

DEVELOPING AN INCLUSIVE CURRICULUM: “EVERY TEACHER MATTERS”

Keith A. Humphreys

*Centre for Advancement in Special Education
University of Hong Kong*

The development of inclusive education practices have led to worldwide discussion of how best to deliver a more equal education opportunity for all. In Hong Kong this has led to the development of the concept of an inclusive curriculum for special schools. This paper looks at the implications of writing an inclusive curriculum that has common curriculum content for all pupils that is based on the State curriculum. Over a four year period, nine special schools for pupils of different designated disability collectively pooled their resources to work for one common curriculum goal. In doing so they discovered that the biggest challenge was to the teacher's hearts and minds. Over 130 teachers were involved in the project. It required a significant paradigm shift in the way the teachers thought both about what they taught and how they taught. It required a common team effort within and across each school. It was apparent that providing equal opportunity to raise standards of education for the all the pupils required the recognition that every teacher had to change their way of thinking, every teacher matters.

Introduction

Four years ago, nine special schools embarked on a development program to work out an inclusive curriculum. When they met the schools were all designated with different disability responsibilities and each of them had their own separate curriculum. They decided to work to one common curriculum based on the central curriculum for all of the mainstream schools in Hong Kong. The project was coordinated by staff at the University of Hong Kong and led by a consultant from the United Kingdom. An action research approach was taken progressively focusing on the teacher's changing understanding as they moved from a psycho-medical paradigm of thought to a curriculum based paradigm. The teachers had to leave behind their diverse disability orientated curricula such as self help skills and perceptual motor training, and move towards teaching new State subjects such as Science, Mathematics and Technology Education. Teachers had to move away from teacher led teaching to pupil centered learning.

In order to understand what they were doing, the teachers worked on the reconceptualisation in cross school groups, so teachers of the profoundly disabled worked alongside teachers of those with severe and moderate difficulties, and with teachers of pupils who attended schools for the physically disabled and the schools for the visually disabled. The significant common feature that each working group shared was the same curriculum subject and a developing understanding of a common continuous level of pupil attainment. The teachers had their greatest

challenge to understanding equality of education opportunity in understanding the paradigm shift in the way they thought.

The road to success in inclusive education; building on existing strengths

The SAME project stands for Systematic Approach to Mainstream Education. The SAME project was created by a group of special school head teachers and their teachers in Hong Kong who wished to develop an inclusive central curriculum that was relevant for all students with special education needs in both special and mainstream schools.

The building of the SAME project was made possible due to the existing strengths of the existing central curriculum which is strong and relevant based on eight key learning areas in schools. It was facilitated by the strong leadership of CASE at Hong Kong University and the heads of the SAME project special schools as well as a highly motivated group of special education teachers with a clear vision, to raise the standard of educational attainment of their students (Li, Tse, & Lian, 2008).

What is an inclusive school?

Inclusion should always be seen as a journey where no school arrives (Curriculum Group Dorchester, 2002). It involves the constant scrutiny and auditing of policies, procedures and practices, to ensure that no groups are underachieving, being marginalised or excluded. Inclusion is more about a state of mind than any specific educational arrangements. The process of learning is considered important as well as the content of what the student learns.

An inclusive special school should be concerned with excellence of educational opportunity in the true educational sense (Cole, 2000) and no longer focus primarily on their previous goals of functional competency and rehabilitation. Inclusive schools need subject expert teachers who know the diversity of learning difference of students.

"Effective schools are educationally inclusive schools. This shows, not only in their performance, but also in their ethos and their willingness to offer new opportunities to pupils who may have experienced previous difficulties. An educationally inclusive school is one in which the teaching and learning, achievements, attitudes and well-being of every young person matter." (OFSTED, 2004, p. 18)

The teacher is the educational change agent (Hargreaves, 2003). At the heart of educational opportunity is the facilitating role of the teacher. Their beliefs and consequent practices are the crucial elements that foster student development. At a time of educational change and when such major paradigm shifts in the nature of education are being promoted what matters most are the teacher's beliefs in what should be taught and then how they should practice their art of teaching (Daniels, 2000). If they are to practice inclusion principles and deliver an inclusive curriculum then every teacher must play their part, every teacher matters.

The drive for inclusion has been with us for over twenty years yet there is evidence that the support for the belief in the principles remains as rhetoric when it comes to practice. Where there are teachers in special schools that are not aware of the central curriculum and the relevance of the key learning areas then there is a lack of inclusion. Where there are teachers in all schools who keep a direct control of their classroom without encouraging student centred learning, then there are students who are not included in their learning. If the paradigms of teaching are to change, then the teachers need to be informed of how to change their practices. If this is not done then the excellent principles become empty rhetoric. Without the teacher's clarity of values there can be no clear paradigms of curriculum delivery. Without the informed teacher there can be no inclusive education. The teacher really does matter.

The teacher in the classroom is like an actor on a stage who must have the will to inspire excitement about learning and the ability to encourage student curiosity and challenge the student's ability to explore and make sense of the world about them. The greater the disability of the student the greater the challenge for the teacher, the more barriers to learning the student presents the more flexible a facilitator the teacher has to be. At this point it is the personality of the teacher which creates the sense of fun and laughter that is germane to educational motivation. Without the teacher's sense of fun there can be no excitement or student curiosity. The teacher matters not only as a professional but also as a person.

A good teacher not only has strong beliefs but is also well disciplined in their art of professional practice. A good teacher has to have a holistic grasp of their responsibilities. The teacher of the twenty first century is not just a person who teaches students in the classroom. A twenty first century teacher is an educator, a person who is an expert in curriculum management, a master of classroom management, a skilled practitioner in assessment and evaluation (Browder, 2001) and above all someone who understands the educational implications of the abilities and disabilities of their students (Lewis, 2003) and encourages student centred learning. The teacher matters because their ability to operate within this complex educational context requires the highest level of professionalism. Without the teacher's highest standard of professionalism there can be no quality of education development.

What is an inclusive curriculum?

An inclusive curriculum is one to which all schools subscribe for all pupils, whether they are in mainstream or special schools. In those countries where the current special school practice is that each school follows its own curriculum and interprets the subjects they teach in a unique way, then the quality of the taught curriculum becomes weakened. This has two consequences. Firstly, the students in special schools are denied access to the educational culture of their able bodied peers and therefore denied equality of opportunity to learn. Secondly, the teachers do not have a critical community in which to develop the quality of the subjects they teach, because there is no shared cross-school appreciation about the nature of the content. When this happens there is no shared platform from which to raise standards of education for students with special education needs. Therefore an inclusive curriculum must relate to the key learning areas of the central curriculum and the values of one central culture.

Since each nation has its own culture and set of values to be transmitted; one curriculum for all students should reflect these. There may be problems of interpreting this culture and these values at level that is developmentally appropriate for students, but this is a challenge for the teacher to meet. Every student needs to have a sense of time and their history, every student needs to have a sense of place and their geography, and every student needs to have access to the arts and literature that is a national treasure. An inclusive curriculum does this by addressing the knowledge, concepts and values that are appropriate to all students as laid out in the central curriculum documentation guidance.

Enabling students to gain access to new knowledge at their own individual level of understanding and at their own pace of learning is central to an inclusive curriculum. This means firstly that teachers need to understand how to give students access to the same subject content but with different levels of response from the teacher. Secondly this approach is much more effectively applied if the students are in control of their own learning. There are many ways of facilitating student control but it takes a lot of confidence from the teacher to move away from the more directive teaching from the front of the class where the teacher moves everyone along at the same pace. The curriculum must therefore promote differentiation through student centred learning.

Developing the current special school scenario in Hong Kong

As the drive to raise standards of education becomes a worldwide political agenda, the responsibility of special schools to achieve the same is essential. A key way to raise standards is to have critical communities where teachers talk a common language across their special schools. In Hong Kong special schools this is a difficult challenge, because many schools tend to have their own unique approach to many of the subjects that are taught in the curriculum (Ainscow et al., 2005). As a consequence it is very difficult for teachers to compare the quality of their practice in delivering subject knowledge. Standards of educational opportunity can only be raised if teachers across a large number of schools speak with each other and compare the quality and depth of their commonly shared subject knowledge. If each teacher 'does their own thing' then they are immune from criticism as no one else can speak the same subject language with them. There is no critical community across all the schools. Special schools need to develop a common curriculum to create a critical community.

The SAME project has identified how each subject of the Hong Kong key learning areas, can be taught to students across a wide range of special schools (Humphreys, 2006a). The teachers from the SAME schools are beginning to talk with one critical voice about the common subjects that they will teach.

Currently there is limited comprehensive reference to the mainstream key learning areas within and across the special schools in Hong Kong. This is because traditionally special schools have not seen the link between the key learning areas of the central curriculum and the levels of their pupil's ability. Teachers develop other subjects and content, to avoid the challenge of seeking a common curriculum continuum of attainment. In the UK there was a major breakthrough when a set of attainment scales was identified for each mainstream curriculum subject. This meant that the very least able profoundly disabled students could be placed on a level

of attainment as their able bodied peers in the mainstream school. There needs to be curriculum continuum of levels of attainment for all students.

A similar approach has been taken in Hong Kong with the SAME project so that all students, every single one, can be assessed as to their level of attainment with the same scales for each central curriculum subject (Humphreys, Ayres, & Thompson et al., 2004). The teachers have produced sets of attainment scales of learning focus within each subject for each key learning area.

The raising of school standards of teaching requires a systematic approach to curriculum management (Forlin, 2005). From the delivery of each subject in each classroom to each student there needs to be in place a systematic approach to record keeping (Forlin & Forlin, 2002), that feeds up to the year groups and then to the Key Stage groups and then to the senior management. This allows the monitoring of quality of teaching related to pupil attainment and it also ensures that sufficient teaching resources are available. Whilst the current monitoring of the subjects taught within special schools is useful, the focus on curriculum management needs to be developed more across the special schools in Hong Kong. The development in the use of computer software has greatly improved the teacher's ability to manage the curriculum flexibly and with greater time saving efficiency. Curriculum planning needs to be more systematically related to collaborative school development.

The SAME project will write curriculum documentation in such a way as produce common structures to manage the curriculum that will allow data to be shared across the special schools (Humphreys, 2006b). These structures will form the basis upon which the curriculum can be managed. The actual curriculum management process, especially at a classroom level, may be a new professional skill that every teacher will have to master. Curriculum planning is a living, ongoing professional process. It is important to recognise that a distinction is being made here between the teacher as a curriculum manager and the teacher as an adult, who, with other adults in the classroom, is capable of teaching and interacting positively with the students.

The traditional way of teaching in Hong Kong is teacher centred, where the teacher is the conductor at the front of the classroom. Lessons are often led by the teacher and then the students are given follow tasks to complete and then pupils will put into groups of different ability to respond. The key is that the teacher remains in control from the front of the class. This leads to rigid lesson delivery where the efficiency of student learning is very limited and for long periods of time students are not engaged in the lesson. This contributes to learned helplessness where the student only seeks to learn if they are being guided by an adult. Many students only learn when a teacher is directly present with them. The use of individual learning programmes (IEPs) may give the teacher an individualised focus, but they can also restrict the scope of pupil curiosity and leave the student out of control of their own learning (Maskell, Watkins, & Haworth, 2003). The IEPs are in danger of being behaviouristic tools for the teacher. Teacher centred approaches to learning restrict diversity of student understanding.

The SAME project will seek to show teachers how they can develop student centred learning. In this context the teacher is a facilitator of student learning opportunities by providing enriched subject content. As a consequence, each student can become engaged in the subject content for much longer periods of time, at their own level of

understanding (Black, 2007). This ensures that differentiation of levels of student response is in the control of the student and therefore at a maximum.

The need to differentiate the student's opportunity for learning can be met by ensuring that all adults in the classroom are suitably informed about the student's learning opportunities. The role of the teaching assistants in special schools has traditionally been where they provide extra care to support the teacher. This does not maximise the use of the teaching assistant as an adult who can be involved in the teaching process. The teacher is an educator, who has to deal with all aspects of curriculum management and delivery, including teaching, but the teaching assistant has a narrower role and this can involve skilful teaching. This can only happen if there is a meaningful teaching dialogue between the teacher and the teaching assistant. In Hong Kong special schools there is scope to develop the role of the teaching assistant as a teacher. This evolving role has been a feature of professional development in the UK and it has been achieved without raising the teacher assistant salaries but rather by modifying their job descriptions. Therefore teacher assistants should be encouraged to engage in a more educational role.

The SAME project will develop procedures that encourage greater involvement of teaching assistants in the teaching interactive process allowing the teaching assistant to be much more aware of what is to be taught and the nature of effective student-led adult collaboration.

Enhancing student inclusion

An included student is one who participates in decision making, where appropriate, at all levels of the schooling process. This is never more important than in the classroom. In student centred learning it is recognised that each student has their own starting point for learning and has their own individual previous unique knowledge base. In student centred learning the teacher recognises the importance of the student's level of engagement and motivation in an activity. Students learn in different ways and through socialising make their own constructs of reality to arrive at their own meanings. In student centred learning the process of being in control of one's environment is as important as what is learned. In this context the teacher facilitates the student's ability to control their day. This is an important aspect of inclusion. An inclusive curriculum therefore develops the learner's autonomy to plan their day.

Within an inclusive curriculum the student is one who takes responsibility for their own learning and who has learned to actively seek to acquire new knowledge and understanding. The student overcomes the learned helplessness often related with disability so that classroom inspired curiosity can extend into the world beyond the classroom. The student is in control of making new connections to their previous constructs of the world in which they live. They are able to reconnect the previously unconnected. This way the student is able to further develop control over their thinking, pace, content, outcomes.

The focus is on encouraging students to use their preferred mode of learning to increase their learning interest, motivate their learning and obtain maximum learning outcomes. Students can progress much faster if they have the control of the subjects upon which they wish to spend more time. The learning impact is not initially on the

academic content but on learning motivation and self confidence which are paramount to these special learners.

Hence an included student is one who has the freedom to work at subjects for the length of time that they wish. They can spend more time on subjects that interest and absorb them as individuals. This is very different from learning at the pace of the whole class in a more regimented way. The student is given access to interesting subject knowledge where they decide what is of value to them. This is not anarchy in the classroom for the teacher is still the provider of the learning facilities, the teacher still constrains the scope of learning but the pupil is free to learn within those constraints. It not prescriptive with narrow teacher set learning objectives and it leads the student into open ended learning and the development of curiosity. Therefore the inclusive curriculum develops student freedom to think within constraints, not free thinking.

Building on strong and effective leadership

Head teachers need to be aware of the management structures that they wish to see working across the whole school (Fullan, 2001). They need to appreciate lead an effective strategy that is understood and applied by all of the teachers (Deal & Peterson, 1999). The head teacher should seek to empower every teacher to think beyond their classroom and to see their role as a team member, able to contribute to decisions about their class and their students at a whole school level (Hord, 1998). Current research findings into the nature and importance of effective leadership in schools highlights, among other things, that: school leadership is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on pupil learning; almost all successful leaders draw on the same basic repertoire of leadership practices (the main elements are: building vision, developing people, redesigning the organisation, managing teaching and learning); and that school leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed. In order to achieve this strong leadership must come from the Head teacher.

Within the new approach, each key learning area needs to be co-ordinated by a subject leader. The role of the subject leader is to secure and sustain improvement in each subject of the curriculum. As a starting point, there are three core roles for subject leaders: Firstly in making judgements about standards of pupils' achievement. Subject leaders should seek to find out how well is their school doing and how they compare with similar schools. Improvement planning begins with an audit designed to establish secure judgements about standards of pupils' achievement, the current quality of teaching and the appropriateness of the curriculum. Secondly the subject leader should evaluate teaching and learning and set priorities for improvement. They should seek to establish what more should the school seek to achieve in one year and identify what must be done to make it happen. Thirdly the subject leader should seek sustainable improvement by identifying targets for improvement, by developing and leading strategies to achieve these targets and by quality assuring the curriculum. They need to take action and check that it happens. The improvement strategy must be put into action and progress is monitored. Judgements about standards are made to identify whether they have been raised. Effective leadership must therefore come from subject leaders.

For any system of school improvement to be effective, every teacher has a responsibility to participate and to appreciate their contribution to the processes that is being established. In this sense all teachers are leaders (Humphreys, 2007). It is unlikely that in the past teachers will have seen their responsibilities as being so widely linking outside of the classroom. Teachers will need to learn how to contribute and to develop their confidence in the process. This is especially the case when teachers in special schools have traditionally seen their prime role as being to teach the individual and not the subject. Even so every pupil should be expected and encouraged to achieve their potential to the highest level (OFSTED, 2008). These expectations should be underpinned by the practical use of data monitoring. All assessment results should be monitored for their effect on particular groups of pupils to pinpoint and tackle underperformance. Collective leadership responsibility must be shared by all teachers.

Building on the strengths of the teacher

In the SAME project teachers will be required to further establish their links with the key learning areas of the central curriculum. In this central guidance clear reference is made to nine generic skills that need to be fostered and to the values and attitudes that need to be developed (Humphreys, 2008). There are clear attainment levels of learning for each subject with guidance on the nature of the content to be taught across the Key Stages. Teachers in special schools need to appreciate this guidance and open their thinking to a more thorough reflection of what they are doing thereby building on conceptual appreciation of the value of the Central curricular guidance.

There are several paradigms that the teachers need to increasingly appreciate as they progress through the evolution of the SAME project. The first educational paradigm is the recognition of referring to students as learners with abilities and not in the medical paradigm as handicapped people with disabilities. The use of terms such as Down syndrome, or intellectually deficient should no longer be seen as relevant. A second paradigm that teachers will have to absorb is that of the student centred learner. This is a philosophical paradigm that reflects different views about the contested nature of learning teaching and knowledge. A third curriculum based paradigm is the notion of the teacher as a curriculum manager who is able to master the subject(s) they teach and from classroom to whole school level contribute to the raising of educational standards. Teachers will need to develop their professional confidence to operate within these complimentary paradigms, building on conceptual appreciation of the values of the paradigms.

The SAME project is also asking teachers to think more critically about the subjects they teach and to move away from the traditional special educational approach that looks at the individual child, with individual education programmes (Pickles, 2004). The special school teacher has a good knowledge of disability but a weaker grasp of the key learning areas subjects to be taught. The teacher in the mainstream school has a good grasp of the key learning areas subjects to be taught but a weaker grasp of the barriers to learning that students need to overcome. This needs to be redressed for both sets of teachers. The new emphasis in the SAME project special schools is on improving the quality of the learning opportunity (Bub & Hoare, 2001) and the teacher developing the quality of their subject knowledge. This subject knowledge will be common across many teachers in many schools and it will be open to peer

related critical scrutiny. The application of the key learning area subjects to students at the early levels of ability will be a fascinating process to be shared. It will encourage teachers to be creative thinkers of exciting opportunities for learning that are common for all students. It is to be hoped that teachers will leave behind the private gardens of their classrooms and open up their new understandings of subject knowledge for all to share, building on a strong subject knowledge that is open to criticism (Jones, 2001).

Above all there is the need for teachers to recognise that if students in mainstream schools need to raise their standards of attainment then so too should students in special schools. Teachers in special schools need to increasingly realise this. The gap between the quality of education in mainstream and the quality of education in special schools must not widen. From an equality of opportunity perspective this is essential. Teachers in the SAME special schools are being, given new tools with which to play their part in the raising of educational standards (Blanchard, 2002). Indeed their work will also have an implication for those students with special educational needs in mainstream schools. In this new educational paradigm, those pupils with special educational needs will be seen to be of significantly higher attainment level of ability within the same common strands of subject learning as their peers in special schools thereby raising standards of educational attainment for each student.

What has been achieved so far?

The SAME project has benefitted from excellent leadership co-ordinated from CASE at Hong Kong University. He has provided the drive, vision and considerable amount of energy to be the catalyst. He has been equally well supported by the nine Head teachers from the participating special schools who have committed themselves and their staff to an immense amount of conceptual development work. Without this team of ten professionals, the energy for the project would never have materialised, and the ideas would have remained as rhetoric rather than innovative professional practice.

The key contributors have been the practicing teachers who had to come to terms with the paradigm shifts and their reconceptualisation of teaching practices in their special schools. They have had to rework their understandings on a number of occasions as they sought to clarify their understanding of this brave new world they were entering. They have had to work with colleagues they had never met before who came from special schools with students that had levels of ability with which they were not familiar (Street & Temperley, 2005). They persevered with their struggle for understanding and this was the greatest single achievement.

At all levels of involvement the contributors had to work in new ways. The most challenging was to write level descriptors of attainment that included every student in their collective group of schools. They had to come to terms with the nature of the subjects for each key learning area and then to write attainment levels for each of the strands of learning within each subject. Next they had to take the objectives of the mainstream key learning areas and break each one of them down into inclusive objectives which would be appropriate for the range of ability of the students (from Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties to Mild Grade). Then they had to

identify how to apply the attainment levels to illustrate teaching situations that were compatible with the ethos of their chosen subject. This not only demanded that the teachers developed knowledge of the subject but also of how it might be taught in an exciting way.

In all of the work that has been achieved so far the contributors recognise that the whole process is a four year development plan and that they are now only half way through. Phase one was to write the Supplements for each key learning area that are being launched today. They are a considerable professional achievement and one that is probably unique as an example of professional co-operation across Special schools in Hong Kong. Every single contributor should be congratulated for their commitment and desire to make this significant contribution to the education of their students.

What is needed next?

The SAME project is not about paper products it is about developing; exciting professional activity. Teachers will be able to use the documentation to appreciate the practical processes that influence professional action. In Phase one the writing of the Supplements has related to the evolution of the Key Learning Areas. The next phase, Phase two is to write Schemes of Work that will support teacher subject knowledge of the Key Learning Areas, the teaching in the classroom and the process of curriculum planning. In doing so this will help teachers to develop a deeper professional ability to develop their student's thinking processes (Whitty, 2006). The role to play by the use of the new computer technologies to aid curriculum planning should also not be underestimated.

This systematic approach to main stream education creates a seamless curricular provision link between special schools and mainstream schools (Tilstone & Rose, 2003). As a consequence the teachers in mainstream schools should benefit from a greater appreciation of how to respond more effectively to their low attaining students. They will gain a better appreciation of the early nature of the key learning area content and also different approaches they can use to teaching and learning. A significant additional benefit will be that instead of the students being seen as being at the bottom of the traditional mainstream level of attainment, the teachers will now see the students as being well advanced in their attainment levels. This in turn will significantly influence the self esteem of the students themselves.

To continue through Phase two the teachers and head teachers will benefit from a lot of encouragement and support. The success of the SAME project will not even be measured at the end of Phase Two. The success will depend on proving that the project is substantial, effective and lasting. The teachers in the SAME project seeking to establish a new tradition in the practice of special education. They must avoid temporary innovation and seek permanent change.

There is a need to plan ahead to provide relevant courses for teachers up to Masters Degree level that will be of benefit not only to other special school teachers but also for the teachers of special educational needs in mainstream schools. There is a clear need for courses for professional development at many levels. These courses should not be generic academic courses; they should be focused within the clear paradigms

that have been identified and be professional development courses that have academic rigour for all teachers of students with special educational needs.

There is a need for political commitment and financial backing if students with special educational needs are to have the same human rights and equality of educational opportunity as their able bodied peers. This commitment to the raising of educational standards for the students with special educational needs depends on the support given to the teachers.

The SAME Project is concerned with the road to success in inclusive education; building on existing strengths. The greatest strength that the SAME project can build upon is the resourcefulness and commitment of the teacher. Teachers of students with special educational needs are themselves special, for they seek to help their pupils overcome their barriers to learning, to develop the abilities they possess. In the context of delivering one common inclusive curriculum for all, every teacher needs effective professional development support. In providing an effective inclusive curriculum, every teacher matters.

References

- Ainscow, M. et al. (2005). *A study of the effectiveness of special schools*, Education and Manpower Bureau Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of The People's Republic of China
- Black, R. (2007). Crossing the bridge: Overcoming entrenched disadvantage through student-centred learning [Online] www.educationfoundation.org.au.
- Blanchard, J. (2002). *Teaching and targets: Self evaluation and school improvement*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge Education.
- Bub, S., & Hoare, P. (2001). *Performance management monitoring teaching in the primary school* Abingdon, UK: David Fulton Publishers.
- Browder, D.M. (2001). *Curriculum and assessment for students with moderate and severe disabilities*. New York: Guilford Press
- Cole, M. (2000). *Education, equality and human rights*. Abngton, UK: Taylor & Francis
- Curriculum Group Dorchester. (2002). *Towards a curriculum for all: A practical guide for developing an inclusive curriculum for pupils attaining significantly below age-related expectations*, Abington, UK: David Fulton Publishers
- Daniels, H. (2000). *Special education reformed*. Abington, UK: Routledge.
- Deal, T.E., & Peterson, K.D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Forlin, C. (2005). Implementing an outcomes-focussed approach to learning: Implications for inclusive education. *CASE News*, 1(2), 3-6.
- Forlin, C., & Forlin, P. (2002). Outcomes focussed education for inclusion. *Queensland Journal of Educational Research*, 18(1), 62-81
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity*. Ne York: Teachers College Press.
- Hord, S. (1998). *Creating a professional learning community: Cottonwood Creek School*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC No. ED424685)

- Humphreys, K. A. (2006a). *Stimulating enjoyment and raising educational standards of achievement for pupils with (severe and profound multiple) learning difficulties*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Special Education, Centre for Advancement in Special Education, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- Humphreys, K. A. (2006b). *The SAME project: Guidance notes for writing teams*. Unpublished document, Centre for Advancement in Special Education, Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- Humphreys, K.A. (2007). *Developing a 'Systematic Approach to Mainstream Education' (SAME) for special schools in Hong Kong*. Keynote lecture, the Marden Forum on Special Education and Rehabilitation, Centre for Advancement in Special Education. Faculty of Education, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.
- Humphreys, K.A. (2008). *The challenge of raising student levels of achievement in an inclusive national curriculum.* In C. Forlin & M-G. J. Lian (Eds.), *Reform, inclusion and teacher education: Towards a new era of special education in the Asia-Pacific Region*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Humphreys, K. A., Ayres, J., Thompson, M. McDermott, M. & Stenhouse, J. (2004). *PACE 2; "P" scale assessment of the national curriculum from Equals*. In EQUALS, Newcastle, England.
- Jones, J. (2001). *Performance management for school: A practical guide for secondary Schools*. Abington, UK: David Fulton Publishers.
- Lewis, V. (2003). *Development and disability*. West Sussex, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Maskell, S., Watkins, F., & Haworth, E. (2003). *Baseline assessment and target setting for pupils with profound and multiple learning difficulties*. Abington, UK: David Fulton Publishers.
- Li, M-C. A., Tse, C-Y. A., & Lian, M-G. J. (2008). The SAME Project: A Hong Kong experience in enhancing accessibility of the central curriculum. *Hong Kong Special Education Forum, 10*, 1-15
- OFSTED. (2004). *Special educational needs and disability: Towards inclusive schools*. London: HMSO.
- OFSTED. (2008). *Raising standards, improving lives*. London: HMSO.
- Pickles, P., (2004). *Inclusive teaching, inclusive learning: Managing the curriculum for children with severe motor difficulties*. Abington, UK: David Fulton Publishers.
- Street, H., & Temperley, J. (2005). *Improving schools through collaborative enquiry*. London: the Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Tilstone, C., & Rose, R. (2003). *Strategies to promote inclusive practice*. Abington, UK: Routledge.
- Whitty, G. (2006). *Teacher professionalism in a new era*. Northern Ireland: General Teaching Council.