The 3P model for creating sustainable educational reform: an epilogue to the special issue

Thomas Peter Gumpel and Judah Koller

Seymour Fox School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

Naomi Weintraub

School of Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Medicine,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

Shirli Werner

The Paul Baerwald School of Social Work and Social Welfare,
Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel, and

Vered Wiesenthal

Seymour Fox School of Education, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel

Abstract

Purpose – This article presents a conceptual synthesis of the international literature on inclusive education while expanding upon, and incorporating, the articles in this special issue. The authors present their 3P model (philosophy, policy and praxis) and relate each paper in this special issue to different aspects of their model.

Design/methodology/approach – This article serves as an epilogue to this special issue of the *Journal of Educational Administration* as well as a discussion of historical and conceptual distinctions between mainstreaming and inclusion while examining global trends in understanding the move toward inclusive education.

Findings – The authors examined the detrimental effects of ableism and a medical model of disability and their effects on the educational system. They conducted an analysis based on examining the philosophy, policy and practice of the inclusive movement, specifically by examining conceptual models and inclusive decisions, conceptual frameworks for describing inclusive policy and a focus of the application to educational administration. The authors examined the global movement from segregation/exclusion to integration and then to inclusionary praxis.

Research limitations/implications – The authors maintain that the inclusion literature lacks a sound positivistic empirical base, and so they present throughout the article possible avenues for such research as well as future directions for comparative research.

Practical implications – Understanding the philosophical underpinnings of the inclusive movement is central to developing viable inclusive educational settings. The authors distinguish between inclusive schools and local educational authorities where stakeholders have moved toward an inclusionary system (the minority) versus locales who are reluctant to move systems to actual change.

Originality/value – This article takes a wider view of inclusionary practices, from one focusing on children with disabilities to one focusing on historical and traditional exclusionary practices. By widening the scope of the inclusion discussion, to one of exclusion, the authors present a viably wider lens to educational administration.

Keywords Inclusion, Exclusion, Educational policy, Medical model, Universal design for learning

Paper type Conceptual paper

In his seminal article on the pernicious effects of ableism on educational policy and practice, Hehir (2002) states that "progress toward equity is dependent first and foremost on the acknowledgement that ableism exists in schools" (p. 22). Hehir continues to place the inclusion movement squarely within the larger diversity movement, an approach supported by other inclusion theorists (Artles *et al.*, 2008; Kozleski *et al.*, 2013) who see educational inclusion as another aspect of the realignment and more equitable distribution of power structures in educational systems. For this epilogue of the special issue of the *Journal of Educational*

Administration, we wish to shift the discussion from its most common foci of praxis. We review and present a summary of conceptual models of mainstreaming vis-à-vis inclusive models as we examine the metamorphosis of inclusionary praxis. We review the other papers in this special issue as we present our 3P model of *philosophy* (Cornett and Knackstedt, this special issue; Kozleski and Stepaniuk, this special issue), *policy* (DeMatthews *et al.*, this special issue; Óskarsdóttir *et al.*, this special issue) and *praxis* (Boscardin and Shepherd, this special issue) while summarizing conceptual models and inclusive definitions, conceptualizing frameworks for describing inclusive policy and providing a critical discussion of procedures and practices focusing on applications to educational administration, while specifically relating to each of the papers in this special issue of the journal.

First P (philosophy): conceptual models and inclusive definitions from segregation to inclusion

Comparisons of international policies in the field of inclusive education provide policy makers with tools, perspectives and resources to design effective and appropriate local policies. The aim of these studies is to highlight current solutions to each country's specific barriers and problems by presenting a general picture of local inclusionary practices along with regulations and appropriate legislation (D'alessio and Watkins, 2009; Meijer *et al.*, 1994). However, comparative studies are problematic since terminology is not unified and is often contradictory.

This is particularly true in the context of policies regarding integration/mainstreaming and inclusion. For instance, in our own work within an Israeli context, we find that these terms are often used synonymously. We see them as diametrically opposed. For the purposes of this article, integration/mainstreaming refers to helping the children with disabilities to adapt to the general education setting for various parts of the school day. Inclusionary practice, on the other hand, focuses on the modification and preparation of the school system to accommodate children with special needs. In a nutshell, we ask, "Who adapts to whom?" In an integrated system, the child adapts to the school requirements. In an inclusionary system, the educational system adapts to the child.

Current policies often regard integration as equal to inclusion. Almost 40 years of research unequivocally shows that mainstreaming does not ensure pedagogical and social immersion of students with disabilities in everyday school activities (Gresham, 1982; Gresham and Reschly, 1987; Hossain, 2012). Mainstreaming cannot be regarded as an inclusive policy. Confusion between inclusion and integration practices persists (Pijl *et al.*, 1997), which leads to significantly different academic, social and emotional outcomes of students (Jackson *et al.*, 2008). As stated by Dyson (1999):

> . . .special education serves the interests of advantaged members of society by maintaining and rationalizing the further marginalization of those whom it claims to help. The establishment of special education creates an *alternative location* for the education of problematic children whose needs and demands might otherwise challenge the established order of regular schooling. . . It legitimizes the treatment of children (and hence adults) with disabilities as deviant. . . and thus contributes to their 'oppression'. (p. 40)

Each country's definitions and specifications of disability vary widely, causing both policy and eligibility requirements to be unclear and often incomparable (D'alessio and Watkins, 2009). Additionally, some educational authorities state *ideas* or *policies* of inclusive education within their rules and regulations, but offer opposing solutions, unclear funding options and vague assessment procedures (Higgins *et al.*, 2006; Lipsky, 2010). Adding to the complexity, when conducting international policy analyses and comparisons, published policies in English (as opposed to the nation's spoken language) are often vague and contradictory.

They also tend to ignore the fact that current policies are but the latest step in an ongoing evolutionary process of discussions and negotiations between competing constituencies and stakeholders, parliamentary bodies and the executive and judicial branches of government. While policy differences may be the result of different political, historical, institutional and bureaucratic trends (Armstrong *et al.*, 2016; Gumpel and Awartani, 2003; Meijer, 1999; Meijer *et al.*, 2003; Vlachou, 2004), it may often be true that certain policies have been intact for such a long time and that dismantling or restructuring them is logistically and fiscally too complex.

What, exactly, are we talking about?

Policy and praxis must stem from clear philosophical and ideological roots; accordingly, an essential first step is the definition of terms. A clear definition of inclusion remains elusive (Clough and Corbett, 2000; Evans and Lunt, 2002) and is a "contested concept" (Cigman, 2007). Following Cigman, educational inclusion can roughly be understood in two contexts. The first involves equity and educational enfranchisement of all marginalized groups who have historically been underserved by the educational system. Such intentional or unintentional marginalization leads to differentiated learner outcomes. This expansive literature puts the inclusion debate on equal footing with other human rights struggles in the school (Kozleski *et al.*, 2013; Kozleski and Stepaniuk, this special issue).

The second context sees inclusion as more focused on learners with special educational needs. This approach is rooted in the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education (UNESCO, 1994) and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 2007). According to Cigman (2007), from a service-provision model for children with disabilities, one group of advocates endorses the idea that schools should "welcome and adapt to all children *as far as possible* [our italics], while the other approach holds that general education schools are incompatible with an adequate education for *some children*" [our italics]. Cigman (2007) labels the first group as "universalists" and the second group as "moderates." Universalists adhere to the belief that it is "possible" to include every child, while the moderates refute this position. Clearly, an empirical evaluation of universalist and moderate approaches and their impact on actual praxis is needed.

Basic steps toward inclusion

Based on our examination of six national inclusive policies (Australia, Canada, Germany, Israel, Spain and the United Kingdom, Gumpel *et al.*, 2020), we observe common steps that shaped each policy. The reader will note that we use the term "steps" as we see these phases as a linear progression. For all examined countries, the education of students with disabilities can be grouped into three different conceptual periods (Hossain, 2012), roughly similar to the concepts of exclusion, segregation, integration and inclusion described by Cornett and Knackstedt (this special issue). We note that despite our study's focus on WEIRD nations (Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich and Democratic, Gumpel *et al.*, 2020), we anticipate that these findings may be applicable to non-WEIRD nations as well (for a discussion of India and Pakistan, Africa and Ethiopia, respectively, see, e.g. Mulat *et al.*, 2019; Okyere *et al.*, 2019; Singal, 2016, respectively).

We refer to the first step as the *separation/separation phase*, characterized by a push to institutionalize or separate children with disabilities, in order to be "relieved" of the burden of caring for them (Uditsky, 1993). Parents were often denied educational services in general educational settings, and those who demanded that their child be educated with children without disabilities were often viewed as unrealistic or unable to accept their child (Hossain, 2012; Uditsky, 1993). Educators claimed that they did not have the resources, facilities and expertise to accept children with disabilities into their school, and doing so would interrupt the learning processes of "normal" children (Uditsky, 1993).

Cornett and Knackstedt (this special issue) examine these systemic shifts. In their discussion of the "original sins" of US policy, they provide a historical understanding of the slow recognition of the rights of children with disabilities, the enactment of laws and the creation of government programs to support equal access from the 1950s till now. Despite the fact that they make only cursory descriptions of the shift from exclusion to segregation to integration and finally to inclusion, Cornett and Knackstedt (this special issue) rightly state that "by examining these original sins, nations working to comply with the CRPD may avoid repeating the mistakes of the US" (p. 17). We ask, is this possible? In our international comparative study (Gumpel *et al.*, 2020), we find that all nations go through these, or similar steps, and so we posit whether shortcuts are possible.

Parents were often denied education in public settings and children either stayed at home or were sent away to separate institutions (Hossain, 2012; Uditsky, 1993). This approach was based on a medical model of disability, which holds that disabilities stem from faulty development and are diagnosed and treated as pathologies. In their thought-provoking paper, Cornett and Knackstedt (this special issue) further describe the insidious effects of a medical model of disability and identify it as the second "original sin" in special education legislation.

Parental advocacy groups began to push back against institutionalization and demanded equal access and education for their children based on a basic and inherent right to an education identical to that received by their nondisabled peers. As demand for an education in local schools grew, so began the era of *integration*. Integration consisted of three main ideologies: rights to schooling and education for all children, the right to an education in local schools, and reorganization of the special education system by focusing on funding, pedagogical issues, assessment and identification of students with disabilities (Vislie, 2003). Children with disabilities were placed in separate classrooms in public schools and, at times, were integrated with their nondisabled peers. However, exclusion from public settings remained the norm for many children with moderate to complex disabilities. Separate classrooms began to appear within general education schools, leading to the idea of *mainstreaming* (Hossain, 2012; Uditsky, 1993), and children were often joined together for classroom activities in order to facilitate socialization with their nondisabled peers (Hossain, 2012).

Concurrently with the shifting view that special educational needs are not indicative of a medically based pathology, an emerging literature began to conceive of disability from an educational and sociological perspective, along with other different and historically marginalized groups (Biklen, 2000; Jones, 1996; Omansky Gordon and Rosenblum, 2001). The understanding of education-based rights began to shift as parents saw their children as having a right to an education alongside and identical to their nondisabled peers and where segregation is an inherent violation of basic human rights and is another attempt to marginalize and pathologize their child. Parallel to other types of critical analyses of diversity, the view of heterogeneity underwent a significant re-evaluation and was seen as a strength rather than a weakness. Inclusion reflects a basic tenet of family and community: all children and their families have a basic right wherein brothers and sisters should learn in the same school. In this realignment of the special education system, from a pathology-based to a rights-based model, any form of segregation can be seen as a form of both psychological (where the child or group feels that his or her self-respect has been injured) and actual (where the child or group *is* humiliated through actual damage to their autonomy) denigration or humiliation (Margalit, 1996).

Salamanca and the CRPD as cornerstones of inclusion

In 1994, over 300 representatives from 90 countries gathered in Salamanca to discuss issues of inclusive education and translate these ideas into worldwide policies. The Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) continues to be a central document for the advancement of inclusive education.

The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, wherever possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have. Inclusive schools must recognize and respond to the diverse needs of their students, accommodating both different styles and rates of learning and ensuring quality education to all through appropriate curricula, organizational arrangements, teaching strategies, resource use and partnership with their communities. (UNESCO, 1994, pp. 11–12)

The Salamanca Statement (UNESCO, 1994) and the UN's Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD, UN General Assembly, 24 January 2007) were driving forces in bringing inclusion practices to the forefront of international educational discourse. Article 24 of the CRPD is even more clearly inclusive and directly mandates that signatories move toward the removal of segregatory educational systems. To date, the CRPD has been ratified by 181 countries. Following ratification, the CRPD enters into force among ratifying States Parties whose parliamentary system is then tasked with implementing the convention (incidentally, the United States is one of only nine nations who have failed to ratify the CRPD).

(1) In realizing this right, States Parties shall ensure that:

- Persons with disabilities are not excluded from the general education system on the basis of disability, and that children with disabilities are not excluded from free and compulsory primary education, or from secondary education, on the basis of disability;

- Persons with disabilities can access an inclusive, quality and free primary education and secondary education on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live;

- Reasonable accommodation of the individual's requirements is provided;

- Persons with disabilities receive the support required, within the general education system, to facilitate their effective education;

- Effective individualized support measures are provided in environments that maximize academic and social development, consistent with the goal of full inclusion. (Article 24, Section 2, UN General Assembly, 24 January 2007)

A bigger picture
We widen our discussion of inclusion by shifting it to include the notion of exclusion (Booth, 2018; Booth *et al.*, 1997; Thomas *et al.*, 2005). Borrowing from Annamma and Morrison (2018), we see the educational system as one in which children with special educational needs are routinely excluded from general educational systems. Such exclusion is another form of marginalization endemic to educational ecosystems with long histories of discrimination of students of marginalized social groups. Historically, such exclusion has been presented both as a method to preserve the hegemony of the dominant group and as a patronizing form of protection in order to "allow" children with disabilities to flourish in "protected environments."

Exclusion can take many forms, from physical segregation in alternative educational settings to the covert or overt reduction of expectations (Ainscow *et al.*, 2000). Students may learn with their peers, but are effectively excluded and marginalized, sometimes because of the lack of curricular or pedagogic, physical and structural modifications and sometimes because of social isolation within a general educational framework. When seen through the wider lens of educational policy, these forms of faux inclusion are colloquially known as "in-out" as the student is "in" the general education environment yet is "out" of contact with his or her peers. Exclusionary systems are dysfunctional ecologies, which strive to maintain a

flawed status quo through the maintenance of ableistic power structures (Hehir, 2002), in the same manner in which they have traditionally excluded other groups of students (Kozleski *et al.*, 2013; Werning *et al.*, 2016).

Kozleski and Stepaniuk (this special issue) present an important and critical analysis as they describe the dangerous effects of a medical model of disability, which is founded on normative notions of the dominant culture in which deviations from arbitrarily determined norms identify "pathologies" in need of assessment, diagnosis and repair. The focus of that "repair" is the individual rather than the arbitrary "normative" parameter. Failure to achieve educational benchmarks is located within the individual rather than the system, which they cohabit with a wide spectrum of other individuals. As Kozleski and Stepaniuk aptly state, for the majority of learners able to "fit" into the predominately ableist educational framework "broadening, removing, or reforming the standard is not the first or obvious policy move." Indeed, Kozleski and Stepaniuk's paper is an extension of Skitric's seminal work on the pathologization of disability as an organizational structure of the schools (1995). In this view, an ableist approach to schooling views learning as a dichotomous state where one can either learn or not. Nonlearners are seen as a hindrance for "learners" and so are shunted aside.

Both Kozleski and Stepaniuk (this issue) and Cornett and Knackstedt (this special issue) describe the inclusion movement as rooted in rights movements and can therefore be understood within the context of the first P we are proposing here: Philosophy. Kozleski and Stepaniuk take a wider approach and connect the inclusion movement with the larger human rights movement touching on the basic rights of all marginalized groups. The authors relate "historical sedimentation of racism that exists within special educational policies and practices" to the critical analysis of the powerful ideology behind inclusionary practice. Cornett and Knackstedt are more specific in their discussion of special education policy. In their thought-provoking paper, they discuss the three "sins" of inclusionary policy: reliance on a medical model, failure to mandate inclusion and a lack of meaningful enforcement. In accordance with their discussion of these three "sins," it is clearly the ideological (or simply by historical default) reliance on a medical model that represents the toxic ideology polluting any further discussion of policy.

Second P (policy): conceptual frameworks for describing inclusive policy

Any organizational model for inclusive policy is better than no organization model at all. It is essential to place inclusionary policy praxis within a larger theoretical framework. Several of the papers in this special issue attempt to do just this (DeMatthews *et al.*, this special issue; Óskarsdóttir *et al.*, this special issue) and provide the reader with conceptual models to understand policy, albeit from different perspectives.

DeMatthews and colleagues (this special issue) describe the Hitt and Tucker theoretical framework (2016). DeMatthews *et al.* describe five components: the need to establish vision, facilitating learning experiences for all students, the development of professional capacity, creating supportive organizations and connecting with external partners. The authors describe effective policy and school leadership within these five factors. The use of this conceptual framework allows for the transfer of knowledge from one system to another (Hitt and Tucker, 2016). In their analysis, DeMatthews *et al.* describe US legislation, policy and procedures as a "never-ending process of finding better ways of responding to diversity." Like their European counterparts (Óskarsdóttir *et al.*, this special issue), they frame inclusionary policy as a process of dealing with marginalized children who are underserved by the school system (Artiles *et al.*, 2011); however, unlike their European Union colleagues, they provide examples only from special education policy and practice in the United States.

Hitt and Tucker (2016) suggest a horizontal theoretical framework where change agents act within four theoretical facets: creating and articulating the vision, setting goals and

standards, communicating the vision and using data. Óskarsdóttir, Donnelly, Turner-Cmuchal and Florian (this special issue) propose an alternative, vertical theoretical framework adopted by the European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. The authors describe a system including: national level (Macro), municipal/community (Exo), local/school (Meso) and school/classroom (Micro), reminiscent of Bronfenbrenner's ecological system model (1976), minus the focus on the chrono-system.

Two papers in this special issue specifically address policy and its organization. DeMatthews et al. (this special issue) analyze policy in terms of its application to principal leadership. While this paper focuses entirely on the United States, the reliance on Hitt and Tucker's model (2016) for understanding policy has international relevance. Óskarsdóttir et al. (this special issue) present two conceptual models. One model refers to the organizational structure of key roles and responsibilities, while another describes a model of distributed leadership. Both articles describe schools or systems where administrators work with staff to create sustainably inclusive schools. An extension of these two papers would address the serious conundrum of working with schools and principals who are reluctant to adopt mandated inclusive policies. Following Lipsky (2010) in his description of the move from agency to street-level implementers of policy, we turn to a discussion of these street-level bureaucrats in our discussion of the third P of Praxis.

Third P (praxis): procedures and praxis
Having established a philosophical and conceptual model of inclusive education, we now turn to a discussion of what is to be done in order to achieve inclusive schools and inclusive educational authorities. In their book, Hehir and Katzman (2012) describe meso and micro levels of change (Óskarsdóttir et al., this special issue) and describe three primary aspects of creating inclusive schools: collaborative problem-solving, relationships, school culture and accountability, and universally designed schools. In our own work studying inclusive practices of Israeli educators, we often come across statements such as "I would love to teach a child with disabilities; however, how can I do that in a fully populated classroom and without any training in special education?" What we are hearing in these statements is a reflection of an ableist conceptualization of the school based on a medical model. These teachers are correctly describing their dilemma within a traditionally structured school, where learning is seen as a binary issue, where uniform standards of mastery dictate that students are either "capable" or "incapable." In our own focus groups of general education teachers, respondents reported that they had insignificant training in special education and that they would *not* recommend integration of children with disabilities in the general education framework if they thought that the receiving school was ill prepared. Despite teachers' statements of support for inclusive practices, they demonstrated little actual knowledge about what inclusion is.

Returning to Skitric's work (1995), schools are bureaucracies structured around concepts of efficiency and productivity and where a baseline, quantifiable and standardized education is packaged and efficiently transmitted to a large group of children with supposed maximum efficiency. Such organizations are obligated to endorse "standardized programs" (Hehir and Katzman, 2012) as well as homogeneity of clientele. In this environment, inclusionary practices are nigh impossible. As all authors in this special issue point out, envisioning an inclusive school means changing the basic structure of the school and focusing on macro to the micro levels of the organization. Skitric (1995) and Hehir and Katzman (2012) emphasize the need for the development of adhocratic problem-solving schools (Mcleskey et al., 2012), a view supported by DeMatthews et al. (this special issue). To create such inclusive schools, praxis must take into account three essential components: the ability of teachers to collectively problem-solve in order to meet the academic and social–emotional needs of all

learners, a thorough understanding of curricular modification based on principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL, Rose and Meyer, 2002) and the development of teacher capacity and individual and collective beliefs in their self-efficacy (DeMatthews *et al.*, this special issue; Tschannen Moran and Hoy, 2001), specifically for reluctant teachers, administrators and educational authorities to include a diverse and heterogeneous group of students in their classroom. In our own work with inclusive teachers, we have repeatedly found that issues of teacher self-efficacy are strong predictors of willingness to attempt inclusive practices.

Collective problem-solvers

Stoll *et al.* (2006) define Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) as a group of professionals who share and examine their ongoing practices based on reflection and collaboration in a growth-oriented forum. According to Stoll *et al.*, PLCs are one form of "communities of practice" and involve six components: shared values and vision, collective responsibility, reflective personal inquiry, collaboration and the promotion of group and individual learning. The literature is replete with examples of the central importance of PLCs in promoting inclusive schools. For instance, according to Hairon and colleagues (Hairon *et al.*, 2017), effective PLCs focus on each of the three components: "community," "learning" and "professional," and it is this complex three-dimensional construct that makes implementation of PLCs in the schools so complex (DeMatthews *et al.*, this special issue; Hairon *et al.*, 2017; Sigurðardóttir, 2010). Nevertheless, we believe that they are key to developing effective inclusive practices (Hipp *et al.*, 2008).

Beyond creating working environments that encourage professional development (Waitoller and Artiles, 2013) via the development of PLCs, successful inclusive programs focus on improving pedagogy for all different learners through the use of UDL and based on responsive evaluations of both learners and practitioners (Boscardin and Shepherd, this special issue). UDL begins with the enabling of access to the curriculum by all students and seeks to develop curricula, strategies and administrative practices, which encourage the participation by all learners in every aspect of the school experience (Hehir and Katzman, 2012). UDL designed instruction is the cornerstone of inclusive educational practice and must become the central element in the collective collaboration and problem-solving aspects of the PLC ((Navarro *et al.*, 2016). According to the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST), UDL encompasses three primary elements: "representation" (modifications that can be made to educational resources in order to make them accessible to all learners), "action and expression" (alternative methods of communication for heterogeneous student groups) and "engagement" (strategies that involve learners with diverse needs) (Center for Applied Special Technology, 2014).

UDL must become the school's organizing nucleus (Center for Applied Special Technology, 2014; Gronseth and Dalton, 2019) and has been consistently linked to positive educational results. For example, in a content analysis of peer-reviewed papers, Al-Azawei *et al.* (2016) found that UDL procedures can be beneficial for a wide mix of learner needs from different educational and cultural settings when coupled with the understanding that the outdated pedagogy of "one-size-fits-all" is no longer appropriate (was ever appropriate?).

Building capacity: running through an open door, or trying to open a shut door?

Despite the fact that many countries have embraced the concept of educational inclusion (Beacham and Rouse, 2012; Malki and Einat, 2018), progress with the implementation of inclusive education remains uneven, at best (Artiles *et al.*, 2020). To more fully understand this slow progress, it behooves us to focus less on individual school systems or individual schools who have embraced inclusive practices and focus on national systems that have

implemented such practices despite stakeholder reluctance (Allan, 2010; Hilton, 2006). We also distinguish between countries with a long tradition of inclusionary practices based on historical social–democratic movements (i.e. Sweden) and other countries without such a cultural and historical infrastructure (i.e. the United Kingdom). We see a vast difference between the educational practices of schools and local educational authorities who have a history of inclusive programming and who have adopted an inclusive philosophy, versus the (perhaps) majority of schools who continue to adhere to their current pedagogic and service-delivery models, sometimes rebranding old wine in new bottles. The international inclusive movement must move beyond declarative statements on the importance of equity, as well as a focus on committed schools or local educational authorities and invest in moving entire systems, even those who are reluctant to change.

In this vein, building consensus and capacity among administrators and teachers (e. g. street-level bureaucrats, see Lipsky, 2010) and other stakeholders (Boscardin and Shepherd, this special issue) is especially challenging as they are often reluctant to move from traditional and segregational special education toward inclusive systems. According to (Oreg, 2003, Oreg and Goldenberg, 2015), resistance to change can be rooted in the implementer's beliefs that the old methods are not only sound, but also better; that is, children are *indeed* best served through traditional and separate programs (e. g., Kauffman and Hallahan, 1995) and/or by the inherent difficulties in fostering any organizational change (Snyder, 2017). Indeed, Orr *et al.* (2008) describe the relationship between resistance to change and organizational resilience (Hoy *et al.*, 1991) or organizational readiness for change (Weiner *et al.*, 2020). For example, in an early study, Scruggs and Mastropieri (1996) found that despite generally positive attitudes toward inclusion, a majority of general education teachers remained reluctant to include children with disabilities in *their* classrooms [our emphasis]; a quarter of a century later, we found similar reluctance in Israel (Gumpel, 2020). Insights from nontraditionally inclusive countries who have moved toward an inclusive educational system provide a unique basis for analysis.

A key to capacity in reluctant settings appears to be a mix of transactional, transformational, distributed and collaborative leadership (Boscardin and Shepherd, this special issue; Óskarsdóttir *et al.*, this special issue). Boscardin and Shepherd specifically address issues of praxis in their discussion of applied aspects of culture and disability embedded within each other while specifically addressing issues of the use of assessment in decision-making. However, building capacity and support does not rely solely on teacher training (Beacham and Rouse, 2012) and professional development (Waitoller and Artiles, 2013), but also on teachers' individual and collective beliefs in their abilities (Tschannen Moran and Hoy, 2001). For instance, Sharma *et al.* (2012) describe the importance of beliefs in teachers' specific self-efficacy to engage in inclusive practices. Soodak *et al.* (1998) found that teachers' beliefs in their teaching efficacy were a strong predictor of their attitudes toward inclusion, a finding also supported by Weisel and Dror (2006). Such self-efficacy beliefs are rooted in adaptive pedagogy and professional support. In Hehir's and Katzman's studies of inclusive schools in the Boston area Hehir and Katzman (2012), schools became active and collaborative problem-solving organizations where teachers' beliefs regarding their own capacity were constantly encouraged. In other words, schools and administrators actively extended the concept of inclusion to include the teachers as well, thereby strengthening their own commitment to their new roles.

Boscardin and Shepherd (this special issue) exemplify the central aspect of the third P (praxis) and present a model for culturally sensitive evaluation central to developing inclusive systems. In addition to a relevant review of both positivistic and post-positivistic approaches to assessment, the authors specifically describe transactional, inspirational, distributed and collaborative leadership, expanding the work of Óskarsdóttir *et al.* (this special issue) by using assessment as the platform to bring these tenets of policy into the

realm of praxis. As described in this section, inclusive praxis clearly goes beyond evaluation and must adequately address the ideological separation from medical and deficit-based models while focusing on support-based assessment as part of the general education system.

Summary

How can our 3P model guide policy and praxis? What does the comparative literature tell us about inclusion for the school administrator? In this epilogue, we have described our 3P model of school change, while associating each paper in this special issue with each level of analysis. We differentiate between different types of administrator challenges. Some schools and local educational authorities have already made decisions to create inclusive systems, to foster equity, to distance themselves from a deficit model of disability and to create schools, which promote a pedagogy of equity. In these schools, the administrator must develop and provide procedures to effectively and efficiently use the human resources already in the school.

However, as we have found, these are the minority of school systems. Many schools and local educational authorities remain resistant to change. Part of this resistance is due to organizational issues and a general reluctance to change, while part of this difficulty is attributed to stakeholder beliefs that the current system of integration or mainstreaming best serves children with special educational needs. The professional literature is replete with descriptions regarding the need to develop inclusive schools, but we can find scant empirical literature regarding mechanisms to foster educational reform in noninclusive settings.

We return to our 3P model of change: philosophy, policy and praxis. There can be no policy without a firm foundation in equity-based educational philosophy and ideology. Likewise, there can be no practice without clear, concise and transparent policy. Sufficiently grounding policy and praxis in a clear philosophical and ideological move from a deficit-based ableistic model to a support-based inclusive model must precede any policy development or implementation. In our own Israeli context, despite years of attempted educational reform, the Ministry of Education displays a lack of clarity and is ambivalent regarding the clear incentivization of policy and disincentivation of retaining the status quo (Gumpel, 2020; Gumpel and Sharoni, 2007). We have found that a poorly implemented policy sends toxic ripples throughout the macro to micro systems. It also adversely affects future reforms by damaging organizational health (Hoy *et al.*, 1991) and practitioners' willingness to take risks.

On a macro implementation level, systems must move beyond the deficit-based medical model to a pedagogic needs model. Such a change is challenging on a macro policy level. National funding mechanisms must change, along with teacher and diagnostician training. Funding mechanisms must retool to accommodate a money-follows-child model (Thomas *et al.*, 2005), a gargantuan and often elusive task.

On the micro level, we see three main challenges for the educational administrator. Teachers must learn to work together to collectively problem-solve and make their lessons accessible to all students. PLCs (Hairon *et al.*, 2017; Hipp *et al.*, 2008; Stoll *et al.*, 2006) are vital for efficiently using the vast amount of institutional knowledge, which otherwise is simply discarded when teachers work alone. Teachers much be able to implement UDL in their classrooms, just as principals and other administrators must implement UDL as an integral part of their pedagogic and administrative leadership.

Administrators, teachers and schools must adapt to meet the increasing complexity of heterogeneous students embedded in increasingly heterogeneous societies. In our work with teachers and administrators around the world, we repeatedly see that most teachers teach as they and their parents were taught. We doubt that this antiquated method of teaching was ever appropriate for heterogeneous student populations, but we are certain that they are inappropriate at present.

References

Ainscow, M., Farrell, P. and Tweddle, D. (2000), "Developing policies for inclusive education: a study of the role of local education authorities", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 211-229.

Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F. and Lundqvist, K. (2016), "Universal Design for Learning (UDL): a content analysis of peer reviewed journals from 2012 to 2015", *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 39-56.

Allan, J. (2010), "Questions of inclusion in Scotland and Europe", *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, Vol. 25 No. 2, pp. 199-208.

Annamma, S. and Morrison, D. (2018), "DisCrit classroom ecology: using praxis to dismantle dysfunctional education ecologies", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 73 No. 1, pp. 70-80.

Armstrong, F., Armstrong, D. and Barton, L. (2016), *Inclusive Education: Policy, Contexts and Comparative Perspectives*, Routledge, London, UK.

Artiles, A.J., Kozleski, E.B., Dorn, S. and Christensen, C. (2008), "Learning in inclusive education research: Re-mediating theory and methods with a transformative agenda", *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 65-107.

Artiles, A.J., Kozleski, E.B. and Waitoller, F.R. (2011), *Inclusive Education: Examining Equity on Five Continents*, Harvard Education Press, Boston.

Artiles, A.J., Harris-Murri, N. and Rostenberg, D. (2020), "Inclusion as social justice: critical notes on discourses, assumptions, and the road ahead", *Theory Into Practice*, Vol. 45 No. 3, pp. 260-268.

Beacham, N. and Rouse, M. (2012), "Student teachers' attitudes and beliefs about inclusion and inclusive practice", *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 3-11.

Biklen, D. (2000), "Constructing inclusion: lessons from critical, disability narratives", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 4 No. 4, pp. 337-353.

Booth, T., Ainscow, M. and Dyson, A. (1997), "Understanding inclusion and exclusion in the English competitive education system", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 337-355.

Booth, T. (2018), *Mapping Inclusion and Exclusion: Concepts for All? Towards Inclusive Schools?*, Routledge, London.

Boscardin, M.L. and Shepherd, K.G. (this special issue), "Leadership for responsive evaluations for special education", *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1976), "The experimental ecology of education", *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 5, pp. 5-15.

Center for Applied Special Technology (2014), *What Is Universal Design for Learning [Online]*, Center for Applied Special Technology, Wakefield, MA, available at: www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl/whatisudl (accessed 20 Febraury 2020).

Cigman, R. (2007), "A question of universality: inclusive education and the principle of respect", *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 775-793.

Clough, P. and Corbett, J. (2000), *Theories of Inclusive Education: A Student's Guide*, Sage, London.

Cornett, J. and Knackstedt, K.M., (this special issue), "Original sin(s): lessons from the U.S. model of special education and an opportunity for leaders", *Journal of Educational Administration*.

D'alessio, S. and Watkins, A. (2009), "International comparisons of inclusive policy and practice: are we talking about the same thing?", *Research in Comparative and International Education,* Vol. 4 No. 3, pp. 233-249.

Dematthews, D., Billingsely, B., Mcleskey, J. and Sharma, U. (this special issue), "Principal leadership for effective inclusive schools", *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Dyson, A. (1999), "Inclusion and inclusions: theories and discourses in inclusive education", in Daniels, H. and Jones, C. (Eds), *Inclusive Education*, Routledge, London.

Evans, J. and Lunt, I. (2002), "Inclusive education: are there limits?", *European Journal of Special Needs Education,* Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 1-14.

Gresham, F.M. and Reschly, D.J. (1987), "Dimensions of social competence: method factors in the assessment of adaptive behavior, social skills, and peer acceptance", *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 4, pp. 367-381.

Gresham, F.M. (1982), "Misguided mainstreaming: the case for social skills training with handicapped children", *Exceptional Children,* Vol. 48 No. 5, pp. 422-431.

Gronseth, S.L. and Dalton, E.M. (2019), *Universal Access through Inclusive Instructional Design: International Perspectives on UDL*, Routledge, London.

Gumpel, T.P. and Awartani, S. (2003), "A comparison of special education in Israel and Palestine: surface and deep structures", The *Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 33-48.

Gumpel, T.P. and Sharoni, V. (2007), "Current best practices in learning disabilities in Israel", *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice,* Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 202-209.

Gumpel, T.P., Weintrub, N., Werner, S. and Koller, J. (2020), *Inclusion Confusion: Understanding Inclusionary Policy in Eight Countries*, Council for Exceptional Children Yearly Conference, Portland, OR.

Gumpel, T.P. (2020), "Incentivizing and Disencentivizing Educational Reform in Israel", *Council for Exceptional Children Yearly Conference*, Portland, OR.

Hairon, S., Goh, J.W.P., Chua, C.S.K. and Wang, L.-Y. (2017), "A research agenda for professional learning communities: moving forward", *Professional Development in Education*, Vol. 43 No. 1, pp. 72-86.

Hehir, T. and Katzman, L.I. (2012), "*Effective Inclusive Schools: Designing Successful Schoolwide Programs*, John Wiley and Sons, San Francisco.

Hehir, T. (2002), "Eliminating ableism in education", *Harvard Educational Review,* Vol. 72 No. 1, pp. 1-33.

Higgins, N., Macarthur, J. and Rietveld, C. (2006), "Higgledy-piggledy policy: confusion about inclusion", *Childrenz Issues*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 30-36.

Hilton, Z. (2006), "Disaffection and school exclusion: why are inclusion policies still not working in Scotland?", *Research Papers in Education*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 295-314.

Hipp, K.K., Huffman, J.B., Pankake, A.M. and Olivier, D.F. (2008), "Sustaining professional learning communities: case studies", *Journal of Educational Change*, Vol. 9 No. 2, pp. 173-195.

Hitt, D.H. and Tucker, P.D. (2016), "Systematic review of key leader practices found to influence student achievement: a unified framework", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 86 No. 2, pp. 531-569.

Hossain, M. (2012), *An Overview of Inclusive Education in the United States. Communication Technology for Students in Special Education and Gifted Programs*, IGI Global, Hershey, PA.

Hoy, W.K., Tarter, J.C. and Kottkamp, R.B. (1991), *Open schools/Healthy Schools*, Sage, Newbury Park.

Jackson, L.B., Ryndak, D.L. and Wehmeyer, M.L. (2008), "The dynamic relationship between context, curriculum, and student learning: a case for inclusive education as a research-based practice", *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 175-195.

Jones, S.R. (1996), "Toward inclusive theory: disability as social construction", *NASPA Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 347-354.

Kauffman, J.M. and Hallahan, D.P. (1995), *The Illusion of Full Inclusion: A Comprehensive Critique of a Current Special Education Bandwagon*, Pro-Ed., Austin, TX.

Kozleski, E. and Stepaniuk, I. (this special issue), "Leading through a critical lens: the application of DisCrit in framing, implementing, and improving equity-driven educational systems for all students", *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Kozleski, E., Artiles, A. and Waitoller, F. (2013), "Equity in inclusive education: a cultural historical comparative perspective", *The SAGE Handbook of Special Education: Two Volume Set*, Vol. 1, pp. 231-250.

Lipsky, M. (2010), *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Malki, S. and Einat, T. (2018), "To include or not to include—this is the question: attitudes of inclusive teachers toward the inclusion of pupils with intellectual disabilities in elementary schools", *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice,* Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 65-80.

Margalit, A. (1996), *The Decent Society*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Mcleskey, J.M., Rosenberg, M.S. and Westling, D.L. (2012), *Inclusion: Effective Practices for All Students*, Pearson Higher Ed, New York.

Meijer, C.J.W., Pijl, S.J. and Hegarty, S. (Eds) 1994), *New Perspectives in Special Education: A Six-Country Study of Integration*, Routledge, London.

Meijer, C.J., Soriano, V. and Watkins, A. (2003), *Special Needs Education in Europe*, Thematic publication, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, Odense, Denmark.

Meijer, C.J. (1999), *Financing of Special Needs Education: A Seventeen-Country Study of the Relationship between Financing of Special Needs Education and Inclusion*, European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, Odense, Denmark.

Mulat, M., Lehtomäki, E. and Savolainen, H. (2019), "Academic achievement and self-concept of deaf and hard-of-hearing and hearing students transitioning from the first to second cycle of primary school in Ethiopia", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 23 No. 6, pp. 609-623.

Navarro, S.B., Zervas, P., Gesa, R.F. and Sampson, D.G. (2016), "Developing teachers' competences for designing inclusive learning experiences", *Journal of Educational Technology and Society*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 17-27.

Okyere, C., Aldersey, H.M., Lysaght, R. and Sulaiman, S.K. (2019), "Implementation of inclusive education for children with intellectual and developmental disabilities in African countries: a scoping review", *Disability and Rehabilitation*, Vol. 41 No. 21, pp. 2578-2595.

Omansky Gordon, B. and Rosenblum, K.E. (2001), "Bringing disability into the sociological frame: a comparison of disability with race, sex, and sexual orientation statuses", *Disability and Society*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 5-19.

Oreg, S. and Goldenberg, J. (2015), *Resistance to Innovation: Its Sources and Manifestations*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Oreg, S. (2003), "Resistance to change: developing an individual differences measure", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 88 No. 4, pp. 680-693.

Orr, M.T., Berg, B., Shore, R. and Meier, E. (2008), "Putting the pieces together: leadership for change in low-performing urban schools", *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. 40 No. 6, pp. 670-693.

Óskarsdóttir, E., Donnelly, V., Turner-Cmuchal, M. and Florian, L. (this special issue), "Inclusive school leaders – their role in raising the achievement of all learners", *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Pijl, S.J., Meijer, C.J. and Hegarty, S. (1997), *Inclusive Education: A Global Agenda*, Routledge, London.

Rose, D.H. and Meyer, A. (2002), *Teaching Every Student in the Digital Age: Universal Design for Learning*, ssociation for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, VA.

Scruggs, T.E. and Mastropieri, M.A. (1996), "Teacher perceptions of mainstreaming/inclusion, 1958–1995: a research synthesis", *Exceptional Children*, Vol. 63 No. 1, pp. 59-74.

Sharma, U., Loreman, T. and Forlin, C. (2012), "Measuring teacher efficacy to implement inclusive practices", *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 12-21.

Sigurðardóttir, A.K. (2010), "Professional learning community in relation to school effectiveness", *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 54 No. 5, pp. 395-412.

Singal, N. (2016), "Education of children with disabilities in India and Pakistan: critical analysis of developments in the last 15 years", *Prospects*, Vol. 46 No. 1, pp. 171-183.

Skitric, T.M. (1995), *Disability and Democracy: Reconstructing (Special) Education for Postmodernity*, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.

Snyder, R.R. (2017), "Resistance to change among veteran teachers: providing voice for more effective engagement", *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, Vol. 12 No. 1, p. n1.

Soodak, L.C., Podell, D.M. and Lehman, L.R. (1998), "Teacher, student, and school attributes as predictors of teachers' responses to inclusion", *The Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 31 No. 4, pp. 480-497.

Stoll, L., Bolam, R., Mcmahon, A., Wallace, M. and Thomas, S. (2006), "Professional learning communities: a review of the literature", *Journal of Educational Change*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 221-258.

Thomas, G., Walker, D. and Webb, J. (2005), "Inclusive education. The ideals and the practice. Teoksessa K. Topping & S. Maloney (toim)", *Inclusive Education*, The Routledge Falmer, Oxon, pp. 17-28.

Tschannen Moran, M. and Hoy, A.W. (2001), "Teacher efficacy: capturing an elusive construct", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Vol. 17 No. 7, pp. 783-805.

Uditsky, B. (1993), "From integration to inclusion: the Canadian experience", *Is there a desk with my name on it? The politics of Integration*, pp. 79-92.

Un General Assembly 24 January (2007), "*Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Resolution / Adopted by the General Assembly, 24 January 2007, A/RES/61/106*, available at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/45f973632.html [accessed 3 March 2020].

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

United Nations High Commisioner for Human Rights (2007), *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*, New York.

Vislie, L. (2003), "From integration to inclusion: focusing global trends and changes in the western European societies", *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 17-35.

Vlachou, A. (2004), "Education and inclusive policy-making: implications for research and practice", *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, Vol. 8 No. 1, pp. 3-21.

Waitoller, F.R. and Artiles, A.J. (2013), "A decade of professional development research for inclusive education: a critical review and notes for a research program", *Review of Educational Research*, Vol. 83 No. 3, pp. 319-356.

Weiner, B.J., Clary, A.S., Klaman, S.L., Turner, K. and Alishahi-Tabriz, A. (2020), "Organizational readiness for change: what we know, what we think we know, and what we need to know", *Implementation Science 3.0.*, Springer.

Weisel, A. and Dror, O. (2006), "School climate, sense of efficacy and Israeli teachers' attitudes toward inclusion of students with special needs", *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 157-174.

Werning, R., Artiles, A.J., Engelbrecht, P., Hummel, M., Caballeros, M. and Rothe, A. (2016), *Keeping the Promise?: Contextualizing Inclusive Education in Developing Countries*, Verlag Julius Klinkhardt, Germany.

Corresponding author

Thomas Peter Gumpel can be contacted at: tom.gumpel@mail.huji.ac.il