

Friday 5th May 2023



Queensland Advocacy for Inclusion
Advocacy for people with disability

Level 2, 43 Peel Street
PO Box 3384
South Brisbane QLD 4101

T (07) 3844 4200
F (07) 3844 4220
E qai@qai.org.au
ABN 97 527 905 201

Senate Education and Employment References Committee

Delivered via email: eec.sen@aph.gov.au

Dear Committee,

Re: Inquiry into increasing disruption in Australian school classrooms

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Committee on the 20th April 2023, to give evidence on the issue of increasing disruption in Australian school classrooms.

Further to our written and oral submissions, please find below QAI's answers to three questions taken on notice from the hearing:

1. Can you elaborate on children in out of home care, how they are reflected in the statistics, who intervenes on their behalf, what happens to them when they get caught up in the cycle? (Senator Kerryne Liddle)
2. Regarding individualised teaching and solutions, is this evidence based? (Senator Jacinta Nampijinpa Price)
3. Can you provide some good case studies or best practice examples? (Senator Matt O'Sullivan)

Our answers further support the need for the Committee to take a nuanced and informed approach to considering the issue of school disruption. "Disorderly behaviour" is likely to be the manifestation of a person's disability in the absence of reasonable adjustments and inclusive pedagogies, or the result of adverse childhood experiences, and will therefore not be successfully addressed through punitive and disciplinary measures.

A comprehensive list of relevant research to support the provision of inclusive education has been collated by the Australian Alliance for Inclusive Education, and is provided to the Committee in **Appendix A** (pages 12-15 of this letter).

1. Can you elaborate on children in out of home care, how they are reflected in the statistics, who intervenes on their behalf, what happens to them when they get caught up in the cycle?

QAI obtained data from Right to Information processes that found Queensland state school students living in out of home care faced 3.54 times the risk of short suspension in 2020 compared to students not living in out of home care. This risk increased to 3.66 when the student also identified as First Nations, increased to 6.78 when they had a disability and increased to 8.34 when the student lived in out of home care, identified as First Nations *and* lived with a disability.¹ Evidence also suggests that other jurisdictions are experiencing similar levels of over-representation. For example, in South Australia, students in out of home care constituted just 1.3 % of school enrolments in 2019 but accounted for 5% of school suspensions.²

It is known that a high percentage of children in out of home care have a disability.³ Many have also experienced trauma in their lives, meaning that access to diagnostic or therapeutic support services or healthcare services may have been limited. QAI's written submission detailed the impact of inaccessible learning environments and the absence of reasonable adjustments for students with disability. This is further compounded when the disability is undiagnosed and increases the likelihood of behaviours relating to disability being misunderstood as truancy.

When a student is living in out of home care in Queensland, they have a Child Safety Officer appointed on behalf of the Chief Executive who stands in place of their parent. The student can access support from an advocate, such as a Child Advocate from the Office of the Public Guardian or a disability advocate if the young person has a disability, who may be able to intervene and make submissions on the student's behalf. However, it is well-known that children in out of home care are often involved with multiple systems, e.g., child protection, criminal justice, NDIS, education etc. Obtaining independent advocacy specifically for the purposes of education can therefore be challenging among so many competing priorities. Further, communication can sometimes be challenging when various government representatives of the State are acting for the child in different systems and capacities.

There is a well-established link between educational outcomes and success in later life, with education being 'one of the most powerful tools by which economically and socially marginalised children and adults can lift themselves out of poverty and participate fully in society.'⁴ Education is fundamentally about socialising students and preparing them for adult life. It teaches essential skills and facilitates pathways to employment and the realisation of a meaningful life. However, for students subjected to inappropriate and frequent recourse to school disciplinary absences, they are denied this opportunity, with profound short and long-term consequences. For example, research has demonstrated that students who have received school disciplinary absences can go on to experience poorer mental health, prolonged

¹ <https://qai.org.au/qld-children-denied-equal-access-to-education/>

² Graham et al., (2020). Inquiry into Suspension, Exclusion and Expulsion Processes in South Australian government schools: Final Report. The Centre for Inclusive Education, QUT: Brisbane, QLD, page 305

³ AIHW Child Protection Collection 2020–21,

⁴ United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation; 'Right to education'; <https://en.unesco.org/themes/right-to-education>

unemployment, increased stigma and feelings of rejection and an increased risk of homelessness.⁵ Further, non-excluded students are taught to segregate themselves from peers who exhibit challenging behaviour, rather than show understanding, empathy, and compassion for people whose behaviour is likely trying to communicate an unmet need.

The over-use of school disciplinary measures for students in out of home care can also constitute the beginning of the 'school-to-prison pipeline', where marginalised and excluded young people are at greater risk of incarceration.⁶ The lack of supervision that occurs following a school disciplinary absence increases the likelihood of students engaging in risk taking behaviour and therefore coming into contact with the criminal justice system.⁷ During their period of disengagement from school, the young person also often has no access to school-based therapeutic supports and little support to complete at-home learning, with negative consequences to their educational outcomes.

Moreover, children in out of home care are already over-represented in the criminal justice system⁸, often appearing before the courts on trivial matters that would otherwise have been dealt with by a parent. Once they enter the system, it can be very difficult to leave it. This is particularly true for First Nations children who are disproportionately overrepresented in both the child protection and criminal justice systems.

Maintaining attendance and engagement with school is therefore a protective factor for young people at risk of entering, or already caught within, the child protection system. For example, schools and teachers play a critical role in identifying early warning signs or abuse and neglect. For some young people, their teacher may be the only consistent and supportive adult in their life.

All of this reinforces why students who exhibit challenging behaviour need holistic, evidenced-based support, not punishment. Behavioural incidents are likely to be a trauma response that require a therapeutic, not punitive, intervention.

2. Regarding individualized teaching and solutions, is this evidence based?

Individualised teaching and solutions are fundamental to the provision of inclusive education. All students, including students with disability, have a right to an inclusive education. This right is enshrined in law (at a state, federal and international level) and forms the basis of education policies throughout the country.

Article 24 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) states that States Parties shall ensure an inclusive education at all levels. This means ensuring that persons with

⁵ Graham, L. (2020) Questioning the impacts of legislative change on the use of exclusionary discipline in the context of broader system reforms; a Queensland case study; *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 24:14, 1473-1493

⁶ Australian Institute of Criminology (2017) Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice

⁷ Hemphill S, Broderick D & Heerde J 2017. Positive associations between school suspension and student problem behaviour: Recent Australian findings. *Trends & issues in crime and criminal justice* no. 531. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology. <https://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi531>

⁸ Colvin et al (2020) Children in out-of-home care and the criminal justice system: A mixed-method study – Report to the Criminology Research Advisory Council.

disabilities are not excluded from the general education system on the basis of disability and that reasonable accommodation and effective individualized support measures are provided.

The Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities provided guidance in 2016 as to what this right means, in General Comment number 4. While not legally binding, it is nonetheless an authoritative interpretation of Article 24, and can be used as a blueprint for what inclusive education means. It says, among other things, that inclusive education requires a transformation in culture, policy and practice that involves strengthening the capacity of the education system to reach out to all learners. It's not just about students with disabilities being physically present in mainstream education. It's about enjoying all aspects of school, including building relationships with peers, and participating actively in all aspects of school life.

As the Australian Alliance for Inclusive Education states, inclusive education is:

*"...a legally supported, evidence-based way of delivering education that recognises the individual characteristics of all students, offers pedagogic alternatives that cater for the diverse educational needs of each child and respects the right of every child to be a part of their communities. It is also a fundamental human right of the child recognised in a range of international human rights instruments and treaties."*⁹

Further, under the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth), the *Disability Standards for Education* provide additional detail on the rights of people with disability to access education on the same basis as others, and the associated legal obligations of education providers.

Inclusive education is therefore about recognising the right of every young person to be welcomed as a valued learner and involves adapting learning environments and teaching approaches to ensure the young person can participate in education on an equal basis with others.¹⁰

There is extensive research that demonstrates the efficacy of inclusive education and the many benefits it brings, not just to students with disabilities but to all students in the classroom. For example, a systematic review of 280 studies from 25 countries established clear and consistent links between inclusive education settings and substantial short and long-term benefits for students with and without disabilities.¹¹

According to the Australian Alliance for Inclusive Education:

"Research indicates that included students develop stronger reading and math skills, have better school attendance, have better behaviour, and are more likely to graduate than students who are not included. As adults, students with disabilities who have been included are more likely to be enrolled in postsecondary education, and to be employed or living independently. Evidence suggests that in most cases there are no adverse effects for typical students who are being educated in an inclusive classroom. Some

⁹ <https://allmeansall.org.au/for-parents/>

¹⁰ Australian Coalition for Inclusive Education, *"Driving change: A Roadmap for achieving inclusive education in Australia"*, February 2021, p4

¹¹ Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. ABT Associates. ERIC. http://alana.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/A_Summary_of_the_evidence_on_inclusive_education.pdf

research shows that these students are more accepting of differences and less prejudiced.”¹²

A comprehensive list of relevant research has been collated by the Australian Alliance for Inclusive Education, and is provided to the Committee in **Appendix A**.

The evidence consistently demonstrates that children who share inclusive schools with children with disabilities have more positive attitudes towards difference, better social skills and awareness, less disruptive behaviours and more developed personal values and ethics.¹³

During the public hearing, Senator Price asked whether it can be a hinderance or problematic for some students to be treated differently. It is certainly true that there can be negative consequences when certain students are treated differently because of their disability. For example, there can be a stigma attached to having a disability which impacts how a student is perceived and therefore treated by others. However, this does not occur simply because the student receives differential treatment. Some people who are treated differently experience positive rather negative consequences. Stigma occurs because community attitudes typically devalue people with a disability.¹⁴ Stigma occurs because society has historically always treated people with disability harmfully, pathologizing them as needing a “cure or treatment” and failing to understand the impact of environmental factors that are, in essence, disabling. Only when true inclusion occurs, and harmful practices such as segregation are discontinued, will community attitudes improve and disability be seen as an ordinary part of our shared humanity.

Senator Allman-Payne asked how the medical approach to disability (as opposed to a social model approach) is negatively impacting young people’s ability to access the support they need in our education system. The social model of disability sees ‘impairment’ as a personal characteristic and ‘disability’ as a social construct created by inaccessible environments.¹⁵ QAI submits that it is the failure to fully understand and adopt the social model of disability that is preventing young people from accessing the support that they need. Failing to understand the interaction between a person’s impairment and their environment transpires as students with disability being expected to conform to, and comply with, teaching strategies and learning environments that fail to meet their individual needs.

By failing to alleviate the impact of inaccessible teaching strategies and learning environments, students with disability continue to be pathologized and seen as the problem. By failing to consider the environmental factors that can trigger challenging behaviour, students with disability unfairly and solely carry the burden of change. They are blamed for behaviour that occurs because of factors that lie beyond their control. Consequently, negative attitudes towards disability remain, entrenching stigma and resulting in discriminatory practices, such as the over-use of school disciplinary absences for students with disabilities. By failing to provide individualised supports and reasonable adjustments, we thwart the attitudinal change that needs to occur for people to become accepting of difference.

¹² <https://allmeansall.org.au/for-parents/>

¹³ <https://allmeansall.org.au/for-parents/>

¹⁴ Osburn, J (2006) An Overview of Social Role Valorization Theory. *The SRV Journal*, 1(1), 4-13

¹⁵ Kayess, R. & Sands, T. (2020) *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: Shining a light on Social Transformation*. Sydney: UNSW Social Policy Research Centre

Treating some people differently to ensure they have equality of opportunity is the very essence of equity and is necessary to achieve an inclusive society.

Dr Kathy Cologon writes:

“There is no ‘other’ in inclusion. At its core, inclusion requires recognising and acting upon the realisation that there is no ‘them’ and ‘us’. There is only ‘us’, and thus an ‘us’ to which, in our diversities, we all belong. This understanding of our shared humanity is fundamental to bringing about inclusive education.

Recognising our shared humanity does not in any way infer ‘sameness’. Inclusion is not about pretending that we are all the same. A focus on sameness involves processes of assimilation, which are not only contrary to, but form a serious barrier to, inclusion. Instead, inclusion is about valuing, celebrating, and sharing our differences as we embrace every aspect of the complexity of human diversities and recognise that we are all equal in our ‘differentness’.”¹⁶

And,

“Inclusion...can be understood as ‘fitting’ educational opportunities, settings, experiences, and systems to the full diversity of students and embracing and celebrating diversity as a positive and rich learning resource.”¹⁷

The Australian Collective for Inclusive Education (ACIE) has produced a roadmap for achieving inclusive education in Australia, including a step-by-step approach to phasing out segregated education.¹⁸ The roadmap outlines six core pillars where efforts for change should be focused and provides a comprehensive list of short, medium, and long-term outcome measures that will track progress over a ten-year period.

3. Can you provide some good case studies or best-practice examples?

There are numerous examples and a growing number of inclusive education experts throughout Australia who could provide further insight into this issue. For example, [SINE](#) – School Inclusion Network for Educators - is a national network of education professionals seeking to ensure they have the skills and knowledge to support diverse learners in their classrooms. Among other purposes, the group meets to share information, resources, and best practice ideas on how to deliver education in ways that uphold the principles of inclusive education. SINE is an initiative of All Means All which is the Australian Alliance for Inclusive Education. QAI recommends the Committee contact All Means All for further guidance with this inquiry.

Additionally, as outlined in our submission and in our oral evidence to the Committee, there are examples of approaches to student support which have proven success in reducing challenging behaviour within the classroom.

¹⁶ Cologon, K. (2019). Towards inclusive education: A necessary process of transformation. Report written by Dr Kathy Cologon, Macquarie University for Children and Young People with Disability Australia (CYDA) ISBN: ISBN-13: 978-0-646-80949-6. Page 3

¹⁷ Ibid, page 17

¹⁸ Australian Coalition for Inclusive Education, “Driving change: A Roadmap for achieving inclusive education in Australia”, February 2021

Firstly, there is the *Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)* model. MTSS is an education-based support structure that focuses on layering support to students in order to identify those with additional academic, behavioural, and social-emotional learning needs.¹⁹ MTSS was a key recommendation of the inquiry into suspensions and expulsions in South Australia, led by Professor Linda Graham, whom the Committee also heard evidence from. MTSS emphasizes the importance of problem-solving, instruction and intervention in educational environments.²⁰ MTSS includes three tiers, the first being a universal layer of support designed to provide assistance and instruction to all students. The first tier is also used to identify students requiring additional support.²¹ These students are then introduced into the second tier, that focuses on small group learning and instruction. From tier two, the students needing additional, individualized support or guidance are identified. The third tier is intended to only be used sparingly as it takes students away from the classroom.²² MTSS prioritises inclusion through focusing on group learning, providing all students, regardless of disability, a level of support and guidance and aims to be responsive to the changing needs of students.²³ The entire framework has the ability to be modified to suit the needs of different schools or cohorts and is highly compatible with other inclusive education models, including Collaborative and Proactive Solutions.

As mentioned during our evidence, this model has been used successfully in some very challenging public school districts in the United States, such as Chicago Public Schools. For example, students were explicitly taught self-regulation and responsible decision-making skills, as part of a focus on their social-emotional learning needs. On page 111 of the final report on the inquiry into suspensions and exclusions in South Australia, Professor Graham writes:

“After decades of negative impact from “zero tolerance” school discipline policies, which highly respected scholars have tied to increased involvement with the justice system, especially for poor children and children of colour, the United States has engaged in evidence-based reforms aimed at improving school climates, teaching quality and student support, recognising that educative responses are more productive than punitive responses.

...In November 2014, the US Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Education (2014) jointly issued a statement strongly discouraging the use of exclusionary discipline with young children, due to the known impacts on children’s academic, social-emotional and behavioural development....Other reforms have included reducing suspension length (e.g., Chicago, Philadelphia), limiting suspensions for minor infractions (e.g., California, Chicago, Philadelphia), requiring skill-building in-school-suspensions alongside tight approval systems and limiting grounds for out-of-school suspension (Chicago), banning out-of-school suspension for truancy (Arkansas) or eliminating suspensions entirely (e.g., Miami-Dade County Public Schools) (Anderson, 2020; Hinze-Pifer & Sartain, 2018).

¹⁹ Linda J Graham et al., “Inquiry into Suspension, Exclusion and Expulsion Processes in South Australian Government Schools,” 2020, pp.140-141.

²⁰ Ibid pp.140-142

²¹ Ibid pp.141-145

²² Ibid pp.141-145

²³ Ibid pp.140-141

While each of these reforms have met with significant opposition from conservative commentators and think tanks claiming that they have resulted in an increase in school violence and serious incidents (Eden, 2019), the empirical evidence shows the opposite. Longitudinal analysis of data from California from the 2011-2012 school year (prior to their school discipline reforms) through to the 2016-2017 school year (several years post-reform), clearly shows a large and significant decline in the number of instructional days lost and a narrowing of the racial gap, attributable to a reduction in the use of suspensions to respond to minor behaviours in all grades (Losen & Martin, 2018). The same study found no evidence that abolishing suspension for minor incidents had resulted in “chaos” and an increase in school violence, as claimed by some commentators (Losen & Martin, 2018). Rather, significant decline in suspensions has been accompanied by improvements in school climate and student academic outcomes.

...Importantly, the recent reforms in US public schools systems did not just involve banning or limiting the use of exclusionary discipline, but rather substituting a non-educative response with evidence-based educative alternatives, including restorative practices, together with the implementation of preventative measures, such as social-emotional learning, as part of a MultiTiered System of Support (MTSS) framework that traverses academic, social-emotional and behavioural domains and which is designed to improve students’ academic achievement, social-emotional understanding, and behavioural interactions.”²⁴

The following sources provide additional analyses of the benefits of MTSS:

- Sailor, W., Skrtic, T. M., Cohn, M., Olmstead, C. (2020). Preparing Teacher Educators for Statewide Scale-Up of Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 1 –18 (Online First). DOI: 10.1177/0888406420938035.
- McCart, A., Choi, J. & Sailor, W. (2020, Apr 17 - 21) Collaboration for Equity and Inclusion Through Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Implementation: Longitudinal Evaluation of Student Outcomes [Paper Session]. AERA Annual Meeting San Francisco, CA <http://tinyurl.com/sdts33e>
- Choi, J. H., McCart, A. B., & Sailor, W. (2020). Achievement of Students with IEPs and Associated Relationships With an Inclusive MTSS Framework. *The Journal of Special Education*, DOI: 10.1177/0022466919897408.
- Choi, J. H., McCart, A. B., Hicks, T. A., & Sailor, W. (2019). An analysis of mediating effects of school leadership on MTSS implementation. *The Journal of Special Education*, 53(1), 15-27. DOI: 10.1177/0022466918804815.

Secondly, there is the *Collaborative and Proactive Solutions (CPS)* model, by Dr Ross Greene. CPS views ‘*challenging*’ behaviour as a form of communication through which children demonstrate that they are having difficulty meeting expectations.²⁵ It is not limited in

²⁴ Linda J Graham et al., “Inquiry into Suspension, Exclusion and Expulsion Processes in South Australian Government Schools,” 2020, p111-113

²⁵ Ross W. Greene and Lives in the Balance, “To End the Use of Restraint and Seclusion, You’re Going to Need New Lenses, New Timing, and New Practices: True Crisis Prevention,” Lives in the Balance, 2020, <https://truecrisisprevention.org>. pp.1-4

application to students with disability but is of specific value to this cohort. The framework seeks to avoid the negative characterisations of students with additional support needs Senator Price alluded to, by focusing on understanding the reasons influencing certain kinds of behaviour instead of attempting to stop this behaviour entirely.²⁶ In education this model can be used to identify students' lagging skills and/or areas where they need additional support.²⁷ CPS focuses on crisis prevention as opposed to crisis management through seeking to proactively identify and resolve the issues or challenges a child is facing in order to reduce the prevalence of 'challenging' behaviours.²⁸ To do so, CPS seeks to engage all parties closest to the issue, including students, teachers, guardians and other caregivers in order to find a well-rounded approach to supporting a child that is consistent both inside and outside of school.²⁹ This approach supports educators' and their classroom management, promotes students' skill development and engagement in problem-solving, and providing cohesive standards of care for students.³⁰

Further, Senator Allman-Payne asked about the supports that young people are needing but are currently struggling to access, creating barriers to their educational participation and leading to challenging behaviours. QAI provides the following two case studies by way of illustration of the type of supports required, including:

- Adjustments and support in the classroom to engage with schoolwork;
- Creative solutions and adjustments to examination processes that ensure students with disability are not set up to fail (this can particularly challenging when the teachers have not themselves developed the curriculum material);
- Social support and facilitation of peer support and knowledge sharing; and
- Greater collaboration and consultation with parents and specialists.

Case study 1

Georgia* lives in rural Queensland and was attending the local P-10 school. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the school quickly adapted to delivering teaching and learning experiences virtually. Georgia flourished while learning online however, missed the social connection with her peers. When the lockdown ended, Georgia was asked to return to physical attendance full time. This created a significant amount of anxiety for Georgia and with her team of specialists, it was agreed to work towards a plan of re-engagement that included a transition process and a hybrid model of learning. Georgia's private specialists provided reports detailing the plan and adjustments required due to her diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder.

²⁶ Ibid p.2

²⁷ Ibid p.2

²⁸ Ibid p.3

²⁹ Ross W. Greene and Jennifer Winkler, "Collaborative & Proactive Solutions (CPS): A Review of Research Findings in Families, Schools, and Treatment Facilities | SpringerLink," *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, no. 22 (2019): pp.550-553; Glenys Mann et al., "Developing Productive Partnerships with Parents and Carers," in *Inclusive Education for the 21st Century* (Taylor & Francis Group), pp. 336–353

³⁰ Ibid p558

Georgia, her mother, and specialists attempted to communicate and work with the school to enact the plan without success before engaging with QAI's Education Advocacy Service (EAS). The school had advised Georgia that they were unable to continue with any remote learning as physical attendance was mandatory and continued remote learning would not be possible due to the resources that the school would require.

The EAS Advocate worked with Georgia, her mother, Georgia's specialists, the school and regional office for months before the school agreed to make the required reasonable adjustments and provided Georgia with some remote learning via a USB however, continued to advise that any work completed would not be graded. Unfortunately, the agreed adjustments were not promptly or effectively implemented. For example, it was requested that Georgia have options in terms of content, such as choosing which book to write an essay on, and that adjustments be made in terms of assessment practices. For example, Georgia have the option to record a presentation rather than stand up and deliver it in front of the class.

As a result, Georgia's re-engagement with physical education was significantly impacted. After months of difficulties with the local school, Georgia and her mother decided to relocate so that Georgia could access another school that was more willing to accommodate her adjustments. Georgia is now doing very well in school and is engaging with her local community.

**Names have been changed to protect confidentiality*

Case study 2

Delilah* is a young indigenous student in year eight at a Queensland High School. Delilah didn't receive adjustments in primary school and was only diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder at the end of primary school. Delilah has difficulties concentrating on tasks that she finds too difficult and avoids authority figures by leaving class and spending time in the toilet block and on the oval.

The school had recorded over 70 'incidents' of Delilah leaving class in the last year. The school had tried strategies such as a modified timetable, behaviour booklets, detention, and short suspensions. At the time of seeking assistance from QAI's Education Advocacy Service (EAS), Delilah's engagement with school had been declining and more individualized supports were required. Delilah's mother felt as though she had been supportive of the school's attempts so far, however they were not working, and she wanted them to engage with specialist supports.

The EAS Advocate supported Delilah and her mother with various tasks, including to attend a case management meeting. The case management meeting was very positive with the school staff listening to Delilah and her mother about the individualized supports that may be beneficial, informed by strategies implemented at home, as well as recent private psychologist and occupational therapy reports.

These included:

- The option for Delilah to use 'time out' cards and other strategies to de-escalate;
- The identification of a quiet space where Delilah could safely go in order to self-regulate, that was near a teacher, and which had access to calming activities such as mindful colouring and listening to music;
- The use of daily check-ins with a support teacher to identify what was and wasn't working;
- Choosing elective classes of Delilah's choice;
- Being placed with teachers with whom Delilah had a good relationship and in classes where positive peer relationships had been identified;
- Scheduling more difficult classes in the morning; and
- An agreement not to use separation from peers as form of punishment.

With the supports provided, Delilah has reported that she is enjoying school more there have not been as many 'incidents' reported by the school over the last couple of months.

**Names have been changed to protect confidentiality*

Thank you again for the opportunity to give evidence to this important inquiry. Please do not hesitate to contact us if we can assist the Committee any further.

Yours faithfully,



Matilda Alexander
Chief Executive Officer
Queensland Advocacy for Inclusion

Appendix A – Research to support the provision of inclusive education

- Cologon, K. (2019). Towards inclusive education: A necessary process of transformation. Report written by Dr Kathy Cologon, Macquarie University for Children and Young People with Disability Australia (CYDA) ISBN: ISBN-13: 978-0-646-80949-6. Access [here](#).
- Hehir, T., Grindal, T., Freeman, B., Lamoreau, R., Borquaye, Y., & Burke, S. (2016). A summary of the evidence on inclusive education. ABT Associates. ERIC. http://alana.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/A_Summary_of_the_evidence_on_inclusive_education.pdf
- Grzegorz, Szumski & Smogorzewska, Joanna & Karwowski, Maciej. (2017). Academic achievement of students without special educational needs in inclusive classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*. DOI: 21. 10.1016/j.edurev.2017.02.004.
- This [article](#) explains the evidence base behind the SWIFT (Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) model which is a “whole school model, driven by multi-tiered system of support for all students...where all students, including those with extensive needs, are fully valued, welcomed, well supported and meaningfully engaged in learning.”

Reviews and meta-analyses:

- Krämer, S., Möller, J., & Zimmermann, F. (2021). Inclusive Education of Students With General Learning Difficulties: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 91(3), 432–478.
- De Bruin, K. (2020). Does inclusion work? In L. J. Graham (Ed.), *Inclusive Education for the 21st Century: Theory, Policy and Practice* (1st ed., pp. 55-76). Allen & Unwin.
- European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education. (2018). *Evidence of the Link Between Inclusive Education and Social Inclusion: A Review of the Literature*. S. Symeonidou (Ed.). Odense, Denmark.
- Oh-Young, Conrad & Filler, John. (2015). A meta-analysis of the effects of placement on academic and social skill outcome measures of students with disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 47. 80-92. DOI: 10.1016/j.ridd.2015.08.014
- Jackson, R. (2008). Inclusion or Segregation for children with an Intellectual Impairment: What does the evidence say? Queensland Parents for People with a Disability.
- Wang MC, Baker ET. (1985). Mainstreaming Programs: Design Features and Effects. *The Journal of Special Education*. 1985;19(4):503-521. DOI: 10.1177/002246698501900412.
- Carlberg C, Kavale K. (1980). The Efficacy of Special Versus Regular Class Placement for Exceptional Children: a Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Special Education*. 14(3):295-309 . DOI: 10.1177/002246698001400304.
- Cole, S. M., Murphy, H. R., Frisby, M. B., & Robinson, J. (2022). The Relationship Between Special Education Placement and High School Outcomes. *The Journal of Special Education*
- McConnell, A., Sanford, C., Martin, J., Cameto, R., & Hodge, L. (2021). Skills, Behaviors, Expectations, and Experiences Associated with Improved Postsecondary Outcomes for

Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 46(4), 240-258.

- Wehmeyer, M. L., Shogren, K. A., & Kurth, J. (2021). The state of inclusion with students with intellectual and developmental disabilities in the United States. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 18(1), 36-43.
- Gee, K., Gonzalez, M., & Cooper, C. (2020). Outcomes of Inclusive Versus Separate Placements: A Matched Pairs Comparison Study. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*. DOI: 10.1177/1540796920943469.
- Cole, S. M., Murphy, H. R., Frisby, M. B., Grossi, T. A., & Bolte, H. R. (2021). The relationship of special education placement and student academic outcomes. *The Journal of Special Education*, 54(4), 217-227. DOI: 10.1177/0022466920925033.

Other research on outcomes:

- Kleinert, H., Towles-Reeves, E., Quenemoen, R., Thurlow, M., Fluegge, L., Weseman, L., & Kerbel, A. (2015). Where students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are taught: Implications for general curriculum access. *Exceptional Children*, 81(3), 312-328.
- Kurth, J., & Mastergeorge, A. M. (2010). Individual education plan goals and services for adolescents with autism: Impact of age and educational setting. *The Journal of Special Education*, 44(3), 146-160.
- Mansouri, M. C., Kurth, J. A., Lockman Turner, E., Zimmerman, K. N., & Frick, T. A. (2022). Comparison of Academic and Social Outcomes of Students with Extensive Support Needs Across Placements. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 15407969221101792.

Research on segregation:

- De Bruin, K. (2019). The impact of inclusive education reforms on students with disability: an international comparison. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 23:7-8, 811-826, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2019.1623327

Research on 'gatekeeping':

- Poed, S., Cologon, K. & Jackson, R. (2022). Gatekeeping and restrictive practices by Australian mainstream schools: results of a national survey. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26:8, 766-779, DOI: 10.1080/13603116.2020.1726512
- Jenkin, E., Spivakovsky, C., Joseph, S. & Smith, M. (2018). Improving Educational Outcomes for Children with Disability in Victoria. Monash University, Castan Centre for Human Rights Law.

Research on Universal Design for Learning:

- King-Sears, M.E., Stefanidis, A., Evmenova, A.S., Rao, K., Mergen, R.L., Sanborn Owen, L., Strimel, M.M. (2023). Achievement of learners receiving UDL instruction: A meta-analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, Volume 122, 103956. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2022.103956.

Other:

- Choi, J. H., McCart, A. B., & Sailor, W. (2020). Reshaping Educational Systems to Realize the Promise of Inclusive Education. In FIRE: Forum for International Research in Education, 6(1), 8-23.
- Kurth, J. A. (2018). Introduction to the special topic issue on the impact of SWIFT technical assistance. *Inclusion*, 6, 1-2. DOI: 10.1352/2326-6988-6.1.1.
- Sailor, W., McCart, A. B., & Choi, J. H. (2018). Reconceptualizing inclusive education through multi-tiered system of support. *Inclusion*, 6, 2-18. DOI: 10.1352/2326-6988-6.1.3.
- Kurth, J. A., Morningstar, M. E., Hicks, T. A., & Templin, J. (2018). Exploring the relationship between school transformation and inclusion: A Bayesian multilevel longitudinal analysis. *Inclusion*, 6, 19-32. DOI: 10.1352/2326-6988-6.1.19.
- Kozleski, E. B., & Choi, J. H. (2018). Leadership for equity and inclusivity in schools: The cultural work of inclusive schools. *Inclusion*, 6, 33-44. DOI: 10.1352/2326-6988.6.1.33.
- Schuh, M. C., Knackstedt, K. M., Cornett, J., Choi, J. H., Pollitt, D. T., & Satter, A. L. (2018). All means all: Connecting federal education policy and local implementation practice through evidence and equity. *Inclusion*, 6, 45-59. DOI: 10.1352/2326-6988.6.1.45.
- Gross, J. M. S., Choi, J. H., & Francis, G. L. (2018). Perceptions of family engagement and support in SWIFT schools. *Inclusion*, 6, 60-74. DOI: 10.1352/2326-6988-6.1.60.
- Sailor, W., Satter, A., Woods, K., McLeskey, J., & Waldron, N. (2017). School improvement through inclusive education. *Oxford Bibliographies in Education*. New York: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/obo/9780199756810-0191.
- Sailor, W. (2017). Equity as a basis for inclusive educational systems change. *Australasian Journal of Special Education*, 41, 1-17. DOI: 10.1017/jse.2016.12.
- Francis, G., Blue-Banning, M., Turnbull, A.P., Hill, C., Haines, S.J., and Gross, J.M.S. (2016). Culture in inclusive schools: Parental perspectives on trusting family-professional partnerships. *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 51(6), 281-293.
- Francis, G. L., Gross, J. M. S., Blue-Banning, M., Haines, S., & Turnbull, A. P. (2016). Principals and parents achieving optimal outcomes: Lessons learned from six American schools implementing inclusive practices. *Revista Latinoamericana de Inclusión Educativa*, 10(1), 61-77.
- Choi, J. H., Meisenheimer, J. M., McCart, A. B., & Sailor, W. (2017). Improving learning for all students through equity-based inclusive reform practices: effectiveness of a fully integrated schoolwide model on student reading and math achievement. *Remedial and Special Education*, 38, 28-41. DOI: 10.1177/0741932516644054.
- Artiles, A. J., & Kozleski, E. B. (2016). Inclusive education's promises and trajectories: Critical notes about future research on a venerable ideal. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 24(43). DOI: 10.14507/eppaa.24.1919.
- Gross, J. M. S., Haines, S. J., Hill, C., Francis, G. L., Blue-Banning, M., & Turnbull, A. P. (2015). Strong school–community partnerships in inclusive schools are “part of the fabric of the school....we count on them.” *School Community Journal*, 25(2), 9-34.

- Algozzine, B., Morsbach Sweeney, H., Choi, J. H., Horner, R., Sailor, W., McCart, A. B., Satter, A., & Lane, K. L. (2016). Development and preliminary technical adequacy of the Schoolwide Integrated Framework for Transformation Fidelity of Implementation Tool. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 35(3), 302-322. DOI :10.1177/0734282915626303.
- Shogren, K., McCart, A., Lyon, K., & Sailor, W. (2015). All means all: Building knowledge for inclusive schoolwide transformation. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 173-191. DOI: 10.1177/1540796915586191.
- Haines, S., Gross, J., Blue-Banning, M., Francis, G., & Turnbull, A. (2015). Fostering family-school and community-school partnerships in inclusive schools: Using practice as a guide. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 227-239. DOI: 10.1177/1540796915594141.
- Kozleski, E., Yu, I., Satter, A., Francis, G., & Haines, S. (2015). A never ending journey: Inclusive education is a principle of practice, not an end game. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 211-226. DOI: 10.1177/1540796915600717.
- Kurth, J., Lyon, K., & Shogren, K. (2015). Supporting students with severe disabilities in inclusive schools: A descriptive account from schools implementing inclusive practices. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 261-274. DOI: 10.1177/1540796915594160.
- Morningstar, M., Shogren, K., Lee, H., & Born, K. (2015). Preliminary lessons about supporting participation and learning in inclusive classrooms. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 192-210. DOI: 10.1177/1540796915594158.
- Shogren, K., Gross, J., Forber-Pratt, A., Francis, G., Satter, A., Blue-Banning, M., & Hill, C. (2015). The perspectives of students with and without disabilities on inclusive schools. *Research & Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 40, 242-260. DOI: 10.1177/1540796915583493.
- McCart, A., Sailor, W., Bezdek, J., & Satter, A. (2014). A framework for inclusive educational delivery systems. *Inclusion*, 2(4), 252-264.
- Sailor, W. (2014). Advances in schoolwide inclusive school reform. *Remedial and Special Education*, Online First. DOI: 10.1177/0741932514555021.
- Sailor, W., & McCart, A. (2014). Stars in alignment. *Research & Practices for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 39(1), 55-64. DOI: 10.1177/1540796914534622.
- SWIFT Center. (2014). All Means All: Ending segregation in schools and achieving education and excellence for all. Special issue of *TASH Connections*, 40(2), 1-18.