Building Inclusion from the Ground Up: A Review of Whole School Re-culturing Programmes for Sustaining Inclusive Change

Christopher McMaster
School of Educational Studies and Leadership
University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

Abstract:

This paper suggests that whole school re-culturing programmes can potentially assist in the creation of more inclusive value orientated schools. The relationship between school culture and successful inclusion has been demonstrated in the literature. Furthermore, the structure of whole school programmes in inculcating inclusive values and practices reflect evidenced based research for sustainability in professional learning and development. Research indicates that change is more sustained when teachers, with the support of school leaders, are given time to explore ideas and integrate them into their practice. This paper reviews whole school inclusive re-culturing programmes developed throughout the world that incorporate best evidence practice. It concludes with a recommendation that whole school re-culturing frameworks can be an effective way to build sustainable inclusive change within our schools.

Key words: inclusion, school culture, re-culturing, whole school, sustainable change

Introduction

The *Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action* claimed that "regular schools with inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes…building inclusive society and achieving education for all" (United Nations General Assembly, 1994, p. ix). The conference at Salamanca brought together over 300 participants representing 92 governments "to further the objective of Education for All by considering the fundamental policy shifts required to promote the approach of inclusive education, namely enabling schools to serve all children, particularly those with special educational needs" (United Nations General Assembly, 1994, preface). Education for All (EFA) encompassed the Millennium Development Goal of meeting the learning needs of all children by 2015 (Rouse, 2006; United Nations General Assembly, 1990). The conference at Salamanca was called as a response to the little attention paid to inclusion in the EFA document produced at Jomtein in 1990. Ainscow and Cesar call the document produced at Salamanca, "…arguably the most significant international document that has ever appeared in the field of special education" (2006, p. 231). The *Salamanca Framework* also stated that the development of inclusive schools should be a priority of national governments.

The link between the culture of a school and the successful implementation of inclusion is more strongly embedded in the consciousness of educational reformers. Schools are attempting to restructure their service provision and internal systems within the constraints imposed from outside. They are now in a better position to recognise aspects of our educational systems, national policies and societal values when they act as barriers to inclusive practices. The ground is fertile for what Thomas referred to as, "the implementation of planned programmes of inclusion" (Thomas, 1997, p. 106). Indeed, the opportunity presented today through whole school approaches towards inclusive change can be the means to build sustainable inclusive practices and values in schools. This paper will discuss the relationship between whole school culture and inclusion, and explore initial efforts at 'diagnosing' or measuring culture. These earlier efforts have been superseded by our thinking and our approaches to building inclusive schools. Reviewed below are frameworks that represent examples of those planned programmes for which Thomas called.

Sustainability is a central success factor in creating inclusive school cultures. The model of professional learning employed must be designed so that the learning that takes place over a period of time is reinforced through experience based reflection. Learning that involves developing theoretical knowledge as well as the skills to enquire into practice has been demonstrated as essential to sustaining that learning (Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, & Fung, 2007), and the framework of professional learning is most effective when it incorporates the exploration and acquisition of theoretical understanding (Franke, Carpenter, Fennema, Ansell, & Behrend, 1998). This theoretical base, "serves as a tool to make principled changes to practice, plus with the skills to inquire into the impact of their teaching" (Timperley, et al., 2007, p. 225). Research noted in the *Teacher Professional Learning and Development: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration,* a synthesis of evidence-informed policy and practice, has indicated that change is more sustained when teachers, with the support of school leaders, are given time to explore ideas and integrate them into their practice (Timperley, et al., 2007).

The developments of indicators (descriptive statements of inclusive aspirations) to review and assess the culture of a school and the recognition of the importance and involvement of the whole school community in the process of change has resulted in the creation of several models designed to restructure school cultures through reflective planning and formative action. Each tool or programme reflects the culture from which it was

produced and was created organically, that is, they developed locally with minimal cross fertilisation from other programmes. Each tool utilises an initial period of self review and reflection, during which a shared definition or vision is established. This is followed by prioritising areas for improvement or development and creating an action plan to address these priorities. Through such whole school re-culturing programmes, schools may have the means to achieve the goal of sustainable inclusive change.

This paper will look at examples from the US states of Michigan and Wisconsion (Whole Schooling), New Jersey and Maryland (*Quality Indicators for Inclusion*), as well as the Canadian provinces of Ontario and New Brunswick (*Indicators of Success*), which have been trialled in local school districts and have been embraced with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Also considered are the Minnesota *Together We're Better* project and the Ohio *Success for All Students.* Both of those programmes ran for the duration of their funding and, despite being well received, were not continued. Finally, the *Index for Inclusion,* first developed in the United Kingdom*,* will be discussed as will its varied use throughout the world.

Excluded from this review are programmes designed solely to increase the integration of students with special educational needs into the mainstream classroom and that lack a framework which empowers all students through ensuring their meaningful participation in the process. Such examples are the state wide systems change/least restrictive environment initiatives from the US states of Michigan, Utah, New York, Pennsylvania, and Kansas; along with the Louisiana state *Validated Practices Initiative*. An exception is the Californian initiated framework, *Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement Activities Tool* (hereafter LRE). This tool was created in response to changes in federal legislation (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA) which emphasised the placement of students with disabilities in the 'least restrictive environment'. LRE is the only school wide programme in this review not explicitly questioning or critically reviewing paradigmatic beliefs. Its focus is reflected in the language of its title—improving a special education model—and it is included here to offer a contrast to the thinking behind the other tools.

School culture and successful inclusion

Zollers, Ramanathan and Yu (1999) discovered a link between successful inclusion and school culture. The researchers noted that such practices were only one part of a *cultural context* that supported inclusive values. Writing at the same time, Corbett (1999) also drew a correlation between the cultural values of inclusion in a school's culture and the extent to which a programme of inclusion can be successful. "It is about creating an institutional culture," she writes, "which welcomes, supports and nurtures diverse needs" (p. 58). Corbett recognised that changing the culture of an institution may be a necessary step in making it more responsive to difference. Carrington (1999) echoed this when she argued that schools needed to reflect on their values and beliefs in order to create inclusive cultures. The implication is that to improve inclusive practice the *ethos*, or culture, of the school must be an important focus of reform efforts.

Ingredients for inclusion

Kugelmass (2006) presented evidence that a culture of inclusion was something deliberatively sought and worked on which included the creation of structures within the school that provided fertile ground to develop and strengthen a shared commitment and vision to inclusive principles. Presenting three case studies of inclusive schools in three separate countries (the United States, United Kingdom and Portugal), she noted distinct

features of each school that reflected an inclusive culture. These were outlined in her study as:

- An uncompromising commitment and belief in inclusion;
- differences among students and staff perceived as a resource;
- teaming and a collaborative interaction style among staff and children;
- willingness of staff to struggle to sustain practice;
- inclusion understood as a social/political issue; and
- a commitment to inclusive ideals communicated across the school and into the community (p. 286).

A model of culture

The means by which each school did the above reflected each school's individual nature; however, these structures were inherently collaborative. In the schools described by Kugelmass there was a conscious effort to create an inclusive culture, a supportive and collaborative atmosphere deliberately created to foster an exploration of deeply held values and beliefs. Schein has created a model, or theory, of organizational culture based on the work of Hall (1959; 1966, 1976; 1983) which consists of three layers that differ regarding their visibility within schools and their consciousness among staff and pupils (Maslowski, 2006). On the first level Schein lists artifacts and practices—those things that can be seen in the school environment. Level 2 consists of the values of the school community, or, 'a sense of what ought to be done.' Level 3 is composed of the underlying values and basic assumptions held by individuals (Schein, 1992). The level of culture reflects the degree of which cultural phenomena are visible. On a surface level, artifacts are considered to be what is seen, heard and felt. This includes physical objects, such as buildings and works of art, but also the visible and verbal displays of interaction—how individuals speak and relate with one another, the language they use and the processes of routine behavior. Schein describes this level as easy to see, yet hard to decipher (p. 17).

The problem of interpreting the meaning and context of these surface level artifacts is compounded if one does not have an understanding or experience of the culture's values and assumptions. Here the researcher or visitor must look beneath the surface to what are the "espoused values, norms and rules that provide the day-to-day operating principles by which members of the group guide their behavior" (Schein, 1992, p. 18). At this deeper level the process of 'cognitive transformation' is started. When the cultural group takes common action based on espoused values and assumptions (and observe the outcomes) they create a shared knowledge. When reinforced, this shared knowledge transforms into basic assumptions or given truths. It is at the deeper levels that what Antonio Gramsci refers to as 'common sense' prevail—unquestioned values—which can be transformed through critical reflection into 'good sense', or values based on experience and critical reflection (Gramsci & Rosengarten, 1994). An example, albeit extreme, from our collective past could be the common sense assumption that not only was the earth flat but that the sun revolved around it. Through the shared experience of exploration and discovery these assumptions were challenged and gradually replaced. As a result, new foundations were laid in the deeper levels of our cultural understanding, which then gradually manifested themselves as new cultural artifacts.

Cultural change as a conscious project

Kugelmass used this understanding to access the 'hidden dimensions' (Hall, 1983) to uncover the 'web of inter-connections' (Geertz, 1973) in each case study school culture. Through participant and non-participant observation, formal and informal interviewing she noted that:

> A deep appreciation for diversity in all aspects of life and an unconditional love of all children emerged as providing the foundation for sustaining the school's culture. Teachers were consistently attentive and responsive to the needs of one another, as well as their students; negative judgments were absent in their language and action. They both valued and demonstrated the kinds of caring relationships that reflected a deep capacity for compassion (p. 282).

As these values were shared, when the inclusive nature of the school was challenged (such as through legislation to standardise instruction or assessment) the school sought alliances within the local communities or with neighbouring schools, responding in a cohesive manner to sustain their inclusive cultures. The point to emphasise is that through consciously fostering an inclusive culture they were also equipped to defend it. Difficulty did not lead to giving up, to assigning inclusion as 'too hard', but rather led to a strengthening of networks within and around the school community.

Measuring school culture: early "diagnostic tools"

By the end of the last decade a linkage of effective leadership and school culture became more evident in the North American literature. How this commonly reflected itself was through the development of culture audits (Bustamante, 2009; Nelson, Bustamante, Wilson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2008; Onwuegbuzie, Nelson, & Bustamante, 2009; Sailes, 2008; Wagner, 2006). School leaders were encouraged to consider their school culture as the essential ingredient to responding to more culturally diverse communities and the movement towards inclusion. Sailes (2008) refers to culture as "an integral part" in school improvement (p. 74). The authors provide "culture triage" surveys (Sailes, 2008), "cultural observation" checklists (Onwuegbuzie, et al., 2009), or "culture audit" questionnaires (Bustamante, 2009; Wagner, 2006) which are of interest here in their similarities to the questionnaires developed as part of the *Index for Inclusion* (Booth & Ainscow, 2011) *Quality Indicators for Inclusion* (Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education, 2006*) Whole Schooling* (Peterson, 2004a) and the *Indicators for Success* (Community Living Ontario, 2005).

Auditing culture or measuring performance?

Wagner and Masden-Copas (2002) stress the utility of outside facilitators to implement a cultural audit, conducting observations and assisting with surveys, the value of which has been confirmed in the literature (Carrington & Robinson, 2006; Dharan, 2006; Smith, 2005). In the model provided by Wagner and Masden-Copas (Wagner, 2006; Wagner & Masden-Copas, 2002), the process concludes with facilitators presenting their written report as feedback to a school improvement team—providing a stark contrast to that of the *Index for Inclusion* and other frameworks reviewed—as the processes outlined in the above research do not fully involve the whole school community in a collective endeavour. Their simplified approach, the *School Culture Triage Survey,* is presented as a 'school leader's tool', to be distributed to teachers and administrators only. The survey consists of seventeen questions and is arranged in three categories: "professional collaboration", "affiliative collegiality", and "self-determination/efficacy". Each question is scored by a Likert scale ranging between 1 and 5. Scores are added for each questionnaire which thereby demonstrate that a school culture is "critical" and immediate attention is necessary, "modifications and improvements" are necessary, "monitor and maintain" with positive adjustments, or "amazing!" as no school has ever scored in this range (Wagner, 2006, p. 41-42). School leaders are encouraged to share the results with their staff teams, identify one or two areas for improvement, and to re-administer the survey several months later.

Wagner and Masden-Copas recognise that "getting the culture right should always precede 'programs'" and that "schools sensitive to their cultures are successful in improving student learning" (2002, p. 42). In cases where the school culture may need more "intensive care" (e.g. scoring low on the survey) a team of two facilitators can enter the school and guide the school community through the process. This team of facilitators would conduct interviews with a wide range of community members (such as teachers, parents, administrators), conduct observations of the school culture guided by twelve observation prompts, survey using the questionnaire, evaluate their findings and present these to the school community. Facilitators are encouraged to "take care to highlight school culture strengths" and "conclude with four or five recommendations for improvements" (p. 53).

Sailes (2008) has suggested a more rigorous auditing approach that combines qualitative and quantitative methods. School leaders are encouraged to consider the school culture and how it relates to diversity. This Sailes refers to as "cultural competency":

> A culturally competent school effectively responds to the needs of its students representing various cultures by honouring, respecting, valuing and preserving the dignity of cultural differences in theory and in practice where teaching and learning are made relevant and meaningful for all students (p. 75).

A detailed audit of the school culture would provide the school leader with the information necessary to improve accessibility, policies and procedures, community involvement, and student achievement. Such an audit would include an examination of school documents, surveys, observations and conducting interviews or focus groups. Such a process would ideally lead to dialogue around strengths and weaknesses as well as improvement plans.

A tool for management

The notion of "culture competency" led Bustamante (2009) to design a "culture audit" for use as a "leadership tool for assessment and strategic planning" (p. 1). She offers ten potential domains (or indicators) to guide school leaders through auditing their school's culture. Auditing methods similarly involves document analysis, statistical analysis of school demographic and achievement data, diagramming of group interactions, as well as interviews and surveys. The School-wide Cultural Competence Observation Checklist, or SCCOC (Bustamante & Nelson, 2007), offers thirty-six questions complete with Likert scale of 1 to 5 for answers. While acknowledging that school leaders have an ethical and moral obligation to help create a 'cultural competent' school, it is also noted that the school counsellor may be ideally placed to explore and audit the health of the school culture (Nelson, et al., 2008).

In these 'culture audits', the depth of cultural understanding exhibited by Kugelmass is absent, as are any critical analyses of the ideological paradigms underpinning value systems. The roots of such audits can be traced to earlier efforts to *quantify* culture. Maslowski (2006) reviewed six quantitative tools for 'diagnosing' school organisational culture. The tools reviewed by Maslowski were developed to measure the depth of a school culture—the basic assumptions, values, norms and cultural artefacts shared by staff members (p. 10). The common feature in each survey is that it provides a numerical analysis of shared or divergent aspects of a culture for school administrators to calculate into their school development plans. While recognising culture as multileveled and involving the seen and the unseen, the 'diagnostic tools' reviewed by Maslowski reflect a concern with organisation culture as opposed to equity or diversity concerns seen in later 'cultural competency' audits. Each tool placed an emphasis on reliability and attempted to establish a *norm* from which to measure.

The most recent of the surveys reviewed by Maslowski dates from 1997 which was a time that reflected stronger beliefs in a medical paradigm—culture is to be 'diagnosed' by a specialist tool, it is deemed 'healthy' or 'sick', those included in the survey (and by implication deemed of more importance) are staff; community participation and student voice are conspicuously absent. Gibson (2006) sees the exercise of voice as an integral component of meaningful inclusion. Failing to give voice to disabled or other minoritised groups is indicative of an exclusionary barrier that separates and designates some as "others" and "illustrates the nature of social control mechanisms at work in social institutions" (p. 319). The language used by the authors of the above culture-measuring mechanisms not only reflects a deficit discourse, but the lack of participation, or 'voice', of different groups in the school community thus reinforces a 'culture of silence.' Here Gibson employs a Freirian term to highlight how an official policy promoting 'inclusive education' is in reality revealed as 'exclusive education.' "In a culture of silence," writes Freire, "the masses are mute, that is, they are prohibited from creatively taking part in the transformations of their society and therefore prohibited from being" (Gibson, 2006, quoting Freire, 1985, p. 320).

International whole school programmes and projects

What was missing in the various mechanisms for measuring school culture or inclusion was the transformational activity which could bring members of the school community together in a shared activity to build on newer ideals and values. Through the process of 'moving' together, the inclusive values could be validated and reinforced in the consciousness of community members. These community members represent all the stakeholders in the school—staff, students, parents, volunteers, administrators, indeed, all those who play a part in the life of the school. In the whole school development programmes reviewed below, there is an inbuilt process not only of review, but of collective reflection, collective planning, and joint action. These processes have been identified in the *Teacher Professional Learning and Development: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration* (hereafter BES), (Timperley, et al., 2007) for achieving sustainability in professional learning and development. A framework for shared action, and review and reflection of that action, is provided. Returning to Schein's cultural model, through the exploration of inclusive values the school community is able to question older assumptions. Through shared action, the process can become one of transforming those older assumptions into new values and assumptions of an inclusive nature. The principle is that through praxis inclusive education is strengthened.

Quality Indicators for Inclusion

The *Quality Indicators for Effective Inclusive Education Guidebook (2010)* was developed by the New Jersey Council on Developmental Disabilities and the New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education. The *Quality Indicators* were designed to be used as part of a reflective process similar to the *Index for Inclusion* (reflect—plan—implement) and can been seen as an organic development of a mechanism for cultural transformation. While similar in many respects to the *Index for Inclusion* (discussed below), the *Quality Indicators* were developed without an awareness of the work of Booth and Ainscow (Orah Raia: personal communication, 30 April, 2012). The *Quality Indicators of Inclusive Schools,* produced by the Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (2006) to help direct inclusive development, were incorporated into the New Jersey whole school approach.

Five school districts in New Jersey expressed willingness to trial the *Quality Indicators* as part of a one year pilot study. A manual was produced following the pilot study as a resource for schools in the state. The manual was designed for use at school district or

school building levels to: “assess the current state of inclusive practices; identify areas of pragmatic strength as well as areas in which further development is needed; and generate a strategic school improvement plan for inclusive education” (New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education & New Jersery Coucil on Developmental Disabilities, 2010, p. 2). It was designed to be a catalyst for change through self-assessment and self-reflection, and bridged the use of auditing indicators and whole school involvement in change.

Indicators in the *Quality Indicators* act as aspiration statements and are followed by brief examples. *Quality Indicators* provides eleven ‘Areas of Practice’ for school community members to review the practice of their school. For example, under Area of Practice 2, School Climate, indicator 1 states: “The school environment is one that celebrates diversity and staff members work to create an atmosphere where human differences are understood and appreciated.” This aspiration statement is followed by several examples of what that might look like in practice, such as “Adults in the school consciously and consistently model respect for differences in their words and actions,” and “students are encouraged not to exclude children from recess activities, the lunch table, etc.” Following these examples, a Likert type scale asks whether school practice reflects the aspiration “fully”, “substantially”, “partially” or “not yet.” While looking somewhat like a measuring device—the manual states that the *Quality Indicators* can be used as “a rating scale with which districts/schools can assess their current status implementing inclusive education practices” (p.1)—the guidebook for the *Quality Indicators* stresses that they are designed to be a “technical assistance tool” and not a monitoring device (p. 3). The intention of the Quality Indicators is to be used as:

- An educational opportunity to learn about key indicators needed to have and inclusive culture and the factors that contribute to them;
- A qualitative self-assessment of a school staff’s attitudes, practices, policies and procedures around inclusion;
- A reflective process to examine and challenge underlying assumptions, beliefs and values that influence behaviour;
- A resource in action planning toward school improvement plans (p. 3).

After the initial pilot study the funding that enabled the New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education to create the Guidebook and manual ended. As a result the Coalition did not have funding to follow up the initial use and as of 2010 have no knowledge of further use of the *Quality Indicators* in that state. Although the resource is offered freely on the Coalition website, President and CEO Paula Lieb expressed frustration that schools in New Jersey were so focused on the implementation of federally mandated practices in connection with Response to Intervention; initiatives in connection with implementing the Common Core and new teacher evaluation procedures in connection with Race to the Top requirements, that they are overwhelmed and not so focused on implementing “inclusion” as a separate focus (personal communication, November 29, 2012).

The Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education (MCIE) has, however, taken their initial work forward. MCIE staff use the *Quality Indicators* to work with school or site based leadership teams to facilitate group processes to, “look at student data, gain teacher input, listen to administrative and community concerns, and be a ‘critical friend’ to improve instruction for everyone in the school building” (Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education, 2012). MCIE have used these indicators as a means of assessing the professional development and systems change needs of schools. When working with a school for a multi-year period, work is primarily with a school-based leadership team to identify the extent to which the indicators are being implemented, and usually have support from the full faculty in implementation. *Quality Indicators* give a place to start planning change and school based

training. The *Quality Indicators* have been utilised to look at change over time, but this has only been anecdotal.

MCIE have also developed *Quality Indicators for Inclusive Building Based Practices* aimed at school leaders and staff team "to assist school teams in determining if their school buildings are inclusive and meeting the needs of their diverse learners. The instrument was developed to reflect evidence-based inclusive practices and is intended to be conducted through a team process, as a self-assessment" (Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education, 2011, p. 1). This streamlined process consists of 25 indicators grouped in four areas: Administrative Support for Inclusive Practices; Collaborative Planning and Teaching Structures; Individual Student Supports; and Individual Education Plan Development. Reviewers are asked to mark each item as either 'initiating', 'developing', or 'sustaining' and to note in 'comments' any action to prioritise. The decision to dispense with the Likert scale scoring rubric in favour of these three choices is similarly reflected in the *Quality Indicators of Inclusive Schools* produced by MCIE (Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education, 2006).

The *Quality Indicators for Building Based Practices* was partially influenced by the Californian *Least Restrictive Environment Self Assessment and Continuous Improvement Activities Tool*. There is no place in this building based review process for student or parental voice. However, another influence into its development was the work of the University of New Hampshire. The Institute on Disability at that university produced the 2009 document, *Essential Best Practices in Inclusive Schools*, originally published in 2002 (Jorgensen, McSheehan, & Sonnenmeier, 2009). *Essential Best Practices* was developed as part of the United States Department of Education funded project *Beyond Access*. *Essential Best Practices*

> reflects what have usually been associated with autism, intellectual disability, multiple disabilities and deaf-blindness. Most of the practices are applicable, however, to *all* students with and without disabilities, because they are based on principles of universal design for instruction and learning (p. 4).

Universal design for learning involves attempting to create a curriculum and learning environment that "allows the student to control the method of accessing information" (Kraayenoord, 2007, p. 392).

Essential Best Practices is designed for use by families, students, staff teams, school boards, or individual practitioners in a variety of ways. Some examples include:

- Students might use the document as a springboard for discussion in a youth group dedicated to eradicating racism and other forms of social injustice in their school.

- A parent might share the document with his child's educational team to discuss programme strengths and those that need improvement.

- A teacher might organise a reflective practice study group to read the document and some of the supporting literature listed in the reference section and then to support one another to design and evaluate lessons that are inclusive of diverse learners (Jorgensen, et al., 2009, p. 4).

It offers twelve statements of best practice and 109 indicators as prompts for reflection and discussion, similar to the indicators and questions found in the *Index for Inclusion* developed in the United Kingdom. A matrix is provided at the end of the document, however, this is not provided as a scoring rubric, but simply as an action planning tool.

Whole Schooling

Similarly, the work of the Whole School Consortium and Wayne State University College of Education in Michigan directed their effort at inclusive developments to the whole school (Peterson, 2007). Principles of Whole Schooling include: empowering citizens in a democracy; including all; authentic, multi-level teaching; building community; supporting learning; and partnering. Whole Schooling is outlined as a whole school project beginning with indicator/questionnaire guided self-assessment and discussion, followed by creating a shared school vision, planning, implementing and reflecting on the process. The person centred planning work of Forest and Pearpoint (1992) have been incorporated into the school re-culturing process to help ensure a shared vision and a voice for diverse members of the school community.

As part of the development of Whole Schooling a three year longitudinal pilot study was conducted in two US states between 1999 and 2002. This study focused on seven schools in Michigan and eight schools in Wisconsin that were selected for exhibiting what was considered 'exemplary' inclusive practice. The primary research focus was to analyse the extent that the authors' five principles (this has been increased to six in later revisions) of Whole Schooling were reflected in the cultures of those subject schools. In the school selection process fifty schools were visited, during which researchers reported the disturbing finding that the browner the school, the less inclusive (or more segregated) the school would be. "It has been most difficult to identify schools with significant numbers of children of colo[u]r who have any close approximation of Whole Schooling practices" (Whole Schooling Coalition, 2002, p. III-3). This important social factor was not pursued by the authors at that time. It was their American colleagues Artiles and Kozleski who asserted that:

> Future inclusive education work must not focus on access and participation in general education for students with disabilities, but rather on access, participation, and outcomes for students who have endured marginalisation due to ethnic identity and ability level in educational systems fraught with inequitable structural and social conditions (2007, p. 359).

However, researchers did note that schools whose inclusion efforts were motivated by social justice concerns tended to be more successful and resilient. As the three year project

progressed, Michigan researchers were increasingly asked by their subject schools to actively assist in developing more inclusive school culture and their methodology shifted to one of participant action research. The Whole Schooling principles then evolved into a whole school programme for school improvement.

The research sought to evaluate the depth of Whole Schooling principles in the cultures of 'inclusive schools'. However, overlooked in their initial research was the extent to which those principles could be exemplified because of the cultural and systemic limitations imposed on a school, and this is a factor all whole school programmes must confront. How far could principles such as *empowering for democracy* be pursued in the Michigan and American context where there is a widely held acceptance of the legitimacy of hierarchy in management structures? Kugelmass (2006) describes a situation in Portugal where collaborative leadership is so embedded in the administrative structure that school principals are elected by staff (and in secondary settings staff and student representatives) every three years. The degree of decision making afforded students and staff, in the management of the school, in the shaping of curriculum, and in the pedagogical practices employed is held within the larger legal framework and cultural values of the state and society. *How* democracy is defined can be equally constrained. Inclusion in schools is an important area where values of social justice in school settings converge with values of social justice in the work place, as the school is both educational establishment and place of employment. The implication contained in the principle, *empowering for democracy*, is that it is not a principle limited to schools, but rather a principle to be applied to the economic and also the political sphere. This relates to how teachers were able to work within their respective systems to how practices of inclusion can be sustained. It also relates to how far teachers or school communities will go to question and challenge those systems.

Writing shortly after the pilot study Peterson (2004b) acknowledged worrying trends in society, such as the growth of narrow and rigid teaching methods; the standardisation of curriculum and assessment; the prevalence of segregation, by class and ethnicity as well as ability; and the presence of autocratic or top down administrative practices. Whole schooling represented a framework to challenge these trends and create alliances beyond national borders:

> We are, however, the makers of our social world. Collaboration which brings people together under a joined vision of caring, inclusive, democratic community has power. Creativity, which will allow us to use our resources and energy, holds great promise (p. 5).

Whole schooling began as a rough framework but has, as have similar whole school approaches, continued to refine itself in response to experience.

California Least Restrictive Environment Tool

In contrast to the focus on values or principles, the California Department of Education produced the *California Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Self Assessment and Continuous Improvement Activities Tool (2000)*. This tool utilises indicators, allows for rating performance, and encourages improvement activities/action planning. It was developed in conjunction with a test development business, WestEd, and results of the assessment are quantified to also be used by the state to measure its 'progress' towards Department of Education targets. A validation exercise carried out by researchers from Griffith University in Australia (discussed here as an example of LRE use outside the United States) exemplifies the nature and focus of this whole school tool. Assessment was carried out by a select team and 'nominated' persons from the school community. This team reviewed aspects of school

practices, rated them on a Likert scale, and then created action plans for selected areas of need (Davies, Bryer, Beamish, & Rawlins, 2005). LRE is illustrative here as an example of a whole school programme that does not encourage a school community wide reflection of values or how those values are reflected in practice.

In California, the *Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) Self Assessment and Continuous Improvement Activities Tool* is facilitated by WestEd employees during a three day 'institute'. During these three days, for which between ten and twenty school teams attend, a school or other educational institution pay $1200US each. The self assessment tool is completed and the facilitators provide analysis and strategies to administrators and teachers. 'Collaboration' in the process is defined narrowly; it does not include students, parents or other school staff. Participants of these 'institutes' receive a two volume Inclusive Education Starter Kit that, according to the West Ed official website, addresses "all students with disabilities" and that quotes research reassuring that "*even* students with severe disabilities achieve important positive learning and social outcomes in inclusive settings" (WestEd, 2012, emphasis added).

WestEd's annual revenue in 2011 was US$126 million. It operates as a tax-exempt non-profit organisation with over 600 employees. It exists as a form of public-private partnership, in that it carries out much of its work through state grants. The description under Californian law is a *Joint Powers Agency*, which provides for the creation of an agency to work with multiple governmental bodies (California Code Section 6500-6536, 2012). *Least restrictive Environment Tools* are available at the state, district and school site levels. The impetus behind the development of the review tools, as other WestEd products, is to assist with compliance to state and federal laws. The rationale for inclusion, as outlines in the Inclusive Education Starter Kit is *federal law* and *state law* (California Department of Education & WestEd, 2005). Inclusion is simply defined as 'membership' in the general education classroom.

Absent in the review process were the voices of students, and the review process did not look at aspects of school culture. As a tool, its design was to look at special education practice. There is no evidence of querying values or beliefs behind their practices; critical self reflection is absent. An example of this from the Australian school which trialled this tool is the planned action to increase the role of the student council in mentoring or coaching students with diverse needs. This was seen as increasing inclusion rather than possibly reinforcing images of students as dependent and in need of benevolent support. "Least restrictive environment" in the context of the United States refers to degrees of integration, and the extent of a child's presence in mainstream setting is decided by an Individual Education Team based on 'appropriateness'. Researchers from Griffith University concluded that the California tool could be a valuable resource to promote inclusion, however, there is no evidence of other Australian schools utilising it.

Together We're Better

The US state of Minnesota linked improving inclusion to sustaining systematic change in the whole school in a manner that began with critically reflecting on values and beliefs. The 1992-1997 *Together We're Better* project used holistic language to guide their project:

> imagine schools where all children have equal opportunity to succeed, where every contribution is used by the community to enhance the educational experience for all, and where all members of the school feel accepted, valued, secure, and useful (Walz et al., 2000, p. 6).

Together We're Better could more accurately be described as a tactic or strategy for change, however, the overall framework resembles that of more structured programmes. The process is designed to include as wide a section of the school community as possible. The first activity these groups participate in is the collective exploration of definitions of words such as 'inclusion.' Participants are encouraged to critically reflect on their own values and actively seek other interpretations through focus group discussion, research, and visiting other schools. This period of reflection lays the groundwork for a shared vision and shared values.

During this process participants were encouraged to develop their own indicators of an inclusive school. These indicators were created during a collective examination of the school culture and environment. Equipped with these indicators teams would identify areas of what the developers call 'dissatisfaction', or aspects of school culture identified as needing improvement. Dissatisfaction was the term chosen to represent an honest examination of expectations and needs that were not being met. Looking at the school culture using a variety of means, from surveys to anecdotal observations was seen as an important way to create the energy necessary to sustain change and overcome the expected resistance to change. The desire to improve, shared by a school taking part in such an endeavour, was similarly recognised as a factor which generated the energy needed for change to take place.

First Steps in the process involved planning and implementing change in those areas. Some of the planning strategies used in this process included PATH (Planning Alternative Tomorrows with Hope) (Pearpoint, O'Brien, & Forest, 1993) and MAPS (McGill Action Planning Systems) for organisations (Vandercock, York, & Forest, 1989). Both of these tools encouraged developing a shared vision of what the desired outcomes or future looks like. The developers of *Together We're Better* recognised the difficulties and dangers in changing deeply held beliefs, illustrated by their formula DxVxF>R, or dissatisfaction times vision times first steps must be greater than resistance to change (Walz, et al., 2000). Their design reflected the understanding of cultural change described by Schein (1992) when they observed: "When people work together toward a common goal, energy will increase and change can occur" (p. 19). The action that followed the creation of a shared vision was noted as yet another vital way to sustain the energy for change to overcome resistance.

The *Together We're Better* systems change project expired with the federally funded grant that supported it in 1997. It represented one part of a multifaceted project designed "to assist in the development of an inclusive, positive, supportive educational system in Minnesota schools"(Colon, Walz, & Vandercook, 1994, p. 9). It sought to bring together students, teachers, families, tertiary institutions and the Department of Education to build a more inclusive education system. A qualitative evaluative report published by the Institute of Community Integration (Thurlow et al., 1999) found that there was an increased acceptance to change as the project unfurled and a gradual expansion of the project to include the wider community, family participation in the life of the schools increased, and increased collaboration.

Success for all Students

In the US state of Ohio, the Ohio Developmental Disabilities Council secured a six year federal grant for the *Success for All Students* (SFAS) project. The project ran from 1998 to 2004 and included twenty-six schools representing a mix of urban, rural and suburban locations, as well as elementary, middle and high school levels. The stated aim of the project was to change the culture of school communities, "where every child is valued and recognised for the gifts and talents he brings; where every child is expected to learn and where every child is welcome" (Ohio Developmental Disabilities Council, 2004, p. 5). *Success for All Students* used grant funding for advocates to work with schools while they

followed the programme. Funding was also utilised for professional development and networking activities between the school.

During the *SFAS* process a rubric was utilised for self-assessment and reflection, and collaborative planning was fostered to implement action plans. This rubric consisted of seven indicators to measure inclusive practices. Participant reflections indicated increased confidence, development of a shared vision, improvements in pedagogic practices, more flexible service provision, and school community members feeling more empowered. The exercise of reflecting on deeply held beliefs was seen as the catalyst behind changed attitudes and practices, and the shared nature of the process was reflected in increased confidence about affecting change. *Success for All Students* was seen as giving schools the opportunity to build capacity (p.21). Barriers to inclusion identified in the project were standardised assessments and accountability, segregated schooling and service provision for students with special educational needs propagating continued lack of awareness of inclusion, and the seeming intractability of some underlying beliefs and assumptions.

Success for All Students followed *The Education Systems Change Project* managed by the University of Dayton, Ohio. This project provided mini grants to individual schools to assist in implementing inclusive practices. The funding for *Success for All Students* was not given directly to participating schools; instead, the monies were used to hire consultants to work individually with selected schools, acting as change or inclusion facilitators. This decision was based on the hope of sustainability of the project once funding ceased: "In order to sustain change after the completion of grant activities, inclusive practices had to become part of each school's culture" (Ohio Developmental Disabilities Council, 2004, p. 7). Ironically, the funding that enabled the SFAS project to provide such valued facilitators also created a deal of disempowerment through the dependency on grant resources. This contributed heavily to the lack of sustainability in this project and offers a lesson to whole school approaches. Very little has subsequently been done with the knowledge gained through the project (Kay Treanor, ODDC: personal communication, 18 May, 2012).

Indicators of Success

A Canadian example of a whole school approach, *An Inclusive School Culture - Indicators of Success* was developed organically by Community Living Ontario (2005) and brings together the concepts of inclusion and social justice. The *Building Inclusive Schools Project* in the province of Ontario recognised several essential features that are consistent in the literature of Europe and Oceania, notably:

- the importance of a shared vision;
- the role of committed school leadership;
- collaboration within the school and wider community;
- inclusion as an issue of social justice that is much wider than a disability issue;
- the importance of individualised learning approaches; and
- the importance of student voice.

The *Indicators of Success* have been brought into 132 schools in Ontario. The result of that exercise was to develop an Action Plan that was then required to be inserted into the individual School Improvement Plans (these are an annual requirement for all schools in Ontario). The *Indicators of Success* has been adapted to other Canadian provinces, such as New Brunswick. There the programme, *Creating an Inclusive School: Indicators of Success* (New Brunswick Association for Community Living, 2011) shows cross fertilisation between provinces (it was introduced by Community Living Ontario through information sessions held in 2008) and integration with the work of Tony Booth and Mel Ainscow. The aims of the *Indicators of Success* are to give schools an opportunity to:

- Stimulate dialogue about the value of inclusion and inclusive education;
- Celebrate current successes and identify ways to improve inclusion;
- Ensure that they are meeting obligations under education and human rights laws; and
- Uncover attitudes, actions, policies and practices that may be a barrier to inclusion and develop a realistic plan to address them (2011, p. 4).

It also, unlike in examples from the United States, embraces United Nations conventions, such as the *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*. Inclusion is seen in New Brunswick as a whole school responsibility:

> An inclusive school requires a shift in the attitudes of all the stakeholders as well as the development and use of policies and practices that reinforce inclusive behaviour. Real inclusion is about actions, not just words…An inclusive school is based on the philosophy that the whole school shares in the responsibility for inclusion. A real culture of inclusion cannot be brought about unless everyone embraces it (p. 6).

Also like the *Index for Inclusion* and Whole Schooling, *Indicators of Success* sees the development of inclusive schools as a foundation for ensuring an inclusive society.

Indicators of Success is built around nine key characteristics or indicators that are believed to constitute an inclusive school culture. These characteristics are seen as equally important in that one factor on its own cannot in isolation bring about an inclusive school. The key characteristics are thus portrayed as cogs or spokes in a wheel. Each key characteristic is explored through indicators that encourage self reflection. Here the New Brunswick Association for Community Living adapted the indicators from the Ontario Association for Community Living by increasing the number of key characteristics from seven to nine and rewording those characteristics and indicators to reflect their own values and beliefs of inclusion. Reflection is encouraged through questionnaires. In the Ontario edition these are tailored to specific groups in the school (administrators, educators, parents, secondary students, primary students and support staff). However, in New Brunswick the questionnaires have been designed for the use of school leadership and staff and do not include parent or child friendly versions.

The *Indicators of Success* is thought of as a catalyst to change for as wide an audience as possible. “It is important to recognise that an inclusive school cannot be brought about by any one individual, no matter how passionate and committed they are to inclusion,” the New Brunswick Guidebook states,

> [a]n inclusive school flourishes because a group of stakeholders share a vision and are prepared to make inclusion a critical component of a successful school...An inclusive school is based on the philosophy that the whole school shares in the responsibility for inclusion. A real culture of inclusion cannot be brought about unless everyone embraces it (2011, p. 4-5).

The process outlined the *Indicators of Success* (both the Ontario and New Brunswick editions) is designed to be cyclical and take place over a sufficient period time to allow for values to be explored, continuing dialogue and actions plans to be created and carried out.

The Index for Inclusion

The *Index for Inclusion* was designed as a process consisting of three dimensions: producing inclusive policies, evolving inclusive practices and creating inclusive cultures (Booth & Ainscow, 2011, p. 13). The *Index for Inclusion* was designed to be used by

individual schools. Initial activities in the *Index* process involve reviewing the existing school culture through questions and indicators. The latest (2011) edition contains optional questionnaires for staff, parents/caregivers and children, and schools are encouraged to adapt these review aids to suit their particular location and community. Analysing the results of this process, schools can identify and prioritise areas of concern (e.g. barriers), areas of strength, and areas to act on. Action plans are developed, followed through, and reviewed for further development. The framework provided by the *Index for Inclusion* is designed to take place throughout a school year, and incorporates the exploration of values and the examination of the theories on which practice and assumptions are based. The sequence encouraged through the *Index for Inclusion* can be likened to a spiral: review, produce a plan, take action, and review the subsequent development.

The indicators in the *Index for Inclusion* are suggested aspirations for development. For example, in Dimension A: Creating inclusive cultures, and the indicator: Building community there is the aspiration statement: The school is a model of democratic citizenship. This aspiration statement is followed by twelve questions to explore, as well as providing space for a school to add their own questions. Does everyone learn to get on well and to be good citizens by being at school? Do all staff welcome the active participation of children and adults in the school? Does the school have public forums where the adults and children regularly share their ideas? These are some of those questions designed to encourage reflection and critical thought. Questionnaires are included in the *Index* as initial prompts in this process of reflection and are tailored for school personnel, parents, secondary as well as primary students. Each questionnaire, as well as indicators and questions, can be adapted by each school to reflect their particular situation.

The *Index* process is designed to be a planning cycle of five phases: "getting started" (initiating the process in the school); "finding out together" (reviewing the school culture); "producing a plan" (creating action plans around prioritised areas); "taking action" (implementing the plan); and "reviewing development" (which also feeds into further reflection and planning). Through reviewing the setting using the indicators and questions school community members can collectively establish inclusive values, integrate existing initiatives or interventions taking place in the school, and start removing barriers, mobilise resources and rethink support systems. Through the reflection and action of collaborating adults and children inclusive development will become an integral part of the school.

There are over 2000 questions in the Index which guide the whole school review. These are organised according to three dimensions: Creating Inclusive Cultures, Producing Inclusive Policies, and Evolving Inclusive practices. These dimensions are divided into six indicators. Each indicator has within it between nine and fourteen statements which elaborate the domain further. Indicators are linked to the questions: behind each question there are values and ways of being. The third dimension, that of inclusive practices, focuses primarily on the curricular implications of inclusive practices. Some of the questions posed by the authors of the *Index* include: What would an inclusive curricula look like? What is currently taught in schools and why? What would an appropriate curriculum for the 21st century look like? They maintain that, "if values are about how we live together, then curricula are about what we might learn in order to live well" (2011, p. 34).

In the third edition of the *Index for Inclusion* special consideration has been placed on values that underpin inclusion. "Values are fundamental guides and prompts to action," write Booth and Ainscow.

> They spur us forward, give us direction and define a destination. We cannot know that we are doing, or have done, the right thing without understanding the relationship between our actions and our values...Inclusion is most

> importantly seen as putting inclusive values into action. It is a commitment to particular values which accounts for a wish to overcome exclusion and promote participation (p. 21).

The *Index* lists fifteen values underpinning inclusion that are explored and considered by the *Index* developers to be necessary for inclusive development. Like most of the *Index for Inclusion*, the words offered are done so in a spirit of exploration and not as final truth (p. 21). Values presented include equality, rights, participation, community, respect for diversity, sustainability, non-violence, trust, compassion, honesty, courage, joy, love, hope/optimism, and beauty. While asking participants to explore their definitions of these words, the authors of the *Index* also ask what their school or classroom would look like were one of those missing. What would a school without *respect* be like? Or a classroom without *joy*? Can there be education without *hope*?

The *Index for Inclusion* has been a feature of English schools for over a decade, with the government providing copies to all primary, secondary, special schools and local education authorities. The second edition of the *Index* has been given to all Welsh schools in the English or Welsh language. The *Index for Inclusion* has been used in over 30 countries around the world and translated into thirty-seven languages as school communities try to clarify the meaning of inclusion and build inclusive school cultures and practices (Booth & Ainscow, 2011). The *Index* has been used in Denmark to help with reforms in decentralising special education and work through pedagogic or paradigmatic dilemmas (Baltzer & Tetler, 2006). It has been adapted for early childcare settings and employed by UNESCO in developing countries. Save the Children has used the *Index* as a tool in several programmes, such as in Morocco and Serbia, to foster self-review of culture, policies and practices, utilising the 'critical friend' to facilitate change (Save the Children, 2008). In Morocco the *Index* process helped community members work to improve their schools as a community resource and take notice of disabled children not attending. Changing negative attitudes among teachers and children was a priority. In Serbia, using the *Index* encouraged one school to develop flexibility in their practice to extend education to the Roma children in their locale.

Some other examples of the *Index* in use include Kyrgyzstan, who inherited a legacy of institutionalisation from the Soviet era, and was faced with the task of rebuilding their educational system, notably in changing teacher attitudes and the delivery of new skills for educators. Early work as part of a USAID-funded project allowed Save the Children to work with cluster schools throughout the country, adapting the *Index for Inclusion* as a key tool (Djumagulova, 2006; Save the Children, 2008). The *Index* was used with schools in the Western Cape Province of South Africa in a two year project funded by UNESCO. There participants contextualised the *Index* to conditions in that country and noted the value of an ongoing process of reflection, development and collaboration (Englebrecht, Oswald, & Forlin, 2006). Research as part of the Four Nation Project involving research teams from Brazil, India and South Africa reviewed the *Index for Inclusion* as a tool and found that the concepts, review framework, questions and indicators were adaptable and useful for the development of inclusive programmes in their countries. The fourth nation in the project was England (Booth & Black-Hawkins, 2001).

Through participatory research in Tanzania, Polat (2011) sought to explore and develop a means to facilitate whole school planning for inclusion that reflected the cultural and economic realities of a country in the southern hemisphere. The project was inspired by the *Index for Inclusion*, though rather than adapt or translate the *Index*, the researchers worked as facilitators and critical friends to, "develop ways in which participating schools could include all learners in their community and improve their quality of education, thereby

impacting learner outcomes" (p. 54) in the specific context of a developing country. The decision, or need, to create their own index is emphasized in barriers to full participation which schools in the northern hemisphere have trouble imagining, such as: infrastructure and resource limitations, large class sizes (80 plus), lack of qualified staff, limited pit latrines, teenage pregnancies, diseases (HIV/AIDS, cholera, and malaria), and distances to travel to school. The process used in the project reflected that of the *Index for Inclusion*, and *Index* like examples from North America: review of current situation—identify barriers and identify needs—plan for action and initiate plan—followed by a review of outcomes, reassessment of situation, and further planning and acting. School coordinating teams in Tanzania placed infrastructure needs highest on the list of priorities. The research project is still ongoing and how far inclusive school policies, cultures and practices will change remains to be seen.

The *Index for Inclusion* is currently being rolled out in the English county of Norfolk (Carter, 2012). After an initial pilot project involving 35 schools the Local Education Authority (LEA) has decided to implement the *Index* to all 450 schools in the authority over a two year period. Eighteen schools will host an 'Index Forum' every six to eight weeks inviting the 25 to 30 schools in their locale. These forums will be used to explore the tool, monitor engagement with the project and explore emerging themes:

> this project offers schools in Norfolk access to a forum of professional reflection and focused discussion about self directed school improvement, using the shared language of the revised index for inclusion. In so doing, it is an aspiration that the culture of dialogue and collaborative peer evaluation around school improvement issues, will be nurtured promoting longer term sustainability of this approach (p. 10).

Additional forums will pilot the Early Years version of the Index across 30 early years settings and pilot the application of the *Index* in a Further Education context. *Index* co-author Tony Booth will act as special advisor to the project. The Norfolk LEA has set aside £230,000 for the research project, which translate to less than £500 per participating school, a minimal amount that will help ensure that schools' efforts do not become dependent on funding. Intended outcomes of the project include sustainable professional development, meaningful participation of staff, students, families and Governors based on shared vision, and a culture of action research within Norfolk schools and settings "where practitioners have an opportunity to participate in 'action research' as they pursue their own improvement tasks" (p. 10).

Conclusion

Inclusion has proven hard to define, and as Slee and Allen (2001) have pointed out, there is an inherent danger in that. However, this lack of clarity or common model of what it is or what it looks like can also be seen as a strength. By the open nature of the term we can continue to explore its deeper meanings and values, deconstructing our ways of thinking. In this sense the term inclusion is more like a spectrum than a measurable goal. We have already moved largely away from concepts such as 'normalisation'—to simply be in is not enough—to a wider interpretation which includes anyone in our schools or communities who face barriers to their full and meaningful participation.

There once was a time in our not too distant past that separate and isolated residential institutions were seen as an acceptable way to 'educate' members of our community with physical or intellectual impairments. This is no longer the case as our societal values and ideas of social justice have 'moved along the spectrum'. This is the critical element that acts as a wedge which gradually widens our perceptions and alters our old way of thinking. By

not having one overarching and concise definition we collaboratively work it out, and the values behind inclusion become more shared.

Whole school re-culturing programmes such as the *Index for Inclusion,* Whole Schooling, *Quality Indicators for Inclusion* and *Indicators of Success* offer a framework through which school communities can move towards the aspirations of inclusion. The strengths of the school wide programmes reviewed are their collaborative nature, involving all members of the school community, and the praxis of reflection, planning, acting, and reviewing outcomes to begin another cycle of exploring the nature, definition and practice of inclusion.

In attempting to 'audit' or 'measure' culture mechanisms have been produced that quantify inclusive 'practices'. These devices, whilst possibly expedient in the eyes of management, serve more to limit the definition of inclusion. Inclusion, in the scope of an audit, is reduced in such a way that it becomes not just measureable, but manageable. The *practice* of inclusion is distanced from the *concept*, and in so doing the effort loses a key ingredient of sustainable change. The school wide programmes reviewed above view inclusion not as a practice, but as a value laden concept, echoing the sentiments espoused in the *Salamanca Statement*. The success and sustainability of current programmes lies in this open exploration of values—open in the sense that it involves all community members and is not averse to challenging existing values, beliefs or assumption.

In each of the whole school programmes reviewed that foster inclusive change the school community underwent a process of learning that involved reflecting on deeply held beliefs. It was John Dewey who observed that people learn not by doing per se but by thinking about their doing (Fullan, 2007). The frameworks employed allowed sufficient time for this exploration and reflection to take place. Each mechanism was designed as a collaborative venture, involving as wide a representation of the school community as possible. Schools utilizing these tools can thus create a shared vision and a shared definition in creating their own model of inclusion. Schools could likewise adapt the process to suit their particular needs and situations. Through such frameworks as *Indicators for Success*, *Quality Indicators*, the *Index for Inclusion* and Whole Schooling inclusive change can be established in a sustainable and meaningful way.

References

Ainscow, M., & Cesar, M. (2006). Inclusive education ten years after Salamanca: Setting the agenda. *European Journal of Psychology and Education, 21*(3), 231-238.

Artiles, A., & Kozleski, E. (2007). Beyond convictions: Interrogating culture, history, and power in inclusive education. *Language Arts, 84*(4), 357-364.

Baltzer, K., & Tetler, S. (2006). *Developing inclusive school cultures in Denmark*. The Danish University of Education. Retrieved from www.uppr.skoleintra.dk/Infoweb/indhod/Projekter/Inklusion/Susan%20Tetler%20og%20

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.

Booth, T., & Black-Hawkins, K. (2001). Developing learning and participating in countries of the south: The role of an index for inclusion. Paris: UNESCO.

Bustamante. (2009). The "culture audit": A leadership tool for assessment and strategic planning in diverse schools and colleges. *The Connexions Project, National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.* . Retrieved from http://csuprofessionaldevelopment.com/images/pdfs/CulturalAudit.pdf,

Bustamante, & Nelson. (2007). *The school-wide cultural competence checklist*. Sam Houston State University. Retrieved from Accessed on 29-11-12 from http://sshs.promoteprevent.org/webfm_send/2151

Government Code Section 6500-6536 (2012).

California Department of Education, & WestEd. (2005). *Inclusive education starter kit: Manual 1* Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.

Carrington, S. (1999). Inclusion needs a different school culture. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 3*(3), 257-268. doi: 10.1080/136031199285039

Carrington, S., & Robinson, R. (2006). Inclusive school community: Why is it so complex? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 10*(4-5), 323-334. doi: 10.1080/13603110500256137

Carter, J. (2012). *Partnership working within 'Index Forums'-Brokering 'improvement' conversations using the shared language of the index for inclusion: Disseminating the index for inclusion across Norfolk schools and settings*. Norfolk Local Education Authority. Norwich.

Colon, E. J., Walz, L. M., & Vandercook, T. L. (1994). Inclusive education: Needs of Minnesota families. Minneapolis: Institute on Community Integration (UAP), University of Minnesota.

Community Living Ontario. (2005). An inclusive school culture: Indicators of success. retrieved on 2 May 2012 in pdf. form from email correspondence

Corbett, J. (1999). Inclusive education and school culture. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 3*(1), 53-61. doi: 10.1080/136031199285183

Davies, M., Bryer, F., Beamish, W., & Rawlins, C. (2005). *Validation of an inclusive practice self-assessment tool to improve school capability*. Paper presented at the Inclusive and Supportive Education Congress International Special Education Conference Inclusion: Celebrating Diversity?, Glasgow, Scotland.

Department of Education. (2000). *California LRE Self-Assessment and Continuous Improvement Activities*. Sacramento, CA.

Dharan, V. (2006). Enhancing effective practice in special education (EEPiSE): In it together. *Kairaranga, 7*(Special Edition), 3-7.

Djumagulova, C. (2006). Redesigning the Soviet education system in Kyrgystan. *EENET Newsletter, 10*. Retrieved from http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/eenet_newsletter/news10/pages6.php

Englebrecht, P., Oswald, M., & Forlin, C. (2006). Transforming schools: Using the 'Index for Inclusion' in South Africa. *EENET Newsletter, 10*. Retrieved from http://www.eenet.org.uk/resources/eenet_newsletter/news10/page16.php

Forest, M., & Pearpoint, J. C. (1992). Putting all kids on the map. *Educational Leadership, 50*(2), 26-31.

Franke, M. L., Carpenter, T., Fennema, E., Ansell, E., & Behrend, J. (1998). Understanding teachers' self-sustaining, generative change in the context of professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(1), 67-80.

Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Gibson, S. (2006). Beyond a 'culture of silence': Inclusive education and the liberation of 'voice'. *Disability and Society, 21*(4), 315-329. doi: 10.1080/09687590600679956

Gramsci, A., & Rosengarten, F. (1994). *Letters from prison*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hall, E. T. (1959). *The silent language*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday

Hall, E. T. (1966). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, N.Y Doubleday.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, N.Y: Anchor Press.

Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life: The other dimension of time*. New York: Doubleday.

Jorgensen, C., McSheehan, M., & Sonnenmeier, R. (2009). Essential best practices in inclusive schools. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire, Institute on Disability.

Kraayenoord, C. E. v. (2007). School and classroom practices in inclusive education in Australia. *Childhood Education, 83*(6), 390-394.

Kugelmass, J. W. (2006). The inclusive school: Sustaining equity and standards *American Journal of Education, 112*(4), 279-292.

Kuglemas, J. (2006). Sustaining cultures of inclusion: The value and limitations of cultural analyses. *European Journal of Psychology and Education, 21*(3), 279-292.

Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education. (2006). *Quality indicators of inclusive schools*. Hanover, MD: MCIE.

Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education. (2011). Quality indicators for inclusive building based practices Retrieved 3 December, 2012, from http://www.mcie.org/usermedia/application/8/quality_indicators_-_building-based_practices_2011.pdf

Maryland Coalition for Inclusive Education. (2012). School-wide and system-wide reform Retrieved 29 November, 2012, from http://www.mcie.org/pages/services/school-wide-system-wide-reform

Maslowski, R. (2006). A review of inventories for diagnosing school culture. *Journal of Educational Administration, 44*(1), 6-35. doi: 10.1108/09578230610642638

Nelson, J. A., Bustamante, R. M., Wilson, E. D., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2008). The school-wide cultural competence observation checklist for school counselors: An exploratory factor analysis. *Professional School Counseling, 11*(4), 207-217.

New Brunswick Association for Community Living. (2011). Creating an inclusive school: Indicators of success. retrieved on 1 May, 2012 from: http://www.nbacl.nb.ca/english/resources/creating_an_inclusive_school.pdf

New Jersey Coalition for Inclusive Education, & New Jersery Coucil on Developmental Disabilities. (2010). Quality indicators for effective inclusive education guidebook,

retrieved on 29 April 2012 from: http://www.scribd.com/doc/73275175/Quality-Indicators-for-Inclusive-Education-Manual

Ohio Developmental Disabilities Council. (2004). Success for all students: Supporting parents and teachers, a project evaluation, retrieved on 21 May, 2012 from: http://www.ddc.ohio.gov/Pub/SFASFinal.htm. Cincinnati, OH.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Nelson, J. A., & Bustamante, R. M. (2009). Assessing schoolwide cultural competence: Implications for school leadership preparation. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(5), 793-827.

Pearpoint, J., O'Brien, J., & Forest, M. (1993). *Planning alternative tomorrows with hope, a workbook for planning better futures*. Toronto, Ontario: Center for Integrated Education and Community.

Peterson, M. (2004a). Towards whole schools: Building a movement for dialogue and action in the 21st century. *International journal of Whole Schooling, 1*(1), 4-7.

Peterson, M. (2004b). Towards whole schools: Building a movement for dialogue and action in the 21st century. *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 1*(1), 4-7.

Peterson, M. (2007). Whole schooling: Strategies and tools for improving teaching and schooling. Retieved on 30 April 2012 from: http://www.wholeschooling.net/

Polat, F. (2011). Inclusion in education: A step towards social justice. *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(1), 50-58. doi: 10.1016/j.ijedudev.2010.06.009

Rouse, M. (2006). Enhancing effective inclusive practice: Knowing, doing and believing. *Kairaranga, 7*, 8-13.

Sailes, J. (2008). School culture audits: Making a difference in school improvement plans. *Improving Schools, 11*(1), 74-82.

Save the Children. (2008). *Making schools inclusive: How change happens, Save the Children's experience*. London: Save the Children.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Slee, R., & Allan, J. (2001). Excluding the included: A reconsideration of inclusive education. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 11*(2), 173-192. doi: 10.1080/09620210100200073

Smith, A. (2005). Index for Inclusion. *Kairaranga, 6*(2), 23-24.

Thomas, G. (1997). Inclusive schools for an inclusive society. *British Journal of Special Education, 24*(3), 103-107.

Thurlow, M., Vandercock, T., McDevitt, M., Medwetz, L., Nelson, M., Sauer, J., & Walz, L. M. (1999). District partnership approach to inclusion: A qualitative evaluation of impact. Minneapolis, MN: Institute on Community Integration.

Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration (BES). Wellington, N.Z: Ministry of Education.

United Nations General Assembly. (1990). *World declaration on education for all*. Paris.

United Nations General Assembly. (1994). *Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Salamanca: UNESCO.

Vandercock, T., York, J., & Forest, M. (1989). The McGill Action Planning System (MAPS): A strategy for building the vision. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 14*(3), 205-215.

Wagner, C. (2006). The school leader's tool for assessing and improving school culture. *Principal Leadership, 7*(4), 41-44.

Wagner, C., & Masden-Copas, P. (2002). An audit of the culture starts with two handy tools. *Journal of Staff Development, Summer*, 42-53.

Walz, L., Vandercock, T., Sauer, J., Nelson, M., Medwetz, L., Thurlow, M., & McDevitt-Kraljiic, M. (2000). Disatisfaction x vision x first steps > resistance: A summary of

learning from supporting inclusive educational environments through systemic change. Minneapolis: Minnesota University, Institute on Communty Integration.

WestEd. (2012). School site team collaboration for inclusive education Retrieved 3 December, 2012, from http://www.wested.org/cs/we/view/serv/43

Whole Schooling Coalition. (2002). Whole schooling research project. Detroit, MI: Whole Schooling Coalition.

Zollers, N. J., Ramanathan, A. K., & Yu, M. (1999). The relationship between school culture and inclusion: How an inclusive culture supports inclusive education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*(2), 157-174. doi: 10.1080/095183999236231