

Bolton Data for Inclusion

The Action Research Centre for Inclusion

(Sponsored by: The Barrow Cadbury Trust)

at

Bolton Institute.

Data No 44:

October 2004

Author(s):

Joe Whittaker and Navin Kikabhai

Title:

An Illusion of Inclusion: Exploring the gulf between educational rhetoric and practice.

Abstract:

This paper highlights the gulf between educational rhetoric and practice in relation to Inclusive Education. In particular, we seek to draw attention by highlighting that what people say is not followed by what people will do. Drawing upon research, a telephone survey of Local Education Authorities in the North West of England, the work draws attention to the comments and practices of how Authorities respond to individuals and families who are seeking mainstream access to local schools, responses that raise a number of concerns.

For further information contact:

Karen Barton (k.barton@bolton.ac.uk), Bolton Institute, Chadwick Street, Bolton, BL2 1JW, England

An Illusion of Inclusion: Exploring the gulf between educational rhetoric and practice

Joe Whittaker and Navin Kikabhai

Overview

This paper, interspersed with reflective accounts, highlights the gulf between educational rhetoric and practice in relation to Inclusive Education. In particular, the concern is not only with the percentage of disabled learners ‘statemented’ and being placed in segregated school or units remaining relatively unchanged, but with how the language of inclusion is being used to disguise the continued discrimination against disabled people. Within this paper we seek to draw attention by highlighting that what people say is not followed by what people will do. Drawing upon research, a telephone survey of Local Education Authorities in the North West of England, the work draws upon the comments and practices of how Authorities respond to individuals and families who are seeking mainstream access to local schools, responses that raise a number of concerns.

Have you ever marvelled and wondered how an illusion is achieved, “*How did they do that?*” we often hear people say. Since ancient times tricksters have used techniques to baffle their audiences, magicians were often accused of being witches, arrested, put on trial and then executed by hanging, burning or drowning. When tricks were performed they would have often been practiced many times with techniques such as prestidigitation ‘*sleight of hand*’ or with equipment such as ‘*egg bags*’ (a cloth bag with a hidden pocket). An interesting technique that developed is known as ‘*misdirection*’, which is used to take the audiences attention away from what the trickster is really doing. There is a particular notion of this technique known as ‘*space misdirection*’ which involves getting your audience to look at a certain place so that the trickster can do something secretly in another place, this is

An Illusion of Inclusion

sometimes done by using your eyes – looking at the left hand while doing something with your right hand – or making a noise or using an assistant or other people usually known as stooges or confederates who are ‘*in on the act*’. Before stooges were initiated into the act they would have adhered to the magician’s charter which begins, ‘*I (your name) promise never to tell anyone how to do any of the tricks even if...*’. Now that you know some of the secrets of the illusionists let us share with you an illusion of inclusion.

Consider for instance the system in which disabled children are placed, a system that is segregated from the mainstream, places known as special schools and units. To return to our illusionist metaphor, we will construct a space deception, a ‘misdirection’ and we shall convince our audiences with lots of noise, ‘*sleight of words*’ about how these children couldn’t possibly be in mainstream. We shall say that these children are better taught in discrete groups away from the rest of mainstream. We shall even convince our audiences that their presence will adversely affect the learning of their peers and that they would better learn with adult surveillance preferably on a one-to-one. We will recruit our stooges and confederates and delude them to be ‘*in on the act*’. They will serve these segregated places with conviction and develop a repertoire of techniques – tricks of the trade – drawn in by the tricksters acclaim. We shall write our charters and statements and draw children and their families in and convince them not to tell and act. Before we know it, hey presto, the trick has been done leaving people wanting for more. “*How did they do that?*” we hear some say, quite simply, it was while our attention was diverted!

The language of Inclusive Education has become an essential part of the educational vocabulary, which is only but a part of an illusion of inclusion. However, many people who have been engaged in the struggle for inclusive education are increasingly aware of the way in which the language of inclusion is being used to disguise the continued discrimination against disabled people. Inclusive education is a term that slips off the tongue and straight

An Illusion of Inclusion

into a policy statement, and everyone is expected to applaud it. Since the government has brought the language of inclusion into various educational arenas we find every local education authority and school will have an inclusion policy. Work, presented here, draws upon research, a telephone survey in which the practice and reactions of Local Education Authorities (LEAs) were noted, responses that highlight the gulf between educational rhetoric and practice. We want to encourage caution and engage with a critical scrutiny of its meaning and implementation in practice. Such caution and concern arises from examples such as when a senior teacher in a college of further education commented that they now had a “*fully inclusive college*”, where all students were treated equally. When we gave a sceptical look we were told that if we didn’t believe him we could go to the college and meet their “*inclusion students*”. Such an example highlights the lack of understanding and difference between inclusion as rhetoric and inclusion as practice.

Over the years different governments have told us that we are moving towards ‘integration’, where disabled children and non-disabled children work together in the same school and where everyone has equal opportunities (DES, 1978). Simultaneously, however, the same governments have stated that there will always be a need for some children to go to segregated special schools, and legislation was introduced to ensure this would happen (DfEE, 1997). Given such a shift in legislation and language of inclusion, people could be forgiven for thinking that all disabled learners have a right to go to their local school, they would be wrong. For many disabled learners continue to be denied a right to education in their local mainstream school. In practice what has tended to happen is that children and their families who are seeking inclusion into their local mainstream school has only happened after a significant struggle with the statutory services, often at immeasurable personal costs to the individuals and their family. Until very recently there were three conditions that prevented disabled children from going into mainstream school, that they had to prove that;

An Illusion of Inclusion

1. Their Special Needs could be met in the mainstream school
2. Their attendance in the mainstream school would not adversely affect the learning of other children, and
3. Their placement within the mainstream school would not be an inefficient use of resources.

The 1981 Education Act introduced, described by many as the ‘integrationist charter’, the ‘Statement of Special Educational Needs’ (SEN). The ‘Statement’ placed a formal obligation on LEAs to provide a written account of the child’s identified needs, the provision they would make to meet those needs and the school placement they would offer. At the time of its introduction the ‘statement’ appeared to offer children and parents real consultation, greater access to mainstream education and more creative and comprehensive support. However this ‘offer’, with strings attached, has proved to be a painful and laborious process in which many children continue to be categorised labelled and segregated. The ‘Statement’ has not opened doors to new and equal opportunities for disabled children but rather has served notice that the mainstream school doors remain firmly closed to a significant number of disabled children.

Significant numbers of learners with statements of special needs has continued to rise. For example, in the years from 1999 to 2000 alone, the number of statements rose from 248,040 pupils to 252,860 (DfES, 2003). Interestingly in 2003 the number had fallen to 250,550 however this illusionary deception can be partly attributed to a fall in the total number of pupils on roll for that particular year. What is revealing is that this ‘fall’ continues to represent 3 per cent of the total number of learners on roll as it had since 1996 (DfES, 2001). Much more concerning is that, in 2001, out of the estimated 258,200 learners 36 per cent (93,700) of children with statements continued to be segregated in special schools or units, this rose to 37 per cent (92650 out of 250,550) in 2003. Even when children with a

particular label are successfully supported in mainstream schools, the statementing process can create other categories and attach new labels to a new group of learners to ensure that the actual percentage of disabled children segregated from mainstream schools remains fairly consistent. For example, from 1996 to 2003 the percentage of learners segregated from mainstream school ranged from 36.9% to 41.5% (DfES, 1997; DfES, 2003).

Labels on learners lead to an educational cul-de-sac.

The labels attached to learners can be many and varied like ‘spectrum’, ‘syndrome’, ‘complex’, ‘disorder’ or ‘challenging’, each can serve to justify a segregated special school place. Even when the label changes the segregated special schools continue to adapt to meet the fashion for new labels. For example, in the 1980s there were many segregated schools for children with the label such as ‘moderate learning difficulties’ (MLD). When there was a shift towards placing children with the label of MLD into mainstream schools, this did not result in the closure of the segregated special schools only a change in its function. The special school would receive children with new labels that emerged from the statementing process, like ‘complex learning difficulties’ or more fashionable labels like ‘Attention Deficit Disorder’ (ADD), or ‘Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder’ (ADHD). Documented in the annual school census it was noted by Ofsted (2001) that there were 1329 special schools identified in total. ‘Severe Learning Difficulties’ and ‘Moderate Learning Difficulties’ schools were recorded as the most numerous with 340 and 320 schools respectively and ‘Delicate’ schools were least numerous with 12 (Ofsted, 2001). To avoid suspicion about any change of function the special schools, continue to use names, which reflect a natural beauty of the countryside. ‘The Elms’, ‘Woodside’, ‘Beech Tree House’, ‘Moorbrook’, ‘The Oaks’, typify the leafy names which attempt to serve as camouflage for their real purpose, which is to segregate large numbers of children from their own natural communities and local schools.

An Illusion of Inclusion

This statementing process is used by professionals to maintain the myth of ‘Special Needs’ and is used to ‘select out’ large numbers of children whose opportunities are denied or restricted.

It is often argued that labels and statements are needed to direct the appropriate resources and support to the particular learner. This is indeed part of the distortion and legacy of a pernicious system, which is based upon a false premise, that it is the ‘individuals difficulty’ rather than the systems deficiencies, which prevent full and active participation of all individuals. Interestingly too, it is important to recognise that the statementing process of a child or the attachment of a particular label is no guarantee that the appropriate support and resources will be provided for the child. A student who had been assessed and statemented to receive a personal support for her needs recently raised this issue. Each year from 1995 to 2000 during the student’s yearly review meeting she had been told that the mainstream school would provide her with an appropriate support. After each year had passed she found herself in the same situation until finally she left the secondary school without ever having the support to which she was entitled (Kikabhai, 2003).

Appropriate support to access schooling should not be seen as ‘conditional’ or as an ‘optional extra’ or dependent on ‘good will’ or for ‘expert delivery only’. Supports should be so effective and available that they are not seen or presented as ‘special’. A ventilator, a signer, an interpreter, a personal assistant, voice recognition software, physical adaptations, accessible transport and toilet facilities, should be as available and central to places where people learn just as much as we take for granted such things as a pair of spectacles, a pen or a text book.

Segregated Special Schools have to close

Whilst segregated special schools remain open there will always remain a pressure on local education authorities to justify their existence, ultimately by segregating children. By using the statementing process children will be directed to places in those schools and many families will be conditioned into thinking that there is no alternative but segregation and a 'special' system. Whilst current legislation continues to give head teachers the power to reject some children and offer the option of a 'special segregated place' we continue to isolate those individuals and fail to learn from them, they become scapegoats for an ineffective and damaging schooling system. The practice and obsession of professionals to take individuals through more and more spurious assessment procedures engineered and constructed that direct children into 'special support services' can often be more expensive than the cost of the ineffective support the individual may or may not eventually get.

Segregated special schooling can be a very profitable business, our local education authorities continue to invest large sums of money into segregated special services, which is as much to do with progressing professional careers rather than meeting the support requirements of the disabled person (Vlachou, 1997). Sending a child away from their own home and local community to a residential segregated special school can cost an average of £40,000 per year, with costs of over £100,000 not unusual for extra 'special' segregated schools. For a child to go to their local school with the necessary support would be a fraction of the cost. Whilst we would argue that cost should not be the issue for effective and meaningful support it is bizarre for education authorities and head teachers to continue to deny disabled children the right to attend their local school on the grounds of insufficient funding, despite the change in legislation. Ironically, we can work out a financial cost of sending a child to a school but we can never work out the loss to the child and his or her local community resulting from their forced removal. Any system regardless of its ineffectiveness

or the damage it may do to individuals will justify its existence, as long as there are significant levels of funding to be had and professional status to be gained (Pugach, 1987; Vlachou, 1997). As noted elsewhere the segregated special school system also requires the continued construction and reconstruction of the child with 'Special Educational Needs' to ensure its continued existence (Solity, 1992).

No Equal Rights means No Inclusive Education.

The most recent Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 is a significant move towards anti-discriminatory legislation and campaigners have been successful in removing two of the three conditions, which have been used to prevent disabled children from going to mainstream schools. However, disabled children still have to prove that their attendance at the mainstream school will not adversely affect the learning of other non-disabled children before they can gain admittance. This caveat is still discrimination against a disabled child and cannot be tolerated; it has to be removed from the current legislation.

Special schools have become the 21st Century gulags, where the collective fears about children who are seen as different is perpetuated and their segregation from other children is reconstructed as 'special education' in a 'safe' environment. These children are in a very real sense 'the disappeared' whose segregation from childhood experiences and the potential for adult life is compelled by law. If inclusive education has any meaning whatsoever it has to be supported by comprehensive human rights legislation that ends the discrimination of disabled children and adults.

Inclusive education cannot exist in a system that offers disabled people partial access, partial support, and partial rights. The presence of ALL learners is only the first step in the eradication of irrational fears about difference – where in learning to value the contributions of others we can learn to know our own value. Inclusion is not merely an educational issue.

An Illusion of Inclusion

It is a right to belong, to be involved, and to be a part of, to feel that your presence is valued and welcomed and that your contribution adds to the learning of others. For disabled people to be denied access to these opportunities means that their human rights are being denied and from such a practice we diminish and impoverish our educational services and fail to recognise and aspire to a service benefit for all.

As it has been inferred before, it is schools, colleges and universities that have learning difficulties because they are unwilling to learn from those they have locked out (Whittaker and Kenworthy, 1997). Where they have not, they have quickly come to value the diversity of contributions, which demonstrates how this changes the narrow and limiting interpretation of education. Teaching and learning involves a web of relationships involving different modes of interchange, a process of sharing and receiving nurtured by a sense of belonging, premised within a context of learning where the boundary between tutor and learner becomes interchangeable. We have to learn different ways of being together and different ways of learning from each other. Good relationships are central to good learning; when we connect with each other we are more likely to learn something new. Relationships hold the key to more meaningful communication and different ways of understanding the world we all live in.

In an inclusive educational system much of what we have come to accept as 'normal' will have to change. Bullying would not be tolerated as a necessary part of growing up, obsessive testing of children would be rendered pointless, grading systems and league tables would be recognised as oppressive, damaging and ineffective. Segregation, isolation and rejection of learners would be replaced by learning in collaboration with peers and teachers, in learning environments where it is safe for people to make 'mistakes' and where diversity difference and justice are central to understanding and learning.

An Illusion of Inclusion

What follows is an account of the struggle of one particular family with a twelve-year-old son, living within one local educational authority in the North West of England. Sadly a typical experience for many families with whom we have had contact. Peter (not his real name) had been statemented as having ‘severe learning difficulties’ and was described as having challenging behaviour, it had been said that he was difficult to understand. Peter attended a mainstream primary school for part of his school day and for another part of the day he was in a segregated special school designated for children with ‘severe learning difficulties’ and design-“*hated*” by Peter. Although Peter experienced difficulties in being understood, his behaviour and comments made it clear he did not wish to be separated from his friends at the local primary school. Often when the taxi arrived to ‘take’ him from his home Peter would park himself on the floor in the front room and refuse to move. The struggle to ‘encourage’ him into the taxi with an impatient driver and escort proved to be a trauma for Peter and the whole family.

The struggle to get Peter into his local mainstream school eventually led to the Independent Special Educational Needs Tribunal. Given that Peter had already demonstrated that he could participate with appropriate support in a mainstream school, given that both his parents were absolutely determined that he should have the educational opportunities and relationships in his local mainstream school alongside his non-disabled peers. Given that the case presented by the local education authority was, in the view of the family members and friends, contradictory and bizarre, the decision of the Independent Tribunal went in favour of the local authority, which has become an expectation rather than a surprise for many who want a mainstream place when their child has been labelled as having ‘severe learning difficulties’. Should we be surprised that the Tribunal have dropped the term ‘Independent’ since they are anything but ‘Independent’ (Crabtree and Whittaker, 1995), and are also referred to as the ‘Special Educational Needs Tribunal’ (SENT). The parents were ‘SENT’

An Illusion of Inclusion

away again in a desperate situation, but still determined that Peter should go to mainstream school, with appropriate support.

It was at this point we asked ourselves which authority in the North West of England would support Peter to attend a local mainstream school, if his family were to move into another education authority. Using a telephone survey we contacted twenty-two local education authorities in the North West (see Appendix 1). With each local education authority we asked to speak with the 'Statementing Officer'. The intention was to speak with a person who would be familiar with current legislation and inclusive education in particular. This was the text we used when we were put into contact with the Statementing Officer:

Hello,

I am a friend of the family and I am ringing you on behalf of a family who at the present time, have a 12-year-old child in a special school for children with severe learning difficulties. The child and the family want a place in a mainstream school with appropriate support. The LEA where they live at this time tell them this is not possible. The family have decided to move to your local education authority and want to know what assurances you can give them that might give them some reassurance that he may go to a mainstream school.

The first telephone survey was conducted in August 2003 followed by a period of 6 months where the scenario was repeated. Two supplementary questions were asked; how many children have moved from special schools in your authority to mainstream school? and do you have an Inclusion Policy?

Findings and Conclusion

Given our introduction concerning the language of inclusion becoming part of the educational rhetoric; it is concerning that this language of inclusion is seldom followed by action that results in the taken for granted everyday experiences of attending a local mainstream school. The research here highlights a diverse range of responses varying from a continual denial of the young person's and families right to mainstream school to a proactive approach to supporting disabled children in mainstream schools. Overall the LEAs have presented a confused understanding of inclusion as a philosophy and inclusion as a practice (see Appendix 2). Whilst it was noted that authorities can and quite clearly do embrace the language of 'inclusion' little has been done to challenge the existing barriers to inclusion in practice. It was expected practice that all LEAs have a Policy on Inclusive Education, yet it was revealing how two authorities stated that they did not. Surprisingly one of these authorities also stated that in the first instance in August 2003 they had "*a very proactive policy*" (LEA 8) on inclusion and 6 months later responded by saying that they did not. When authorities were asked about the number of children moving from special schools to mainstream a broad range of responses emerged. The vast majority of LEAs commented that they did not have any transfer figures in addition to comments such as:

There are children in mainstream but mostly in primary. Jan 02 to Jan 03 Mainstream to Special School 11, Special School to Mainstream 1, Jan 01 to Jan 02 Mainstream to Special 20, Special to Mainstream 5, Jan 00 to Jan 01 Mainstream to Special 16, Special to Mainstream 3

LEA 1

There has been an increase of 30% to 40% of children from special schools to mainstream. We've still got a long way to go.

LEA 2

An Illusion of Inclusion

Most children in mainstream.

LEA 5

It's unusual to move a child with SLD to mainstream. To move from a SLD school to mainstream is very extreme. You're always going to have special schools, because you've got children with severe handicaps.

LEA 7

There are no children with SLD in mainstream some children from EBD (Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties) sector.

LEA 8

Some children with SLD in mainstream.

LEA 11

To be honest with you it is a rare occurrence, not in my experience since 1998.

LEA 12

In the last 7 years I've only known one child to have done that, their need wasn't as severe as originally thought.

LEA 14

There are no examples, it happens both ways.

LEA 17

An Illusion of Inclusion

There are some children in mainstream, but it's not the norm. There is one parent who is requesting mainstream, they wouldn't cope with it they aren't able to meet his needs. It is easier in primary school. They haven't got the social skills. There have been children with Downs Syndrome, they can't cope with it who have transferred from mainstream to special school. Could be detrimental to others. There was one person who went all the way through secondary school.

LEA 18

Child with SLD would never transfer to mainstream.

LEA 20

These responses reveal the gulf between educational rhetoric and practice, responses that reflect the disturbing myths and assumptions that are central to challenging embedded values in the education system, values that are based upon principles of separateness and exclusion. Unfortunately, the response to our presentation of a 12 year old child labelled with 'severe learning difficulties' seeking mainstream access would result in the vast majority of authorities in this study unable to conceive of the possibility of Peter's needs being met in a mainstream school, an experience that an increasing number of families could have expressed without confirmation from this study. What families may not have known was the consistency of the negative attitudes within the LEAs in the North West. Demonstrated through comments such as:

We would have to look at case papers.

LEA 3

Depends on how severe.

LEA 4

An Illusion of Inclusion

Very hard to say. Have to have papers, look at it thoroughly. Very rarely successful. Take into account of cost, what's best for the child. Can't think of any 'SLD' – very low IQ – that are statmented in mainstream.

LEA 5

Very difficult to say without background. Its what all authorities would do. It's a long-term process. Need to consider the safety of the school and child, in the best interest of the child. Very difficult to answer. Looking to close special schools.

LEA 8

He would be assessed and we would accept his current statement. I don't know how severe his severe difficulties are. That may be what the family want but not what the child wants, he could be repeating the emotions of the parent. The levels of support are not achievable in secondary schools.

LEA 17

These responses raise questions as to the way in which LEAs are interpreting their policies and implementing their practices, are children labelled as having 'SLD' to become the 'Ah but, surely you don't mean them'? Individuals whose separation is based upon difference, a difference that is negatively valued, justified by the actions and practices of segregated social systems. These segregated practices are at the root of an irrational fear of difference, social systems of this type feed fears and insecurities maintaining damaging myths and assumptions.

Some of these responses, in this study, are far removed from the government's current legislation on inclusion and are more reminiscent of the embedded deficit thinking that

An Illusion of Inclusion

continues to locate the child's impairment as the 'problems' rather than ineffective support strategies, responses such as:

They would have to show they could access the curriculum. What are the child's problems? We would clearly have to look at the type of the child. They do arrange sometimes some integration depending on their problem usually cookery, drama or what they are capable of.

LEA 18

Depends on what the problems are. Our mainstream schools are very good at dealing with people with certain problems... They don't move from special school to mainstream, because of their problems, they're not mainstream.

LEA 19

Whilst it may be argued that some authorities recognise that much work needs to be done in the area of inclusion, reflected in the following responses:

...we are intending to be more proactive in this area.

LEA 8

For once this Authority is quite progressive, it is a government issue, there will be authorities dragging their heels. The bottom line is to close special schools.

LEA 14

However, as already stated, there are LEAs that continue to deny disabled learners a right to education in mainstream provision. Yet one authority in the borough of London clearly advocated a policy of inclusion when presented with the same scenario:

An Illusion of Inclusion

No problem at all – we do have a clear policy on inclusive education and if you wanted separate school then we would have to sit down and talk with the parents and explain our policy. Clearly we would like to look at previous statement but we would want to find out what the child support requirements were. The child would go into the mainstream. We only have 2 special schools, we would look at the statement, and place the child into the nearest mainstream school which has a vacancy. We do recognise that some authorities would not. We would provide resource funding when needed even if the child did not have a statement.

LEA 23

Whilst this is no panacea for inclusion there is a clear difference, miles apart, in educational rhetoric and practice between this response and those presented by the LEAs in the North West of England, which raises a number of serious concerns. These noted responses from these LEAs illustrate the conflicting and contradictory approaches and practice that blatantly discriminate against young disabled learners. Some LEAs respond directly to the statement and documentation often without any mention of the child and their stated preferences. It was a typical response from authorities to accept documentation first rather than the young person and or families understanding. Much of the documentation that attempts to describe a young persons support needs is often based upon a false notion that these needs remain static and are not subject to change over time. On many occasions, whilst supporting families seeking mainstream provision we have witnessed the deluge of paper work that tells us nothing about the child's needs in terms of how they could be supported in mainstream but rather how segregated provision and their needs, presented as being deficits, will be suited in 'special' provision.

It has been the case that parents seeking inclusion into mainstream provision have relocated to local authorities where schools have proactive approaches to supporting disabled

An Illusion of Inclusion

children into mainstream settings. Numerous families and disabled children have struggled through the maze of hostility, sometimes amounting to immeasurable personal cost in order for children to participate in non-segregated schools. Recently at a panel meeting, involving the governors of the school, where one such family struggled for mainstream access, the head teacher justified the individual's exclusion by claiming the interests of the community and the adverse effects on the learning of others. What appears to be disturbing with this position is the head teacher claiming to represent the community, whilst living nowhere near the community for whom the school serves, nor had they a vision of supporting young disabled people, nor had they an understanding of the local authorities position in working towards promoting inclusion. Interestingly the governors overturned the head teacher's decision to exclude.

In this culture of rhetoric around the language of inclusion we all need to learn from the lessons of inclusion, young disabled people have a right to mainstream education, schools need to develop a sense of humility in their approaches to their vision, leadership, teaching and learning. Authorities need to support their schools in their attempts to welcome all families from the community in which the schools serve, governments need to support their authorities in order to recognise the contributions of all its citizens, we have to be creative and think 'outside' the segregated box. Segregated schools must close, in order to begin the challenge of eradicating the irrational fear of difference, for disabled children to learn with their non-disabled peers, to dispel the notion of 'special', to create a just and equitable system of education from which young people exit and enter on the cusp of adulthood with opportunities to exercise their rights and liberties, to challenge the institutional discrimination that many disabled people continue to experience, to enter and contribute to meaningful relationships and in order to adversely effect the learning of us all!

References

- Crabtree,C and Whittaker, J. (1995) *How Independent are the Independent Special Needs Tribunals?*, [Online] Available: <http://www.inclusion-boltondata.org.uk> [2004 March 11].
- Department for Education and Employment. (1997) *Excellence for all children Meeting Special Educational Needs*, London: HMSO.
- Department for Education and Science. (1978) *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People (The Warnock Report)*, London: HMSO.
- Department for Education and Skills. (2001) *Statistics of Education: Special Educational Needs in England: January 2001*, London: The Stationery Office.
- HMSO. *Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001*, London: The Stationery Office.
- Kikabhai,N. (2003) *Working Towards an Emancipatory Research Approach*, Unpublished MRes Dissertation, Institute of Education, University of London. [Online] Available: <http://www.inclusion-boltondata.org.uk> [2004 October 9].
- Ofsted (2001) *Performance Assessment And National Contextual Data (PANDA) for Special Schools*, London: OfSTED.
- Pugach, M. (1987) *Teacher Education's Empty Set: The Paradox of Preparing Teachers of Learning Disabilities*. in FRANKLIN,M. (ed) (1987) *Learning Disability: Dissenting Essays*, Sussex: The Falmer Press.
- Searle,C. (2001) *An Exclusive Education: Race, Class and Exclusion in British Schools*, London: Lawrence & Wishhart.
- Solity,J. (1992) *Special Education*, London: Cassell.
- Vlachou,A. (1997) *Struggles for Inclusive Education*, Buckingham: OUP.
- Whittaker,J and Kenworthy, J. (1997) *Does your College of Further Education have Learning Difficulties?* [Online] Available: <http://www.inclusion-boltondata.org.uk> [2004 March 11].

Appendix 1

Local Education Authorities contacted

Blackburn and Darwin

Blackpool

Bolton

Bury

Calderdale

Cheshire

Cumbria

Knowsley

Lancashire

Liverpool

Manchester

Oldham

Rochdale

Salford

Sefton

St. Helens

Stockport

Tameside

Trafford

Wigan

Warrington

Wirral

One London Authority

Appendix 2

Code Response

August 2003

January 2004

	Comments made from authority	Transfer Figures	IE Policy	Any Other Comments
LEA 1	<p>Would have to see papers</p> <p>We could not make a decision</p>	No figures	<p>Yes very pleased with it.</p> <p>“Low % of children in special school”</p>	<p>Could give no reassurance that mainstream placement would be available.</p>
LEA 1	<p>Depends on circumstances</p> <p>We would look at the papers</p> <p>They would keep the child in the same school until they felt they could be in mainstream</p> <p>There are children in mainstream but mostly in primary</p>	<p>I’d have to transfer you to someone who would know</p> <p>Jan 02 to Jan 03 Mainstream to Special School 11 Special School to Mainstream 1</p> <p>Jan 01 to Jan 02 Mainstream to Special 20 Special to Mainstream 5</p> <p>Jan 00 to Jan 01 Mainstream to Special 16 Special to Mainstream 3</p>	<p>Have Code of Practice</p> <p>Yes everyone is expected to have policy</p>	<p>If tribunal say ‘SLD’ is appropriate we’re not allowed to go against it, if they say jump we say how high</p>
LEA 2	<p>We would clearly do all that we could to provide a mainstream placement.</p> <p>We have different types of provision</p> <p>Resource schools inclusion</p>	<p>No figures on transfer- too busy at the moment to get them.</p>	<p>Clear policy on inclusive education.</p>	<p>Very reassuring. Gave the strong impression that he wanted to help the family.</p>

An Illusion of Inclusion

	They would like to talk to the parents.			
LEA 2	<p>We couldn't give any assurances, would need to see papers.</p> <p>Wherever possible we would place the child in a mainstream but for some children that's not appropriate</p> <p>It would depend on whether it would adversely effect the learning of others or efficient use of resources</p>	<p>There has been an increase of 30% to 40% of children from special schools to mainstream</p> <p>We've still got a long way to go</p>	Policy on IE	
LEA 3	<p>We would have to look at case papers.</p> <p>In the first instance the child would go into a similar school from where he has come from</p>	<p>No figures</p> <p>That has happened but I can't tell you how many times.</p>	We do have a policy on IE	
LEA 3	<p>Couldn't give guarantee at all</p> <p>Look at evidence available</p> <p>Need to look at Statement</p> <p>Consider Parents view</p>	<p>No figures</p> <p>No knowledge at the moment</p>	IE Policy	<p>Contact Parent Partnership</p> <p>Setting up a £5 million pounds special school</p> <p>Love to go to mainstream, don't want to set up children to fail</p>
LEA 4	Have to see the papers.	No figures	<p>"Working that way"</p> <p>Towards inclusion.</p> <p>2007 special schools attached to a mainstream school.</p>	We do have a special school for SLD but fairly full at the moment.

An Illusion of Inclusion

LEA 4	<p>The provision they're in at the moment, the child would be placed, probably no places and would be out of school</p> <p>They'll be out of school some time</p> <p>Would speak to parents</p> <p>Depends on how severe</p>	<p>No figures</p> <p>Had some with physical rather than severe learning difficulties</p>	<p>No Policy at the moment</p>	<p>Have to listen to professionals</p> <p>Special school Review 2006</p> <p>It takes time</p>
LEA 5	<p>Case papers</p> <p>Wherever possible we will seek to include.</p>	<p>No figures but will try and get them. She will ring me back. She rang back and left a message to say that <i>in her experience and that of her colleagues this had not happened and it had never been requested.</i></p>	<p>Absolutely we have a policy on inclusive education.</p>	<p>Very helpful.</p>
LEA 5	<p>Very hard to say</p> <p>Have to have papers, look at it thoroughly</p> <p>Very rarely successful</p> <p>Take into account of cost, what's best for the child</p> <p>Can't think of any 'SLD' – very low IQ – that are statmented in mainstream</p> <p>I can assure you that it can work in a Special School</p>	<p>No Figures</p> <p>Most children in mainstream</p>	<p>Policy on IE</p>	
LEA 6	<p>We would have to taken into consideration the other children.</p>	<p>No figures</p>	<p>Policy Yes</p>	<p>Little reassurance</p>

An Illusion of Inclusion

	Would include “where possible”			
LEA 6	<p>Will need to look at papers</p> <p>If there are any places</p> <p>We’re full</p> <p>Resource based schools 3 places in each year group available</p> <p>Different authorities have different practices</p>	<p>No Transfer figures</p> <p>Some parents don’t want it.</p> <p>Coordinator available to look at transfer of child.</p>	I think there is a policy	
LEA 7	<p>To move from a SLD school to mainstream is very extreme</p> <p>Would work with the family</p>	No figures on numbers.	Policy yes	<p>Offer reassessment</p> <p>Little reassurance of mainstream placement. Quite shocked at the suggestion.</p>
LEA 7	<p>I couldn’t give any assurances</p> <p>We would have to look at what’s in the statement, because the ethos today is mainstream wherever possible, you’re not trying to set yourself as an enemy you’re objective is to work with the family, not make enemies.</p> <p>We would write to the family and make recommendations, the family would be able to question the LEA, we would be open to discussion it wouldn’t be a closed door.</p>	<p>No figures.</p> <p>I don’t know off the top of my head.</p> <p>Its unusual to move a child with SLD to mainstream</p> <p>You’re always going to have special schools, because you’ve got children with severe handicaps</p>	<p>Policy on IE</p> <p>You’re always going to have special schools, because you’ve got children with severe handicaps</p>	
LEA 8	Take into consideration the current provision.	No figures as yet. Given that this is very new to us.	Yes very proactive policy	

An Illusion of Inclusion

	“But we are intending to be more proactive in this area”			
LEA 8	<p>Very difficult to say without background</p> <p>Its what all authorities would do</p> <p>It’s a long term process</p> <p>Need to consider the safety of the school and child, in the best interest of the child</p> <p>Very difficult to answer</p> <p>Looking to close special schools</p>	<p>No transfer figures</p> <p>There are no children with SLD in mainstream some children from EBD (Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties) sector.</p>	No Policy	
LEA 9	<p>Very helpful</p> <p>Would submit the current papers to the “panel” and they would decide.</p>	The figures for transfer should be on the web site.	Yes policy	
LEA 9	We are an authority committed to Inclusive Education	<p>No Figures</p> <p>There are children in mainstream (2)</p>	Policy on IE	
LEA 10	Statement education officer will decide based upon the papers sent by the current lea.	No figures on transfer	Policy of IE	We will see if they (the child) can manage.
LEA 10	<p>Without details its very difficult to say</p> <p>Depends on the nature and severity</p> <p>First instance will put them into SLD school</p>	<p>No Transfer figures</p> <p>Do have some children with SLD in mainstream</p>	Policy on IE	
LEA 11	Places would be dependent on availability.	No figures	Yes to policy.	
LEA 11	We would request statement or parents to send information	No Transfer	Policy on IE	

An Illusion of Inclusion

	Certainly do our best if it's the parents wish	Not common that children transfer but expect some integration at year 10 and 11 Some children with SLD in mainstream		
LEA 12	Look at paper No decision Another assessment will be required	No figures Possible figures. However, children would go into SLD first.		Yes o definitely we do have a policy on inclusive ed
LEA 12	I could not say what we would do, we'd have to look at the papers, they would be looked at by Head of Service and it would depend on the view of the service Each child is different	No transfer figures You would have to write to the authority To be honest with you it is a rare occurrence, not in my experience since 1998	Policy on IE	
LEA 13	We would look at records.	Fairy minimal move from special to mainstream. "I did have one" who moved from a special into a mainstream school. So it does happen. We would hopefully have evidence to "persuade" a mainstream school to "take the child on"	We have an inclusion policy.	
LEA 13	Do the best we could	No Transfer figures	Policy on IE	

An Illusion of Inclusion

	<p>Need copies of papers</p> <p>What you've got to bear in mind is the severity</p> <p>Very rarely go against parents wishes working with Parent Partnerships</p>	<p>Some children with SLD in mainstream school</p>		
LEA 14	<p>Policy is for inclusion where ever possible</p> <p>Strategic plan to facilitate</p>	<p>Figures should be available but don't know who has them.</p>	Yes	<p>Very helpful</p> <p>Inclusion was presented as being very important</p> <p>Keen to be helpful.</p> <p>Continually stated that inclusion was there policy</p>
LEA 14	<p>It largely depends on the Authority were they are.</p> <p>Our policy is mainstream school, if you can be in a mainstream school it will happen.</p> <p>They would go into a special school first.</p> <p>Would depend on the area they move to, if you lived close to a mainstream school there is a greater chance to go into mainstream.</p> <p>For once this Authority is quite progressive, it is a government issue, there will be authorities dragging their heels.</p> <p>The bottom line is to close special schools</p>	<p>In the last 7 years I've only known one child to have done that, their need wasn't as severe as originally thought.</p>	Yes	
LEA 15	<p>"More difficult at secondary school"</p>	<p>No figures</p>	Yes	
LEA 15	<p>If child moves authority we would be obliged</p>	<p>We do have transfer figures but</p>	Policy on IE	

An Illusion of Inclusion

	to do what the statement says until the statement is reviewed on an annual basis, Things are different in secondary school	there are no children from 'SLD' schools who go into mainstream		
LEA 16	We would have to look at the papers "We do take parents wishes into consideration"	No figures	Yes do have a policy	
LEA 16	LEA would decide on individual needs Parents opinion would be taken into account We would look at files and look at provision but if files say SLD then we would do that	No Figures We have one or two with 'SLD' in mainstream	Policy on IE	
LEA 17				
LEA 17	He would be assessed and we would accept his current statement I don't know how severe his difficulties are That may be what the family want but not what the child wants, he could be repeating the emotions of the parent The levels of support are not achievable in secondary schools	No figures, we don't maintain figures. There are no examples, it happens both ways.	Policy on IE It doesn't mean at all costs	
LEA 18	Very helpful- but the chances very little. What are the "child's problems". We would clearly have to look at the type of the child.	No figures but assured me that there were "Not many not even a handful" "They would have to show they	Yes	

An Illusion of Inclusion

		could access the curriculum”		
LEA 18	<p>Couldn't make a decision</p> <p>Would need to see the paper work</p> <p>Couldn't give any guarantee, would depend on the recommendations of the review panel</p> <p>They do arrange sometimes some integration depending on their problem usually cookery, drama or what they are capable of.</p>	<p>No official figures</p> <p>There are some children in mainstream, but its not the norm</p> <p>There is one parent who is requesting mainstream, they wouldn't cope with it they aren't able to meet his needs</p> <p>It is easier in primary school.</p> <p>They haven't got the social skills. There have been children with Downs Syndrome, they can't cope with it who have transferred from mainstream to special school</p> <p>Could be detrimental to others</p> <p>There was one person who went all the way through secondary school</p>	<p>Policy on IE</p> <p>The person who decided this was not educated in this area.</p>	
LEA 19	<p>We would have to have all the papers relating to the assessment.</p>	<p>They could request that information about the number of children who have been transferred</p>	<p>Do have an inclusive education policy.</p>	
LEA 19	<p>Depends on what the problems are.</p> <p>We would write to the LEA and have a look at the statement and look at appropriate</p>	<p>No transfer figures</p> <p>Once we've decided, they usually stay there in secondary special</p>	<p>Yes we probably do,</p> <p>You can contact</p>	

An Illusion of Inclusion

	<p>provision.</p> <p>It would depend on individual circumstances.</p> <p>Our mainstream schools are very good at dealing with people with certain problems</p>	<p>schools</p> <p>They don't move from special school to mainstream, because of their problems, they're not mainstream</p>	<p>the special educational needs inspector who may send a copy.</p>	
LEA 20	<p>No comment</p>	<p>For us to 90% of our children in mainstream.</p> <p>Depends on how "severe they are"</p> <p>We do not have the figures of those who have moved from a special school to a mainstream school.</p>	<p>We do have a policy.</p>	<p>We do have a policy of inclusion.</p>
LEA 20	<p>Can't give assurances</p> <p>Need to have a copy of statement, statement would go to professionals</p> <p>Parents could look at the schools in the area, we have 3 schools that are accessible</p> <p>There are very few inclusive authorities</p>	<p>No transfer figures</p> <p>Child with SLD would never transfer to mainstream</p>	<p>Policy on IE</p>	
LEA 21	<p>They would have to take a view based on the statement and the previous advise.</p>	<p>There have been children move from special to mainstream.</p>	<p>We do have an IE policy</p>	
LEA 21	<p>We would need to read all the advice and make a judgement</p> <p>It is an inclusive authority obviously we take each case as it comes.</p>	<p>No transfer figures</p> <p>We do have some children in mainstream</p>	<p>No Policy</p> <p>You would have to check with the town</p>	

An Illusion of Inclusion

			hall	
LEA 22	The address is important- a decision would be taken at the panel meeting. Based upon the papers we get from the LEA	<p>No figures as yet We are thinking of We can't say now.</p> <p>Special school relocated to a secondary school. They do integrate where appropriate</p> <p>We have not yet got to the position where there is one head teacher.</p> <p>This is a resource school.</p> <p>We would like it to happen but we have to work with the school as well and there may well be no access for some children.</p>	Yes policy- we are strong leaders	
LEA 22	<p>We would look at SLD school and there would be a review after 6 months. The child's information would go to a review panel.</p> <p>I can't say what would happen, they wouldn't be able to move school.</p>	<p>We do have some children who move from special school to mainstream</p> <p>Our SLD school is on the same campus they use the same facilities.</p>	Policy on IE	
LEA 23	No problem at all – we do have a clear policy on inclusive education and if you wanted separate school then we would have to sit down and talk with the parents and explain our policy. Clearly we would like to look at		Yes policy.	

An Illusion of Inclusion

	<p>previous statement but we would want to find out what the child support requirements were.</p> <p>Very proactive.</p>			
LEA 23	<p>We do have an inclusion policy</p> <p>The child would go into the mainstream</p> <p>We only have 2 special schools, we would look at the statement, and place the child into the nearest mainstream school which has a vacancy</p> <p>We do recognise that some authorities would not.</p> <p>We would provide resource funding when needed even if the child did not have a statement</p>	<p>We only have 2 special schools left</p>	<p>Policy on IE</p>	