

The Inclusion Ladder

A checklist for mainstream education actors to self-assess if your education project is inclusive of children with disabilities?

- Progressive (to be read vertically)
- A variety of criteria
- Non-exhaustive
- Giving examples
- Which you can adapt to your needs.

Your project is unaware of inclusive education for children with disabilities	Your project is sensitive to inclusive education for children with disabilities	Your project is responsive to inclusive education for children with disabilities	Your project is transformative to inclusive education for children with disabilities
<p>Disability inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Inclusion is mentioned generally, but with no explicit reference to children with disabilities □ Understanding of disability is based on a medical or charity model and very basic (e.g. visible disabilities only) <p>Inclusive education (IE) implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The project has activities at school level but not specifically for children with disabilities and no outreach is planned to find children with disabilities (out of school) □ Children with disabilities are referred to special schools and not supported in mainstream schools 	<p>Disability inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It offers services to children with only a specific type of disabilities e.g. physical or mild disabilities □ It considers that disability inclusion is the role of organisations with a disability mandate <p>IE implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Children with disabilities are in special units/classes (integration) or in mainstream classroom/school but without support □ Teacher training includes basic Universal Design for Learning (UDL) □ Parents of children with disabilities receive minimal information □ Most of the services offered in your project (e.g. SEL, MHPSS, WASH, ICT etc.) are welcoming to children with disabilities but are not made accessible (e.g. no staff trained on inclusion, no accessible material, no accessible infrastructure, etc.) 	<p>Disability inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It embraces that inclusion is the responsibility of everyone □ It focuses on children with disabilities, but may not support children with more complex needs □ It uses a Human Rights Based Approach, and aligns with the UNCRPD article 24 and General comment #4 □ It uses the OECD Disability Policy Marker <p>IE implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It uses at least one track of the twin-track approach e.g. responds to the needs of children with disabilities (but not tackling systemic barriers) □ It trains teachers in the principles and practices of inclusive education in addition to UDL □ Parents are informed about disability and encouraged to support their children's education □ Children with disabilities are supported to learn in mainstream schools and are provided with reasonable accommodation (though not always sufficient for their needs) □ It raises community awareness and involves school management <p>Intersectional lens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ A gender analysis using an intersectional lens is available 	<p>Disability inclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It ensures all children with disabilities are reached in all education activities, recognising that at least 10% of learners in any country will be learners with disabilities □ It ensures the inclusion of children with disabilities including children with mild to severe disabilities and also includes out-of-school children <p>IE implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It uses a twin track approach i) responding to specific needs of children and ii) transforming the school system, by ensuring advocacy and coordination with education authorities □ It offers education opportunities in the most appropriate educational setting, whether formal or non-formal, in inclusive settings whenever possible with adequate support, ideally in a mainstream classroom with sufficient support and reasonable accommodation. □ It provides transitory classrooms or small group teaching for children needing it (e.g. Children with more severe disabilities) □ It provides adequate inclusive education teachers training (in-service & pre-service) □ It provides support systems to teachers (e.g. itinerant teachers, resource centers, etc.) □ It provides support systems to students themselves (e.g. buddy systems, classroom assistants/ volunteers, shadow teachers etc.) □ It supports parents and promotes a supportive community □ Parents of children with disabilities are in the board of school management or Parents Teachers Association □ It promotes a multi sectoral approach in particular with health (including rehabilitation, WASH, MHPSS) and social affairs □ It promotes what works and advocates for IE at a national level <p>Intersectional lens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ An intersectional analysis of Gender, Age and Disability (& other relevant factors) is available at program level and specific versions are developed at local level

<p>Intersectional lens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ There is no targeted action in relation to gender, age or disability □ A risk protection analysis has not been carried out (Did you know that children with disabilities are 4 times at risk of any type of violence?) <p>Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ No budget is planned for accessibility <p>Participation of OPDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The project does not involve Organisations of Persons with Disabilities (OPDs) <p>Data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ There is no disaggregated data on boys and girls with disabilities and data collection does not consider age and other intersectional factors <p>Budget allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Children with disabilities are not mentioned in the narrative (or mentioned simply as a category of vulnerabilities) but no budget lines are dedicated to their inclusion 	<p>Intersectional lens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Gender, disability and age have been systematically included in data and information collection, but activities have not been adapted to ensure equal benefit from the project. □ Protection risks are not systematically identified, nor are mitigation measures in place. <p>Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It offers limited accessibility within schools (eg. only a basic ramp with no quality checks or compliance to the accessibility standards (e.g. ramp is too steep)) <p>Participation of OPDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ The project informs OPDs/individuals with disabilities and “assumes” what the issues are for children with disabilities without asking opinions <p>Data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It collects data on children with disabilities but does not use a functional approach (such as the Washington Group Questions), but uses broad categories that are hard for people to categorise, miss many children and may lead to incorrect data (e.g. physical/ hearing/ visual/ multiple impairment) <p>Budget allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ A very small amount is dedicated to inclusion, less than 2% of the overall project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Targeted activities are implemented (though not holistically) to ensure that children who are discriminated against on the basis of disability, gender or age benefit equally from actions (e.g. Toilets are separated and accessible and additional human resources if needed is provided in addition to the menstruation kit) □ Protection risks analysis is carried out; its findings feed into project activities (e.g. school chart, staff training, complaint mechanism and referral systems) and mitigation measures are set in place (e.g. friends walking children to school). <p>Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It budgets for inclusion and follows international guidance on accessibility and inclusion such as the IASC recommendations for 0.5% of total budget to be allocated for accessibility and 3-7% of total budget for assistive devices and reasonable accommodations <p>Participation of OPDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It involved consultations with OPDs and involves OPD though possibly not at every stage of the project □ It calls on disability organisations to support children with disabilities and ensure proper referral to relevant services for example <p>Data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It collects disability-disaggregated data using the Washington Group Questions (WGQ) e.g. short set of 6 questions or Child Functioning Module (CFM) <p>Budget allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Its budgetary allocations for disability-inclusive education is at least 5% of the budgets (Cf. Call To Action following TES 2022) □ There is a budget for gender analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Activities are designed to address roots caused of inequalities and barriers where intersectional factors like gender age and disability intersect fostering lasting changes. □ Specific responses target children with disabilities in need of protection and all information is provided in accessible formats. <p>Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It provides relevant accessible teaching and learning material and assistive technologies □ It ensures physical accessibility compliance with either the national standards if exist and if not ISO 21542:2021 ISO - ISO 21542:2021 - Building construction — Accessibility and usability of the built environment □ It ensures all products for communication and information are in accessible modes e.g. Easy Read, audio, video with captioning and sign language, etc. <p>Participation of OPDs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It ensures the meaningful participation of OPDs and women’s associations throughout the project □ Equity in recruitment is promoted actively (e.g. Staff, teachers, etc.) □ Women with disabilities are hired and receive adapted assistance <p>Data collection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It collects data disaggregated by gender, age and disability, using the WG/UNICEF Child Functioning Module (24 questions for children aged 2-4 or 5-17) and the CFM-Teacher version (20 questions) in school □ The project analysis considers intersectionality, which compounds the marginalization and vulnerability of persons with disabilities (age, gender, language, economic status, religion, etc.) □ It ensures inclusion throughout the project cycle (inception, design, delivery, M&E, reporting) and develops disability-specific indicators (Cf. Inclusive Education Project Checklist). <p>Budget allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ It has two-track budgeting; ensuring at least 10% of the budget is allocated towards addressing the rights and meeting the requirements of children with disabilities □ It provides allocation for intersectional analysis of Gender, Age and Disability and relevant programming adaptation (e.g. transportation/hotel fees after late training for women)
---	---	---	--