

Management of Inclusive Education

SEMINAR REPORT

4-6 October, 2004

*Sudesh Mukhopadhyay
Jayanti Prakash*



National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110 016

**NATIONAL SEMINAR ON
MANAGEMENT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION**

SEMINAR REPORT

**Sudesh Mukhopadhyay
Jayanti Prakash**



National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016

Prepared for publication by Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay and Ms. Jayanti Prakash
National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration
17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016
New Delhi – 110016

March 2005, NIEPA (5H)

© NIEPA

Printed at M/s Anil Offset & Packagings Pvt. Ltd., Delhi-110007

FOREWORD

I have great pleasure in presenting you this report of the National Seminar on Inclusive education. Despite some important developments in Inclusive Education in India, particularly during the last two decades, through important debates, policy decisions and generation of professional literature, Inclusive Education, by and large, continues to be exclusive; a concern for a few dedicated educators. Large majority of the mainstream educators – educational planners, managers as well as teachers at all levels – continue to be oblivious of the intrinsic importance of Inclusive Education and gauge its role in the context of human rights, and overall development of the society. Inclusive Education continues as exclusive domains of a few concerned about ‘a small issue’. We must contest this.

India has reiterated its commitment to education for all; she is pursuing the goal to declare education as a fundamental right. Various reviews and evaluative studies indicate positive developments in education for all; the lofty goal so far elusive seems to be in sight. We are fast approaching the ‘*last mile management*’ situation and associated problems. It is now time to move from education for ‘all’ to ‘*each*’ and every child in the country. It is only by inclusion of ‘*each child*’ that we will be able to achieve education for all.

An important focused group in this context is children who are challenged. For, often they get ignored and sidelined under the pretext of ‘fate’ and ‘bad luck’. Every child born in the country – whether challenged or otherwise – is born with the same right to education. It is the obligation of the civil society and educational administration to ensure that every child finds a place in the broad framework of education.

We hope this report will reach out to many more new sensitive and responsive minds in the country and extend the boundaries of the concern for inclusive education. Together, we will pursue our crusade till all are included in education.

I complement my colleagues, particularly Professor Sudesh Mukhopadhyay, for bringing this concern and area of professional action in NIEPA’s overall academic framework. I also thank all the professional colleagues who made meaningful contribution in the seminar through presentation of papers and active deliberations during the seminar.

NIEPA, New Delhi
14 February, 2005

Prof. Marmar Mukhopadhyay
Director (I/C)

CONTENTS

	<i>Page No.</i>
The Context	1
Seminar Themes	6
Seminar Purpose	8
Participation	8
Reporting of Proceedings	9
<i>Inaugural Session</i>	9
<i>Presentation of the Theme Paper: Managing Inclusive Education</i>	10
<i>Business Session I: Policy on Inclusion</i>	12
<i>Business Session II: Planning for Inclusion</i>	15
<i>Business Session III: Managing Inclusion</i>	17
<i>Business Session IV: Developing Manpower for Inclusion</i>	20
Closing Session	22
Feedback Exercise	
Annexure I – Programme Schedule	27
Annexure II – List of Papers Circulated	30
Annexure III – List of Participants	32

NATIONAL SEMINAR ON MANAGEMENT OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

4–6 October 2004

THE CONTEXT

The trends in the educational provision for children with disabilities have since the past two and a half decades continued to focus on their education in the same setting as that for their peers without special needs. The education now being most advocated for children with disability is inclusive education. Inclusion workably implies attending the school that the pupil would have attended in the absence of a significant special need. It implies a radical reform of school in terms of curriculum, assessment, pedagogy and grouping of pupils (Mittler¹, 2000). The emergence of the present thinking in provision of services for children and people with disabilities is the result of development and interaction of ideologies. According to Lipsky and Gartner² (1999), the manner in which we choose to educate students with disabilities is a consequence of the ways in which we view disability.

The Disability Movement – UN Initiatives

Under the influence of disability movement in various countries and the advocacy by disabled themselves, the United Nations (UN) passed a series of conventions and declarations like Convention on The Rights of the Child (1989), World Declaration on Education for All (Jomtien, 1990) and the UN Standard Rules on the Equalization of Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities (1992, modified 1993) stated that general education authorities are responsible for the education of persons with disabilities in integrated settings. Education for Persons with Disabilities should form an integral part of national educational planning, curriculum development and school organization (Savolainen and Alasuutari³, 2000). These gave an impetus to human rights and social justice approach on disability issues and the education of on disabled. These discourses, according to Jha⁴ (2001), led to the emergence of a viewpoint that education of the disabled is an entitlement in the mainstream school and a denial of it is a denial of equal opportunity.

¹ Mittler, P. (2000). Working Towards Inclusive Education - Social Contexts. London: David Fulton Publishers.

² Lipsky, D.K. & Gartner, A. (1999). *Inclusive education: A Requirement of a Democratic Society*. In Daniels, H. & Garner, P. (Eds.). *Inclusive Education – Supporting Inclusion in Education Systems*, London: Kogan Page Limited.

³ Savolainen H. and Alasuutari H. (2000). Introduction. In Savolainen H., Kokkala, H. and Alasuutari H. (Eds.). *Meeting Special and Diverse Educational Needs: Making Inclusive Education a Reality*. Helsinki: Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

⁴ Jha, M.M. (2002). *School without walls: Inclusive education for all*. Oxford: Hiennemann Educational Publishers.

2 National Seminar on Management of Inclusive Education

The school reform approach emerged with the Salamanca, World Conference on Special Needs Education Statement, (1994). The concept of inclusive education was first introduced globally through this statement and was adopted by 92 governments and 25 international organizations as a guideline framework for formulating policies, development of inclusive schools and provision of special services. The statement enunciates, “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” (Lipsky & Gartner, 1999, p. 21). *Thus, inclusion came to be viewed not as a reform of special education but restructuring of the general education system.* In the context of education, the restructuring of schools along inclusive lines is a reflection of the social model in action (Mittler, 2000). This approach favoured the evolution from integrated education (where the child is adapted to fit the mainstream environment) to inclusive education (where environment is adapted according to the needs of the child). A continuum of services is represented by special education to integrated education to inclusive education. All this appears to be a battle of terms, a whirlpool of jargons. The layman, professionals and implementers, all alike are still trying to come to terms with this new vocabulary.

Other Country Experiences

Though many countries have accepted the ideological basis for inclusive education, the practices and organization of these services, being context-bound, differ from country to country depending upon their respective political, economic and geographical situations. In a survey conducted by UNESCO⁵ (1995), countries across the world reported integration as the most important issue in their policies and practices. Integration was perceived as the basic provision of special education in regular schools, curricular and pedagogical adaptation, support services for mainstream teachers and care for particular groups. Comparing the situation with that in 1986, the report observes, ‘special education provision is more firmly located within regular education’ (cited in Jha, 2002, p.55). In majority (96%) of the 63 countries involved in the survey, the National Ministry of Education held sole or shared responsibility for the administration and organization of services. Others sharing the responsibility were mostly the ministries of health and social welfare/social affairs/social development. State funding is the predominant source of financing, while other funding comes from voluntary bodies, non-governmental organizations and parents. With regard to patterns of special education provisions, a complex picture emerged with wide variations in different forms of provisions being provided. A range of options was available for different categories with special schools being a predominant feature. A total of 28 countries included some coverage of special educational needs within general initial teacher training. In about 30% of countries, no training was provided. Many countries acknowledged the importance of parents in matters relating to special educational provision. However, most countries did not give

⁵ UNESCO (1995). Review of the Present Situation in Special Needs Education, Paris.

parents an absolute right to choose a particular form of provision for their child. This has resulted in varied models and practices of management of inclusion. Some of the international practices are mentioned below:

- Many countries have legal frameworks, which recognize ‘comprehensive schooling for all’ and lay down the standards for inclusion. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of the US has a key regulatory principle stating that “each school district shall ensure a continuum of alternative placements to meet the needs of children with disabilities (i.e. instruction in regular classes, special classes, special school...); and make provision for supplementary services (e.g. resource room or itinerant instruction) to be provided in conjunction with regular class placement” (IDEA regulations, 1994, cited in Boudah & McCorkle⁶,2000).
- According to Education Act of UK, 1993, the Local Education Authorities have the main duty to identify, assess and provide for children requiring statements of special needs. The duty covers children from the age of two and the school named on child’s statement is required to accept the child. The parents are to be involved in the assessment and statement process and have a say in the school they prefer their child to attend. The Code of Practice (1994) made it mandatory for every school to have a staff member responsible for coordinating the response of school to pupils with special educational needs, known as special needs coordinator (SENCO). The key role of SENCO, as recognized by the Code of Practice is in the areas of liaising with and advising fellow teacher, coordinating provision for children with special educational needs, liaising with parents, contributing to in-service training of staff and liaising with support agencies (Crowther, Dyson and Millward⁷, 2001).
- In Denmark, the 1975 Primary Act on the Folkeskole in principle established a comprehensive basic school from the first to the tenth form. In the same period, however, and until about 10 years ago, the number of support lessons spent on special education increased quite a lot, and these lessons were mainly special arrangements outside the classroom in so-called clinics at the school. This paradoxical incompatibility was reflected in legislation of 1990, Government Notice on Special Education; it pointed out that ‘it lies with every teacher to plan and carry out his teaching with so much differentiation to the greatest possible extent, it accommodates those differences in learning conditions which the students are having’. In Denmark, there is no direct legislation on integration, only guidelines. A wide range of support is available to regular schools to assist in the education of children with special needs.

⁶ Boudah, D.J. & McCorkle, L.S. (2000). *Inclusion*. In Reynolds, C.R. & Jangzen, E.F. (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Special Education*. (Vol. 2, pp. 928- 933). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

⁷ Crowther, D., Dyson, A. & Millward, A. (2001). *Supporting public with special educational needs: Issues and Dilemmas for Special Needs Coordinators in English Primary Schools*. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 16(2), 85-97.

4 National Seminar on Management of Inclusive Education

- Sweden has been constantly moving towards inclusion from the last three decades with a greater degree of integration. The country follows an itinerant specialist teacher model and has developed new teacher training programmes to prepare them for the new tasks and special needs education has been included in the general pre-service training programme (Stukat⁸, 2002).
- The World Bank's⁹ assessment of Asian Region for provisions of special educational needs (1994) stated that provision for children with special educational needs has improved remarkably (however, patchy) over the past few years and plans indicate a continuation in this trend. Non-governmental organizations or private voluntary organizations have been sometimes more influential than government agencies in initiating special needs educational development.

Policy and Practices in India

The efforts of the Government of India over the last two and a half decades have been towards providing comprehensive range of services towards education of children with disabilities. The government initiatives in the area of Inclusive Education can be traced back to National Educational Policy, 1986, which recommended, as a goal, 'to integrate the handicapped with the general community at all levels as equal partners, to prepare them for normal growth and to enable them to face life with courage and confidence'. *Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI) Act 1992*, passed in the Parliament, was created by the then Ministry of Welfare (presently known as the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment) to regulate the manpower development programmes in the field of education of children with special needs. The PWD Act, 1995, directs the Government and Local Authorities to ensure that every child with a disability has access to free education in an appropriate environment till he attains the age of eighteen years and endeavour to promote the integration of students with disabilities in the normal school.

The integrated education provision for children began with a view to covering children with disabilities under regular system of education. This approach was not only regarded as conducive to children's development and education but also on economic basis as the regular system of education is modified to respond to needs of all students. The Integrated Education for Disabled Children (IEDC) Scheme, started in 1974, to cover children with disabilities under the regular system of education, is being implemented in 27 States and 4 UTs, through over 41,875 schools benefiting more than 1,33,000 disabled children (MHRD Report¹⁰, 2002-2003). It purports to provide educational opportunities for the disabled children in common schools, to facilitate their retention in the school system.

⁸ Stukat, K. (2002). Three Decades of Integrated Education. In Alur, M. and Hegarty, S. (Eds.). *Education and Children with Special Needs: From Segregation to Inclusion*. New Delhi: Sage Publications Limited.

⁹ Lynch, J. (1994). *Provision for Children with Special Educational Needs in the Asia Region*. World Bank Technical Paper Number 261. Washington: The World Bank.

¹⁰ Government of India, (2003). HRD Annual Report 2002-2003. Ministry of Human Resource Development.

The Janshala report (Jan-March, 2001) shows that of the 200 million children in 6-14 years of age group, approximately 12 million are children with special needs (about 6%), of which only one million are attending school. With such a large number of children out of school, the goal towards EFA remains a distant dream. The NSSO Survey (Disabled Persons in India, 58th Round, 2002) shows that 9029 children are with any kind of disability per 100000 children in the age group of 5-14 years. The number of children per 1000 disabled children in ordinary schools is 475 in rural areas and 444 in urban areas. With education being a fundamental right in our country, the children with disabilities have a right to quality education along with other children. IED was initially introduced in the states in a small way by taking one block/cluster as a pilot project in each DPEP district. Of a few hundred blocks in 1998, IED is currently being implemented in 2014 blocks of 18 DPEP states. Ten states of Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tamil Nadu and Uttaranchal have up scaled the IED programme to all the blocks (Janshala¹¹, 2003).

The State Education Department is usually the implementing agency for IEDC. The Scheme, as of today, provides for:

- Implementing integrated education in select districts and blocks.
- Appointment of a special teacher to provide support.
- Training of special teachers for supporting inclusion.
- A Resource Room, having all the essential equipment, learning aids and materials, may be provided for a cluster of schools implementing the scheme of integrated education.
- Removal of architectural barriers to provide easy access to the children with disabilities.
- Financial assistance for purchase/production of instructional material and equipment for the children.
- Preference to be given to blocks where the schemes of Integrated Child Development (ICDS) and Early Childhood Centres of Education (ECCE) exist, support to be made available for disabled children.
- Financial assistance to the NGOs working in the area of integrated education.

The scheme is being widely utilized for providing integrated education by the government departments, while the share of NGO effort is remarkably high in implementing IEDC.

IED component was also introduced in DPEP districts as additional to IEDC scheme operating in those districts. Towards this end, DPEP supported:

- Community mobilisation and early detection
- In-service teacher training
- Provision of resource support

¹¹ Government of India and UN Systems. *Perspectives in Special Needs Education in India: A Journey from Isolation to Inclusion*. Community Based Primary Education: Janshala, Monthly Newsletter, Jan-March, 2003 (On-Line), Available: <http://www.un.org.in/JANSHALA>

- Provision of educational aids and appliances
- Removal of architectural barriers

All these activities are now to be supported by the programme. *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (SSA) that visualizes providing quality primary education to all children by 2007 and upper primary education by 2010. It also addresses the vulnerable out-of-school children. The SSA provides for Rs.1200 per child allocation for children with special educational needs. Programme interventions by government and/or NGOs are to form part of the plans for access, retention and quality elementary education (SSA framework for Implementation). The programme attempts to break the rigidity and gives flexibility and discretion to implementing agencies to allocate the funds as per needs. The steps needed for implementation of IED under SSA are classified under three headings:

1. Direct Services to Children – These are identification, formal and functional assessment, preparation of individualised need-based profile, provision of all necessary required support, aids and appliances and learning material suitable to the special need of a child and barrier-free environment.
2. Support Services – Sensitising and training parents, teachers, community leaders and the community as a whole; provision of physiotherapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, counseling etc. in the resource room; vocational education of disabled children at upper primary level; use of technology in special aids and appliances, computer assisted instruction and development of low cost/no cost teaching and learning aids using indigenous material; adaptations in the evaluation system.
3. Monitoring and Evaluation- This is an important aspect for assessing progress and providing improvement in the process. Therefore, an adequate and efficient mechanism needs to be in place for this purpose. This can also be done in partnership with NGOs (SSA Framework for Implementation, p33).

Other Initiatives

There are also initiatives undertaken by the other ministries/departments that have contributed towards mainstreaming of children with disabilities. There are District Rehabilitation Centres and Vocational rehabilitation centres established by Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, besides other schemes of assistance for persons with disabilities and voluntary organizations working in the disability sector. There are six National Institutes for the Handicapped in India, which provide direct services (e.g. assessment, early intervention, training etc), conduct human resource development programmes, engage in research activities independently and in collaboration with voluntary agencies, and produce resource material and equipment relevant to Indian needs. The National Institute of Open Schooling too provides an alternative form of education to children with disabilities with flexibility. The CBSE and other Boards of School Examination have provided for relaxation to disabled students.

SEMINAR THEMES

The last decade has witnessed a lot of activities by way of policy interventions and enabling legislation for promoting the education of children with special needs. There are

a lot of variations available across the globe. Conceptual clarity is yet to emerge. There are several issues in the road towards inclusion.

- One of these is the problem inherent in policies and their ideological basis. According to Tomlinson “as long as teachers are told to be inclusive, not given higher resources, but also urged to get more mainstream children to higher educational ‘standards’ they resist. Current policies do not satisfy teachers in either mainstream or separate school, nor academics who urge more extensive form of inclusive education.” (Cited in Jha, 2001, p.77). This statement is equally true for India. One needs to understand implications of these policies for management of Inclusive education across the country.
- States like Karnataka, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu have been upfront in implementing IED in association with the NGOs, however, with differing levels of involvement. Non-government organizations have been more active and have developed their own inclusive education programmes. Many of these represent cases of restructuring of special schools to offer specialized services. These NGOs prepare children with disabilities to be mainstreamed in regular schools, sensitize the schools staff towards diverse needs, train and support teachers and generate community awareness. They are also involved in implementing IED component in selected blocks. This partnership could have implications for management of inclusive education.
- Over the years, the NGOs approach has witnessed increased strength of commitment, professional soundness and favourable attitude towards inclusive education and a significant role in initiating, supporting and implementing a variety of services for children with disabilities. Can these be recognized and considered as possible exemplars of management of inclusive education?
- Private Schools are also organizing Inclusive Education without taking funds from the government scheme. India has about 45% of its schools, especially at the secondary level as aided or private schools. Many of these are in urban locations. Many of these schools have started practicing inclusion at their own initiative or on the demands of the community. Till date, coverage under such initiatives has not been systematically recorded in the official statistics (Mukhopadhyay, 2002)¹². Are there any lessons to be learnt from these practices?
- A system which does not attend to views and concerns of the people for whom it is meant is most likely to be unresponsive to their needs. The field observations show that the percolation effects of the envisioned programme seem to be diluted sometimes limiting the inclusion of child to mere placement and thus contributing to the negative experiences of children and their parents. Management practices need to reflect on questions such as ---*Does the placement entail positive experiences for the child or is it a mere obligation to admit the child in the school? Is regular class instruction sufficient to bring about the*

¹² Mukhopadhyay, S. and Mani, MNG, Education for All, Year 2000 Assessment: Education of Children with Special Needs (2002) in Govinda, R. (Ed.), *Education India 2000*. New Delhi: Oxford Press.

progress of students with disabilities in crucial academic and social skill areas? Does it improve educational experience of the child? What are the practices that would contribute towards it? Being aware of wide ranging needs of children would help professionals, administrators as well as policy makers to make the school experience relevant to them.

- Lastly, but most importantly are the teachers of children with disabilities who face additional demands and need to be supported to teach in integrated classroom. But what is appropriate support? What and who should it comprise of? These indicate the need to reflect on Manpower needs of this emerging area and dialogue between agencies responsible for generating manpower – NCTE, RCI, University Departments, NCERT and NIEPA and also parallel bodies at the state level.

SEMINAR PURPOSE

This seminar aimed primarily at bringing together perspectives of people from different fields i.e. government agencies, NGOs, university departments actively supporting the inclusive education programmes in different states across the country, with the express purpose to have deliberations on the *Management of Inclusive Education*, focusing around the following:

- Visualizing the management of Inclusive Education in the coming years in the national and international perspectives.
- Deliberating on the partnership between various major Institutes contributing to the manpower needs and its implications for management of inclusive education.
- Making recommendations for facilitating Policy Interventions and Planning Strategies to have a more effective reach out to children and youth with special education needs.

It also aimed at affording an opportunity to share and deliberate on the best practices for the management of Inclusive Education at *primary, secondary and higher education levels* in rural as well as urban settings as exemplars of Management of Inclusive Education in the government and non-government sectors.

PARTICIPATION

The participants included Professionals, Officials from Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, State Governments, other government agencies, representatives from NGOs and University Departments working for inclusive education. In all – attended the seminar (Annexure-III). As many as 26 papers on major dimensions of the problem proposed to be discussed were presented divided under four sections, viz:

- a) Policy on Inclusion,
- b) Planning for Inclusion,
- c) Managing Inclusion, and
- d) Manpower Development for inclusion.

Besides the inaugural and valedictory sessions, four business sessions discussed various issues raised in the papers with active participation of experts and participants, as presented in the brief reporting that follows.

REPORTING OF PROCEEDINGS

Day 1

A. Inaugural Session

Prof. P.K. Joshi, Director, NIEPA and chairman of the inaugural session, while welcoming the seminarians enumerated the initiatives in the forms of policy and legislation towards inclusive education, with due thrust on inclusion of children with disabilities in education with appropriate support systems. He suggested that NGOs, universities, and government agencies need to come together for successful implementation of inclusive education.

Dr. Uma Tuli, Chief Commissioner of Disabilities, New Delhi, the Chief Guest at the Seminar, while delivering the inaugural address, focused on the initiatives made in the areas of Access, Education and Employment for All since 2001. As per NSSO Survey of 2002 there are 85 million children with disabilities in the country. Only 45% of them are in school. About 30,000 children are enrolled in regular schools in Delhi. Directions have been given to MCD Schools for making schools accessible even by using contingency funds. Ninety-one per cent of schools in Delhi are now accessible. Five national workshops were conducted for administrators to orientation towards disabilities and special requirements thereon. The presentation also focused on barriers faced in implementation of inclusive education. There is poor linkage between pre-school and primary education. The transport is not accessible to person with disabilities. There are delays and lags in providing Disability Certificates, which are provided at the rate of 29 lakhs per year. Insufficient coordination between government departments and NGOs also inhibits implementation. She also made some suggestions for successful implementation. Inclusive education demands execution of multi-level cooperative activities and convergence of resources. So, holistic approach for rehabilitation and education services must be followed. Integrated sports and cultural activities must be organized. Universities and media have an important role in generating public awareness. The case study of Amar Jyoti demonstrated the model followed for successful implementation of inclusive education.

Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay, Head, Educational Policy Unit, NIEPA, while introducing the Seminar Papers and the schedule (Appendix I) for the Seminar, expressed NIEPA's concern for promoting inclusive education, since professionalism in this area needs to be enhanced.

The special guest for the inaugural session, Mohtarma Talat Azad from Agha Khan University, Pakistan shared experiences of inclusive education of the Agha Khan University Integrated Education for Disabled Children (AKUIED) Programme, elaborating various initiatives taken towards IED consequent upon Pakistan's policy on

Special Education (1999 and 2002). Mainstream school surveys have been conducted. Whole School improvement programme has been undertaken in Phase-II. Pakistan Association for Inclusive Education (PAIE) has been constituted with about 2000 members. For training purposes, M. Ed Course as well as Module on IE (Distance Mode) has been drafted. Inclusive Education has been integrated into different programmes at AKU. Many challenges confront the implementation of inclusive education. According to her, the practices, policies and culture of mainstream government schools inhibit the inclusion of children with disabilities. There are two separate departments for education and special education in the country, which make the integration of two streams of education difficult. Allotment of time in courses of education for integrated education and development of an integrated course including marginalized areas is required. Adapting Index of Inclusion for implementation at the local level and networking between various agencies at regional level is important for facilitating implementation of inclusive education in the country.

Observations

After the presentations, the participants made some observations especially regarding the concept of inclusive education. Prof. Mohammed Miyan pointed towards the existing confusion between terminologies of integrated and inclusive education. Very few models of inclusive schools exist and there is an essential need of merging special and general education. Dr. Uma Tuli, explained the difference between integration and inclusion and also emphasized on the role of resource centres in implementing inclusion. Mohtarma Azad explained that in integration, the child has to adjust in the mainstream curriculum while in inclusion; the curriculum has to be adapted for different learning styles. Prof. Jangira referring to NSSO Surveys, including also the NCERT Survey, stated the definitions for various disabilities were found to be different. Mr. M.M. Jha said that a criterion of 40% disability does not make sense in providing education services in the context of EFA.

B. Presentation of the Theme Paper

Managing Inclusive Education – Policy to Implementation

Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay presented the theme paper entitled, “Managing Inclusive Education – Policy to Implementation”, explaining the path from the policy to implementation of inclusive education and the barriers therein. Inclusive education means removing all barriers to provide education for all children. The questions we need to answer as planners and implementers are:

- How quality education can be effectively and efficiently delivered for all children?
- What are the barriers for achieving this goal?
- What are current policies designed and operational practices being implemented for inclusive education provision?

Enumerating the UN Policies on inclusive education, Prof. Mukhopadhyay expressed that one is not sure about the magnitude of disability in India in absence of reliable and comprehensive database although NSSO Survey (2002) has made a projection of 9029 children per 1,00,000 children in the 5-14 years age groups. Regional disparities have neither been addressed nor understood. According to her, SSA focuses on inclusive education and, thus, funding may not be a constraint. However, the question remains, with such a large number of children out of school, is SSA going to achieve EFA? Several decentralized structures have been created at the local level for supporting education like Village Education Committees and Mother Teacher Associations but there is no mention or inclusion of parents of children with disabilities role in them. There are also no efforts for removing gender disparities in case of education of children with disabilities. Application of school mapping and micro planning would work for covering all children with disabilities. There is also a need to re-look and integrate health and employment policies in context of inclusive education.

Prof. Mukhopadhyay also outlined the Equity Concerns of EFA for assessing inclusion. These are:

- Academic achievement and other student outcomes.
- Equitable access
- Equitable treatment
- Equitable opportunity to learn
- Equitable resources.

She emphasized the need of partnership between government departments and agencies, NGOs, university departments, Boards of Education in implementing inclusive education. There is a need for communication and generating awareness regarding disability services being provided by the government and NGO sector, and a website can be created for this. EDUSAT (Educational Satellite) can also be very well utilized for this purpose.

Post-Presentation Observations

Prof. Jangira (Education Specialist, World Bank), who chaired this session, referring to the broad overview presented in the theme paper, posed questions like how can issue of the unreached be addressed and what were the support services available in the system and the schools? The theme paper was then declared open for suggestions and discussion

The participants raised various questions. Dr. Anita Julka asked how can one address children not learning in the context of policy of non-detention. Dr. Punani pointed out that discussions were always based on Central Government models while there needs to be focus at state level as the State Governments were responsible for implementation. Dr. Sushma said that there is already a policy of 3% reservation in the University for disabled students, so this should be put in to practice. Under inclusive education more groups of children need to be covered rather than only disabled children. Also, there was very little networking between NGOs and government organizations. Ms. Renu Singh said that the policy and planning of inclusive education had very little emphasis on preschool education.

Ms. Usha Grover pointed out that there was a no course in cross-disability available to train grass root level workers. Mr. Raman Shankar was of the opinion that though IEDC Scheme is a very comprehensive scheme that covers pre school education, the support given by SSA and DPEP for early intervention is not very strong. Ms. Rajul Padmanabhan emphasized on accountability on the part of teachers for inclusive education. Problems are more faced in higher secondary classes where the resource teacher is not familiar with the content of the curriculum. Prof. Jangira explained said that special schools have low expectations and, therefore, achievement of children is low. However, if the child is in integrated setting, achievement is not lower than special schools. In countries, where performance and achievement are highly valued, the children with disabilities are mostly excluded. Mr. M.M. Jha said that in the context of certification for disability, we should use the common principle of jurisprudence “innocent until proven guilty” since education is a right for all children.

Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay, in responding to the comments and questions, said that non-detention policy should not mean no learning for children. She agreed that there needs to be more focus at State level and that early intervention should be encouraged. There is a need to look not only at academic evaluation but also at social evaluation of the implementation of the inclusive education. It is very important to monitor performance and the Boards of School Education have a very important role to play in this regard.

Further, the support systems needed to include all students in schools as well as the partnerships required between different stakeholders.

C. Business Session I: Policy on Inclusion

Prof. Jangira chaired the session. Six presentations were made at this session.

Mr. M.M. Jha’s, presentation (Ministry of HRD), “From Special to Inclusive Education-International Perspectives and Indian Policies” elaborated the need for studying the discourses at the country level and highlighted difficulties crafted by policies. According to him, models and perspectives lead to practices and literature focuses on medical model, sociological and institutional perspectives on disability. Reforms are needed in schools to become inclusive schools which must include mixed abilities and practice inclusive pedagogy. He questioned them relevance of Indian policies and practices. According to him, NFE has not helped in educating children with disabilities and IEDC schools are running as special schools. Education Bill may lead to further segregation by using terms like “special needs” and “learning disabilities.”

Dr. Anita Julka’s, (NCERT) presentation on Teacher Education Policy for Inclusive Education reported the findings of NCERT conducted research to assess teacher education programmes in a sample of 43 DIETs in ten states. It revealed that in 70% of states, special educational needs were covered in one-two Papers in an optional paper. The special educational needs were the included within in-service training in a tiny measure. Factors responsible for variation were principal of DIETs and personnel trained in the area. 51% respondents felt no significant impact of training imparted on teachers. There was a lack of resource persons in area of special educational needs. 79% of respondents felt that no resource room was available for special educational needs

practice. There were no linkages established with NGOs working in the field. The study indicated the need for resource materials and linkages to be established. Advocacy and research are required to be undertaken in the area of pedagogy for training the teachers in inclusive education.

Ms. Indumathi Rao, (CBR Network, Karnataka), in her paper, “Inclusive Education: A Case for Evidence-based-Policy Planning” explained the concept of evidence-based policy planning as a process of observing and understanding the grassroots realities to trace the path to achieve the expected goals. Still many children with disabilities have no access to schools and very few girls with disabilities are able to reach higher classes. We have failed miserably in achieving EFA Goals to provide education within neighborhood schools, compulsory retention after enrolment, and compulsory achievement of every child. Funding has been allocated without much result. Definition of special educational needs must be framed in a specific education perspective, as for example; the Karnataka Portage Udisha scheme is being better utilized than IEDC. It emphasizes that inclusive education should not be an “Add-On” programme with must be seen as a strategy of achieving UEE.

Ms. Vijaya Dutta, (Institute of Cerebral Palsy, Kolkata), in her presentation, “Strategic Policy Formulation for Children with Multiple Disabilities” referred to the EFA daunting challenge to achieve in the light of a large number of out of school children, lack of manpower and services in rural areas. As such, formulation of policies must acknowledge successful practices and identify facilitating factors for inclusive education such as: teacher training, support services, collaborative practices, specialized instruction and Participation of all stakeholders, etc. She shared the general belief that not all children with disabilities can be included because: teacher-student ratio is high; there is undue emphasis on rote learning and emphasis on grades. She made suggestions for policy formulation and implementation like alternative methods of evaluation, modification of curriculum, sensitization of teachers and modifying physical environment for better access.

Ms. Madhumita Puri, (Society for Child Development, New Delhi) in her paper, “Students with Learning Problems: To Include or Not To!” addressed to issues regarding practical basis of inclusion for children with learning disorders, accepting that inclusion of children with learning disorders is non-negotiable. Curriculum adaptation and modification is required for slow learners and the intellectually impaired children. Schooling must be the same for all children and not just social inclusion for children with special educational needs. Provision need to be made for inclusion of children with learning disorders through measure like: Admission to All, Focus on pre-school intervention, including TLM, Reframing prescribed workbooks accredited certification of educational achievement, etc.

Dr. Bhushan Punani, (Blind Person’s Association, Ahmedabad), through his paper, “Planning for Inclusive Education: The Gujarat Experience” shared the experiences of implementing inclusive education in Gujarat. Integrated education started in Gujarat in 1981 with 11 students and grant of Rs 65,000. It now covers all disabilities with a grant of 12 crores. To achieve EFA, strategies utilized by the state are: Involving community and state machinery, Utilizing all existing schemes for supporting education of children with disabilities, Early Intervention, Residential Education, Promoting social

communication and Revamping existing machinery. These efforts have resulted in higher educational opportunities for persons with disabilities and certainly in creating future job opportunities. Teacher training under SSA has led to sensitization and fostering of inclusive education. It is important to monitor and evaluate inclusive education and this is possible by shift to student-centered classroom practices. Tools and procedures for evaluation of inclusive practices at pre-school and primary levels should be developed. The model of strategies adopted in Gujarat is going to be replicated in China and Mongolia as well as other countries in South Africa. It is also important to share experiences with other states in India as well.

Observations

The session Chairman, Prof. Jangira observed that Gujarat is an example of implementation of inclusive education through collaboration of many institutions. We can learn from this state for further planning procedures. Mr. Punani highlighted the unique exemplars of Gujarat for which 60% of fund allocation comes from Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. Mostly addressed to rural areas, NGOs are handling implementation at community level. Gujarat Council for Social Research has been set up to monitor at district level and the parent's support for these programmes is tremendous. Ms. Rekha More said that Education Department of Maharashtra has modified textbooks in history and geography for children with varying learning needs. Mr. Mishra expressed that special education must come under one Ministry, which should be Ministry of Human Resource Development. Mr. Raman Shankar, acknowledged Gujarat as a concrete example of inclusive education. While Ms. Madhuri Deshpande opined that there is need of amalgamation of special education, integration and inclusion based on the needs of children. Dr. Sushma wanted the Gujarat experience to be documented so that it could be implemented in other states, which, as Prof. Mukhopadhyay told, is being documented as a part of on going research project on inclusive education in NIEPA. Mr. Punani said that RCI has also documented its case study in its publication "Summit of Mind". Mr Jha said that there have been various perspectives presented in the Session. There is thus a need of reexamining the definition of special education and identification. The very concept of normality is now being questioned. There must be separate funding for implementation of inclusive education. Ms. Indumathi Rao said that cost-effectiveness, considering the context, must also be kept in mind for policy and planning.

Prof. Jangira, concluding the session, remarked that a number of observations have been made on the basis of evidence. Also, in 1991, PIED showed how inclusive education could be implemented with the class size of 60-65 children. Inclusive education is not an issue of disability but of EFA. Large lists of out of school children have been prepared but no efforts have been made to trace out these children. The policy is fragmented due to the administrative arrangement of the two Ministries handling education of children with disabilities. Out of 80 countries, only in 7 countries does the dual system of education continues to exist. This must come to an end. Definitions of disability must include all that causes barriers in learning, thus making them functional. There are misconceptions that inclusive education is costly. Inclusion means teacher must reach out to all children and not just children with disabilities. So the denominator for calculating cost includes the number of all children. There are many aspects about inclusive education, being implemented today that need to change. Special education and

general education both need to come together. Curriculum adjustments are required to be made and classroom management has to be taken forward. Millions cannot afford specialist help. Teachers must carry out identification of Learning Disability, not psychiatrists. Pre-service teacher training is more fragmented today which needs to focus on responding to needs of all children. Module of three months Foundation Course by RCI is not going to work for EFA. Policies of teacher education must change. Special Schools should become resource centers for inclusive education. An independent body must evaluate SSA. Policy must be dynamic to be an enabling policy. There must be a forum for sharing e.g. on website.

Day 2

Business Session II: Planning for Inclusion

Dr. Ranjana Srivastava, UEE Specialist, chaired the session. Five papers were presented at this session. Ms. Meera Devi (State Project Office, Karnataka) in her presentation, “Management of Inclusive Education in Karnataka” said that inclusive education is an integral part of UEE in Karnataka where about 36,402 children have been mainstreamed. The budget for inclusive education has been planned in the participatory mode in partnership with NGOs. The state organizes identification camps, provides aids and appliances and medical intervention for children with disabilities. Awareness and training programmes for teachers/parents are conducted and education is provided to children with disabilities in different settings. DIETs in Karnataka run RCI recognized courses. NGOs are utilized as resource centres. Convergence with other departments is established. No-rejection policy is being followed in school admissions. The challenges for the future are to raise awareness for education of children with disabilities, training more personnel, providing more appliances. A study is also being conducted to evaluate the inclusive education programme in terms of learner achievements.

Ms. Sreekumari presented Mr. Ahammed Kutty’s paper entitled, “Planning and Management of Inclusive Education in Kerala” and shared strategies of planning and implementing inclusive education in the state. Every year in June, a list of children with disabilities is collected from District Education Officers, medical examination is conducted and, based on this, a final list is prepared of students with more than 40% of disability. Integrated schools have been created through IEDC scheme. NGOs act as resource centres. Resource teachers provide support to children. Disabled children are given concessions. Visually impaired students give examinations through computers. A 5-day field level training programme is run under SSA for teachers. SSA has also encouraged research for developing material for the hearing impaired children.

Mr. K. Raman Shankar (NAB, Mumbai) in “Working towards Inclusive Education-Practices and Strategies of National Association for the blind” focused on the work of NAB in the area of inclusive education for the visually impaired. As a result of NAB’s efforts, around 20,000 visually impaired children are attending regular schools and approximately 5000 children are covered under IEDC. While implementing inclusive education, financial sustainability and community participation are both very important for its success. Awareness of all community stakeholders is also essential. For example,

retired headmasters worked for mobilizing community assistance. Para-professional courses were conducted for urban housewives and Social Animators Course for rural participants by the organization. Integrated Camps were organized to tap peer groups. Community Awareness Camps were also organized. Skill enhancement programmes were conducted to train teachers in Braille, tactile teaching material etc. Due to sensitization of community, decrease in visits by professionals has been achieved; they now visit once in fifteen days. Few children do not need the itinerant teachers, since parents have undergone para-professional course. Parents have also taken initiative to send their children to non-IEDC schools with support from NAB. NAB gives financial and technical support to smaller NGOs and encourages them to work on government grants. A number of its partners are working for cross-disabilities. Measures have been initiated for improvement of the IEDC Scheme. The ratio of resource teacher to student has been reduced to 1:6 in the revised scheme. It is now open to suggestions from stakeholders and practitioners. Support systems and services are also vital for inclusion.

Dr. Amitav Misra (Rohilkhand University) in “Evaluation of Inclusive Education Practices and Implications for SSA in UP” presented the findings of the evaluation study conducted by the UP Government of the state’s IED programme. The study evaluated the impact of IED on learning and attitude of teachers. The sample comprised of randomly selected 10 primary schools. Methodology comprised interviews, observations and achievement assessment tools. It was found that success of IEDC was dependent on student-teacher ratio and capacity of school to accommodate all children. Out of total a number of 69 disabled students in the schools, majority of students were orthopaedically disabled, only seven were with intellectual impairment. Only four children had dropped out. Case studies of children were conducted. The achievement patterns showed that children with hearing impairment had high achievement while children with visual impairment had lower achievement. Achievement of children with learning disabilities was higher than other categories, but lesser than non-disabled students. On grade level assessment, all children were found to be functioning at several grade levels below actual grade. However, social maturity of all children with disabilities was found to be at par with non-disabled students except those with intellectual impairment. Retention of disabled children was found to be good. About half of teachers attitude was found to be non favourable towards disabled students. The study concluded that: Appropriate resource support should be made available; In-service teacher training is required; IEPs must be implemented; It is important to adapt TLM; Administrators must monitor classroom transactions; there is need to plan collaborative group work; provide more support to teachers; to identify and recognize dedicated teachers; and that each NPRC should get at least one teacher trained for six-week course; quality and method of teacher training be standardized; and teacher training be redefined and planned.

Dr. C.R. Das, (State Project Office, Orissa) in his paper, “Inclusive Education by Orissa Primary Education Programme Authority” focused on strategies being followed by the State of Orissa for implementing IED, especially the paradigm shift from Integration to Inclusive Education reflected in implementation of the programme. The state gets grant under SSA for implementation. The activities taken under IED include: Survey for identification; Enrollment of identified children; Organization of Medical Camps in convergence with other organizations; Distributing aids and appliances; Training for teachers, parents, VEC, anganwadi workers; Providing barrier-free environment;

Strengthening Special Schools; Theme-based camps at cluster level; Conducting community awareness programmes; Organising TLM exhibitions and workshop on inclusive education; Developing IEPs with the help of NGOs; and Conducting research on IED Programme. The state plans to establish a State Resource Centre and District Disability Centres for children with disabilities.

Observations

The Chairperson concluded the session saying that the activities undertaken in four States reflect different stages of implementing inclusion. Common to all is the need to create an appropriate environment in the schools. Planning in a systematic manner to change the schools is a vital shift from integration to inclusion. A formal statement of vision is necessary which may comprise: Conceptualizing inclusion in the present context; Statement of how schools should change; Planning for individualised education programme (TLM, skills required must be addressed); Modifying curriculum to meet needs of all children; Training of all school personnel; and Parameters of evaluation at different stages must be created. Besides, policy needs to be understood with other existing policies in mind. All children must learn in their own learning styles. Remedial support may not be required if teaching learning is effectively planned.

Business Session III: Managing Inclusion

Prof Smriti Swarup, Dean, SNDT University, Mumbai, chaired the session. Three presentations were made at this session. Ms. Madhuri Deshpande (Centre for Opportunities in Education and Rehabilitation, Pune) in “Philosophy and Practices of Inclusive Education, Case Study of Ankur Vidyamandir: An Inclusive School” presented the case of an inclusive school providing education to both disabled and non-disabled students from pre-school to Class X in Marathi as well as English medium. The school, run with a goal that children with disabilities are everyone’s responsibility, follows zero-reject policy in school admissions. It has 9% severely challenged and 45% socially marginalised children. There is appropriate placement and grouping of pupils on the basis of individual needs. Multi-level teaching is followed in classroom. There is modification of curriculum according to individual needs. Need-based programmes are conducted which include functional academics and vocational training. Support system includes services of therapists and doctors. Favourable attitude towards inclusion has been developed with the help of personnel in school and parent training.

Ms. Renu Singh (AADI, New Delhi) in her paper, “Charting the Way Forward-From Isolation To Collaboration” focused on Indian context of implementing inclusive education and new expectations arising from the general system of education, indicating changes required at the school and classroom levels to encompass collaboration among general and special education teachers. Sharing experiences from AADI (Spastic Society of Northern India) of supporting inclusion in the mainstream schools, she spoke of models of collaborative teaching which could be utilized in schools for inclusive education and about the special and general educators need to undergo role changes to realize inclusion.

Mr. G.K. Aggarwal (Shikshit Yuva Seva Samiti, Basti) in “Creating Services for Children with Special Need at Pre-School Level” focused on integrating the services for

young children with disabilities within the ICDS structure, elaborating that intervention services could be easily provided with the help of ICDS in rural areas. Creating such services would involve training of ICDS workers, convergence with other government programmes or NGOs, ensuring programme sustainability and follow up. He also suggested activities that can be carried out by the Anganwadi worker for providing intervention services.

Observations

The participants agreed that ICDS should be the main agenda of inclusion and importance of early intervention cannot be ruled out. There should be special training and development of resource material for Anganwadi workers. The chairperson said that a community of administrators should be created for implementing inclusion since they can bring about changes in the system.

Day 3

Business Session III (contd.): Managing Inclusion

Ms Anuradha Mohit (Special Rapporteur, National Human Rights Commission), chaired the continued session on Managing Inclusion. A set of another six papers was presented at this session in continuation of the earlier one. Ms. Saraswathi Narayanswamy in “A Case Study of Balvidyalaya: The School for Young Deaf Children” presented the model of early intervention services provided by the organization. She said that hearing-impaired children were least included, since they do not develop verbal language skills on their own. Early intervention services are thus required to enhance receptive and expressive language. Balvidyalaya prepares children with hearing impairment for inclusion into regular schools. It uses Montessori materials and has created TLM in Tamil. It has also developed Dhvani Cards and curriculum for the 0-6 year age-group. The methodology used is Auditory Oral Mode/ Multi-sensory approach. It conducts orientation programme for professionals and also provides counseling parents. Teachers are also trained at the organization. According, early identification, intervention and development of human resource for support is essential for inclusion of children at the later stage.

Ms. Smita Pais (Ali Yavar Jung Institute of Hearing Handicapped, Mumbai) in her paper “Management of Inclusive Education of Children with Hearing Impairment” elaborated that hearing impairment is an invisible disability and, therefore, often remains undiagnosed. It leads to associated language problems and educational difficulties. For effective inclusion of children with hearing impairment, early identification and intervention is essential. Generating awareness, conducting research on genetics of deafness and establishing Disability Helpline and Indian Sign Language Cell would help in this direction. To facilitate the mainstreaming of children, adaptations in curriculum and teaching are important. The models of teaching used should be that of Consultant/Team/Co-teaching. Training Programmes should be conducted to train teachers to teach children with hearing impairment.

Ms. Rajul Padmanabhan (Vidyasagar, Chennai) in her presentation “Inclusion- Challenge and Opportunity” expressed that inclusive education must be seen as a reform in general education. More research is needed to produce empirical evidence in this area. Other observations made in the paper maintain that inclusive education cannot happen without overhaul of curriculum, therefore a broad-based curriculum must be adopted e.g. based on Gandhiji’s concept of basic education. Training of teachers must be spread over a longer period of time. It is dangerous to try and train general educators by special educators, as they are not familiar with general education. IEPs should be avoided, as, when they are translated into general education, it would be disastrous for children. Cooperative partnership needs to be developed among general and special educators. Sharing her experiences from an inclusive school run by the organization as part of a CBR project, it was observed that mainstreaming of children with disabilities resulted in overall improvement of schooling experience of children. Average results in State Board examination rose to average 70%. The teaching methodology evolved by teachers themselves resulted in shift towards activity-based teaching. Urban teachers resist inclusive education and government schools have much red tapism. These have to be targeted. Higher education should be more vocationalized so that jobs are possible.

Dr. Suneeta Kulkarni and Dr. Meera Oke, (SOHAM, Pune), in their paper, “Inclusion – The Real McCoy Recommendations from a Field Perspective” explained that it was important to take developmental perspective towards inclusion. Once we start living with differences, different models emerge. Faulty orientation, labels and academic jargons plague the special education and integration of children. Limited scope of policy has inhibited the development of range of services. The services are provided with a charity syndrome, rather as a matter of right. For implementation of inclusive education, there should be appropriate assessment procedures and goals designed for children. Networking with various agencies and organizations is important. Parents play an important role as partners. Documentation and dissemination of research would help in developing new and appropriate practices. Lessons for maximising the use of resources/lessons can be learnt from other communities.

Ms. Shyamala Dalvi, (Fr. Agnel School, Mumbai) in “Promoting Inclusion Preventing Inclusion – A Case Study” focused on the model of inclusion being followed by the school. Admission to the school is decided through lottery system. The school runs an orphanage with 100 students. The model of inclusion being followed by the school is that of the Acronym RADICLE, which stands for:

- R- Red alert at earliest level
- A- Assessment by a team of professionals
- D- Differential Diagnosis
- I- Intervention
- C- Collaboration
- L- Learning
- E- Evaluation

The three case studies of children in Secondary sections were reported to show the model in action. It is also important to accept that without involvement of peers, parents and whole school, inclusion cannot be possible. It was observed that, curriculum rigidity of

National Open School posed a barrier for children with disability. The policy framers must get a feedback from implementers for improving the policy.

Ms. Usha Grover, (National Institute for the Mentally Handicapped, New Delhi) in the paper, "Inclusion of Mentally Challenged Children." outlined requirements for implementing inclusion. The acronym INCLUSION stands for:

- I- Infrastructure
- N- National Level Policies to implement
- C- Capacity Building
- L- Legislation Reform
- U- Understanding
- S- Sensitisation
- I- Initiatives
- O- Organisation
- N- Networking

According to her, it is important that all ingredients come together in timely manner to successfully implement inclusive education.

Observations

Mr. Naba Kishore Singh (MHRD), requested participants' comments and suggestions on the Scheme of IEDC, which is being revised, by the ministry, to be called the Scheme for Inclusive Education. There are many overlapping elements in SSA, IED Component and IEDC. He raised questions such as: why should they not be merged (since IEDC is catering to small number of children)? Is providing assistance through resource teacher in the teacher-student ratio of 1:8 feasible in IEDC? The participants observed that support systems are required for inclusive education to work. It need not be bound by stringent ratios of the Scheme. Special Educator is also required for a time frame and has to expend time on traveling.

The chairperson conducted this session with the observation that certain criterion must emerge on what is required by each individual child. Documentation of what works and what does not need to be done. A multi-disciplinary approach must be followed for supporting inclusion. Teacher training also must be carefully reviewed in this context.

Business Session IV: Developing Manpower for Inclusion

Prof. Mohammad Miyan (Dean, Jamia Millia Islamia) chaired the session. Five papers were presented at this last Business Session of the Seminar.

Mr. Vijay Shankar, (Shri Rambhadracharya Handicapped University, Chitrakoot) in his paper, "Role of Management in Promoting Inclusion for Children with Disabilities," explained that inclusion is different from Integration, since children do not need to adjust to systems, which must change to meet needs of all children. Planned management in inclusive education would work towards greater efficiency. The aim should be to make society more inclusive. The TLM should be developed for all children. For manpower development in all areas of disabilities, B. Ed. Courses and in-service training should include training for identifying and teaching children with disabilities. Curricular adaptations/modifications must take place and for this, NCERT's model of adapting

Environmental Studies can be replicated. NGOs also have a role in implementing Persons With Disabilities Act.

Dr. Smriti Swarup (SNDT University, Mumbai) in her presentation, “Inclusion: A Challenge in Teacher Education” said that there should not only be focus on teacher education in training for inclusive education, but also on promoting higher education in Universities for students with disabilities. From the point of view of teacher educators, it is important to take cognizance of factors of training teachers like: are general school teachers familiar with the concept of inclusion?; do they understand the diverse educational needs of the learners in the class and their implications?; and Is it important for them to understand and tailor their teaching methods to meet needs of learners? For this, modernizing and restructuring of teacher education is required. Teacher education institutions need to be rejuvenated to augment changes. The components of teacher education should be inter-related, aiming at sensitizing all teachers towards special needs of children, providing skill training and role models. The competencies that need to be imparted to the trainees are instructional planning, collaboration and behaviour management for becoming inclusive teachers. Long-distance courses may not be effective in this regard.

Dr. Neerja Chadha (IGNOU) in her paper, “Manpower Development through Distance Mode” focused on lack of trained personnel for implementing inclusive education. There is an immediate need of programmes to train a large number of professionals. The distance courses are serving this purpose. These programmes are able to take services to the doorstep and have flexibility in terms of pace, place and duration of study. The latest ICT technology is utilised very well for this. EDUSAT is also ready and software needs to be developed for training. Flexibility associated with distance mode of training allows emergence of need-based relevant programmes. There are also extensive study centres available throughout the country. These programmes are also cost-effective. There should be more focus on utilising the potential available such as parents, care-givers and professionals in the areas of disability.

Dr. Sushma Sharma (Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra) in her presentation, “Inclusive Education and Manpower Development,” expressed that inclusion demands children with disabilities to be placed in general classroom and the teacher has to focus on diverse needs. There are not enough facilities for manpower development and training general teachers. The national institutes have to undertake this responsibility. NIVH too has no faculty for a four-year Degree in special education. There is also no networking among University Departments providing training in special education. More UGC Schemes should be there for training in inclusive education. However, there should be no compromise on quality in training through Distance Mode. Collaborative and constructive partnerships should be created among special and general education, parents and para-professionals for manpower development.

Dr. Asha Singh (Lady Irwin College, New Delhi) in her paper, “Academic Inputs Towards the Growth of Inclusive Education” focused on role of Lady Irwin College and model being followed for training manpower for inclusive education. Inclusive education is a part of regular curriculum at the department. It also has a specialization on “Children with Special Needs” at the Masters level in Child Development programme. The students

are provided practical experience of working with children with disabilities through a pre-school and an NGO “Enabling Centre” supported by the faculty of the department. Enabling Centre gives inputs for inclusion under Experimental Scheme of Department of Education. Research with focus on disability is conducted and database continues to expand. Kits for teaching-learning are developed and the students of the department conduct case studies of children with disabilities. The parents too have expectations from teachers to teach their children with disabilities.

Observations

The chairperson summed up various points raised in the session to showcase the difficulty in the process of inclusion. Responsibility lies in the hands of apex agencies, which need to take help from the resource institutions in implementing inclusion. Teacher educators need to be trained. Both formal and informal modes of training are needed and enhancement of quality is required through convergence. A MoU must be signed between RCI, NCTE and UGC for development of human resource. In higher education, materials be developed for enhancing learning. There is also a fundamental need for coordination and networking and developing long-term plans for manpower development in inclusive education. There is a need for more attention paid to the mode of implementation of training, which should not be limited to textbooks. Implications of Distance Mode must also be scrutinized.

CLOSING SESSION

Concluding Address

The concluding session had an address by Prof. Marmar Mukhopadhyay, Joint Director, NIEPA, on Leadership in Management of Inclusive Education. According to new we have to move from pity to regarding persons with disabilities as equals and begin with a new mindset. Various management principles that are relevant for management in inclusive education include:

- Nurture a familial ambience
- Ensure participation of all
- Create awareness that education is a total living experience
- Create mechanisms for participation of all
- Develop collective future vision
- Develop indicators of quality and benchmarks
- Develop plan that is dynamic
- Develop data for decision-making
- Introduce cost-analysis and cost-consciousness
- Create mechanisms for inter-departmental linkages
- Inspire emotive rather than cognitive
- Move from Inspirational Leadership to Primal Leadership
- Innovate and encourage innovation
- Celebrate success and celebrate failure: learn from mistakes

Availing EDUSAT for Inclusive Education

Prof. Mukhopadhyay also spoke about EDUSAT- the educational satellite to be launched by ISRO. This would generate National Network by linking all DIET's. Seventy uplink facilities to be established and 10,000 secondary schools would be linked. Virtual classrooms will be set up with two-way tele-conferencing facilities. Interactive communication will be possible through the network. Seventy-four channels will be available. This is a great opportunity to create awareness in different languages and to decide as to what needs to be done at the national and regional level for promoting inclusive education through the educational channels. These channels could also be well utilized for training purposes.

Cost-Effective Resource Mobilization

Sharing his views in the closing session, Prof. Jangira advised to focus on optimizing participation of all learners and not just the disabled. Ambiguity about pre-school education needs to be curbed. For children with disabilities, this is a matter of survival. Due to dual policy, there is a perception that special and regular systems are the competing systems that need to go together. However, centrality of education has to be in the structure as well as in policy decisions. Support systems like health services and aids and appliances are also needed. Support from the institutions and the parent has to be mobilized. The whole system has to change from top to bottom incorporating interventions for disabilities at every level. Resource and cost-efficiency need attention. Sharing data from good practices is required to develop cost efficient programmes.

The Seminar ended with a vote of thanks by Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay.

Feedback Exercise

Professor Sudesh Mukhopadhyay asked participants to write back three things they have learnt from Seminar and three things they would like to discuss in future for the purpose of seeking feedback.

Feedback was received from some of the participants. Sample of these are as under:

Feedback 1

Thank you very much for giving IICP the opportunity to participate in the Seminar on Management of Inclusive Education so efficiently organized by you. The care with which you looked after all the participants was really appreciated by everyone.

Through the papers presented and the stimulating, sometimes heated, discussions that followed a lot of issues were raised. The variety of problems some organizations faced while trying to implement Inclusive Education were highlighted, together with the strategies used for tackling such problems. The success stories of some organizations indicate that Inclusive Education is possible within specific setups.

A lot of work is going on in implementing Inclusive Education all over the country but it is the tip of the iceberg and there is a lot yet to be achieved. We have to work together to develop a practical and flexible blueprint of implementing Inclusive Education that can be modified and adapted to meet the needs of educational institutions. While developing this it is very important to keep in mind the fact that we have to cater to children with a wide-range of disabilities. It is essential that the Core Team working on this project should comprise people representing different streams including mainstream educators, special educators, administrators, parents and people with disabilities.

For the successful implementation of Inclusive Education, the blueprint should specify, in detail, the kind of support systems that will be available to all educational institutions. We also need to make a joint effort to create awareness regarding disability issues and sensitise all sections of society.

Another important exercise would be to redefine the role and objectives of schools – mainstream and special – so that the focus shifts from an exam-oriented philosophy to one that stresses holistic growth facilitating each child to achieve his /her potential.

Ms. Vijaya Dutt
Principal, Centre for Special Education
Indian Institute of Cerebral Palsy
35/1 Taratolla Road
Kolkata -700088

Feedback 2

It was an excellent opportunity that you gave me to present our organisation at the national level. I sincerely thank you for the same. You and your team were remarkable in organisation of the whole Seminar. The deliberations were excellent and participants (Hand picked by you) were very genuine and straightforward.

Things I appreciated:

1. Wide spectrum of work was presented which would give a positive direction to IE. People working with various disabilities and the possibility of their inclusion could be examined by all of us.
2. Government initiatives and schemes were explained quite in details without beating round the bush. It made us aware of many steps we should be taking to either partner up or get the benefit of the Govt. schemes. Representation of the officials and our dialogue with them was possible.
3. The last but the most important aspect of the seminar was “the emphasis on professionalism in education” Policies, Management and the Manpower was a very systematic way the thinking of the participants was maneuvered. This difference was conspicuous as I have attended the seminars on IE and generally there is no outcome. Therefore on my return the first thing that I did was to give all the material to my staff for a detail study. Take reviews from them and take a stalk at the work that we are doing at COER.

The things that I would like to take up at COER are:

1. Take the responsibility of Manpower development in the state of Maharashtra with the help of RCI and Ministry of SJ&E. I contacted the Commissioner of Disabilities, State and District and brought them for a visit to school. Will soon register with them and proceed.

2. Networking with Govt. And NGOs for give and take of Information and set up an IE Yahoo group (with Dr. Sushama Sharma and Dr. Saraswathy).
3. Work for the wider spread of IE through EDUSAT. Getting prepared and planning for the virtual classroom concept and how our teachers and children will get accustomed to operating on the sets. Accordingly I will book two slots a week and work at it. I am writing to you all this as the tempo of the seminar is still strong. Bless me that I get the strength to do all that I plan. Prof. M. Mukhopadhyay gave a very inspiring speech and there could not have been a better ending. His views were way beyond the deliberations of the 3 days when we were only at apractical level of thinking and operations (passing the buck). He made us stop the buck right at ourselves. That was a great experience.

Ms. Madhuri Deshpande, Director
Centre for Opportunities in Education and Rehabilitation (COER)
5, Vidyadhan Apartments
Opp. Law College Rd.
Sonumai JoshiPath
Pune-411004

Feedback 3

Three things those were useful:

1. Provided coverage of the extent of 'Inclusion' happening in several pockets of India.
2. Fairly good mix of Govt. Departments and the field perspectives.
3. The compilation of articles was comprehensive, and well conceived.

Things we would like to see happen in the future, where we would like to be involved.

1. Develop material for training teachers in inclusion practices.
2. Undertake research related to assessment procedures.
3. Help design and produce programs for teacher training to be used by EDUSAT.
4. Help organize with NIEPA similar such programs in other parts of the country, so as to enable networking with other organizations.

Dr. Suneeta Kulkarni & Dr. Meera Oke
Directors, SOHAM (Training Research and Development)
Pune, India.

**Seminar on Management of Inclusive Education
(4-6 October 2004)**

Programme Schedule

4 October, 2004

- 0930 **Registration**
- 1000 **Inaugural Address: Dr. Uma Tuli, Chief Commissioner of Disabilities**
- Sharing Experiences from Pakistan: Ms. Talat Azad,**
Tutor AKU- IED, Pakistan
- Chairperson: Prof. P.K. Joshi, Director, NIEPA**
- Workshop Setting: Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay, Senior Fellow & Head**
Educational Policy Unit NIEPA
- 1115 **Tea Break**
- 1140 Presentation of Theme Paper: *Prof. Sudesh Mukhopadhyay*
- 1300 **Lunch Break**
- 1400 **Session I- Policy on Inclusion**
- Chairperson: Prof. N.K. Jangira, Former Head, Teacher Education, NCERT**
Consultant- World Bank

Papers Presented

- Madan Jha* From Special to Inclusive Education: International Perspectives and Indian Policies.
- Anita Julka* Teacher Education Policy for Inclusive Education
- Indumathi Rao* Inclusive Education – A Case for Evidence Based Policy Planning
- Vijaya Dutt* Strategic Policy Formulation to Address the Needs of People with Multiple Disabilities –Physical and Neurological with respect to Inclusive Education in India.
- Madhumita Puri* Students with Learning Problems: To Include or Not To!
- Bhushan Punani* Shift from Integrated to Inclusive Education – Gujarat Experience.
- 1600 **Discussion**

5 October, 2004

0930 **Session II- Planning for Inclusion**

Chairperson: *Dr. Ranjana Srivastava, Specialist in UEE*

Papers Presented

- Meera Devi* Management of Inclusive Education under SSA in Karnataka.
- Ahammed Kutty. E.* Planning and Management of Inclusive Education for Disabled Children in Kerala under SSA
- K. Raman Shankar* Working Towards Inclusive Education: Practices and Strategies of NAB
- Amitav Mishra* Evaluation of Inclusive Education Practices and Implications for SSA in UPMr. *C.R. Das:* Inclusive education by Orissa Primary Education Programme Authority

1200 **Discussion**

1300 **Lunch Contd.**

1400 **Session III- Managing Inclusion**

Chairperson: *Prof.. Smriti Swarup, Dean, SNTD University, Mumbai*

Papers Presented

- Madhuri Deshpande* Ankur Vidyamandir – Its Philosophy and Practices of Inclusive Education
- Renu Singh* Charting A Way Forward: Special Schools in the New Millennium
- G.K. Agarwal* Creating Services for Children with Special Need at Pre-School Level

1500 **Discussion**

6 October, 2004

0930 **Session III Managing Inclusion Cont...**

Chairperson: *Ms. Anuradha Mohit, Special Rapporteur, National Human Rights Commission*

Papers Presented

<i>Saraswathi Narayanaswamy</i>	A Case Study of Balvidyalaya, The School for Young Deaf Children
<i>Smita Pais</i>	Management of Inclusive Education of Children with Hearing Impairment
<i>Rajul Padmanabhan</i>	Inclusion- Challenge and Opportunity
<i>Suneeta Kulkarni and M. Oke:</i>	Inclusion: The Real McCoy Recommendations and from A Field Perspective
<i>Shyamala Dalvi:</i>	Promoting Inclusion Preventing Exclusion: A Case Study
<i>Usha Grover:</i>	Inclusion of Mentally Challenged Children

1030 **Discussion**

1100 **Tea Break**

1130 **Session IV Developing Manpower for Inclusion**

Chairperson: *Prof. Mohammad Miyan, Dean, Faculty of Education, Jamia Millia Islamia*

Papers Presented

<i>Vijay Shankar Sharma</i>	Role of Management in Promoting Inclusion for Children with Disabilities
<i>Smriti Swarup</i>	Inclusion: A Challenge in Teacher Education
<i>Neerja Chadha</i>	Manpower Development through Distance Education
<i>Sushama Sharma</i>	Managing Manpower Needs for Inclusive Education
<i>Asha Singh</i>	Academic Inputs towards the Growth of Inclusive Education

1300 **Lunch Break**

1400 **Discussion and Concluding Session**

List of Papers Circulated

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Author</i>	<i>Title</i>
	Uma Tuli	Towards Making Inclusive Education A Reality
	Sudesh Mukhopadhyay Jayanti Prakash	Managing Inclusive Education: Policy to Implementation
Section A	Policy on Inclusion	
	Madan Jha	From Special to Inclusive Education: International Perspectives and Indian Policies
	Vijaya Dutt	Strategic Policy Formulation to Address The Needs of People with Multiple Disabilities – Physical and Neurological with Respect to Inclusive Education In India
	Anita Julka	Teacher Education Policy for Inclusive Education
	Indumati Rao	Inclusive Education – A Case for Evidence Based Policy Planning
	Madhumita Puri*	Students with Learning Problems: To Include or Not To!
	Bhushan Punani	Planning for Inclusive Education – Gujarat Experience
Section B	Planning for Inclusion	
	Meera Devi	Planning and Management of Inclusive Education under SSA in Karnataka
	Ahammed Kutty. E	Planning and Management of Inclusive Education for Disabled Children in Kerala under Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
	K. Raman Shankar	Working Towards Inclusive Education: Practices and Strategies of NAB
	Amitav Mishra Girijesh Kumar	Evaluation of Inclusive Education Practices in Primary Schools and Its Implications for Sarva Siksha Abhiyan in UP

* Only Power Point Presentations.

Section C Managing Inclusion

**Maria Kamalam
P. Nagalakshmi** Making a Difference: Inclusion and Collaboration

Madhuri Deshpande One School for All
Case Study on Ankur Vidyamandir –
An Inclusive School

**Saraswathi
Narayanaswamy** Emerging Practices of Management on
Inclusive Education: A Case Study on
Balavidyalaya, The School for Young Deaf
Children

Renu Singh Charting The Way Forward: From Isolation To
Collaboration

Gopal Krishna Agrawal Creating Services for Children with Special Need
at Pre-School Level

**Suneeta Kulkarni
Meera Oke** Inclusion: The Real McCoy Recommendations
from A Field Perspective

**Varsha Gathoo
Smita Pais** Management of Inclusive Education of Children
with Hearing Impairment

Shyamala Dalvi* Promoting Inclusion Preventing Exclusion: A
Case Study

Usha Grover* Inclusion of Mentally Challenged Children

Vijay Shankar Sharma Role of Management in Promoting Inclusion for
Children with Disabilities

**Section D Manpower Development
for Inclusion**

Smriti Swarup Inclusion: A Challenge in Teacher Education

**Neerja Chadha*
Prabha Chawla** Manpower Development Through Distance
Education

Sushma Sharma* Manpower Development and Inclusive Education

Asha Singh Academic Inputs Towards the Growth of
Inclusive Education

* Only Power Point presentation

List of Participants

New Delhi

Ms. Anita Julka
Reader
Department of Education of
Groups with Special Needs
NCERT, Sri Aurobindo Marg
New Delhi-110016.
Fax: 91-11-6868419

Ms Usha Grover
NIMH, Regional Centre
Kasturba Niketan
Lajpat Nagar
New Delhi-110024

Ms. Jasmeet Kaur
Guru Nanak College of Education
Road No. 75
Punjabi Bagh
New Delhi-110026
Mobile: 9810509206
E-mail: Jasmeetdivtej@yahoo.co.in

Mr. M.M. Jha
D-F/118, Satya Marg
Chanakyapuri
New Delhi
Phone: 9810143089, 24673428
E-mail: madan.jha@wolfson.oxford.ac.uk

Shri S.K. Mishra
Member Secretary
Rehabilitation Council of India
23 A, Shivaji Marg
(Near Karampura Complex)
New Delhi
Fax: 25911967
Phone: 25928020

Ms. Archana Prabhakar
Aanchal Disability Resource Centre
Kautilya Marg
Chanakya Puri
New Delhi

Ms. Neerja Chadha
IGNOU
School of Continuing Education
Maidan Garhi, New Delhi.
Phone: 29535926

Ms. Prabha Chawla
IGNOU
School of Continuing Education
Maidan Garhi
New Delhi
Phone: 29535926.

Ms. Anuradha Naidu
SABALA-ACTION AID
C-75, South Ext. II
New Delhi-110049
E-mail: anuradhan@actionaidindia.org
Phone: 51642348-Ext.204

Dr. Uma Tuli
Chief Commissioner of Disabilities
6, Bhagwan Das Road
New Delhi.
Phone: 011-23386054, 23386154
E-mail: ccpd@hub.nic.in

Shri O. Nabakishore Singh
Director (NC)
M/HRD, Shastri Bhawan
New Delhi-110001
Phone - 011-23070989

Dr. Ranjana Srivastava
Consultant (Edu) and
Honorary Director,
Centre for Education Research & Development.
New Delhi.

Dr. Meena Gautam
NCTE
(National Council for Teacher Education)
IG Indore Stadium
New Delhi-110002

Ms. B. Uma
Social Worker
Aanchal Disability Resource Centre
Kautilya Marg, Chanakyapuri
New Delhi-110021

34 *National Seminar on Management of Inclusive Education*

Prof. N.K. Jangira
Sr. Educational Specialist
The World Bank, New Delhi Office
70, Lodhi Estate
New Delhi-110003.
Phone: 24619491 Ext.-355
Mobile: 9891327392
E-mail: njangira@worldbank.org

Ms Meenu Bhambani
Consultant, The World Bank
New Delhi Office
70, Lodhi Estate
New Delhi-110003

Ms. Madhumita Puri
Sector A, Pocket B, 1305
Vasant Kunj
New Delhi-110017
Email: madhumita@disabilityindia.org

Ms. Nandana Shukla
A1/5, Safdarjung Enclave
New Delhi.

Prof. Mohammad Miyan
Dean
Faculty of Education
Jamia Millia Islamia
New Delhi-110025
Mobile: 9810313634
E-mail: mm_cdol@rediffmail.com

Dr. (Mrs.) Poonam Srivastava
Planning Commission
Yojana Bhawan
New Delhi-110001

Dr. Anuradha Mohit
Special Rapporteur
National Human Rights Commission
C-3/3125, Vasant Kunj
New Delhi-110017

Ms. Renu Singh
Director
School for Rehabilitation Sciences
Action for Ability Development and Inclusion (SSNI)
2, Balbir Saxena Marg, Hauz Khas
New Delhi-110016

Dr. Asha Singh
Head
Department of Child Development
Lady Irwin College
Sikandra Road
New Delhi.
Phone: 9811052247
E-mail: cabm@del3.vsnl.net.in

Dr. Shanti Auluck
MUSKAAN
Parents Association for the Welfare of Children with Mental Handicap
B-2, Vasant Kunj
New Delhi-110070
E-mail: auluck@vsnl.com
Phone: 26891747

Dr. L V. Reddy
Sr. Research Officer
Ministry of Labour and Employment Exchange Building
Pusa Campus
New Delhi.
Phone: 25841256

Gujarat

Dr. Bhushan Punani
Executive Director
Blind People's Association
Jagdish Patel Chowk
Surdas Marg
Ahemdabad-380015
Phone: 07926303346
Mobile: 09825014210
E-mail: blinabad1@sancharnet.in

Haryana

Dr. Sushma Sharma
Reader in Special Education
Kurukshetra University
Kurukshetra- 136119
Phone: 01744-238606,
Mob: 09416154053 ,
E-mail: ksushmak@sify.com

Ms. Swar Saidha
The Shri Ram School-Aravali
Hamilton Court, DLF Ph-IV
Gurgaon

Karnataka

Ms S N Meera Devi
Senior Programme Officer
SSA Karnataka
Office of the State Project Director
New Public Offices, Nrupatunga Road
Bangalore

Ms. Indumathi Rao
Regional Advisor, #134,
1st Block 6th Main
3rd Phase, Banashankari III Stage
Bangalore-560085
Phone: 91-80-26724273, 26724221
E-mail: cbrnet@vsnl.com

Kerala

Ms. Sreekumari Ammi B
Asst. Professor
SCERT
Kerala, Poojappura,
Trivandrum 12.

Maharashtra

Ms Smita Pais
Ali Yavar Jung National
Institute for the Hearing Handicapped
KC Marg, Bandra (W)
Mumbai
Phone: 022-2640-0215/0228/9176
Fax: 226422638 Mobile: 09819564131

Ms. Madhuri Despande
Centre for Opportunities in Education and Rehabilitation (COER)
5, Vidyadhan Apartments
Opp. Law College Road
Sonumai Joshi Path
Pune-411004
Phone: 020-5662362
E-mail: coer@vsnl.net

Dr. Suneeta Kulkarni
Educational & Developmental Psychologist
K-14, Himali, Near Mhatre Bridge
Erandwane
Pune-411004
E-mail: suneeta@vsnl.com

Mr. K. Raman Shankar
Deputy Director (Education)
National Association for the Blind
Department of Education
Rustom Alpaiwalla Complex
124-127, Cotton Depot, Cotton Green
(Near Reay Road Railway Station East)
Mumbai- 400033,
Phone: 022-23700953

Dr. Meera Oke
Human Development & Family Relations
B-21, Sahadeo Heights
Off Baner Road, Pune-411008
E-mail: meera@vsnl.com

Prof. Smriti Swarup
Dean and Director
SNDT Women's University
Sir Vithaldas VidyaVihar
Juhu Road, Santacruz (West)
Mumbai-400049
Phone: 0982052571

Mrs. Shymala Dalvi
0-3, G-5, Panchdeep Cooperative Housing Society
Sector-29, Vashi, Navi
Mumbai, scdalvi@yahoo.com

Ms. Rekha More
Ali Yavar Jung National Institute for the Hearing Handicapped
KC Marg, Bandra (W), Mumbai.
Phone: 022-2640-0215/0228/9176 Fax: 226422638

Orissa

Dr. Chittaranjan Das
Asst. Director IED, SSA Orissa
Bhubneshwar
Orissa
Phone: 09437012721, 0674-2402721 Fax- 0674-2402721

Tamil Nadu

Ms. Rajul Padmanabhan
Deputy Director
1 Ranjit Road, Kotturpuram
Chennai-600085,
E-mail: enable@vsnl.com

Ms. Saraswathi Narayanaswamy
Honorary Principal,
Bala Vidyalaya, 18, 1st Cross Street
Shastri Nagar, Chennai-600020
Phone: 044-24917199
E-mail:hear@balavidyalayaschool.org

Uttar Pradesh

Dr. Yogendra Pandey
Lecturer in Special Education
JRH University, Chitrakoot (UP)
Phone: 09431089265

Dr. Amitav Mishra
Reader in Special Education
Faculty of Education & Allied Sciences
M.J.P Rohilkhand University, Bareilly
Uttar Pradesh
E-mail- jeevandhararri@yahoo.co.in

Shri Vijay Shankar Sharma
Lecturer in Special Education
Faculty of Education,
JRH University, Chitrakoot-210204
Phone: 09412409625

Shri Gopal Krishna Agrawal
Director, Shikshit Yuva Seva Samiti
Pandey Bazaar, Basti, (U.P)
05542-242280, 272002
E-mail: syssbst@sify.com

West Bengal

Ms. Vijaya Dutt, Principal
(Centre for Special Education)
Indian Institute of Cerebral Palsy
(Formerly Spastic Society of Eastern India)
P-35/1 Taratolla Road,
Kolkata, West Bengal
Phone: 033-24013488, 24010240,
E-mail: sei@giascl01.vsnl.net.in

Special Guest

Ms. Talat Azad
Tutor, AKU-IED
Karachi, Pakistan
E-mail: talatazad@aku.edu

