot do everything".

At different stages of planning, the involvement of parents and NGOs is crucial to avoid conflicts and to promote democracy. Parents who do not trust local school authorities often hide disabled children. The "mainstreaming principle" is still questioned by both parents and teachers. Some teachers have "fears" of not being able to meet the demands of parents who would like to send their disabled children to the nearest school as a result of advocacy campaigns. This is a dilemma. Schools should already accept these children and make proper preparations. The children must be allowed to start school. You cannot wait for the inclusive education system to be fully established before initiatives are taken. Have parents/teachers the right to insist that a disabled child should be in a mainstream school? Can the school refuse to accept the child? Our opinion is that parents are the biggest advocates for inclusive education. Parents often argue that they cannot afford to provide school uniforms for their children. We were informed that school uniforms are not compulsory to school attendance according to the law. Parents and students, however, regard school uniforms as a "strong, moral demand". This is one attitudinal problem to be dealt with.

Specific regards must be paid to the views of NGOs. We only met representatives of DEAFSA at the meetings. The organisation strongly argued for a fast development of a South African sign language. The present situation- with limited access to education activities- faced by many deaf students- due to lack of trained interpreters was confirmed and discussed.

In WP 6 you can read:

"Institutional planning is now a critical part of national planning for higher education, and higher education institutions will be required to plan the provision of programmes for learners with disabilities and impairments through regional collaboration. This is now a requirement of the National Plan for Higher Education" (WP 6, p. 28)

Other NGOs (visually impaired, intellectual disabled, multiple disabled etc.) must also be listened to, in order to avoid segregation and isolation of disability groups.

In Human Resource Development for the First Stage of Implementing Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education, (2004) it is stated: "Specific reference should be made to content, methodologies and matters relating to Braille, South African Sign Language, Assistive Devices and Augmentative Devices" (p. 2).

It must be remembered that inclusive education is a broad and embracing concept, also including, for examples, street children, criminal youth, orphans, children infected with HIV/aids etc.

These are challenges to consider in preparation of the transformation. The key word is again "collaboration" involving all partners. Decentralised systems should accompany the paradigm shift. The responsibility at community/district/provincial government levels must be further clarified. Our opinion is that steps forward are difficult to take without local contextualisation.

This means to introduce a kind of "generic"/reflective training. How do you see your own school as part of the shift? ("a bottom-up instead of a "top-down" approach, reference to our discussion in the previous report, October 2003, p. 11).

2.3 "The way forward"

The establishment of sustainable local organisations for the inclusive education transformation was finally discussed at all the meetings. How do we see the way forward? How could research councils be used? Quite a lot of suggestions were made. A proposal, submitted by many discussion groups, was to utilise already formed committees etc. for the work (PCCIE). The main issues to address in committees will be:

resource mapping (who is doing what?)
 structure (how do we coordinate?)
 staff training needs (how and at what levels?)

Below we have summarised conclusions of the attended meetings. What kind of action has to be taken at local levels on the way to reach inclusive education?

-PCCIE/alternative Committees should be the coordinating body with direct links to NCCIE and to educational management and to other related management sectors (i.e. social services, health services, correctional services) of the Province. All levels of decision-making authorities must be represented.

-Links should be established to parents' bodies, Teacher Unions, Universities/Teacher Training Institutions, NGOs and others.

It is, of course, important that members of the committees are well informed and knowledgeable of policy documents and with keen interest in inclusive education.

Committees ought to be included in the total national skills development plan for the paradigm shift. This is from our point of view an essential part of the cooperation with the experts from Finland. (Mission Report South Africa 15-23.3 2004, p. 3).

The "terms of reference" for the committees were suggested as follows:

- to drive the process by the assistance of educational staff of different categories
- to address Human Resource Development needs
- to further run advocacy campaigns in nodal areas for sustainability
- to develop staff training programmes together with relevant Universities
- to share experiences of good practice and to address the challenges and outcomes of research under the umbrella of inclusive education
- to accentuate lifelong learning and adult education
- to encourage creativity activities of teachers in inclusive education

- to support the power of self- governed initiatives of teachers
- to create conditions for networking
- to prioritise educational plans and activities at local levels
- to record and to report the results of work
- to initiate and to support evaluation

3. PROPOSED INVOLVEMENT OF THE STOCKHOLM INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION IN THE FIRST IMPLEMENTATION PHASE ("UNIVERSITY LINKAGES")

3.1 Service providers: the South African intentions.

If you analyse the tender invitation document for Human Resource Development for the First Stage of Implementing Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education, and relate it to our previous report (October 2003, Chapter 6, Proposed Collaboration), the "scope of work" requirements of selected service providers could be summarised by the help of some key concepts in the two documents:

develop

conduct

evaluate/report

modify

The first concept: *develop* refers to the preparation of "a manual for field-testing". This might be typical teacher trainer task. It is a question of finding target groups from the list of selected 30-30-30 (Full Service Schools, Special Schools/Resource Centres and DBSTs) in relation to the knowledge areas and experiences of universities. Thus, you must have a thorough capacity picture of the service providers. It is preferable to have mixed groups (teachers, special teachers, educational psychologists, therapists, social workers etc). The objectives, the contents of courses, the methods, the time frame and the examination mode should also be considered.

The second concept: *conduct* deals, from our point of view, with the design of an overall local implementation plan as well as running the field-testing courses. "Conduct" is closely connected to "curriculum adaptation as well as screening, identification, and assessment" (Human Resource Development for the First Stage of Implementing Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education, p. 2). The concept *conduct* embraces both educational and administrative assignments. The field-testing must be closely accompanied by research, e.g. parallel evaluation (i.e. process/systemic evaluation). Another important research task is the "fusion" of the capacity of service providers/universities and local demands.

The third concept: *evaluate/report* could be looked upon from at least two perspectives. Teacher trainers must evaluate and report the outcome of the field-testing courses at local levels with careful consideration of the participants' opinions. Some crucial questions when evaluating at this level are: How did the course prepare us for a better communicative understanding of barriers to learning in the local society? How did the course manage to liase theory to practice? Did the course focus on the utilisation of existing resources, cooperation and networking etc?

The impact of the courses must be further reported at provincial levels with feedback to the national level. This is necessary for a comparative analysis of the outcome of the courses based on evaluating/reporting at local levels. Thus, you will get a good basis for modifications and further development in order to avoid "frozen" course manuals.

This leads us to the fourth concept: *modify*. According to Human Resource Development for the First Stage of Implementing Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education, the process of modification is divided into three steps, including a time frame. A question is at what level manuals should be written considering the demands from different provinces/districts of the country. It would, of course, be possible to agree upon the general contents, such as ideology, values and the theoretical framework. In provinces, however, modifications involve adaptations of the contents, in order to meet the training demands from the different local environments.

It is important to allow differently worked out manuals that create the condition for a dynamic process. The step-by-step modification model will probably be a good guideline for the ongoing transformation into a democratic school system.

3.2 Conclusions: next involvements of the Stockholm Institute of Education

At the final meeting with the Directorate for Inclusive Education of the Department of Education during our visit to South Africa we presented suggestions for the next three years involvement of the Stockholm Institute of Education.

Our suggestions are written in a concentrated form, action orientated, and closely linked to each other (reference to Appendix 5). The stages must follow in the order proposed in our model. The stages are also adapted to the Human Resource Development Plan.

The first stage refers to the appointment of Human Resource Service providers. We find the criteria for the selection process relevant. Our future cooperation, however, will be built upon good knowledge of the specific capacity areas of selected providers. Thus, we could be appropriately involved in this process on a consultative basis. It is of utmost importance that the appointment procedure runs smoothly and is completed in due time.

The second stage could be characterised as a "mapping" of knowledge areas, staff capacity and experiences of service providers appointed. This process must go hand in hand or closely accompany the selection of service providers (phase one). In practice, this means to establish a knowledge database on both relevant research and existing courses on inclusive education. We have constructed a simple form that could hopefully assist in the mapping (reference to Appendix 4). Of course, the form might be revised and supplemented, but we think it could be a basis of the mapping work. This mapping is an important task of the second stage with regard to the initial cooperation.

Another aspect of the concept "database" is a planned Swedish initiative in constructing a "discussion over internet platform", in order to exchange ideas, to update each other on actions taken at different universities/teacher training institutions, and to disseminate information of relevant research in the field (books, papers, internet links, interesting conferences etc.). Such a platform could start in connection with the finalisation of a contract on cooperation between the partners. The platform must also be looked upon as a "scene of action" for joining theory and practice. In the long run, our intentions are to involve education administrators and professionals in the field.

The third stage involves planning and designing of field- testing manuals. An overall course structure must be established for the selected "30-30-30 groups". Some of the leading principles of this work should be:

- basic needs of the target groups (local barriers to learning) must be matched with course contents and capacity of the service providers
- the design of manuals should take into account the different problems faced in provinces/districts.
- different ways of giving the courses should be considered, i.e. pre-service and in-service courses, workshops/seminars in different places combined with distance learning etc.
- course participants' mother tongue must be taken into consideration when planning the courses

The fourth stage must include a "test period" of running a first course for a selected group of the "30-30-30". In order to evaluate the contents and methods applied in the first field-testing manuals, the selection of the "test group participants" should be based on a penetrating principle of "difference". The differences might include:

- geographical distribution
- type of barriers
- levels of support
- local organisation etc. (reference to Appendix 5)

The difference principle could give comprehensive information on the impact of the first prepared manuals.

The fifth stage concentrates on the gradual distribution to and accomplishment of courses for all the "30-30-30". The field-tested course manual should now have reached such a qualitative standard that it would be possible to consider the integration of contents and experience of proper teaching methods into, for examples, basic teacher training at different levels, specialised teacher training and in-service teacher training in South Africa.

The sixth stage completes the first three years of cooperation. We have now come to the stage where recommendations and decisions of inclusive education are possible to make for the nationwide goal "to build an open, lifelong and high-quality education and training system for the 21st century" (WP 6, p. 45). Are we now ready for "the big leap"?

In summary, we would like to suggest the following areas to be emphasised in a prospective first phase institutional cooperation between the Directorate for Inclusive Education of the Department of Education of South Africa and the Stockholm Institute of Education. This might also form the basis of Terms of Reference for the cooperation in the next three years. The Swedish partner should have as its objects to participate in:

- the final appointment of qualified service providers at the request of DOE
- the mapping of existing resources of selected service providers
- the establishment of two databases
 - a) a knowledge database on both relevant research and existing courses on inclusive education
 - b) a "discussion over internet platform"
- the planning/networking/designing of manuals for field-testing of relevant courses
- the conduct and accomplishment of the first period for field-testing manuals
- the review and improvement of the field-tested manuals/courses
- the gradual distribution to and accomplishment of courses for all the "30-30-30".
- the integration of contents and experience of proper teaching methods into basic teacher training, specialised teacher training and in-service teacher training
- the recommendations and decisions for nationwide goals of inclusive education

Appendix no. 1

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR VISIT BY STOCKHOLM INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION (TEACHER EDUCATION UNIVERSITY), TO SOUTH AFRICA

1 BACKGROUND

Sweden together with Finland has agreed to a three-year 2003/4-2005/6 support to the Department of Education to implement the first phase of White paper 6 - Building an Inclusive Education and Training System.

The Swedish grant amounts to SEK 20 000 000. Within the budget there are funds set aside for cooperation with Finland for capacity building and with Sweden for university linkages. The Stockholm Institute of Education (Teacher Education University) has been identified to look into the possibilities of cooperation with the Department of Education and training institutions in South Africa.

2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE VISIT

The Stockholm Institute of Education visited South Africa in October 2003 for a first visit and presented a report to the South African Department of Education, DoE. The DoE is of the opinion that there is a need to follow up the report and draw up the framework for the cooperation. It suggested that Stockholm Institute of Education visit South Africa at the same time as a team of Finnish consultants visit South Africa.

3 TASKS

The task of the Stockholm Institute of Education

- Discuss with officials in the DoE responsible for teacher education, issues related to teacher training in inclusive education.
- Visit Universities with teacher education, recommended by the Directorate for Inclusive Education at DoE, with the objective to identify areas of mutual common courses with regard to inclusive education.
- Have joint discussions and planning between the partners involved, South Africa, Finland and Sweden.
- Reach an understanding on what is expected from the Stockholm Institute of Education and on methods of implementation.
-

4 METHODOLOGY, TEAM AND TIME SCHEDULE

The work shall be carried out through

- Reading relevant documents presented by the Directorate for Inclusive Education,
- Visiting, interviewing, discussing with the Directorate of Inclusive Education, Department of Education and universities identified by the Directorate of Inclusive Education.

The team shall consist of Assistant Prof Örjan Bäckman and Professor Rolf Hedin from the Stockholm Institute of Education.

The work is planned for three weeks, two weeks in South Africa, 15-27 March 2004.

5 REPORTING

The team jointly with the Directorate of Inclusive Education will prepare a report in English on how to collaborate. The report shall be submitted to Sida and Department of Education in South Africa, electronically and in 3 hardcopies no later than 15 May 2004.

Appendix no. 2

PROGRAMME, ITINERARY, MEETINGS, AND STUDY VISITS

(prepared for Örjan Bäckman and Rolf Helldin, Stockholm Institute of Education and Minna Saulio and Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland. Present at provincial meetings were provincial directors of inclusive education, colleagues from other relevant directorates, university representatives (faculties of education/teacher training), other training providers, disabled peoples' organisations (mainly DEAFSA) and other key persons)

15 March 2004 - Meeting with the **Directorate for Inclusive Education of the National Department of Education, Pretoria. Swedish consultants' meeting with Embassy of Sweden/Sida (Helen Nordenson).**

16 March 2004 - Meeting with **Provincial Department of Education, Limpopo** in Polokwane.

17 March 2004 Limpopo Province - School visits to one Full-Service School and one Special School/Resource Centre and **continued meetings.**

18 March 2004 - Internal discussions and travel from Polokwane to Cape Town.

19 March 2004 - Meeting with **Provincial Department of Education, Western Cape** (and **representatives from Eastern Cape, KwaZulu Natal**) in Cape Town.

20 March 2004 - Weekend. **Internal discussions.**

21 March 2004 - Weekend. **Internal discussions.**

22 March 2004 - Public Holiday. **Internal discussions and travel from Cape Town to Pretoria.**

23 March 2004 - Meeting with **Provincial Department of Education, Gauteng** in Johannesburg.

24 March 2004 - Final meeting with the **Directorate for Inclusive Education of the National Department of Education, Pretoria.** Participation in Annual meeting (South Africa - Finland - Sweden). Debriefing and **presentation of proposed involvement of the Stockholm Institute of Education** in the First Implementation Phase ("university linkages").

25 March 2004 - Meeting with **Provincial Department of Education, Northern Cape** (and **representatives from North West, Mpumalanga**) in

Kimberley. Meeting with National Board of Education, Finland.

**26 March 2004 - Internal discussions and meeting with Embassy of Sweden/
Sida (Helen Nordenson).**

Appendix no. 3

LIST OF PERSONS MET

This list does not claim to be complete and correct. We did not manage to record all names, we might have left out some persons or misspell names (difficult handwriting) for which we make apologies.

Embassy of Sweden/Sida, Pretoria

Mrs Helen Nordenson, Senior Programme Officer

Directorate for Inclusive Education of the Department of Education, Pretoria

Dr. Sigamoney Manicka Naicker, Director Inclusive Education, National Department of Education
additional staff in the Directorate Inclusive Education

Meetings Provincial Department of Education, Limpopo.

L. Cherian, University of the North
Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland
M.M. Komati, CSS
Ruth Lentsoane,
M-J Maaice, Physes
WP. Mabitsela, DSM
P.J. Makgato, A & C Coordinator,
HB. Mamogobo, Curriculum LAC
M.L. Maphila Psych
M.S. Marara, ECD
S.R. Mashangoane, Principal
N.V. Mashao, CSS
N.P. Masutha, Deaf Federation of Limpopo Province
M.R. Mathivha, DSM
MSJ Mbokieni, University of the North
SE van der Merwe, University of the North

M.M. Moabelo, Provincial Coordinator
Patience Mogoba, Principal
Asnath Mojapelo
F.M. Mojapelo, Curriculum LAC
H.M. Motimele, H.O.D.
G.K. Motshologane, University of the North
S.M. Naicker, Directorate for Inclusive Education, NDoE
R.H. Nengwekhulu, Head, Limpopo Department of Education
A.M. Nkoana, Psyses
Joe Nollom, SGM
Kate Rampola, Capricorn Curriculum Support
M.B. Raselalome, Educator
M.N. Rathando, CES
E.S. Rossom, Project Manager SE
Minna Saulio, National Board of Education, Finland
T.G. Sekhu, Principal
T. Shez, Mec's Office
J.G. Tshifularo, Physes

Meetings Provincial Department of Western Cape

Gillian Burrows, Deaf Federation Western Cape
L. Collair, Dept. Education Psychology, University of Stellenbosch
Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland
S. Lazarus, Faculty of Education, University of Western Cape
Fiona Lewis, Western Cape Education Dept
Eva Mahlangu, Directorate for Inclusive Education, NDoE
S.M. Naicker, Directorate for Inclusive Education, NDoE
Peter Present
M. Robinson, Cape Technikon
Minna Saulio, National Board of Education, Finland
C.T. Sifunda, KwaZulu Natal, Dept of Education
Sindiswa Stofile, University of Western Cape
Matthi Theron, Director, Western Cape Education Dept
B.P. Thuynsma, Peninsula Technikon

Meetings Provincial Department of Gauteng

Z.O. Amod, Witwatersrand University
C.F. Ayres, Western College for Further Education and Training
E.M. Bosch, Gauteng Department of Education
Aneene Dawber, Witwatersrand University
L.D. Dtydom, Gauteng Department of Education
Ricky Govencer, Gauteng Department of Education
Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland
G. Kgarle, Gauteng Department of Education

Binky Lebetta, Gauteng Department of Education
Emily Lentle, Gauteng Department of Education
P. Mabusela, Gauteng Department of Education
A.D. Mafada, Gauteng Department of Education
K.M. Makhaga, Gauteng Department of Education
Selto Maki, MIR Consulting
S.J. Malaka, Gauteng Department of Education
R.T. Mashiane, Gauteng Department of Education
J.M. Mathibela, Pan South African Language Board
M.M.Ria Mathivha, Gauteng Department of Education
H. Matjeke, Gauteng Department of Education
Wowo Mbuli, Gauteng Department of Education
A. Meyers, Head ESS Gauteng Department of Education
Emily Mnisi, Inclusion Support Services
F. Mokoena, Gauteng Department of Education
Salty Mothne, Gauteng Department of Education ESS EW
S.M. Naicker, Directorate for Inclusive Education, NDoE
Manga Nalini, Gauteng Department of Education
S.A. Netshihemi, Pan South African Language Board
Sarah Sanser, Gauteng Department of Education
Minna Saulio, National Board of Education, Finland
J.M. Segabuthe, Gauteng Department of Education
Nyatho Senkey, Gauteng Department of Education
E.F. Smith, Gauteng Department of Education
Lea Smith, Dept of Social Services and Population Development
Claudine Storbeck, Witwatersrand University/Deaf Education
Friendly Thwala, Gauteng Department of Education
Ojaceer Usha, Gauteng Department of Education

Meetings Provincial Department of Northern Cape

Hawa Abass, Head Inclusive Ed., Northern Cape Department of Education
J.Duze, Northern Cape Department of Education
Eric Ganz, North West Department of Education
M. Gumede, National Department of Education
Jussi Karakoski, National Board of Education, Finland
Ansie Kitching, North West University
Nelly Lekgau, Mpumalanga Department of Education
L.L. Makhosi, ECD
K.C.H. Makodi, North West Department of Education
Shadrack Malhaise, Kimberley Deaf NC
A.S. Malinga, Neleb College, Mpumalanga
E.Martin, Director Curriculum
A.F. Mavan, Neleb College, Mpumalanga
Meshack Mmdawe, DEAFSA, Mpumalanga
Joe Molai, Mpumalanga Department of Education
Atunty Molemane, Mpumalanga Department of Education
Ntobi Mxenge, Mpumalanga Department of Education

S.M. Naicker, Directorate for Inclusive Education, NDoE
D. van Niekerk, Northern Cape Department of Education
P.Nkosi, Northern Cape Department of Education, NIHE
P. Phillipa, North West Department of Education
Minna Saulio, National Board of Education, Finland
Terens Smith, North West University
Z. Sprang, North West Department of Education
M.J. van Zyl, North West Department of Education
Sipho Sukati, Mpumalanga Department of Education
J.J. van Wyk, North West Department of Education

Appendix no. 4

UNIVERSITY MAPPING FORM MARCH 2004

Stockholm Institute of Education (Teacher Education University)

Box 47308, SE-100 74 Stockholm, SWEDEN

Tel. + 46 8 737 96 21, Fax. +46 8 737 96 30

Dr. Örjan Bäckman E-mail: orjan.backman@lhs.se

Dr. Rolf Helldin E-mail: rolf.helldin@lhs.se

University Mapping Form March 2004

Date:

University visited:

Department:

Mail address:

Telephone:

E-Mail:

Website

Persons met:

**Person in charge of Teacher Education/Training/
Director of studies:**

Contact person(s) for further information:

1. Present courses related to inclusive education in teacher training programmes?

YES

NO

Designed and prepared Curriculum (a) on inclusive education?

YES

NO

Name of the Course(s):

Manager(s) of Course(s)/Contact person(s):

2. Research related to inclusive education?

YES

NO

If yes, give examples of research and references:

Annual report (including research activities) published?

YES

NO

How would you like to characterize the "knowledge profile" of the University?

3. Readiness and plans to prepare a course(s) related to inclusive education?

If you do not give a course(s) in inclusive education, do you think you have (will get) resources to arrange such a course(s):

YES

NO

Suggested name of a course(s):

Possible course managers/planners/involved lecturers:

Mail address:

Telephone:

E-Mail:

4. Organisation of courses relevant to inclusive education?

If you give a course(s) on inclusive education, how do you fit it/ them into the regular teacher education programme with regard to time frame, organisation of the University etc.)?

If you plan a course(s) on inclusive education, will it be possible to fit it/them into the ordinary time frame/present organisation of the University during the period 2004-2006?

Experience of distance education and/or any kind of extension teacher education courses?

YES

NO

If yes, give examples:

Established contacts and/or co-operation with local and district authorities?

YES

NO

If yes, give examples:

5. Support, planning together, mutual co-operation and exchange of ideas?

How would you like to design and prepare (an) adequate course(s) in inclusive education (e.g. main contents and distribution forms: university located or distance education or combinations, relations between lectures, seminars, literature studies, student assignments, examination etc.)?

How do you look upon the role of the Stockholm Institute of Education?

How do we co-operate and supplement each other in the best way?

Appendix no.5

Summary of proposed involvement of the Stockholm Institute of Education in the First Implementation Phase (“university linkages)

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5	Stage 6	Stage 7	Stage 8	Stage 9	Stage 10
Human Development Resources: Appointment of service providers.	Mapping of existing resources in Teacher education and Research available in inclusive education Construction of a DATA-BASE	Planning/Networking of possible courses based on mapping findings Swedish – South African cooperation	Selection of participants for “field testing courses” for designing “manuals”: Full-service schools Special schools/Resource centres DBST Considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographical distribution • Barriers • Levels of support • Local organisation (participants mixed groups?) • Bureaucracy • Management (decision-makers/administrators) • Attitudes and Advocacy • Infrastructure • Curriculum adaptation 	Further development of manuals/courses at different levels. Full distribution to 30-30-30? - Basic teacher training - Specialised training - In-service training	First face of transformation completed an evaluated: Recommendations-Decisions for a nationwide development and implementation based on finally designed manuals	THE BIG LEAP	?	?	?
Financial assumptions and planning									
A close over arching coordination of STRUCTURE, present RESOURCES and STAFF DEVELOPMENT NEEDS necessary throughout the phases.									
Responsible persons/Authorities during the process: Project managers, Provincial Directors of inclusive education, Provincial coordinating committees, Research councils, Provincial management teams, NGOs, Teacher/Student unions									
Summary of RESEARCH activities during the phases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping of existing resources (e. g. available university courses, South African and international research in inclusive education) 									

- Analyses of knowledge areas needed
- Analyses of needs in the “field”
- Process/Systemic evaluation

Appendix no. 6

DOCUMENT STUDIED AND REFERENCES

Basson, R. (2002). In-School Research Team - End-of-Term report..
Johannesburg: School of Education, Witwatersrand University.

Bäckman, Ö. (1997). Trends in Special Needs Education. *Paper presented at Northern Cape Department of Education, Training, Arts and Culture Seminar, Kimberly, South Africa, February 4 1997.*

Bäckman, Ö. (1997). *Final report. Institutional Co-operation between the Ministry of Education of Botswana, Division of Special Education and the Stockholm Institute of Education of Sweden, Department of Special Education.* Stockholm/Gaborone: Stockholm Institute of Education/Botswana Ministry of Education.

Bäckman, Ö. (1998). *Final Report. Institutional Co-operation between the University of Botswana, Department of Educational Foundations -Special Education Unit- and the Stockholm Institute of Education of Sweden, Department of Special Education.* Stockholm/Gaborone: Stockholm Institute of Education/University of Botswana).

Bäckman, Ö. & Helldin, R. (1998). *A Study on Special Education taught at Primary Teacher Training Colleges in Botswana.* Gaborone: University of Botswana, Department of Educational Foundations, Special Education Unit.

Bäckman, Ö. & Helldin, R. (2003). *Building and Inclusive Education and Training System. Possibilities of cooperation with the Directorate for Inclusive Education of the Department of Education and Teacher Training Institutions in South Africa.* Report from a visit to South Africa, 4-17 October 2003. Stockholm/Pretoria: Stockholm Institute of Education/Directorate for Inclusive Education.

Department of Education. (2001). *Education White Paper 6. Special Needs Education. Building an inclusive education and training system.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2002). *Programme Document for the First Phase of Implementation of White Paper 6.* Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2003). *Conceptual and Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of Inclusive Education. 1. Special Schools as Resource Centers. 2. Full Service Schools. 3. District-Based Support Teams*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education. (2003). *Education Statistics in South Africa at a Glance in 2001*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2003). *Management Plan for Roll Out of Education White Paper 6 on Special Needs Education: Building an Inclusive and Training System*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2003). *The Human Resource Development Plan for the Nodal Areas as Part of the Implementation of Education White Paper 6*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2004). *Curriculum Adaptation Guidelines of the Revised National Curriculum Statement*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2004). *Draft National Strategy for Screening, Identification, Assessment and Support*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2004). *Human Resource Development for the First Stage of Implementing Education White Paper 6 on Inclusive Education*. PM. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Department of Education, Directorate: Inclusive Education. (2004). *The 11th Meeting of the National Co-ordinating Committee on Inclusive Education (NCCIE)*. Pretoria: Department of Education.

Englbrecht, P. et al. (1999). The possible role of special schools in inclusive education. *South African Journal of Education*, 19(3), 230-234.

Englbrecht, P. et al. (2001). Developing a support programme for teachers involved with inclusion in South Africa. *International Journal of Special Education*, 16(1).

Englbrecht, P. et al. (2001). Teachers' attitudes towards and experience in implementing inclusive education in South Africa. *Acta academica*, 33(2).

Fraser, N. (2003). *Den radikala fantasin. Mellan omfördelning och erkännade*

(The radical imaginative power. Between redistribution and recognition).
Gothenburg: Daidalos.

Helldin, R. (1997). *Specialpedagogisk kunskap som ett Socialt problem (Special Education as a Social Problem)*. Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education Press.

Helldin, R., Lucietto, S. & Völkel, B. (2003). *Pupils' School Failure or Schools' Failure ?* Stockholm: Stockholm Institute of Education

Kachelhoffer, A. & Newmark, R. (1997). The Child with Down Syndrome in the normal classroom. *Paper presented at the 35th Annual Conference of the Education Association of South Africa, Amanzimtoti, January 1997. Published abstract.*

Karakoski, J. & Saulio, M. (2004). *Mission Report South Africa 15-27.3 2004*. Helsinki: National Board of Education.

MacKenzie, J. & Njaba, X. (2001). Training educators for inclusive education: What do educators want? *Paper presented at the conference: "Promoting resilience in individuals with intellectual disability", East London October 3-5 2001.*

Moletsane, R., Hemson, C. & Muthukrishna, N. (2003). Educating South African Teachers for the Challenge of School Integration: A Teaching and Research Agenda? *Draft Paper, HSRC/UP School Integration Colloquium 2 October 2003, Gauteng.*

Mittler, P. (2000). *Working Towards: Inclusive Education*. Great Britain: David Fulton Publishers.

Naicker, S.M. (1999). *Curriculum 2005. A Space for All. An introduction to Inclusive Education*. Cape Town: Renaissance.

Sayed, Y., Soudien, C. & Carrim, N. (2003). School inclusion and exclusion in South Africa: Some theoretical and methodological considerations. *Draft Paper, HSRC/UP School Integration Colloquium 2 October 2003, Gauteng.*

SCOPE (the South African- Finnish Co-operation Programme in the Education Sector). (2003). *Opening Schools for All Children in South Africa. The Experience of Inclusive Education in Mpumalanga and Northern Cape Provinces*. (Edited by Dr. Maria Da Costa, Institute of Education, The University of Warwick). Pretoria: SCOPE.

Sida. (2000). *Teacher Education, Teachers' Conditions and Motivation*. Stockholm: Sida, Department for Democracy and Social Development-DESO Education Division.

Sida. (2001). *Education for All: a Human Right and Basic Need. Policy for Sida's Cooperation in the Education Sector*. Gothenburg: Elanders Novum AB.

Sida. (2003). *The right to education for children, young people, and adults with disabilities and special learning needs*. Sida's Cooperation in the Education Sector: Reference papers. Stockholm: Sida, Department for Democracy and Social Development-DESO Education Division.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). (2000). *Human Development Report. Human rights and human development*. New York: UNDP.

UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2001). *Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education, A Challenge And A Vision*. Conceptual Paper for the Education Sector. Paris: UNESCO.

UNESCO. (2003/2004). *Gender Education For All. The Leap To Equality*. Paris: UNESCO.

United Nations. (1989). *The Convention on the Right of the Child*. New York: UN.

United Nations. (1994). *The Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities*. New York: UNDP.

Van Rooyen, B., Newmark, R. & Le Grange, L. (2003). Systems discourses in South Africa's White Paper 6: Special Needs Education. *Acta Academica* 35(1), 167-187.

Western Cape Education Department. (2001). *Abuse No More. Dealing Effectively with Child Abuse*. Cape Town: Western Cape Education Department.

Western Cape Education Department, Directorate: Specialised Education Support Service. (YEAR ?). *Policy on Special Education Services for Learners Manifesting or at Risk of Experiencing Emotional and/or Behavioural Difficulties*. Cape Town: Directorate: Specialised Education Support Service.

Vislie, L. (2003). Spesialpedagogikkens vilkår under modernitetens ulike faser (The Conditions of Special Education during different Phases of Modernity). *Paper presented at the Workshop on Special Education and Democracy, November 13 2003, University of Örebro, Sweden.*

World Bank. (2000/2001). *World Development Report. Attacking Poverty.* Washington: World Bank.