Education Equity Research Initiative

- **Launched**: March 2016 at CIES, Vancouver in response to the prominence given to equity across the Sustainable Development Goals.
- **Goal**: advance the field of global education towards equity-oriented education policy and programming.
- **What We Do**: The Education Equity Research Initiative is a collaborative partnership that connects organizations and individuals committed to building stronger evidence and knowledge for improving solutions for equity in and through education.

EducationEquity2030.org
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS

1. No Poverty
2. Zero Hunger
3. Good Health and Well-Being
4. Quality Education
5. Gender Equality
6. Clean Water and Sanitation
7. Affordable and Clean Energy
8. Decent Work and Economic Growth
9. Industry, Innovation and Infrastructure
10. Reduced Inequalities
11. Sustainable Cities and Communities
12. Responsible Consumption and Production
13. Climate Action
14. Life Below Water
15. Life on Land
16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
17. Partnerships for the Goals

EDUCATION EQUITY RESEARCH INITIATIVE
EducationEquity2030.org
Equity is a theme across Goal 4 Education targets... with 7 of 10 targets specifically addressing equity.
Disability Task Team

- Year 1 Landscape Analysis, identified disabled populations as one of the most educationally marginalized, with an incredibly scarce amount of data collected and aggregated across contexts.

- Disability Task Team launched in Year 2

- Grown to over 35 member agencies, organizations, & individual consultants

- Pursuing 3 research questions this year:
  - Screening & Identification
  - Effective Interventions
  - Policy & Financing

EducationEquity2030.org
PANEL: Screening & identification of disabilities and special learning needs

01 Josh Josa, USAID
High-level overview discussing need for more systematic approaches to identification, referrals, and supports.

Systematic School-based Disability Screening: A Comparative Analysis of Formal Approaches Across Select Country Contexts

03 Emma Jolley, Sightsavers
Using the Washington Group/ UNICEF Child Functioning Module in an early childhood setting in rural Malawi

04 Carina Omoeva, Rachel Hatch & Stephen Luke, FHI 360
Identifying children with special learning needs: results from a study testing a toolkit to screen for functional disabilities
Systematic School-based Disability Screening: A Comparative Analysis of Formal Approaches Across Select Country Contexts

CIES | San Francisco | 18 APRIL 2019
Josh Josa, USAID | Evan Johnston, NYU | Ola Abu Alghaib, Leonard Cheshire
Stephen Luke, Sonia Holzman & Aynur Gul Sahin, FHI 360
Population level
Depends on awareness of respondent
Should **not** be used as a tool to diagnose

Individual level
Depends on results of tools / assessments
Can be used by non-medical professionals
Intervention

- Need for systemic referrals to appropriate services and supports
- Need for sensitization and behavior change communication
- Individualized Education Plans & connecting back to the classroom
A Comparative Look at Special Education & Inclusion in the U.S.

Access copy: http://tinyurl.com/y2fm333y

Evan Johnston | Graduate Assistant, Doctoral Student
Twitter: @evanmjohnston
evan.johnston@nyu.edu

Center for Policy, Research, and Evaluation
Metropolitan Center for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools
(NYU Metro Center)
Twitter: @metronyu
Background

Judicial context of desegregation and civil rights

• Brown v. Board (1954)
• Education for All Handicapped Children (1975)
• Renamed Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (2004)
• Sec. 504 of Title II of ADA
Background

Establishment of educational rights

- Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE)
- Least restrictive environment (LRE)
- Codified through an individualized education program (IEP)
- Rights come from the law, not the constitution
Provisions

Process- referral

• Identification under dual discrepancy (RTI) or referral by teacher, parent, counselor
• Disability has to fall in 1 of 13 categories
• Referral meeting (outline difficulties and strengths)
• Requests for any relevant screenings/tests
• Parental consent is key
Provisions

Process-evaluations

- Evaluations in all areas of suspected disability
- Some testing can be done outside schools
- Administered in home language
- By professionals
- Observation
- > 12 years → also vocational testing (1997)
Procedures

Outcomes

• Disability diagnosis (or not)
• IEP outlining:
  • services
  • a decision regarding placement
  • rationale for placement
  • accommodations (daily instruction and testing)
Challenges

Safeguards

- Advance notice not provided
- Screening or notice provided in wrong language
- Sent to wrong address
- Parent wishes not heeded
- Speed of recourse (school, district, Office for Civil Rights)
Challenges

Services

• Increased inclusion but not necessarily equal access to curriculum (tracking)
• Increases in inclusionary placements have not been equal
• Compliance with services when OT/PT or Resource staff needed
• In-class services lacking (DHH)
• Teacher quality/turnover/burnout
Challenges

Disproportionality

• Underservicing
• Racial/gender/linguistic/class biases in identification, testing, labels, placement
• Over-referral
• Under-referral
• Schools using labels and placements punitively (exclusionary practices)
Disaggregating data by disability to support inclusive education

Ola Abu Alghaib, PhD | Leonard Chaeshire
Ola.AbuAlghaib@leonardcheshire.org

Programme Manager at Leonard Cheshire & International Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC) board member.
Why is data on people with disabilities important?

**DATA**
- Understanding of the scale & needs of people with disabilities
- Guides impartial & equitable access to services
- Supports transparency & accountability
- Demonstrates progress towards global commitments
Types of Data

National Household/Individual Data
- Censuses
- Surveys – General (e.g., DHS)
- Special Surveys

National Administrative Data
- EMIS
- Other Administrative Data
- Surveys – Service Delivery Indicators
- Policy, Finance, Others

Programme Data – Household, Individual
- Special Surveys
- Impact Evaluations
- Qualitative Data (FGs, Interviews, Ethnographic)
Disability-disaggregated data: current context

• Data exists but has limitations
• Sources are too scattered & and usually not comparable
• Not enough is known about
  • Where the gaps are
  • Where the greatest needs are
  • Scale of limitations
• Disaggregation by disability type has been overlooked
• Data that does exist is often hidden and unused
The Disability Data review

Provides an overview of the current disability data landscape and identifies where there are current gaps in bodies of data, particularly in light of the indicators linked to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities (UNCRPD).

• Collation and analysis of data from 40 countries
• Across 16 indicators
• Identifies available data and existing gaps
• Analyses how to support monitoring and evaluation efforts for the SDGs and the CRPD

Prepared for the Global Disability Summit in July 2018 by DFID and Leonard Cheshire
The **Disability Data** Portal
disabilitydataportal.com

- Collation & analysis of data
- Disaggregated statistics
- Integrated visuals
- Snapshot of what data is available
- Examples of how to analyse information in an SDG framework
Inclusion in education

**Primary School completion rates**
- People with disabilities: 35%
- People without disabilities: 87%

**Secondary School completion rates**
- People with disabilities: 26%
- People without disabilities: 69%

Explore disaggregates  Compare countries
Limitations

- **Availability of data** – in some cases, disability disaggregated data was not available in chosen countries.

- **Date of data** – many of the datasets are not up to date and do not reflect the situation today

- **Ability to compare** – data sets presented in the report are not directly comparable, as data is drawn from different data sources, use different methodologies and cover different time periods.

- **Methodological issues** – there was a range of quality of data and in those instances where data collection methodologies were unclear, the data set was excluded from analysis.

- **Verification** – due to the limited timeframe for preparing the data set, the data calculations have not been verified by NSOs. This is a next step.
Considerations

• A substantial amount of data on disability exists
• Data collection is moving towards being more accurate and comparable
• Data collection is only the first step, policy makers and other actors need to utilise data to ensure that disability inclusion is realised.
• Very little, if any, data being collected about students with special education needs in schools
School-based screening Landscape Analysis
Stephen Luke, Sonia Holzman, & Aynur Gul Sahin

- **Objective**: To investigate how schools and education systems are making efforts to screen and identify students with disabilities, the working group builds upon its previous inclusive education policy landscape analysis to examine and compare various approaches used in Ghana, India, Malawi, Pakistan, and South Africa.
Research Questions

The aim of this work is to better understand:

a) **Forms of screening** and **disability domains** assessed, including **RTI** as an approach to identification

b) Articulation of **referral process** for those falling below any established screening thresholds

c) **Nature of supports** provided, e.g.,
   a) Accommodations/Assistive Supports
   b) Curricular Modifications
   c) Supplemental Instruction

d) Systematic **data aggregation** to inform policy and practice

e) **Challenges** – as part of this work we also explore stated challenges to providing necessary supports to students with special needs
   a) Availability of local resources and networks of support
   b) Sufficient level of teacher training to serve a diverse range of students with special learning needs
   c) Financing to support reasonable accommodations/assistive support
## Current Approaches to Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Childhood</th>
<th>Typically triggers a visit to a medical professional, or assessment center</th>
<th>Referral and placement decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At the start of school; over time/several years of failing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common Educational Settings

* There are several education settings used in LMICs, but only inclusive education is supported by the CRPD.

Screening & Identification

"My First Day", Ghana
- Vision, hearing, local tools

"Key Informant Method”, India, Malawi, Pakistan
- Checklist, parent report

“Learner Development Pathway”, Malawi
- Teacher report, guidance booklet, Washington Group

“Individual Support Plan”, South Africa
- Teacher report, medical records
Nature of Supports

**Assistive Devices/Materials**
- Wheelchair, mobility device distribution
- Braille texts, glasses, tactile materials
- Transportation stipend, accessible infrastructure
- Medical interventions

**Instruction/Supports**
- Seating arrangements
- Resource teachers
- Technical teacher training
  - Inclusive Education
  - Disability specific pedagogy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Malawi</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-service:</strong></td>
<td>Montfort Special Needs Education College</td>
<td>Select schools *New curriculum will require inclusive education component</td>
<td>All, not standardized</td>
<td>Select schools</td>
<td>Select schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-service:</strong></td>
<td>Select schools</td>
<td>Select schools *upcoming TOT</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Select schools</td>
<td>Select schools; Provincial training institutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: NGO, external training
Challenges

- Attitudes and stigma
- Lack relevant data
- Financing
- Teacher training
- Effective Interventions
- Tracking of learning outcomes
- Linkages between health and education
- Coordination of efforts
- Regional variance
Opportunities

- Parent-Teacher Associations
- Community based accountability
- Coordination, collaboration
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