Today, school is becoming a rapidly changing learning environment. Thinking about students as a homogeneous population is no longer allowed, as diversity – in terms of culture, language, gender, family organisation, learning styles and so on – has emerged as a key challenge for education today.

The debate on Special Educational Needs largely reflects this challenge, as working in school implies careful reconsideration of what we mean by “normal” and “special”. Current educational intervention is generally based on a deficit and “within-child” model of facing SEN, whereas very little attention is given to the role of learning environments. The focus is on the child more than on the whole class, and on cognition and technical provisions more than on affective, sociocultural and community dimensions of learning. Conversely, regarding students and their needs as “hidden voices” allows us to adopt a transformative approach which sees diversity as a stimulus for the development of educational practices that might benefit all children and help school to become an inclusive and “moving” organisation.

The aim of the book is twofold: on the one hand, it offers a systematic overview of the inclusive education state-of-the-art in six countries (Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, UK, and USA) based on the contributions by well-known scholars such as Christy Ashby, Barbara Brokamp, Fabio Dovigo, Kari Nes, Mara Westling Allodi, Tony Booth, and Beth Ferri; on the other hand, the book analyses five cases of good practices of inclusion related to different subjects and school levels.
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INTRODUCTION

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

In the last thirty years, inclusive education has emerged as a central topic for instructional systems engaged in confronting the issues of inequality and injustice that arise from the exclusion of students deemed not suited to fully accessing and participating in education. Indeed, during this time teachers and researchers have become increasingly aware of the many challenges that implementing inclusive education involves, not only in terms of ethical questions, but also at a practical level, as inclusion has proved to be a complex construct, covering a wide range of phenomena. On the one hand, we are very far from reaching the goal of ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promoting lifelong learning opportunities for all, as proposed by UNESCO, as data show that as of 2013, 124 million children and young adolescents were still out of school (UNESCO, 2015a; UNESCO, 2015b). On the other hand, this is not an occurrence that only affects so-called developing countries: in spite of the amount of resources spent annually on education, many affluent and developed nations are still dealing with severe rates of early school leaving, while a large proportion of students have only limited or no access to mainstream schools.

This tendency has recently strengthened concern about the return on investment from instruction, as education is now considered a major lever for economic performance, not only for individuals, but also at the national level. As a consequence, instead of focusing on getting a real understanding of educational issues schools are actually dealing with, measuring students’ performance has currently become a self-supporting and pervasive activity which further increases anxiety about educational attainment and pushes governments to adopt measures that often worsen the situation even further (Ball, 2003; Nelson Espeland & Sauder, 2016). Competition fuelled by international ranking of schools systems is nowadays accepted as the panacea for improving educational organizations, according to the myth of learning accountability based on standard curricula. However, forcing education to comply with a pumped-up model of the economy – which is currently showing all the negative effects of this pressure, by the way – not only emphasizes the limitations of conventional teaching in the face of the new scenario created by post-industrial society, but also prevents schools from valuing diversity as a primary resource to foster learning and participation.
Instead of promoting inclusion as an effort to develop quality education for all by appreciating and building on differences, diversity has been framed essentially as an expression of personal maladjustment. Accordingly, schools generally try to fix the problem through arranging a set of separate provisions for each individual child, so as to help him/her catch up with the other “normal” students. Until recently, this perspective largely shaped the way disabled children were managed within educational settings. However, extensive criticism of these practices has already been put forward since the 1980s, especially from the area of disability studies (Davis, 2013). Consequently, even though what inclusive education implies is still a controversial subject, there has been a considerable expansion towards an enlargement of its aim and scope from the focus on assisting children with disabilities to the goal of “increasing the participation and broad educational achievements of all groups of learners who have historically been marginalized” (Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson, 2006). This entails a shift from the provision of extra help to some supposedly defective students to the development and dissemination of hidden resources normally available in the educational environment, inside and outside of school, to promote education for all children.

In this sense, encouraging inclusion implies questioning the traditional dynamics of separation that characterize most school relationships: special learners are taken away from mainstream students the same way that special teachers are disconnected from mainstream teachers, often already starting in teacher education courses. Accordingly, the divide so created makes it difficult to develop a shared language and find solutions to problems that, quite often, fall into that wide area not clearly defined by the normal/special dichotomy, as in the case of ethnic minority students or early school leavers. However, even when we accept that inclusive education is not confined to the specific group of disabled students, but also comprises learners who suffer from discrimination because of age, gender, socioeconomic conditions, ethnic origin, sexual orientation, level of attainment and so on, it is difficult to overcome the inclination to classify children according to these categories, which imply that individuals can be identified with, and therefore equated to, their deficits. Consequently, the process of categorization implicitly reaffirms the gulf between special and mainstream education, further extending the number of students who are deemed unfit to attend regular classrooms. The notion of special educational needs is a good example of such a nebulous label that situates the problem within the child, thereby preventing us from acknowledging and tackling real school issues that are prevalently external and act as barriers to learning and participation. Focusing attention on looking for the “needs” of individual students diverts from getting the whole picture about how national and local policies, school organisation and culture, teaching approaches and curricula, have a deep impact on the level of educational inclusion.

Therefore, in order to reduce barriers to learning and participation we need to reconsider the way special education deals not only with the traditional groups of disabled or abnormal children, but also with the new “special” students regarded...
as problematic because of their economic, social or cultural capital. Special needs interventions addressing so-called challenging pupils have usually been justified by adopting a technical vocabulary which would disguise them as objective, self-evident procedures. Nevertheless, the panoply of diagnostic tools employed by special education to screen and treat children in terms of clinical cases proved to be at least ineffective, if not harmful, when used to manage learners’ diversity.

Briefly, special education cannot see the forest for the trees, thereby encouraging the spread of new and subtle forms of exclusion in schools. This situation accounts for the common observation that inclusive education is a complex undertaking, as many obstacles stand in the way of change. As soon as we succeed in tackling exclusion in some specific area, inclusion seems to move away as new barriers are created and new questions arise. Far from discouraging efforts towards educational justice, this should be assumed to be a reminder that exclusionary pressures in school and more generally in society are multifaceted and protean. Consequently, we need to work on preventing exclusion as well as on fighting it, knowing that any step forward in the right direction is not just a little addition to a never-ending task, but also a small change which can have large, systemic effects on the entire educational organization. To attain this goal, the rise of diversity in schools has to be seen not as an issue to be brought under control through increased standardization, but as a resource that helps us cope with the complex society we live in.

LINKING INTERNATIONAL ACCOUNTS AND GOOD PRACTICES

This book aims to take stock of the above-mentioned topics by both offering an overview of the current situation of inclusive education in six countries (Germany, Italy, Norway, Sweden, the UK, and the USA), and analysing five cases of good practices of inclusion related to different subjects and school levels. Even though the meaning and purpose attributed to inclusive education vary according to the national contexts (and also within them), nowadays concern about inclusion is a common thread which contributes to significantly shaping the educational policies and curricula of many countries. We are aware that international reviews, especially those addressed at achieving strict comparisons of educational structures, often tend to offer a simplistic view that reduces the complexity of school policies and practices to a handful of alleged key factors, usually underestimating both the role played by local environments and cultures, and the variety of differences normally existing within the same national context. So, through their accounts, the contributions on the one hand provide an analysis of what opportunities and critical points each country is dealing with in promoting inclusive education nowadays, and on the other offer some useful lessons that emerge from practices related to the implementation of inclusion in schools. In doing this, we tried to avoid both the risk of presenting each country as a whole and compact entity, and to presume that good practices can be transferred directly from one educational environment to another with no consideration for the role played by different contexts.
Moreover, it is not only the meaning of concepts and terms commonly used with reference to inclusive education that vary according to the sites’ features, but we should also delve into the way students and their families interpret them, paying special attention to the voices of groups that are usually unheard through favouring inclusion as a participative process. In our view, providing support for inclusion means listening to each student’s opinions and aspirations as an effort to improve the way schools respond to diversity. Seeking equality in educational settings does not necessarily lead to homogenisation: on the contrary, participation of all children is essential in order to value difference, as the unique contribution that any learner can be enabled to give to the school communities starting from his/her perspective and capabilities. Everyone in schools and communities is not only asked to identify barriers to learning and participation and collaborate to reduce or eliminate them, but also invited to actively commit to the endeavour of transforming school cultures, policies and practices, so benefitting from and building on differences as an opportunity for valuing everyone equally. In this sense, diversity cannot just be respected or tolerated, but should be adopted as a systematic approach to improving the school environment. In turn, this entails that there is not one general model of inclusion, but several strategies that, prompted by specific circumstances, lead to different change paths and results. As we noted, inclusion is not the umpteenth technical procedure we apply to improve measurable school outcomes. It involves starting an extended conversation with children, families, staff, and governors about the ways schools could be improved on the basis of ethical assumptions shared by stakeholders.

Developing a dialogue about values allows schools to translate them into practices founded on respect for diversity, thereby enhancing teaching and learning strategies, helping reform curricula, and fostering new educational relationships with the whole community. This process not only reinforces the shift from individualization to personalization of children’s learning, but also emphasizes the active role learners play – both singularly, as a group, or as the whole class – in establishing and furthering the priorities for school development. Discussion on what a school should undertake as a step towards inclusion often supports participants in generating forms of creative thinking, which encourages people to challenge unfair conventions and behaviours and inspire innovative educational problem-solving. This is especially the case when we pay attention to ensuring a degree of diversity in the debate, looking for different opinions and practices that arise from a variety of educational settings, helping us question patterns normally taken for granted. This way, group discussion can boost effective teamwork in schools as the main way to promote inclusive projects based on trust and extended participation. Accordingly, inclusive change cannot be pursued without going beyond classroom walls, if we want the efforts towards equity would not to be confined to isolated initiatives, but to become a stable feature of the educational organization.

Moreover, beyond being articulated in different ways, values such as equity, justice, participation, or respect for diversity are also subject to constant evolution
INTRODUCTION

over time. This contributes to characterizing inclusive education as an ongoing process rather than a final, permanent condition, even though envisioning inclusion as a destination plays an important role in sustaining and orienting efforts in the right direction. For this reason, we need to cultivate a transformative perspective on inclusion as a shared enterprise that aims to enhance learning and participation for all through the creation of a sense of mutual interdependence fostered by collaboration. This enterprise involves building fruitful, durable relationships between schools and their communities, as a way of promoting diversity and inclusion as pivotal elements for a democratic society.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

As we anticipated, in the first part the book provides an overview of the current situation in inclusive education in six countries, whereas the second part is devoted to the analysis of five cases of good practices of inclusion in different educational settings.

In Chapter 1, Tony Booth outlines a story about inclusion and exclusion in education in the UK, offering a glimpse of what an exploration of inclusion and exclusion involves when we move away from a narrow notion concerned only with education and the participation of particular groups. Elaborating on the “Index for Inclusion”, the chapter links inclusion to the idea of the common comprehensive community school for all, and discusses the role of a framework of inclusive values in sustaining the possibility for such a policy in the face of opposing pressures.

Chapter 2, by Beth A. Ferri and Christy Ashby, examines the impact of recent US standards-based neoliberal educational reforms on students with disabilities, and on inclusion. Although such reforms promise increased school district accountability for students with disabilities, they have actually intensified existing inequalities, including increased drop-out rates, and intensified exclusion and segregation of students with disabilities. The chapter endorses an ever more expansive notion of inclusion, watchful of the dictates of market-based reforms on the most vulnerable students.

Chapter 3 provides an overview from Fabio Dovigo of the evolution of the Italian school system in the face of the recent shift from the traditional mainstream model established in the 1970s with the abolition of special schools to the recent introduction of new categories such as learning disabilities and special educational needs. The chapter analyses how such a change is posing new challenges for school policies and practices, emphasizing the need to review the conceptual framework assumed by special pedagogy so as to develop a more comprehensive view of inclusive education.

Then in Chapter 4 Kari Nes discusses how inclusion in education is understood and practiced in Norway, in particular where special education is concerned, and what the present challenges are. The chapter examines how on the Norwegian school and classroom levels inclusive practices that support learning and participation for
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all exist, as well as exclusionary tendencies, questioning why Norway is currently mentioned among those countries where public education is increasingly challenged because of an endemic failure to provide adequate learning opportunities for all children.

In Chapter 5 Barbara Brokamp describes the specific form of support that both educational institutions and municipalities in Germany require if they seek to have inclusion guide their further development. The account clarifies how developments in schools and the realisation of inclusive values are embedded in municipal, social policy and global contexts, highlighting the endemic conflicts that Germany still endures in terms of educational standards or the way the education system has developed.

Building on experiences from interventions in schools, in Chapter 6 Mara Westling Allodi analyses ideologies and socio-cultural values that have influenced – both overtly and subtly – the educational organisation in the Swedish school system, in ways that may thwart the traditionally agreed-upon humanistic values of fairness and virtue that are however in a way still supposed to be in force. These forces that influence the learning environments of schools and classrooms therefore may counteract the efforts to build developmentally healthy and effective learning environments.

Part 2 opens with the contribution of Pasquale Andreozzi and Anna Pietrocarlo, which aims to investigate the evolution of inclusive education through the analysis of qualitative data collected from a number of schools in Northern Italy. The chapter shows that inclusive practices in Italy are quite fragmented, as they are tied to the individual initiative of teachers in schools. Consequently, inclusive projects are often short-lived due to the high turnover of teachers, as well as the lack of personnel with full-time contracts.

In Chapter 8, Clara Favella illustrates how good practices based on the implementation of creative art-based projects can help develop inclusive education by fostering intercultural sensitivity in schools. Even though projects based on art and creation are now popular as educational practices, we still lack a systematic analysis of the quality and the outcomes they achieve. This research aims to contribute to filling this gap, showing how art projects aimed at children aged 10 to 14 contribute to enhancing schools’ sensitivity towards cultural differences.

In Chapter 9, Fabio Dovigo and Vincenza Rocco depict how inquiry-based teaching methods, promoted on a European level as procedures for the renewal of science teaching, may further inclusive projects focused on science education in primary and secondary schools. The chapter shows how inclusive evaluation plays a key role in helping inquiry-based teaching methods boost both teachers’ motivation and students’ interest and achievement in science education, as well as increase participation for all learners in education for sustainability.

Chapter 10 provides an account from Fabio Dovigo and Francesca Gasparini about the work childcare services carry out to foster inclusive relationships with families of children 0–3 years old. The chapter highlights how building spaces for
everyday conversation with parents is crucial to promoting active participation by
supporting, collaborating, and partnering with caregivers. It also delves into the
teachers’ professional development, required by the introduction of new forms of
counselling, such as those described in the chapter.

Finally, in Chapter 11 Emanuela Zappella examines the factors that influence
the transition from school to work and facilitate inclusion of disabled people in the
workplace. The analysis shows that accommodations are a crucial element, as they
allow the construction of balanced relationships leading to satisfactory arrangements
both from the point of view of the worker and the company. Training is also vital for
providing useful tools for addressing the construction of an inclusive environment
that embraces all the employees and their relationship with the disabled worker.
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PART 1
THE STATE OF THE ART OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN SIX COUNTRIES
TONY BOOTH

1. PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LED BY INCLUSIVE VALUES IN ENGLAND

Experiences with the Index for Inclusion

INTRODUCTION

How should a story about inclusion and exclusion in education in the UK start?

I have to remind readers of the differences between the four ‘countries’ of the UK – England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. Each country has separate histories and legislative frameworks for education. However this should not distract us from recognizing the diversity within each country and the influence on education of local politics, cultures and histories. Even with unifying national pressures it may be possible for two schools at opposite ends of the same street to have more in common with schools at opposite ends of Europe than they do with each other.

Stories of inclusion and exclusion express differences of belief, values and perspective. When academics swap accounts of education in their countries they sometimes tell an official version close to that promoted by their government. In this way an academic life on the international circuit can seem part of a country’s diplomatic service. My approach to educational development contrasts with an official perspective largely under the influence of neoliberal values. I wish to see education developed in accordance with inclusive values, a project that is summarised in the Index for Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2011, 2016).

Communication about inclusion cannot get far without a definition of inclusion and its connection with exclusion, even though this is often omitted in articles and academic discussions. So I after suggesting how a story of inclusion and exclusion in England might start, so setting a broad context, I define the concept for education. I focus on inclusion in education as a process of developing the common school for all, underpinned by the process of putting inclusive values into action. I indicate the way the Index for Inclusion, designed to be part of this process, has been used to support schools. I conclude by stressing that the framework of ideas summarized within the Index for Inclusion is necessarily in a continual state of development.

STARTING A STORY FROM ENGLAND

A personal perspective, or story, on inclusion and exclusion in England might start like this…
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Inclusion and exclusion in any country are shaped by its cultures and histories. In England, the largest country in the UK, many are still coming to terms with the loss of a colonial empire in the middle of the 20th Century which was founded on early industrialization supported by military conquest and slavery. Echoes of a powerful monarchy still fly in the flags of its distant Commonwealth outposts in St. Helena, Australia and New Zealand. The so-called British national anthem calls on a deity to save a single person, the monarch. So democracy, an essential element of inclusion, is a work in need of progress in the UK.

To compensate for its loss of status as the preeminent world power, many treasure an attachment to the United States, which though itself in decline remains the largest global economic and military power. Governments in Britain like to think that they have a special relationship with the US (“two countries divided by a common language”). The UK news and popular culture disproportionately reflect what happens thousands of miles away in the US rather than a few miles away in mainland Europe. Though England is a little over twenty miles from the coast of France, swimming distance for the intrepid, and part of Europe, people commonly behave as if it was a similar distance from the coast of New England in the US. So, for these people, the US becomes ‘us’ and the rest of Europe is seen as ‘them’, ripe for exclusion.

In 2016, in a bid to hedge his geopolitical bets, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer signed an agreement with China for them to build nuclear power stations in the UK. This is a wonderful expression of the way the winds of power are blowing and of a lack of concern in reality with national sovereignty when it comes to trade and finance. This was shortly before a referendum was to be held on continued membership of the EU, primarily, it seemed, because of pressures to increase the security of borders against foreign bodies, claimed to be an assertion of sovereignty.

Following the conflagration in Syria which policies of successive UK governments helped to bring about, Lebanon had taken a million refugees, Turkey, 1.8 million, Jordan 600,000, Germany had agreed to take 800,000 and the UK, 20,000 over five years. Though people in the UK have marched in tens of thousands, to say ‘Refugees are Welcome Here’, their government and its supporters effectively trumpet their lack of compassion. Yet if you try to stop compassion towards the suffering of people beyond the country’s borders then may be matched by a lack of compassion within the country. This is the situation in modern Britain, a country where the austerity response to the economic crash of 2008 has fallen disproportionately on the poorest. Incomes have fallen substantially for the poor but have risen for the richest 1%. Bonuses have been preserved for the bankers whose recklessness and misplaced quick-rich algorithms helped to foster the crash. There is a rise in the use of food banks and a decrease in benefits to disabled people based on the rapid assessments by a private company, incentivized to reduce public expenditure. Suicides amongst vulnerable people are on the increase… (Barr et al., 2015).
DEFINING ‘EXCLUSION’

My story of inclusion in England provides some of the elements of the complexity of the concept. I have been arguing for several decades against the dominance and lack of rationality of a narrow approach to inclusion in education primarily concerned with the desegregation and mainstream participation of children and young people categorized as having special educational needs or viewed as having disabilities. Despite its expression of commitment to a wider view, this book also encourages that link. In the presence of a presumed predominant view it takes only a few references in a text to confirm readers in the perspective they brought with them. These are “discourse markers”, often found at a text’s beginning and end.

The continued popularity of the narrow view of inclusion implies that there are powerful interests sustaining it or that my arguments are not well known or are poorly constructed. There is a formidable array of structures associated with the notion of ‘special educational needs’ to do with legislation, training courses, academic departments and professional jobs. These all perpetuate the delusion that educational difficulties can be resolved through categorization and intervention in the lives of children and young people rather than in schools, their teaching and learning activities and the relationships within them. Further the individualism of this approach attaches well to, and derives power from the neoliberal ideology currently controlling the direction of global educational development. This is very hard to contest. For ideology encloses us like a self-sealing bubble. We may think that it can be burst by the sharp point of our rationality but subsequently find that we have made only a tiny, temporary and rapidly closing hole.

In recent years I have tried a different tack in opposing the dominant view. I see it as only one of several advocacies for the increased participation in education of a particular group or section of the population vulnerable to exclusionary pressures. I call this inclusion A. So divisions and discrimination in education related to disability are matched by parallel concerns with gender, class, ethnicity, religion and citizenship – which includes issues of migration, refugees and asylum. I have avoided the term ethnic or religious minority since the history of South Africa and several countries in the Middle East tells us that exclusion is an abuse of power rather than majority. There is then, a series of inclusions A: A1, A2, A3… Without an awareness of shared rights to participation of all groups, advocacy for one group can be in competition with others for public attention and finance. I have urged people concerned with advocacy of the interests of particular groups in education to raise their gaze from children to engage too, with access to, and participation in, education of adults, including through employment.

When people want inclusion to be simplified to a concern with the access to and participation in the mainstream of children categorized as having special educational needs they may collapse complex identities and experiences inside this single term. So the exclusion attributed to the deficit of a disabled child may arise from discrimination towards their gender or ethnicity. The term ‘special educational
needs’ operates as a ‘vacuum cleaner concept’ sucking up educational difficulties that have arisen through barriers in the curriculum, relationships, or gender and ethnic discriminations, into an individual deficit bag. In this way the language of ‘special educational needs’ contributes to the scandal of discrimination towards Roma children particularly, but not only, within Eastern Europe (O’nions, 2010). When I questioned the continued separation from the mainstream into special schools of large numbers of Roma children at a meeting at the ministry in the Czech republic, I was told that parents of non-Roma children were not ready to accept ‘vermin’ in their schools. My stomach churns as I repeat this, knowing how close it is to the classification as ‘cockroaches’5 of Tutsis, in radio broadcasts, before the genocidal massacres in Rwanda in 1994. A celebrity columnist for the Sun newspaper in the UK referred to migrants using the same word6 and yet she was invited as a keynote speaker at a British University despite student protest. That year, 1994, associated with one of the most horrific illustrations of exclusion in history, is given special significance by the supporters of ‘inclusion A1’ as the year of the ‘Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education’ as marking a major step forward on the road to inclusion (Kiuppis & Hausstatter, 2014). The parochialism of discussions of inclusion from this narrow perspective might also be indicated by the fact that 1994 was the year that Nelson Mandela became the first Black president of South Africa.

I contrast the narrowness of inclusions A with inclusion B. Inclusion B in education is about the participation, wellbeing and identity of everybody, adults and children. It is contrasted with exclusion and in making this link with its opposite it becomes a rounded concept with which we can engage in productive thought. It has three essential elements. It is concerned with increasing the participation and reducing the exclusion of individuals in the mainstream of life within and beyond education. This puts together inclusions A in their various forms with an added concern for all, both adults and children. The idea that it is about increasing participation of all, ties inclusion to the development of a participative democracy.

But in order to encourage the participation of individuals and groups we have to create systems and settings that are welcoming, anti-discriminatory and have cultures, policies and practices that reinforce their capacity to respond to the diversity of children and adults in ways that value them equally. This means avoiding any hierarchy of value amongst children and adults and generally implies the avoidance of separate tracks that reinforce such hierarchies.

Yet, most importantly inclusion arises as we put inclusive values into action. If we are to go beyond supporting inclusion as a fashion or career move we have to do it because it connects to our fundamental values. The advocacies of inclusions A cannot be successfully sustained without the wider developments of inclusion B, in settings and systems and their underpinning by inclusive values.
Creating responsive settings and systems in education in ways that involve everyone equally, involves linking schools with their surrounding communities. In England this means seeing inclusion as about the promotion and development of ‘comprehensive community education’. This is the movement to create a common secondary school for all, arising in the middle of the last century to replace the tripartite, selective education, dividing the mass of children at aged eleven for one of three schools based on attainment and measured ‘intelligence’.

I have extended the ideas of ‘non-selective’, ‘comprehensive’ education and the ‘common school’ to apply to preschool, school and post-school education. In most countries selection is asserted in higher education through a hierarchy of educational opportunities. The Index for Inclusion from its first edition was connected to the work undertaken by myself and colleagues, Patricia Potts and Will Swann over twenty years at the Open University, from 1979 to 1999. We set out to transform approaches to educational difficulty by linking them to the conception, practice and development of the ‘common school for all’.

The idea of comprehensive education can be linked to ‘popular education’ designed to serve the interests of the mass of people rather than powerful elites. The grammar schools were seen as the apex of the tripartite hierarchy and had the same status within the minds of many as the Gymnasium in Germany. However, the elite private schools (confusingly called public schools), remained above the grammar schools, dominating places at elite universities. Private schools take 7% of the population yet their students make up the majority of high status positions in English public life (Kirby for the Sutton Trust, 2016). Once the right to establish private schools was seen as enshrined within human rights law, private schools became politically untouchable.

The comprehensive secondary school became the majority system, by the middle of the 1980s. This ended the domination of primary schools by this decisive judgment of the value of children at age eleven. Yet, selective education remained a bone of contention between the major political parties until Tony Blair led the ‘New Labour Party’ to abandon its distinctiveness from the Conservatives in education and health and much else. While subsequent governments did not increase the numbers of grammar schools, they effectively reintroduced selection through a competitive system of national testing and inspection designed to recreate hierarchies between and within schools. They also progressively curtailed democratic control over education by reducing the power of local administrations. However in 2016, grammar schools were beginning to subvert legislation preventing an increase in their numbers, by setting up what they called ‘annexes’, even though these were located many miles away and served entirely different communities.
The following two examples epitomize the extremes of competition and internal division characterizing some schools. Crown Woods College in South London is organised as three mini-schools for learners divided by their perceived top middle and low “ability”. The children wear different uniforms and have different lunch and break times (Yarker & Benn, 2011). In the school where my granddaughter started at aged eleven, she had to take a verbal reasoning test and was then allocated to one of four groups for each of her subjects, based on expectations for her achievements in The General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) at age sixteen. These examinations are graded from A* (added as a grade above A to signal particular success) to F. Only grades A* to C are seen as of value to the schools. My granddaughter was allocated to one of four groups for each subject called, A*-A, A*-B, A-C and C. The last of these must really mean ‘F’ or ‘Fail’ and therefore of little worth to the school or society since otherwise the children would be included in the A-C group. Both these examples indicate practices that are abusive to children.

DIVISIONS OF FAITH

Faith based schools are also a major barrier to the development of the ‘school for all’. About a third of all schools in England are founded on an appeal to families of a particular faith and funded mainly by the state. The majority of these schools are Anglican, the branch of Christianity founded by King Henry the Eighth because he was unhappy with the refusal of the Pope to grant him a divorce from his wife Catherine. The monarch remains in England as the head of this church with bishops having a right to participate and vote in the unelected upper tier of parliament, the House of Lords. The next most common group are Catholic schools primarily founded originally because in 19th century Britain, Catholics were excluded from attending schools for the State religion. There are smaller numbers of other Christian foundation, Islamic, Hindu, Sikh and Jewish religious schools. Their religious designation means that, whatever the protestations made by some, they are not established to serve all within their surrounding communities and can contribute to community division. In our research project in the early 2000s we studied two schools on the same street in an area with a very high number of people of Bangladeshi heritage. A Catholic school had no Muslim pupils while 100 metres away a so-called non-denominational community primary school had 99% Muslim pupils. The Muslim children frequently crossed the street in order to avoid passing directly in front of the Catholic school and church on their way to school (Ainscow, Booth, & Dyson, 2005).

The way in which faith schools perpetuate community divisions is best illustrated in the UK in the school system in Northern Ireland where the very great majority of schools remain as either Catholic or Protestant, eighteen years after the agreement that was meant to end violent community conflict. In the 1980s, special schools made up the majority of non-denominational or so called ‘integrated’ schools in Northern Ireland. This was not an outbreak of inter-community peace, for the discriminatory
nature of the label of ‘special educational needs’ had obscured differences in identity deemed almost sacred for children without the label.

While the existence of faith schools prevents the development of comprehensive community schools, they involve particular discriminations in employment of teachers and other staff. For example, it is impossible for an atheist to gain a senior position in a faith school, but someone of faith has no barrier to becoming a head teacher in a community school. There remains some in-built bias towards the Church of England in the system as whole, which further discriminates against atheists. Every school has to include a daily act of Christian worship. The Secretary of State for Education, declared in 2015 that schools had an obligation to teach that Britain is ‘mainly Christian’ and need not mention atheism in the religious education curriculum (The Telegraph, December 27th 2015). She refused to accept a high court ruling that such an omission was unlawful since it breached a duty to ‘to take care that information or knowledge included in the curriculum is conveyed in a pluralistic manner’ (Regina (Fox and others) v Secretary of State for Education). She also contested and ignored the findings of a two-year ‘Commission on Religion and Belief in British Public Life’ (Woolf Institute, 2015), that only a sizeable minority of people in the UK (40%) say they are Christians and therefore it cannot be regarded as ‘a Christian country’ whatever that means. So the education system is designed to make Christians more at home than those from other religions other than Christianity and especially devalues those with no religion.

THE MULTIPLICATION OF DIVISION

From the early 1980s onwards, governments have further undermined the idea of education under the control of communities. They have persisted in the curtailing the power to affect education of democratically elected local representatives, teacher unions and the teaching profession. This rise of the central control of education and health increased as government contracted in other areas. Thus state manufacturing, prisons, transport, energy, and other utilities including water were sold off to private companies. As government found they had decreasing opportunities to measure and parade their successes they focused more closely on ensuring that improvements in education and health would be seen as due to their interventions. This resulted in reorganizations at each change of government. The dislodging of local control over education is best represented by the rapid growth of schools, directly funded from the central government and outside local authority influence, called Academies, and the smaller growth of ‘free schools’ usually run on authoritarian lines and set up without regard to the needs for additional school places in an area. These are seen as cousins to the charter schools of the US and the free school experiment in Sweden, respectively.

While the private sector in 2016 remains relatively small, perhaps the most divisive change involved the introduction into education, from the 1990s onwards of the ‘quasi-market’ in which the test, examination and inspection results are
publicized as the basis for parental school choice. Though England may provide a particularly extreme example, elements of this approach has been spread around the globe under the cloak of neoliberalism.

VALUES TO THE RESCUE?

Faced with pressures pushing education systems away from the development of school for all in their surrounding communities those who oppose these trends need a powerful counterforce. I have been influenced for all my academic career by the words of an Italian political novelist and activist, Ignazio Silone:

The distinction between theories and values is not sufficiently recognized, but it is fundamental. On a group of theories one can found a school [of thought]; but on a group of values one can found a culture, a civilization, a new way of living together…. (Silone, 1950: 119)

Silone it turned out later was a dubious figure, acting as a police informer for the Mussolini regime within the communist party (Biocca & Canali, 2000). Nevertheless the understanding I took from his words, that educational and social development are ethical enterprises remains valid. Values are a necessary bridge between the results of educational research or policy discussions and the actions we decide to take in education. But more fundamentally many educational concepts such as ‘development’, ‘improvement’, ‘quality’, ‘good practice’, inclusion, cannot be given meaning without connecting them to a set of values. One person’s good practice may be another person’s educational nightmare.

Yet, the role of values in responsible action has been downplayed in the last thirty-five years. This is encapsulated by the title of Alasdair McInrye’s 1981 book: ‘After Virtue’, presaging the rise of ‘managerialism’ as the dominant style of British public sector organisations, in which active values or “virtues” appear neutralised through the goal of “efficiency”. For the philosopher Michael Sandal, moral arguments in ever larger areas of life, have been driven out by the spread of market thinking. They are like a muscle that has wasted from disuse but can be strengthened again with exercise (Sandal, 2009: 11–12).

Michael Sandal underestimates the extent to which others see the goal of efficiency and the reign of the market as an expression of virtue and I make this clear below in contrasting inclusive and excluding values. But he is right in suggesting that if we want our actions to be informed by the values we wish to own rather than be values we claim to reject, then we need to work on the connection between values and actions. I call this the acquisition of values literacy.

My view of values as necessarily connected to actions contrasts with a view of values as impressive words to be flourished rhetorically. This might be seen in the espousal of British values by the UK government. Schools in England are required to promote four values as fundamentally British and to integrate them into their teaching. These are said to be ‘democracy, the rule of law, individual liberty,
and mutual respect and tolerance of those with different faiths and beliefs’ (DfE, 2014: 5). This promotion of British values is meant to help to counter Islamic ‘extremism’ and is part of the Government’s 2011 ‘prevent’ strategy. This singular view of ‘extremism’ excludes the fundamentalism of the market favoured by the government itself. The four British values headings and their detailed implications for action are left undefined. It is hard to say they are particularly British or are assiduously pursued by government. For example, ‘respect for the rule of law’ implies that access to legal representation and the outcome of court hearings are unrelated to wealth yet the legal aid that gives poor and vulnerable people a chance to fight injustice through the courts has been cut. One might also consider how respect for the law is encouraged by a selective, ‘national curriculum’, which does not apply to Academies or Free Schools.

VALUES IN THE INDEX FOR INCLUSION

I have always seen my academic work as starting from a commitment to values or principles. When I first started writing seriously, I saw two principles as framing my direction: ‘a comprehensive principle’ and a connected ‘principle of equality of value’ of all. I worried away at these ideas over the years and gradually extended them into a framework of values, through innumerable dialogues with teachers and students in many countries. I wanted to create a values framework with sufficient complexity for the activities it was required to guide.

I display the sixteen headings for inclusive values on a three dimensional figure or dodecahedron as shown in Figure 1. The headings are not themselves values but become values as their meanings are elaborated and the implications for action are understood (see Figure 1). They are discussed in detail in the Index for Inclusion (Booth & Ainscow, 2011, 2016).

The framework can be seen as a values universe, an answer to the question: ‘how should we live together?’ This age old philosophical question took the form in past eras of: ‘how should a rich man live?’ But I give it the form: how should we live together on this planet – an interconnected ‘us’ – ‘animals, trees, rocks and air? In justifying the origins of this framework I have drawn encouragement from Kant’s injunction ‘Sapere Aude’, commonly translated as ‘dare to know’ – ‘dare to know what you know’. Kant’s words come from Horace who compared an individual who postpones the “hour of right living” to someone waiting for a river to run dry before he will cross — “yet on it flows, and on it will flow, rolling its flood forever.” Horace’s advice is to stop hesitating: sapere aude, incipe – ‘Dare to be wise: begin!’ So I have come to trust that the process of piecing together my values framework through processes of reading, reflection, dialogue and ‘experimental trials’ with teachers, children, families and their schools yields an important way for conceiving and promoting development.

In the most recent edition of the Index (2016) a universe of inclusive values is contrasted with one of excluding values (see Figure 2) which might also be called
‘neoliberal’. Neo-liberal values dominate thinking about education and are always liable to subvert and take over from more inclusive values. In this way a concern with equality can give way to a concern with hierarchy, rights to opportunity, participation to consumption, community to in-group, respect for diversity to monoculture, sustainability to exploitation, trust to surveillance, honesty to image, courage to compliance, non-violence to coercion, compassion to self-interest, hope to determinism, love to authority, joy to reward/punishment, beauty to efficiency and wisdom to power.

Figure 1 and 2. Inclusive and excluding values provide an answer to the same question.
Contrasting inclusive with excluding values helps to get past a trap of regarding values as universal as suggested within other UK approaches to values-led educational development such as ‘living values’ (Farrer, 2000; Hawkes, 2003) or the approach promoted by Common Cause, (Holmes et al., 2011). It is clear that different people value very different ways of life. While neither inclusive nor excluding values are universally held both are universalisable; meaning that in theory all peoples could choose to live by them. The ‘neo-liberal’ project extending market fundamentalism into all areas of our lives embraces a framework of excluding values and creates pressures for it to be adopted universally. A life-project to encourage the spread of inclusive values within education and society can be seen keeping alive the flame for an alternative way; a reminder that another world is possible.

VALUES AS IMPERATIVES

I see some values as having the status of imperatives. I follow Theodore Adorno in his insistence that education must strive to reduce the possibility of another Auschwitz – the worst possible outcome of a failure of respect for diversity and avoidance of violence. But I also include as an imperative, the expression of our inter-generational responsibility to pass a planet to the next generation in which people, other animals and plants can continue to flourish. Human deployed global warming is a real threat to the survival of life in the near future. Even so, it is only the most compelling of the many dramatic dangers of environmental degradation we humans have created. Faced with the changes to their lives that action demands, many retreat into denial. This has become a major hurdle we have to clear in order to encourage mass action on climate change (Marshall, 2014).

In his later writings Felix Guattari, incorporated the ecological imperative into what he called ‘ecosophy’ (Guattari, 2000). For Guattari as later for Naomi Klein the reality of global warming ‘changes everything’ (Klein, 2014). As he argued “ecology questions the whole of subjectivity and capitalistic power formations”. Connecting ecology to subjectivity, provides a change of minds, no longer seen as separate from our bodies but part of the same nature which provides the source of our health and our life.

One of the far-reaching ways in which connecting people to nature challenges the exclusionary bedrock of capitalism is in the ownership of land conferred as a ‘right to own property’ in article 17 of the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The illusory nature of such a right was challenged during a visit of inspectors in Pres- shire during a Forest School session where children learn co-operative survival skills and an appreciation of nature. A class group was in an ancient Norfolk woodland – Lion Wood – when the school Inspector asked the children: ‘who owns the wood?’ Perhaps he expected the name of the local landowner but a child replied: “nobody owns the wood – the trees and the animals own the wood.”

In the 18th Century, Rousseau expressed no less eloquently and rather more extensively, the absurdity of land ownership:
The first person who, having enclosed a plot of land, took it into his head to say this is mine and found people simple enough to believe him was the true founder of civil society. What crimes, wars, murders, what miseries and horrors would the human race have been spared, had some one pulled up the stakes or filled in the ditch and cried out to his fellow men: “Do not listen to this imposter. You are lost if you forget that the fruits of the earth belong to all and the earth to no one!” (Rousseau, 1754: 109)

The ‘academies’ that I mentioned earlier are managed by sponsors and trustees as well as governors and are commonly arranged in ‘chains’ or ‘multiple academy trusts’. The growth of Academies and free schools has seen a major shift in the ownership of land towards both central government and the trusts and away from local democratic ownership. With the giving of powers to corporations to contest public ownership under previous trade agreements and particularly under the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiated between the US and the EU, this transfer of ownership makes the British school system and its lands, ripe for further privatization. The temptation for the government to balance its books by selling off land worth billions of pounds may prove irresistible. This will be a new enclosure of public land or ‘commons’ as happens with shopping malls in English cities, diminishing local community use and ownership. It will rival the great enclosures of agricultural land from the 14th to the 18th century. It will be even more difficult to keep alive the ideas and cultures of ‘common schools for all’ within a privatized system.

I am not expecting an end to the delusion of land ‘ownership’ any time soon but have provided a brief exploration of the far-reaching implications of ecological sensitivity as an illustration of where a serious engagement with values can lead us. Deep engagement with values always leads to action.

I recognise that the process of reflecting on a values framework and values headings is unfinished. I am currently dwelling on the value of interconnectedness as a seventeenth heading in my framework. It contrasts with the excluding values headings of ‘separation’ or ‘specialisation’, or ‘isolation’.

THE INDEX IN USE

The index suggests how values, pedagogical principles and imperatives can be connected to the detail of all aspects of school life, in classrooms, staffrooms, kitchens, playgrounds, buildings and displays and in relationships amongst and between adults and children and with their surrounding communities. Since the third edition published in 2011 this has included an outline curriculum to support schools to adapt what they teach so that it better reflects the lives of children and adults involved in and around schools. The Index was also expanded for the third edition so that schools could connect into a single strategy all principled approaches to their development to do with citizenship, global interconnections, environmental
sustainability, outdoor learning, anti-discrimination, peace and democratic education. In the fourth edition there is explicit discussion of the way the Index can support schools to respond to the pressures from inspection and accountability regimes in a way consistent with inclusive values. Where people broadly ascribe to the values framework of the index they use its values, seventy indicators and two thousand questions to stimulate their own ideas for the collaborative development of their settings (Booth & Ainscow, 2016).

The Index is a summary of ideas for stimulating reflection and action to promote the development of the common school for all. Since 2000 it has been used by thousands of schools in almost fifty countries. As for other texts, there is no correct way of reading and using it. Use varies from action on a single idea from one of its questions to the full integration into school development processes, expanded to include all levels and categories of staff as well as parents, governors, children and young people. Some work with earlier editions in England was summarized in Rustemier and Booth (2005).

From 2011 onwards one English County adopted the third edition of Index as part of its approach to school development. Despite our efforts to demonstrate otherwise, it was seen by some in the local authority as a distraction from the outcomes focused approach of the local authority. The authority was under threat from the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) to rapidly increase national test results or face being taken over by a private company. I have called this county Pre-Shire, to reflect both the ‘pressure’ under which the authority was working and as a contrast with a second county in which work started in early 2016 where the introduction of work with the Index has strong support from the senior leaders in the authority. We are calling that county ‘Post-Shire’. In this section I provide examples of work with the Index in ‘Pre-Shire’.

WORKING WITH PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

People commonly suggest that it is ‘more difficult’ to work with the Index in secondary (11–16/18 years) than primary schools (4–11 years). There is no doubt that we have more examples of in-depth work with the Index in the latter than the former. There is an issue to do with the size of a school and the organisation required to involve the whole school community in such work in a large school that may be spread across departments, perhaps in several buildings. We need a concerted effort to further develop a process for working with the Index in secondary schools, which addresses the barriers that are encountered. There is an issue in all school about how we work with a shared text, given that there may be only one or two hard copies available, even though schools also receive a Portable Document Format (pdf) version.

However we did have some successes with secondary schools in Pre-Shire. The deputy head of a large secondary school quickly became an enthusiast for the Index:
‘It’s a brilliant project and a brilliant tool; it’s changed the way I think about leadership and the school.’

She had reflected on why parents did not come into school. As a geography teacher herself, she thought she would try inviting parents to attend model geography lessons specially put on for them after school so they could see the kinds of things their children were learning. 80 parents wanted to come and she put on 3 lessons so they all could attend. This idea is not to be found in the Index directly so I asked her why she attributed this work to reading the Index. She replied: “the Index made me think I could dare to invite parents to these lessons.”

She mentioned that she say the Index as countering T.S. Elliott’s vision of hell as representing utter disconnection in his introduction to Dante’s Inferno:

He said “hell is a place where nothing connects to nothing”...whereas in the Index, everything connects to everything...My master plan is to weave it in seamlessly into the school. When Ofsted visited they said that we had many good lessons but few outstanding lessons, only 6%, and there were questions about literacy standards and the active participation of children in lessons. So I’ve decided that we are going to concentrate on using section C2 [the section on orchestrating learning] right across the school. Orchestrating learning is our core purpose. If we do what’s in here I think we can get it up to 40%. I want them to move from thinking about teaching to facilitating learning. That’s a big cultural shift. For the children it means asking them what you have learnt today, not what have you been taught. I actually want to do it all, but I need to create a focus for them to work it out. People will buy into it.

We now have a half-termly training session involving teachers, students, parents and governors. The task at the first meeting was to look at what makes an outstanding lesson. We spent two hours locked in the drama studio. It was brilliant.

CONNECTING THE INDEX TO PRESSURES FROM OFSTED

In the last example the teacher felt she had to integrate the official outcomes focused approach to development with the improvements to the conditions for teaching and learning fostered by the Index. This was a feature of many of the examples of successful work with the Index. In an infant and nursery school the head teacher reported on the priority to increase attendance set for the school following an inspection:

We are an area of considerable deprivation and difficulty. One of our difficulties was around attendance. We had very low attendance here: around 82% across the whole school year. The government want us to get up to 95%. We came across the Index for Inclusion and we looked at all the questions around barriers to good attendance and chose three or four areas that we could really tackle.
One question in particular provoked particular discussion. It asks: ‘are children who have been absent given a genuinely warm greeting on their return?’ The teachers acknowledged that they sometimes greeted children who they did not think had legitimate reasons to be absent with sarcastic comments such as ‘oh, I see you have a nice new pair of shoes’ or ‘did you have a good holiday?’.

It made us question our own practice, think about the things we are currently doing in school and ways that we could do a bit better. We acted on the dialogue we had around those questions by drawing up an action plan. We were able to put a lot of things in place over the course the year to the extent that that the attendance went from that really low base and we are now hitting the 95% mark. And that’s made a big difference to us. I am not saying that the Index made us do everything differently but it made us think about things differently and made us put in place things that we might not have considered doing before. So that was a good experience and now with other school improvement projects we tend to go to the Index first and ask if there is an area we can use to start our thinking.

PUTTING THE INDEX AT THE HEART OF SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT

Turner Infant School started their engagement with the Index by setting up a new school development team to broaden consultation. They added governors, parents and children to the senior teachers who had previously been involved. But after a child asked ‘what do we do while the adults are talking’ they revised their approach to including the views of these young children. Parents filled in questionnaires and were involved in focus groups. The comments of parents and children on behaviour, bullying and playground use, led to substantial change. An early action was to divide the playground into zones with different activities and to increase adult supervision, something the children had particularly requested. They built these consultations into annual routines with the focus groups with parents run by other parents. This marked a significant point in the developing trust between teachers and parents in the school.

The school integrated the Index into what they needed to do to obtain ‘the Rights Respecting Schools’ award. They talked with parents and governors when they were leaving the school at a point of openness and reflection to provide fresh insights on what they could improve. There was a move to use staff expertise more resourcefully after the head told his staff: ‘you don’t blow your own trumpets enough’. So staff invited others to come and see learning activities they felt to be particularly successful.

One member of staff led on environmental issues; improving a community garden, recycling food waste from classrooms and kitchens prompted by the indicator on waste (B1.13) which also led to a discussion of package free lunches and many children adopting them.
After a mass of disparate activities, the Index has now become integrated into the School Improvement Plan. There is a column in the plan for the contribution of the Index to meeting any particular priority so ‘it forces people who are responsible for that area of the plan to actually look at the Index and use it’. The Index has helped to knit together the improvement of the school. As the head commented: ‘It has to work because it shares our values’.

ENGAGING WITH THE DETAIL TO TAKE CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT

At Gregory White Junior School, a senior teacher and teaching assistant led the Index work. They started with staff agreeing to look at Indicator C2.9, ‘Staff plan, teach and review together’, and particularly at two of the questions d) and e): ‘Do teachers plan activities so they make use of each others’ knowledge and skills?’, and ‘Do teachers use collaborative teaching as an opportunity for learning from each other?’ This prompted the teacher to share her strength in ICT with a colleague who was a PE specialist by teaching each other’s classes. Colleagues soon began to work in a similar way ‘drawing on each other’s strengths’. The questions in the Index were particularly appealing:

One of the most useful things with this resource, as opposed to any other we’ve worked with, is everything is a question. Just the fact that it’s written as a question makes you properly consider it.

The Index questions were also helping ‘a core group of governors to get much better at challenging’ and in turn the questions were helping teachers to support what they said was happening with evidence.

They had started to use the Index to support the environmental focus of the school. Staff had already made great use of the schools’ extensive grounds, transforming the playground with fitness machines, developing the adjoining green space with an orchard, wild area, mud kitchen, massive story chair and a theatre. Indicator: ‘A1.7 The school is a model of democratic citizenship’ prompted them to link activities in the environment with citizenship and parent participation. The staff had been discussing question l) ‘Do children engage in jobs which contribute to the development of the school?’

It isn’t an obvious eco-link but everyone looking after your environment that has to be about citizenship. And then we looked down the list of jobs and immediately there’s composting, cooking of food, tree planting, there are lots of things in there… Or in question b) under that indicator – ‘Do staff, children and families deliberately create a culture of participation and collaboration?’ I think we’ve got much better at engaging parents but predominantly that’s mums, so maybe doing stuff in the garden, practical outdoor stuff, maybe that’s where we can get our dads in and involved…
PROMOTING EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT LED BY INCLUSIVE VALUES IN ENGLAND

But the biggest contribution of the Index was in helping them to take control of their own development:

We’ve had to make a conscious choice over the last few years to stop being told what to do and to start looking at what we think works for our children and where we want to go. Interestingly at the point where we started to develop for ourselves and looked at the Index and at other schools, that’s when we stopped being Satisfactory and became Good. We’re moving rapidly towards doing outstanding things. The Index has really helped us to do that thinking for ourselves.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this chapter I have offered a glimpse of what an exploration of inclusion and exclusion involves when we move away from a narrow notion concerned only with education and the participation of particular groups. I offered one version of the start of a story of inclusion and exclusion in England. The history of inclusion and exclusion is as old as, or older than, humanity, linking perhaps beyond human history to ecological compatibilities and incompatibilities. I have tried again to provide a convincing argument for a broad view. I have linked inclusion to the idea of the common school, or comprehensive community school for all, and discussed the role of a framework of inclusive values in sustaining the possibility for such a policy in the face of opposing pressures. I indicated the way an engagement with the value of sustainability challenges taken for granted understandings of the way our societies operate.

Supporting the development of the common school as well as challenging assumptions in education and society are the tasks that I set out to fulfill in writing the Index for Inclusion. I have provided examples, from Pre-shire of the way schools are able to use the Index for Inclusion to promote inclusive ways of thinking and acting despite pressures to act otherwise. While this happened in Pre-shire in difficult circumstances it remains to be seen of the greater support offered by the authority in Post-Shire will be able to better modify the UK government’s neoliberal educational policies.

NOTES

1 Quote 31, Page 638, the fourth edition Oxford Dictionary of Quotations, attributed to George Bernard Shaw, though he was probably paraphrasing Oscar Wilde from ‘The Canterville Ghost 1887): ‘We have really everything in common with America nowadays except, of course, language’.
3 http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/02/refugees-welcome-uk-germany-compare-migration
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