

Report on Education White Paper 6 Implementation

An Overview for the Period: 2001-2012

September 2012

Department of Basic Education

Table of Contents

- Purpose 3
- Background 3
- Inclusive Education defined 3
- The concept of Barriers to learning 4
- Approaches and strategies from Education White Paper 6 5
- Roles and responsibilities of the National Department of Basic Education and Provincial Education Departments 5
- Achievements at National level over the years 6
- Provincial Education Departments' achievements over the years 8
- Overall performance assessment of DBE in the implementation of White Paper 6 29
- Overall performance assessments of provinces in White Paper 6 implementation 30
- What has not been done by the DBE? 30
- What has not been done by PEDs? 31
- Key strategic levers for DBE to improve the implementation of WP6 32
- Key strategic levers for PEDs to improve the implementation of WP6 32
- Risks, root causes and mitigation strategies 33
- Concluding remarks 35

Purpose

The main objective of this report is to present a comprehensive reflection on progress made in respect of the implementation of the Inclusive Education Policy from 2001 to 2012. Furthermore, it is to identify and isolate challenges, gaps and mitigation strategies to address the identified challenges and gaps.

Other objectives include the fostering and harmonisation of the conceptualisation of the Inclusive Education Policy and its intentions as well as putting to test and evaluating the widely held view both from within the Department and the general public that the Inclusive Education Policy has failed.

Background

- HEDCOM and CEM directed that special attention be focused on the implementation of the Inclusive Education Policy;
- The meeting between the Deputy Ministers of DWCPD and DBE also underscored the directive of HEDCOM and CE;
- During its workshop of 25-27 July 2012 the Portfolio Committee on Basic Education directed that DBE develops a comprehensive report on the implementation of Inclusive Education Policy since its launch in July 2001;and
- The need for developing a comprehensive report on Inclusive Education further followed from the PC for DWCPD's request to DBE for responses to concerns and questions raised during public hearings on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities that were conducted on 25-26 July 2012.

Inclusive Education Defined

There are divergent views and conceptions about what Inclusive Education is about and what it seeks to achieve. In most countries of the world, the conceptualization of the policy tends to be influenced by critical socio-political views and which sectors of society stand out as marginalized.

Those views influence the angle and approach that get to be adopted in building an inclusive education system and subsequently an inclusive society. A definition that is adopted by the Department of Basic Education that aligns itself neatly with Education White Paper 6 and other international instruments is the

one that was provided by UNESCO which defines Inclusive Education as follows:

“a process of addressing and responding to students’ diversity by increasing their participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education” (UNESCO, November 2008)

It is now recognized more widely that difficulties experienced by learners result not from individual problems, but rather from the rigid teaching methods and organization of schools (UNESCO 2005). The “disability” is *not in the individual*, but rather is a result of the *inability of the system* to address the needs of all learners. This brings to scrutiny, the concept of barriers to learning which is itself understood differently, thus requiring that close attention be paid to it.

The Concept of Barriers to Learning

From the foregoing paragraph it follows logically that the concept of barriers to may not be narrowly be located to learners and thus be viewed as only referring to special needs: it is broader and more comprehensive than that. WP6 defines the concept of ***barriers to learning as difficulties that arise within the education system as a whole , the learning site and/or within the learner, which prevent access to learning and development for some learners***. This definition lands itself to the following categorization of barriers to learning, which the education system must be cognisant of and use it to mitigate the impact of the wide spectrum of barriers to learning in maximizing participation of all learners in their learning and development:

- ***Systemic barriers*** e.g. overcrowded classrooms, inaccessible school buildings, inequitable resourcing of education, etc.
- ***Societal barriers*** e.g. HIV/AIDS, safety and security concerns, bullying in schools, socio-economical factors, etc.
- ***Pedagogical barriers*** e.g. under- and unqualified teachers, inappropriate and undifferentiated teaching methodologies of teaching and assessment, teachers’ knowledge content gaps, classroom management and organization, etc.
- ***Intrinsic barriers*** e.g. behavior difficulties, developmental delays, neurological and physical disabilities, etc.

These categories of barriers to learning therefore present a strong argument for a ***Multidisciplinary Approach in isolating and reducing them.***

Approaches and Strategies from Education White Paper 6

Education **White Paper 6** isolates the following approaches and strategies for the implementation of the **Inclusive Education Policy**:

- Building capacity in all education departments;
- Establishing district support teams;
- Identifying, designating and establishing full-service schools;
- Establishing institution-level support teams;
- Establishing mechanisms for the early identification of learning difficulties;
- Developing the professional capacity of all educators in curriculum development and assessment;
- Mobilizing public support; and
- Developing an appropriate funding strategy.

Roles and Responsibilities of Basic Education and Provincial Departments

For the effective and harmonized implementation of the policy, the following roles and responsibilities are identified for the national and provincial education departments:

DBE's Roles and Responsibilities	PEDs' Roles and Responsibilities
Develops legislative framework, policies, strategies and guidelines	Implement legislative framework, policies strategies and guidelines
Translates policies, strategies etc into a Sector Plan	Develop Action Plans in line with the Sector Plan
Provides guidelines on resources required to implement policies	Mobilise resources required to implement policies
Identifies national priorities in	Ensure that national priorities are

consultation with provinces	recognised, adhered to and actualised through plans
Working with and through provinces, monitors implementation of policies and programmes and report to HEDCOM and CEM	Monitor the implementation of policies and programmes at district and school level and report to the DBE

Achievements at National Level over the Years

The national Department of Basic Education has achieved the following milestones in the implementation of WP6 from 2001 to 2012:

- Piloted the implementation of WP6 through a **Field Test** in 30 districts, 30 special schools and 30 designated full service schools;
- Solicited **donor** funding for the Field Test from Finland and Sweden amounting to **R54m**;
- Developed the **screening, identification, assessment and support (SIAS) strategy** for early identification of learning difficulties and support;
- Developed **Inclusive Learning Programmes** to guide the system on how to deal with disabilities in the classroom;
- Developed **Funding Principles** to guide PEDs on how to fund the implementation of WP6 as interim measure;
- Submitted two funding bids to Treasury for the **Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme** from which **R1.5bn** was allocated for **2008 MTEF** and **R300m** for **2009 MTEF** on **Equitable Share** basis;
- Developed **Business Plan Development guidelines** for PEDs for **Expansion of IE Programme**;
- Developed **Guidelines for Full Service/Inclusive Schools**;
- Developed **Guidelines to Ensure Quality Education and Support in Special Schools and Special School Resource Centres**;
- Developed **guidelines for implementing concessions** throughout the grades;

- **Audited all special schools for the Blind** to develop an intervention strategy to improve quality of teaching and learning in those schools;
- Ran an R18m tender to procure assistive devices and technology to 33 special schools and 10 full service schools to model the provision;
- Reviewed the Inclusive Learning Programmes to Guidelines for Inclusive Teaching and Learning;
- Converted 10 ordinary schools to full service schools as a model for R11m;
- Incorporated inclusivity principles in all CAPS;
- **Audited reform schools and schools of industry** as part of their transfer to DSD;
- Trained 200 district officials including SMTs in Visual impairment as well as in Deaf Education;
- Developed the **Inclusive Education Strategy** that is currently implemented;
- Developed **Guidelines for Responding to Learner Diversity in the Classroom through the National Curriculum Statement** and orientated 2 474 district officials and grade 10 subject advisors in 2011; 110 stakeholders in 2011; 3 035 district officials and subject advisors for grade 11 in 2012; 163 stakeholders and special schools lead teachers in 2012 and 968 district officials and subject advisors for grades 4-6 in 2012;
- Is developing the South African Sign Language curriculum as subject for grades R-12;
- Has developed a framework for qualifications pathways at NQF level 1 for learners with moderate and severe intellectual disability; and
- Is currently developing an Action Plan to provide access to education for out-of-school children and youth including severe and profoundly intellectually disabled ones.

Provincial Education Departments' Achievements over the Years

Due to disparities and conflicting priorities across PEDs in respect of resourcing and implanting the Inclusive Education policy, there are glaring discrepancies in the outcomes that have so far been realized by individual departments. Following are individual PEDs' achievements in key strategic areas on the implementation of the policy:

Expansion of Inclusive Education and Special Needs Budget Allocation for 2012/13 Year

Province	Programme 4	Expansion of IE	Total
EC	675 556	0	675 556
FS	312 621	6 700	319 321
GP	1 354 062	0	1 354 062
KZN	1 057 997	338 000	1 395 997
LP	263 854	0	263 854
MP	225 171	0	225 171
NC	97 839	0	97 839
NW	261 603	49 796	311 399
WC	782 098	68 224	850 322
Grand Total	5 030 801	462 720	5 493 521

The budget allocated to the Inclusive Education policy implementation should provide for Special Schools (Programme 4) as well as for the Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme. The current Treasury Budget Structure makes provision for only Special Schools, which presents a major challenge for most provincial departments in implementing WPC.

Analysis:

- Only FS, KZN, NW and WC allocate for both sub-components with KZN allocating the highest (R388m) for 2012/13, followed by WC (R68.2m), NW (R49.8m) and FS (R6.7m);
- Other five provinces (EC, GT, LP, MP and NC) top-slice from Programme 4 for some activities of Expansion of IE Programme – thus making slow progress in implementing the IE policy; and
- Of the R5.5bn allocated for 2012/13 only R463m is for the Programme for the Expansion of IE.

The **key challenge** in this priority area is that Five provinces have not appropriated funding for the Programme on the Expansion of Inclusive

Education resulting in serious backlogs in those provinces regarding the implementation of the policy in its entirety.

Special Schools, Learners and Teachers, EMIS 2009

Province	Number of Special Schools	Learners with Single Disability	Learners with Multiple Disabilities	Number of Teachers
EC	40	8741	6512	816
FS	19	3409	1471	502
GP	116	24363	12104	3109
KZN	63	11238	8690	979
LP	10	3054	1914	272
MP	18	3352	3026	317
NC	10	1559	66	139
NW	33	4518	375	426
WC	81	15698	1529	1667
Grand Total	390	75 932	35 687	8227

Special schools like ordinary schools belong to PEDs. Special schools' roles according to WP6 are to admit children with severe and profound disabilities and to play the role of Resource Centres.

Reportedly the majority of special schools have long waiting lists of children awaiting admission for which PEDs need to put mechanisms in place and support districts in finding learning spaces for such children.

Analysis:

- 2009 data revealed that GT had the largest number of special schools followed by WC and the KZN;
- Special schools were the lowest in LP and NC, each having 10; and
- In total, there were 111 619 learners with disabilities accessing education in special schools.

Challenges:

- Most special schools battle with governance and management matters especially financial management thus requiring same attention and support as ordinary schools;
- There is very limited access to education for Autistic children across provinces and affected parents have to send them to private schools with unaffordable fees; and
- Physically disabled and incontinent learners are not adequately provided for in special schools.

Learners with Disabilities in Ordinary Schools, EMIS 2009

Province	Learners in Special Classes	Learners in Mainstream Classes	Total Enrolment
EC	948	18,708	19,656
FS	4,788	16,667	21,455
GP	3,726	12,397	16,123
KZN	6,504	15,721	22,225
LP	3,043	3,940	6,983
MP	1,482	12,051	13,533
NC	34	3,390	3,424
NW	1,251	6,581	7,832
WC	200	13,104	13,304
Grand Total	21,976	102,559	124,535

Guidelines for Full Service Schools, screening, identification, assessment and support (SIAS) and for Responding to Learner Diversity in the Classroom through the NCS (Curriculum Differentiation) are key in providing responsive support to learners.

Findings:

- Of the 124 559 learners admitted to ordinary schools in 2009, 21 976 (17.6%) were in separate classes;
- The separate classes are called different things in different provinces; and
- As much as the phenomenon of special classes ensures integration, the first step towards inclusion it is problematic as a permanent arrangement and thus anti-inclusion.

Challenges:

- The “permanency” factor attached to special classes/units is problematic as learners stay in those classes throughout their schooling years; and
- Inherent labelling and stigmatisation of learners placed in special classes.

Learners Per Category of Disability, EMIS 2009

Category of Disability	Number of Learners	Prevalence
Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)	3 490	3.3
Specific Learning Disability	13 394	12.8
Autistic Spectrum Disorders	1 781	1.7
Behaviour Disorders	7 787	7.5
Blind	927	0.9
Partially Sighted	2 623	2.5
Cerebral Palsy	6 410	6.1
Deaf	6 323	6.1
Hard of Hearing	1 428	1.4
Moderate Intellectual Disability	28 523	27.3
Severe Intellectual	24 047	23.1

Disability		
Physical Disability	3 992	3.8
Epilepsy	3 597	3.4

Learners Per Category of Disability Per Province, EMIS 2011

Prov.	ADD	Autistic	Behavior	Blind	Cerebral Palsy	Deaf	Deaf-Blind	Epilepsy	Hard Hearing	MID	MID-SID	Other	Part. Sighted	Phys. Disable	Psych. Disorder	SID	Specific Learn	Total
EC	221	163	238	63	102	556	131	127	101	192	326	258	134	79	137	231	33	092
FS	20	81	68	1	600	10	0	117	36	112	0	0	36	90	4	281	2	458
GP	3 224	416	706	139	832	657	17	345	317	901	254	847	623	821	107	802	857	865
KZ	682	506	930	13	151	235	8	668	249	255	863	222	242	407	40	034	624	129
LP	219	228	253	85	456	442	3	416	328	366	520	47	249	306	22	591	314	845
MP	155	24	647	34	89	125	1	94	21	550	72	3	95	110	23	808	41	892
NC	33	15	110	14	34	53	1	27	40	92	26	0	13	29		321		808
NW	217	71	440	24	220	234	0	183	77	241	593	50	163	174	7	735	238	667
WC	689	167	75	18	324	40	3	307	62	315	4	0	59	247	1	795	510	616
Grand Total	5 460	671	467	391	808	352	164	284	231	024	658	427	614	263	341	598	619	372

The two tables immediately above are unanimous in terms of the findings:

Findings:

- Moderate Intellectual Disability (MID) accounts for 27.3% of learners in special schools, Severe Intellectual is second with 23.1% followed by

Specific Learning Disabilities e.g. Dyslexia, which account for 12.8%; and

- As much as Blindness and Deafness accounted for 0.9% and 6.1% respectively, they require a lot of expertise including the adaptation of materials.

Challenges:

- Though Autistic Spectrum Disorder (Autism) affected 1.7% of learners with disabilities in 2009, it is the most complicated yet very less provided for in the system;
- Learners with Cerebral Palsy are not adequately provided for both in terms of incontinence facilities and in terms of personal support personnel; and
- Moderately and Severely Intellectually Disabled (SID) learners (in the majority of disabilities) are victims of “push-out” tendencies of ordinary/mainstream schools and walk away with school reports which are both not accredited and not recognised by the world of work.

Additional Indicators for Measuring Progress Made by PEDs

- Strengthening of neglected special schools as per the 2002 Audit;
- Conversion of special schools to Resource Centres;
- New special schools that have been/are being built;
- Assistive devices and technology procured for special and full service schools;
- Specialist professionals (therapists, psychologists, etc) employed;
- Remedial teachers, special needs teachers etc. employed in special schools;
- Remedial teachers, special needs teachers etc. employed in Full Service Schools;
- Teachers without requisite qualifications in special schools;

- Ordinary schools converted to Full Service Schools without infrastructure upgrade;
- Ordinary schools converted to Full Service Schools through infrastructure upgrade;
- Teachers trained in Inclusive Education-related activities;
- Inclusive Education staff establishment; and
- Composition of functional district-based support teams (DBSTs) that have been established.

Special Schools That Have Strengthened

Province	Number of Schools	Expenditure R'000
EC	42	38 476
FS	19	71 093
GP	73	59 889
KZN	71	638 227
LP	34	43 112
MP	4	21 970
NC	4	2 223
NW	32	47 385
WC	16	41 500
Grand Total	295	963 5

The audit of all special schools that was conducted in 2002 found that 135 special schools were seriously neglected and dysfunctional and required focused strengthening. Neglect led to high incidents of learner abuse, buildings falling apart especially hostels, no effective teaching and learning, no appropriate and effective support to learners etc.

Findings:

- To date 295 special schools have been strengthened through almost R1bn spending;

- Rural-urban divide, competing priorities and legacy of the past impacted progress differently:
- EC and LP strengthened more schools (42 and 34 respectively) spending less budget of R38m and R43m compared to FS (19 schools) and WC (16 schools) which spent R71m and R41m respectively; and
- GT (73 schools) and KZN (71 schools) strengthened same number of schools spending R60m and R638m respectively

Special Schools Converted To Resource Centres

Province	Number of Schools	Expenditure R'000
EC	3	2 043
FS	3	273
GP	15	27 280
KZN	14	427 065
LP	6	46 156
MP	21	6 400
NC	4	99 000
NW	8	4 418
WC	24	44 065
Grand Total	98	656700

Converting special schools to Resource Centres as WP6 strategy entails targeting SSs for devoted resourcing with dedicated funds to extend specialized services to other schools within the district. This is driven through the use of the **Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme (EIEP) funded by Treasury through the Equitable Share of R1.5bn for the 2008 MTEF and R300m for the 2009 MTEF respectively.**

The **main challenge** with budget allocation for inclusive education is the current **Treasury Budget Structure which only makes provision for special schools through Programme 4, which essentially is a sub-programme of Inclusive Education.**

EC, GP, LP, MP, and NC have never allocated funding for both MTEF cycles leading to top-slicing of Programme 4 for IE activities and the following **variations in progress** made.

Analysis:

- Allocation for EIEP factor: KZN (14 RCs: R427m) and WC (24 RCs: R44m) progressed by far compared to EC (3 RCs: R2m) and FS (3 RCs: R0.3m) for example; and
- Through top-slicing from Programme 4, LP (6 RCs: R46m) and NC (4 RCs: R99m) spent more than WC (24 RCs: R44m) without EIEP allocation.

New Special Schools Built/Being Built Per Province To Date

Province	Number of Schools	Expenditure R'000
EC	1	300 000
FS	2	67 000
GP	1	80 000
KZN	7	287 500
LP	1	900
MP	0	0
NC	0	0
NW	4	7 300
WC	9	44 000
Grand Total	25	786 700

Analysis:

- Some PEDs conducted feasibility studies for possibly building new SSs;
- One of strategies to increase access to education for out-of-school children and youth of school-going age;
- Since the advent of WP6, 25 new SSs have been/are being built to the value of R787m – some already completed;
- Majority of new SSs in WC followed by KZN and NW, all three that always allocated budget for Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme – progress ahead of others not surprising;

- However infrastructure norms/guidelines for SSs do not exist yet; and
- On average one SS cost R100m to build from scratch.

Special and Full Service Schools With Assistive Devices and Technology

Province	Special Schools	Full Service Schools	Expenditure R'000
EC	38	4	4 801
FS	4	34	2 294
GP	54	8	16 000
KZN	71	73	497 006
LP	1	4	2 383
MP	15	89	5 453
NC	4	0	290
NW	32	112	37 230
WC	7	108	18 769
Grand Total	226	432	584 226

Assistive devices and technology mediate the impact of disability to enhance learning and development. These include; spectacles, hearing aids, cochlea implants, wheelchairs, White Boards, Perkins Brailers, white canes, Bookmakers, Augmentative and Alternative Communication devices (AAC), etc. It is to be noted that DoH and DBE are responsible for health-related devices and curriculum-specific devices respectively. Presently, DBE provides for both categories due to lack of coordination between governments on the provision of access to specialist services including assistive devices.

Special Schools are currently provided for from Programme 4 whilst Full Service Schools are provided for from the Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme and in some provinces, from top-slicing of Programme 4.

Findings:

- A total of 435 FSSs have received and the majority is in NW (112 – 25.7%) followed by WC (108 – 24.8%); MP (89 – 20.5%); and KZN (73 – 16.8%); and

- The highest expenditure for this is in KZN (R497m) followed by NW (R37m); WC (R19m); and GT (R16m).

Challenge:

There is **no Government Coordinating Framework** to provide access to specialist services including access to health professionals and assistive devices.

Health Professionals Employed

Province	No. of Schools	Psychologists	Therapists	Social Workers	Prof Nurses	Other
EC	8	12	34	0	4	10
FS	20	7	49	18	12	1
GP	82	0	512	0	0	0
KZN	71	16	86	41	26	52
LP	6	0	1	0	5	1
MP	17	5	5	7	4	15
NC	2	0	2	1	0	0
NW	32	1	13	0	7	31
WC	1529	49	24	49	45	49
Grand Total	1 767	90	726	86	103	159

Availability of specialists is key for the early identification of barriers to learning, implementation of SIAS as well as for intervention programmes. In particular, the availability of therapists is critical for assessment of learners for provision of assistive devices and technology particularly for physical disability.

The allocation of funding for the Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme was in part intended for the creation of these posts to facilitate the further roll out of inclusive education.

Findings:

- Analysis found glaring disparities in the provision of access to specialist services to schools across provinces and within each in terms of types of the professionals;

- 1 738 SSs and FSSs have access to specialist professionals – WC (88.0%) the only province providing schools high access – all others provide access to less than 5% of schools – situation acutely dire in EC (0.5%); LP (0.3%) and NC (0.1%) all three which never budgeted for Expansion of Inclusive Education;
- The overall access displays rural-urban divide except in KZN (9.2%) with its commitment to the policy: GT (17.9%) and WC (61.0%) are better resourced for SIAS than their rural counterparts providing less than 4% access;
- Provision of assistive devices and technologies better off in GT(68%) and KZN (13%); and
- Across the spectrum therapists are in the majority (63.1%) followed by psychologists (8.5%); social workers (8.1%) and professional nurses (5.5%).

Challenge:

DBE struggles to attract health professionals as the department does not yet pay the Occupation Specific Dispensation (OSD) to these professionals, whilst Social Development and Health do.

Remedial and Special Needs Teachers Employed in Special Schools

Province	Remedial Teachers	Special Needs Teachers	Learning Support Educators	Teacher Assistants/Aides	Total in Special Schools
EC	80	16	0	99	0
FS	4	0	0	74	78
GP	0	201	0	0	201
KZN	10	158	0	328	496
LP	0	0	0	0	0
MP	20	0	5	35	60
NC	2	0	0	0	2
NW	0	518	0	66	584
WC	0	0	591	0	591

Grand Total	116	893	596	602	2012
-------------	-----	-----	-----	-----	------

These categories of teachers and teacher assistants constitute a support structure during lesson presentation and assessment to improve learner participation and performance. It is **critically important that all teachers are capable of differentiating during teaching, assessment and** in the support they provide to learners.

Except for Learning Support Teachers the other categories of teachers are placed at individual schools while the former category need to be essentially placed at the district to provide itinerant services to schools.

Findings:

- Special schools largely have access to 40% LSEs followed by access to 34.4% Special Needs teachers; 30% Teacher Assistants and 5.8% Remedial Teachers; and
- NW and WC special schools each enjoys 27% access to overall curriculum support followed by KZN with 22.5% while LP and NC provide no curriculum support at all.

Challenges:

- these curriculum delivery supporters are used differently in different provinces;
- Majority of SSs are not organized according to grades which impacts on use of Teachers Assistants; and
- Though majority of Teacher Assistants in Schools for the Deaf can sign they are without the NSC

Remedial and Special Needs Teachers Employed in Full Service Schools

Province	Remedial Teachers	Special Needs Teachers	Learning Support Educators	Teacher Assistants/Aides	Total in FSSs
EC	9	76	43	0	128
FS	0	19	0	0	19
GP	0	0	216	0	216

KZN	50	0	0	100	150
LP	0	0	0	0	0
MP	0	0	3	0	3
NC	0	0	0	0	0
NW	62	1	0	0	63
WC	0	0	108	108	216
Grand Total	121	96	370	208	667

Findings:

- FSSs in most provinces provide access to curriculum support;
- WC provides the highest access with 40.8% followed by KZN as with SSs with 28.3% then EC 12.1% and NW with 11.9%; and
- LP, MP and NC provide no access to curriculum support to FSSs.

Challenge:

- these curriculum delivery supporters are used differently in different provinces; and
- How Remedial Teachers, Learning Support Teachers and Special Needs Teachers are used in most FSSs whereby they are used to man special classes/units which are set aside for learners who are identified to be experiencing learning difficulties are placed on a permanent basis leading to discrimination, labelling and stigmatisation.

Teachers Without Requisite Qualifications in Schools for the Blind and Deaf

Province	Number of Schools	Teachers With Basic Braille, Not Qualified	Teachers Without Braille Knowledge of Braille at All	Teachers With Basic Sign Language, Not Qualified	Teachers Without Sign Language At All
EC	0	0	0	0	0

FS	2	62	0	66	0
GP	6	50	0	30	0
KZN	10	43	53	120	3
LP	0	0	0	0	0
MP	1	13	6	57	200
NC	1	6	6	24	6
NW	32	539	17	521	57
WC	7	68	7	167	0
Grand Total	59	781	89	985	266

Visual impairment as well as Deafness are isolated because they are the highly specialised compared to other disabilities which largely depend on Curriculum Differentiation.

Findings:

- The phenomenon affects 53 SSs (80.3%) of the 66 schools (22 for the Blind and 44 for the Deaf); and
- The ratio of teachers without knowledge of the South African Sign Language (21.8%) is higher than that for teachers without knowledge of visual impairment (10.9%).

Challenge

- There is lack of capacity in the country to produce Braille materials; and
- The majority of teachers teaching in schools for the Blind and schools for the Deaf does not have the requisite qualifications and competence suitable for these schools.

Designated Full Service Schools Without Infrastructure Upgrade

Province	Number of Schools	Expenditure R'000
EC	14	0
FS	26	1 574
GP	68	0
KZN	70	1 949

LP	11	0
MP	140	3 000
NC	4	43
NW	112	26 902
WC	108	18 768
Grand Total	553	52 236

Converting ordinary schools to full service/inclusive schools is more than just making them environmentally accessible for physically disabled learners: It includes but is not limited to: orientating teachers into WP6 (advocacy); training teachers in Inclusive Learning Programmes (now, Curriculum Differentiation), as well as establishing school-based support teams (ILSTS) and ensuring their functionality. The activities largely depend on the Expansion of IE Programme budget allocation.

This is one of key strategies to mainstream support to learners and it is in line with UN Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities.

Findings:

- To date, 553 FSSs have been designated with associated expenditure of R52.2m;
-
- MP leads the process 25.3% followed by NW (20.3); WC (19.5%) and KZN (12.7%); and
- Typically, EC, LP and NC have fallen far behind due to unavailability of the Expansion of IE Programme budget over the years.

Challenge:

- Delay in mediating the Guidelines for Full Service Schools is retarding progress in mainstreaming disabilities and support.

Designated Full Service Schools With Infrastructure Upgrade

Province	Number of Schools	ExpenditureR'000
EC	4	11 005
FS	2	222 000

GP	7	36 660
KZN	50	446 381
LP	11	7 450
MP	1	3 863
NC	1	28 000
NW	112	62 250
WC	14	3 500
Grand Total	202	821 109

Infrastructure upgrade includes installation of ramps, rails, walkways, drop-off or pick-up spots, modifications of classrooms and toilets, etc. This is done by implementing Universal Design Principles in the design and during construction. This is another intervention that relies heavily on funding from the Expansion of IE Programme.

Findings:

- To date 202 ordinary schools have been made environmentally accessible to physically disabled learners;
- Together, R4.8bn has been spent on the physical upgrade of the schools;
- Majority are in NW (112) followed by KZN (50); and WC (11); and that
- There are serious backlogs in EC, FS, GT, MP and NC.

Challenge:

- The Inclusive Education being expected to do everything to ensure inclusivity including infrastructure work which is not the competence of the directorate;
- Full service schools being perceived as quasi special schools; and
- Other ordinary schools refusing to take responsibility to include and support needy learners but referring (push-out factor) to either full service schools or special schools.

Teachers Trained in Inclusion-Related Activities

Province	Number of Schools	Trained in SIAS	Trained in Inclusive	Orientated in WP6	Trained in Deaf Education	Trained in Visual Impairment	Expenditure R'000
EC	47	198	12	0	43	3	0
FS	31	1418	602	700	54	0	414
GP	75	750	750	750	0	0	0
KZN	46	205	0	3817	0	0	6450
LP	34	240	240	240	1	35	0
MP	478	6090	2285	920	1027	1215	0
NC	8	166	90	166	0	12	11
NW	144	3865	89		30	17	25
WC	1529	108	108	108	40	0	200
Grand Total	2392	13040	4176	6701	1195	1282	7100

Training in areas such as in SIAS, visual and hearing impairment are part of IE HRD strategy. Training in specialised areas prepares teachers to have requisite qualifications and skills to teach in schools for the Deaf and the Blind in particular and the skilling of teachers in these skills is targeted to be achieved by 2014.

The specialised training of teachers is led from Teacher Development and the Inclusive Education Directorate at DBE. The plan is to provide specialised and accredited training courses.

Findings:

- 2 363 schools have participated in the various training activities related to Inclusive Education; and
- 13 040 teachers have been trained in SIAS to capacitate them for early identification of barriers to learning and interventions.

Inclusive Education Officials Based at District Level

Prov.	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Total	Vacancies
EC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FS	0	0	74	0	8	5	87	0
GP	0	0	130	55	3	0	0	188
KZN	0	0	13	9	11	0	33	27
LP	0	0	4	1	0	0	5	0
MP	0	0	35	0	4	0	39	17
NC	0	0	34	3	0	0	37	60
NW	0	3	41	0	3	0	47	15
WC	47	24	5	0	0	0	76	3
Grand Total	47	27	336	68	29	5	243	310

This is an indicator of capacity to implement the IE policy at different levels of the system. It is recommended to have officials across disciplines including psychologists to drive the implementation of inclusion at district level.

Findings:

- Only WC employs such IE officials at level;
- The majority of IE officials are at level 3; and
- There are unfilled vacancies in some provinces.

Challenges:

- Currently the implementation of Inclusive Education is acutely under-resourced across the different levels of the system;
- The organisational structure is not uniform and nor is its strategic placement in the departments' organogram; as well as
- The high mobility rate and redeployment of knowledgeable officials and teachers.

Composition of Functional District Based Support Teams (DBSTs)

Province	Curriculum	IE	Psychologists	Therapists	Social Workers	Learning Support Educator	EMGD	Infrastructure	Circuit Managers
EC	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FS	21	8	4	5	11	51	67	4	0
GP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
KZN	48	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	12
LP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MP	4	39	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
NC	12	17	3	0	0	4	1	1	17
NW	6	35	0	0	0	8	3	3	3
WC	16	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	8
Grand Total	107	107	15	20	23	71	91	20	40

It is highly recommended to constitute a DBST with multiple disciplines and programmes across the organisational structure e.g. to have officials from Curriculum; IE; EMGD; Infrastructure; etc to ensure an integrated approach in providing support. It is imperative that each discipline identifies its role(s) as part of a team and for disciplines to plan together. IE alone may not constitute a functional DBST as necessary expertise and competence lie across programmes and policy areas

Findings:

- None of the programme officials in districts of EC, GT and LP;
- There is an equal number of Curriculum and IE officials wherever they exist which is most likely could have been the influence of the joint NSLA Lekgotla that started in 2012;and
- There is an observable uneven and skewed distribution of Curriculum and IE officials across districts as some districts do not have any of these officials at all. This could be attributed to the legacy of the past.

Challenge:

- Guidelines for Full Service Schools and Special Schools have not yet been mediated.

Performance of Learners with Disabilities in the NSC, 2010-2011









Province	No. Wrote 2010	No. Passed 2010	Pass Rate 2010	No. Wrote 2011	No. Passed 2011	Pass Rate 2011	Growth Rate in Number	Growth Rate in Passes
EC	101	72	71.30	141	102	72.30	39.60	41.67
FS	52	49	94.20	36	33	91.70	-30.77	-32.65
GP	406	354	87.20	429	374	87.20	5.67	5.65
KZN	148	134	90.50	109	95	87.20	-26.35	-29.10
LP	34	13	38.20	16	10	62.50	-52.94	-23.08
MP	3	3	100.00	6	6	100.00	100.00	100.00
NC	13	13	100.00	5	5	100.00	-61.54	-61.54
NW	13	12	92.30	9	8	88.90	-30.77	-33.33
WC	120	95	79.20	96	64	66.70	-20.00	-32.63
Tot/Ave	890	745	83.71	847	697	82.29	-4.83	-6.44

Analysis:

- 890 learners with disabilities wrote the NSC exam and 847 wrote in 2011 representing a drop of 4.8%;
- 745 (83.7%) learners with disabilities passed in 2010 compared to 697 (82.3%) in 2011 dropping by 1.4%;
- The ratio of learners with disabilities writing the NSC to their counterparts has been 0.2 over the two years far below the expected 4-6% in general population;
- The overall performance of learners with disabilities (+/-80%) is higher than for their counterparts but the subject combinations differ markedly between the groups – limited access to the sciences for learners with disabilities impacting on career choice; and














































- The endorsed NSC limits further studies.

Overall Performance Assessment of DBE in the Implementation of WP6

Key Systemic Levers	Performance Rating
Development of guidelines on policy directives for implementing White Paper 6 e.g. Guidelines for Full Service/Inclusive Schools	
Soliciting funding for initiating the implementation of the policy e.g. Donor funding , national treasury etc.	
Development of funding norms for an inclusive system	
Guidelines on curricular needs for learners who are either moderately to severely intellectually disabled or are gifted	
Development of personnel provisioning norms for an inclusive system	
Development of an integrated system for early identification of barriers to learning and early intervention	
Mobilisation of stakeholders for effective implementation of the policy	
Monitoring the implementation of the policy in provinces	

In the main, the DBE has not managed to put in place human resource and funding norms and standards for an inclusive which has had an adverse effect in its role to guide and direct provincial departments in resourcing the implementation of the policy.

Overall Performance of Provinces in White Paper 6 Implementation

Province	Designated Resource Centres	Designated Full Service Schools	Accessible Full Service Schools	IE Officials Employed at District	Functional DBSTs Established
					
FS					
GP					
KZN					
LP					
MP					
NC					
NW					
WC					

One key finding on the overall performance of PEDs suggests that provinces that have so far not provided equitable share funding of the Expansion of Inclusive Education have struggled in most priority areas of the implementation of the Inclusive education policy.

What Has Not Been Done?

Amidst the above milestones that have been achieved over the years, there have been gaps and challenges that have retarded progress and compromised it. These have occurred at different levels of the system.

What Has Not Been Done By Basic Education Over The Years?

- Not using the opportunity Treasury provided to influence budget structure review to include Expansion of Inclusive Education;

- Strengthening inter-departmental cooperation and stakeholder engagement for inclusion;
- Development of a curriculum for moderately and severely intellectually disabled learners;
- Development of guidelines for funding an inclusive system;
- Development of guidelines for human resource provisioning for an inclusive system; and
- Timeous provision of Brailled workbooks and textbooks.

What Has Not Been Done By Provincial Departments Over The Years?

- EC, GP, LP, MP and NC have never appropriated funding for the Expansion of Inclusive Education Programme resulting to serious backlogs in the implementation of the policy;
- Implementing the Funding Principles as provided by DBE resulting in glaring disparities in resourcing Inclusive Education;
- Recognising Inclusive Education as one of key national priorities;
- Following guidelines for developing a Business Plan for the Expansion of Inclusive Education;
- Distinguishing between Special Needs Education and Inclusive Education; and
- Ensuring DBSTs are established as multi-disciplinary teams.

Key Strategic Levers for Implementation of White Paper 6

In order to plug the policy gaps experienced in the implementation of this policy, strategic levers have been identified and distributed across the two levels as follows:

Key Strategic Levers for the DBE

- Development of an Inclusive Education Strategy and monitor its implementation;

- Developing training manuals and providing training of district officials in Guidelines on Curriculum Differentiation, Full Service Schools and Special Schools;
- Completing the adaptation of workbooks grades R-9 for Braille, for Sign Language users and for users of Augmentative and Alternate Communication;
- Reviewing and streamlining SIAS for gazetting as policy and full rollout;
- Finalising the development of the South African Sign Language curriculum as subject for grades R-12 and preparing the system for its phased-in implementation from 2014 onwards;
- Finalising the development of a Framework for Qualification pathways for intellectually disabled learners at NQF level 1;
- Developing a curriculum for moderately and severely intellectually disabled learners which is aligned to a Qualification Framework for intellectually disabled;
- Developing policy directives and strategies for out-of-school disabled children and youth including the severely and profoundly intellectually disabled;
- Developing funding and human resource provisioning guidelines for an inclusive system; and
- Providing guidelines for an effective Organisational Structure and its equitable resourcing for implementation across the system.

Key Strategic Levers for Provincial Departments

- Appropriating funds for the Expansion of Inclusive Education;
- Building capacity at school level using Guidelines for Curriculum Differentiation, for Full Service Schools and for Special Schools;
- Procuring adapted workbooks and textbooks for affected schools using national catalogue;
- Training and re-orientating district officials and teachers on the revised and approved SIAS;

- Conducting teacher training in the SASL curriculum grades R-12 and resource its implementation;
- Implementing an approved curriculum for moderately and severely intellectually disabled learners;
- Resourcing and implementing the policy directives and strategies that will facilitate improved access to education for out-of-school disabled children and youth including the severely and profoundly intellectually children and youth;
- Implementing approved guidelines for funding and human resource provisioning for an inclusive system;
- Facilitating the establishment of functional district-based support teams (DBSTs) and school-based support teams (ILSTs) and resourcing them, as well as
- Equitably resourcing the Inclusive Education units at provincial and district level.

Risks, Root Causes and Mitigation Strategies

Risk	Root Cause	Mitigation Strategy
Differences in the implementation of the Inclusive Education Policy across provinces in terms of approaches, models, strategies or priorities	Incoherent understanding of Inclusive Education Policy	Advocacy on White Paper 6 starting from very Senior Management levels going down levels, from national through different levels within and outside of the DBE, using same messages
Expansion of Inclusive education only funded in the main in NW, WC and KZN since 2008	The current Treasury Budget Structure that allocates budget to special schools only (Programme 4) when special schools	DBE to make use of the opportunity provided by Treasury to make inputs on the review of the budget structure to forge alignment

	are a sub-component of the Inclusive Education Policy	with Action Plan to 2014: Towards the Realisation of Schooling 2025
Inclusive Education and Special Needs are located in different Branches and Directorates across provinces	Variations in the Organisational Structure of DBE between national and provincial level	Organisational structure to be reviewed and harmonised as far as practicable
Uneven capacity in terms of Human Resource that drives the implementation across all levels of the system (Essentially only four professional staff members of the Directorate at DBE driving the implementation)	Variations in the Organisational Structure of DBE between national and provincial level	Organisational structure to be reviewed and harmonised as far as practicable
Limited and uncoordinated access to specialist services (assistive devices and technologies, health professionals such as psychologists, therapists, professional nurses etc)for learners experiencing barriers to learning	Absence of a Coordination Framework from government to regulate roles and responsibilities of Education, Health and Social Development	Government to put in place a Coordination Framework to clearly define roles of different departments and how to share scarce resources and avoid double-dipping
Stakeholder participation in the implementation of the Inclusive Education Policy.	Fragmented approach in stakeholder mobilisation by the DBE, playing itself out in programme-specific approach	The QLTC to broaden its scope and mobilise all stakeholders of the DBE for implementation of the entire Sector Plan

Concluding Remarks

Implementing White Paper 6 has been a challenging journey as no supportive systems existed prior to the implementation. A number of systems and strategies emerged along the way.

The 2020 vision of WP6 of converting 500 primary ordinary schools to full service schools was realized within the first 11 years of implementation. One of the critical experiences that derives from having field-tested the implementation of the policy has been the importance of support structures particularly the DBST and the need for ensuring that it is constituted with officials from across disciplines.

Finally, harmony in the conceptualization of the policy across levels is fundamental as it impacts on the choice of an approach and model that get to be adopted for the development of an inclusive system.

