

Strength through Diversity

9th Policy Forum, OECD, Paris, 17 March 2022

Measuring and evaluating inclusion in education: developing and applying indicators

Proceedings of the Ninth Policy Forum



STRENGTH
through Diversity



Strength through Diversity

9th Policy Forum, Paris, 17 March 2022



The Ninth Policy Forum of the OECD *Strength through Diversity* Project (hereby the “Project”) took place on 17 March 2022 via Zoom. Over 100 participants from 20 OECD and two non-OECD countries, as well as representatives from the European Union, the Council of European Commission/Council of Europe INSCHOOL Project, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), civil society and several academic institutions attended the Forum. Presentations shown in the meeting can be found at <http://www.oecd.org/education/strength-through-diversity/>.

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Paulo Santiago, Head of Division for Policy Advice and Implementation in the Directorate for Education and Skills at the OECD, provided opening remarks for the Policy Forum. He welcomed the participants to the meeting and expressed gratitude for their attendance at past events organised by the Project over the last five years. Mr. Santiago acknowledged participants’ support for the analytical working papers, Policy Fora and country-specific reports that provide comprehensive evidence on diversity, equity and inclusion in education.

Mr. Santiago emphasised that the *Strength through Diversity: Education for Inclusive Societies* Project proposes a holistic approach to diversity in education and examines a broad range of diversity dimensions. These include migration-induced diversity; ethnic groups, national minorities and Indigenous peoples; special education needs; gender; gender identity and sexual orientation; and giftedness. In addition, the Project analyses how these dimensions intersect and how they are influenced by overarching factors such as socio-economic status and geographic location. With a special focus on the COVID-19 pandemic, Mr. Santiago illustrated the growing attention and significance of equity and inclusion in education. The global pandemic created new challenges in ensuring equity and inclusion in education opportunities for all learners and particularly for the most vulnerable students. Many OECD countries have already implemented policies and practices to foster inclusion of diverse student groups. Despite the progress made, important gaps remain, such as limited research and few studies measuring and evaluating the impact of inclusion in education.

Mr. Santiago outlined three key objectives of the Policy Forum:

- To discuss the role of indicators for inclusion at the system and school levels;
- To present different country examples of indicators and their use in education settings, considering both the benefits and challenges;
- To promote discussion among participants about opportunities for future developments in the area of indicators for inclusion and envisage forward-looking policies for their adoption in education systems.

Following Mr. Santiago’s opening remarks, Ms. Lucie Cerna (OECD Secretariat/Directorate for Education and Skills) welcomed participants to the Policy Forum. She provided a brief overview of the Project’s work on topics related to diversity, equity and inclusion in education. She presented the holistic framework of the Project that provides a comprehensive tool to analyse inclusion across

different dimensions of diversity. To achieve this, evidence is combined into a common framework to address some of the resulting knowledge gaps. The framework examines five key policy areas: governance; resourcing; capacity building; school-level interventions; and monitoring and evaluation. This Policy Forum focuses on the last policy area.

Ms. Cerna then introduced the draft working paper “Indicators of inclusion in education: A framework for analysis”. The paper highlights the importance of collecting and analysing data on inclusion in education. Selecting specific indicators on inclusive education can alert policy makers of impending challenges and help them measure reforms’ impact, account for specific needs through funding schemes or feed into teachers’ professional learning. Ms. Cerna presented the inputs–processes–outcomes model that can be used as a conceptual framework for the development of indicators of inclusion. Inputs generally denote all sources provided to a system to achieve a certain outcome. Processes refer to all educational activities (teaching practices, assessments, distribution of funding, individual support, etc.) that transform inputs into outcomes. Outcomes span from academic to socio-emotional and economic well-being. Finally, Ms. Cerna highlighted some of the considerations that could be taken into account when developing a framework for indicators of inclusion. Countries should balance the need for more disaggregated data to monitor and target students with costs, privacy issues and labelling risks. Policy makers could also consider which intersections of individuals’ characteristics may create particular challenges.

MAIN LESSONS

- Indicators of inclusion in education are essential to implement effective policies and monitor the achievement of targets for the education system. To collect and analyse data on inclusive education, policy makers should aim to compile both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Quantitative indicators can include targeted household surveys and learning assessments as well as data collections on disabilities, social inclusion and segregation of students. Qualitative indicators can focus on the mapping of laws and policies on inclusion in terms of responsibilities of policy makers.
- Greater equity and inclusion in education cannot be achieved without efforts to collect and analyse data on the most excluded segments of the population. At the same time, data collections should avoid labelling that stigmatises learners. Developing and selecting specific indicators can help education systems to translate their will to achieve greater inclusion into the possibility of actually measuring their inclusiveness and, consequently, act on it. Indicators can thus be major drivers of policy reforms and can help outline policy goals. Moreover, indicators can flag barriers and challenges for certain groups and trigger policy responses.
- When designing indicators, it is important to measure what is valued rather than value what measured. In doing so, countries can analyse data on the most excluded groups. If inclusiveness is not assessed, then policy makers and observers might judge an education system according to the often limited data they have available. This might misdirect them or, in the case of absence of data, result in challenges that require action being overlooked. In fact, without data that monitors developments over time, policy makers and other stakeholders might become convinced that progress is being achieved even if it is not, particularly if the initiatives are widely supported. Instead, by developing indicators on inclusive education, countries will draw the attention on the issue, making it an accepted goal of the education system.
- The OECD Child Well-being Measurement Framework is an example of a comprehensive and child-centred framework. Multiple indicators were developed that focus on various types of outcomes, such as learning outcomes and life satisfaction, and data are disaggregated by several dimensions of diversity, such as gender and socio-economic status. Indeed, policy makers should not neglect the most marginalised children in data collections. However, despite recent efforts, some dimensions of diversity are underrepresented in data collections due to the risks related to labelling and data privacy concerns. Moreover, there is a strong need to examine the interconnected nature of child well-being such as health and education outcomes. The need for more disaggregated data also needs to be balanced with costs of data collections.
- Every learner matters and matters equally. Through inclusive education, barriers to participation and learning can be identified and eliminated. By designing and implementing indicators of inclusion at the school level, schools can be supported in their efforts to move in an inclusive direction through promoting higher accountability and more effective monitoring and evaluation. Indicators of inclusion also have the potential to identify the necessary tools to raise standards for every student. However, using indicators for inclusion can be challenging at the school level with schools often struggling with the implementation of a complex indicator system due to a lack of capacity. They might thus need additional support, guidelines and illustrative examples with sample questions. Furthermore, the general lack of a common understanding of inclusive education leads to additional barriers linked to curriculum design and teacher training. It is therefore crucial to ensure clarity regarding what is meant by inclusive education, use evidence as a stimulus for change and develop organisational cultures that view student diversity positively.

Sessions

The Policy Forum was structured in two main sessions, both of which comprised two presentations by guest speakers and a plenary discussion. The first session discussed the role and use of indicators for inclusion in education at the system level. First, Mr. Manos Antoninis (Director of the UNESCO GEM Report) and Ms. Anna D’Addio (Senior Policy Analyst at the UNESCO GEM Report) introduced their work on the Global Education Monitoring (GEM) report, demonstrating both quantitative and qualitative indicators for inclusion. Then, Mr. Chris Clarke (OECD Centre on Well-being, Inclusion, Sustainability and Equal Opportunity) presented the new framework for measuring and monitoring child well-being. Their presentations were followed by a plenary discussion with participants discussing the lack of common definitions of “inclusive education” and the challenges of implementing system-wide indicators while considering intersecting dimensions of diversity. The session was moderated by Ms. Lucie Cerna (OECD/EDU) with the support of Ms. Elisabeth Stumvoll (OECD/EDU) as a note-taker.

During the second session, presenters and participants discussed how indicators are used at the school level to analyse and foster inclusion. First, Mr. Mel Ainscow (Emeritus Professor at the University of Manchester, Professor of Education at the University of Glasgow and Adjunct Professor at Queensland University of Technology) presented the Index for Inclusion, a tool that he co-designed and that was translated into 40 languages and adopted by schools all around the globe, while acknowledging some challenges in its adoption. Then, Mr. Denis Durmish (European Commission and Council of Europe Joint Project “Inclusive Schools: Making a Difference for Roma Children”) introduced the “Inclusive Schools: Making a Difference for Roma Children” (INSCHOOL) project, an example of field work on fostering inclusion in schools also through the application of the Index for Inclusion. The project focuses on fostering the inclusion of Roma students (together with other groups of vulnerable students) in different European countries. The presentations were followed by a plenary discussion with participants, discussing the practical challenges of applying indicators at the school level and the need for national leadership in overcoming those challenges. The session was moderated by Ms. Cecilia Mezzanotte (OECD/EDU) with the support of Ms. Irmak Günal (OECD/EDU) as a note-taker.

Session 1 – Indicators for inclusion at the system level: How do countries and organisations design and use them?



SESSION 1: INDICATORS FOR INCLUSION AT THE SYSTEM LEVEL: HOW DO COUNTRIES AND ORGANISATIONS DESIGN AND USE THEM?

Expanding on the importance of indicators highlighted by Ms. Cerna in the introduction, presenters from the UNESCO Global Education Monitoring (GEM) Report and the OECD Centre on Well-being, Inclusion, Sustainability and Equal Opportunity (WISE) shared their frameworks and publications on indicators for inclusive education. This session was moderated by Ms. Lucie Cerna.

Mr. Manos Antoninis and Ms. Anna D'Addio presented the 2020 GEM report that focused on inclusion. The GEM team also published two regional editions on inclusive education: 1) 2020 Latin America and the Caribbean Report and 2) 2021 Central and Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia Report. Mr. Antoninis highlighted three key messages: diversity is a strength to celebrate; every society has ways to exclude; and inclusion is a process. Policy makers should aim to collect system-level and individual-level data while avoiding labelling that stigmatises learners. Quantitative indicators can be helpful in summarising this wealth of information into simpler aggregate measures. While outcomes of some vulnerable groups were often not observed, household surveys are a valuable tool, thanks to which these can be estimated (e.g., Roma out-of-school rates). Mr. Antoninis also discussed how disability measurements have evolved. He highlighted how new data collections go beyond intellectual difficulties towards functional disabilities. For example, some countries now collect information on whether children can remember and accept change, or if they feel depressed and anxious. In his final point, Mr. Antoninis stressed that large-scale assessments offer new perspectives on measurements of student experience at school. For instance, the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) estimates the index of social inclusion or the index of between-school socio-economic segregation. These indexes helped reveal before-hidden trends and cross-country comparisons in student segregation.

Ms. Anna D'Addio presented some of the qualitative indicators from the UNESCO GEM Report. Her presentation focused on UNESCO's Profiles Enhancing Education Reviews (PEER). PEER fosters qualitative understanding of some of the themes that are key to the Sustainable Development Goal 4, which aims to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all" by 2030. PEER's aim is to describe and map laws and policies on the topic of inclusion. This information is used to inform changes in the system to advance the education system. For instance, the GEM analysis showed that 68% of countries have a definition of inclusive education, but only 57% of them cover multiple marginalised groups. Ms. D'Addio also highlighted some key take-away points on governance in education. For example, in most countries, legislation gives education ministries more responsibility in the area of disability compared to, for example, gender. Policies, on the other hand, also address other groups. Many countries, for instance, have policies in place targeted at gender equality, linguistic minorities or ethnic/Indigenous groups. In Ms. D'Addio's final remark, she underlined that many education systems do not define inclusive education. Moreover, countries around the world have different types of school organisation in place. Ideally, schools should provide equal opportunities to all students, irrespective of their background. However, as the report shows, less than 17% of countries with valid information on education provision for students with disabilities, set their placement in truly inclusive frameworks by law.

Mr. Chris Clarke presented the OECD "Measuring and Monitoring Child Well-being" report. In 2015, the OECD started collecting valuable data on student well-being. Since then, numerous publications

on this topic have been written in relation to various frameworks. The “Measuring and Monitoring Child Well-being” report, published in 2021, presents a comprehensive framework for measuring and monitoring child well-being that is built on a robust review of evidence. In the report, good well-being means “both being able to live a “good” childhood in the here-and-now and being able to develop the skills, abilities and competencies needed for a good future, given their circumstances”. Therefore, it is crucial to monitor whether children are provided with resources and opportunities that allow them to learn. The framework was developed based on an ecological and multi-level approach to child well-being. It is centred on child outcomes, including: material well-being; physical health; cognitive and educational outcomes; and social, emotional and cultural outcomes. These outcomes are influenced by children’s activities, behaviours and relationships. Furthermore, children’s settings and environments can also impact outcomes. Lastly, the framework monitors overarching public policies. Mr. Clarke then mentioned two main activities to operationalise this framework that the WISE Centre is currently working on: the update of the OECD Child Well-Being Data Portal and the creation of a Child Well-being Dashboard with 20 indicators. These cover, for instance, life satisfaction, share of children who do not spend time playing outside and children in households reporting difficulties ‘making ends meet’. In his final remarks, Mr. Clarke identified some key challenges. He flagged that some areas of children’s lives are measured better than others, and that the most marginalised children in highly vulnerable positions, such as those exposed to maltreatment, violence or homelessness, are often poorly covered by data. Moreover, children’s own views and perspectives are not always accounted for in data collections on well-being. Finally, existing cross-national child data are not well suited to the inter-connected nature of child well-being making it difficult to track linkages such as education outcomes and health.

Plenary discussion

In the plenary discussion, participants thanked presenters for their valuable contributions. Participants and presenters generally shared the view that inclusion needs to be viewed as a process and no single indicator can completely measure it. Furthermore, frameworks should be treated as guidelines: when applying them, policy makers need to be pragmatic and recognise that not every aspect of inclusion can be measured perfectly. Inclusive education and inclusion lack a single, shared definition. This leads to various challenges, such as in the field of curricula and textbook design and the training of teachers in the area of diversity and inclusion. Some participants expressed concerns regarding the use of the “special education needs” label. They maintained that it is a social construct often associated with a deficit view of particular children. Participants agreed that the term should not be understood as “deficits”, but rather as opportunities and needs of children. Furthermore, they reinforced that collecting data has a great potential to inform future improvements for students’ well-being and inclusion. Surveys, such as those conducted by the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA), provide valuable information on diverse groups outcomes, such as Roma living conditions or Roma exclusion. The next part of the discussion focused on the design and implementation of indicators. Some participants indicated that the challenges ahead lie in the implementation of system-wide indicators for inclusive education, while taking into account the impact of intersecting dimensions of diversity. Finally, while many data collections on inclusion are available, transforming them into specific activities and measures at the school level poses a major challenge.

Summary of Session 1: Indicators for inclusion at the system level: how do countries and organisations design and use them?

Over the past decades, an increasing number of countries have moved towards more inclusive education systems. In order to effectively monitor and evaluate the results of the reforms, it is important for education systems to collect and analyse data on the most vulnerable population groups. Development of specific indicators can help policy makers identify relevant areas for further improvement and provide information on how to address some of the challenges faced by diverse groups.

Although there is no single indicator that can measure inclusion in a global framework, collecting diverse data can help countries identify groups that need policy intervention. Both quantitative and qualitative indicators at different levels can help with these efforts. Moreover, it is important to stay informed about other aspects of student well-being apart from learning outcomes, such as mental health and anxiety levels. Large-scale assessments, such as PISA, can be helpful in these efforts as they already monitor, e.g., students' sense of belonging in school. The new child well-being framework, developed by the OECD's WISE centre, also provides countries with a comprehensive monitoring system that focuses on a variety of outcomes, from material to social and emotional well-being. Qualitative indicators can be used to complement the picture by mapping laws and policies in different countries according to specific themes around language, gender, ethnicity/Indigeneity or disability.

Despite much progress, knowledge gaps remain. Surveys and international datasets lack information on the youngest and most marginalised children. Moreover, there is a strong need to examine the interconnected nature of child well-being such as health and education outcomes. The general lack of a common understanding of inclusive education leads to additional barriers linked to curriculum design and teacher training. Finally, countries need system-level indicators for inclusive education that go beyond students with special education needs and take into consideration all student groups and eventually intersecting dimensions of diversity.

Session 2 – Indicators for inclusion at the school level: how can we measure inclusion in schools and classroom?



SESSION 2: INDICATORS FOR INCLUSION AT THE SCHOOL LEVEL: HOW CAN WE MEASURE INCLUSION IN SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS?

In this session, presenters shared their experiences on designing, developing and applying indicators for inclusion in schools and classrooms. The session was moderated by Ms. Cecilia Mezzanotte (OECD/EDU).

Mr. Mel Ainscow presented the Index for Inclusion, which he co-developed over the last couple of decades, and that was translated into 40 languages and adopted by schools in several countries. Mr. Ainscow emphasised the importance of indicators at the school level for a variety of uses: monitoring, evaluation, accountability, comparison and improvement of inclusive schools practices. School-level indicators can be useful to foster inclusive environments through curriculum, assessment systems, pedagogic practices, and relationships within schools and wider communities. Yet, they need to be well-understood and their purpose should be properly communicated. Building on these pillars, Mr. Ainscow outlined the framework for the Index for Inclusion that is built on three inter-connected dimensions: creating inclusive cultures, producing inclusive policies and evolving inclusive practices. For each of the dimensions, the Index provides indicators with a set of explanations and questions whose aim is to collect evidence, raise standards for each student and help schools become more inclusive. For example, an important aspect of creating inclusive cultures is students' co-operation. The Index therefore encourages schools to ask questions such as: "Do students seek help from and offer help to each other when it is needed?" or "Do students avoid racist, sexist, homophobic, disablist and other forms of discriminatory name-calling?"

The Index for Inclusion aims at bringing together different actors including teachers, parents and a wider community to eliminate barriers to attendance, participation, achievement and learning, and to mobilise resources for the development of an inclusive environment. Mr. Ainscow underlined that the Index is very detailed, admitting that this is its strength, but also a major challenge in its implementation. To address this drawback, the "Reaching Out to All Learners" UNESCO resource pack aims to make the Index more practical and realistic, through a reduced number of questions and accounts of school practices. The pack contains three guides for schools on school development, classroom practices and how to engage in activities with partners outside of the school. Mr. Ainscow concluded his presentation by highlighting that inclusion is an on-going process, with school improvement being technically simple, but socially complex. In order to build an inclusive system, it is necessary to mobilise human resources in a collective effort while identifying and eliminating barriers to inclusion.

Mr. Denis Durmish then presented the European Commission and Council of Europe (EU/CoE) Joint Project "Inclusive schools: Making a Difference for Roma Children" (INSCHOOL) initiated in 2017. So far, the project has been implemented in 22 schools in various countries. The main aim of the first two cycles of the project was to increase social inclusion of Roma students by promoting inclusive education policies. The current third cycle will specifically focus on the policy aspects by supporting the design implementation of national inclusive policies and innovative practices in the participating countries. The project applies the Index for Inclusion as the main methodology to be further promoted as a useful and innovative tool. INSCHOOL carries out interventions in schools with the aim to increase the understanding of the benefits of inclusive education and to support school governance, culture and methodologies. While there is a great focus on the social inclusion of Roma students, the project

also takes into account the interaction of the entire school population inside and outside of the school. A coordination team made up of a trained facilitator and local civil society come together to identify challenges and help schools decide what kind of services, support and activities are needed to develop an inclusive environment. Various methods are used to identify challenges, for instance in course material, teacher-student relationships and teaching practices. Findings are regularly discussed with policy makers and other stakeholders in order to overcome identified gaps and inconsistencies in schools.

The EU/CoE Joint Project implements a systemic approach to address challenges to inclusive education and discusses educational methodologies such as services, activities and support for the schools, while collecting a wealth of data through questionnaires. The Index for Inclusion was used as a measurement tool. This methodology invites stakeholders to embrace a continuous discussion and reflexion about the best possible ways to overcome challenges. Schools were also evaluated by administrative surveys from municipalities to document their efforts to increase the level of inclusion and archive examples of good practices of an effective use of the project's methodology. Mr. Durmish concluded by summarising some of the main findings of the project in Romania. Overall, schools involved in the project made efforts to promote the inclusion of Roma students. However, absenteeism, which impedes the development of basic skills, has been a key issue affecting Roma students in the last three school years and less than half of participating students reported participation in extracurricular activities before or after classes. This suggests that there is a continuous need to promote dialogue with all stakeholders.

Plenary discussion

Participants congratulated presenters for their contributions, which they found insightful and relevant to current policy debates, and actively engaged in a plenary discussion. The discussion first addressed the leadership opportunities of students in eliminating barriers to inclusion and the need to extend these opportunities to all students. Some participants highlighted that it is important to understand schools through the eyes of students and include student voice in the process towards inclusive education. Student leadership can also help overcome some of the barriers and challenges of their peers. Furthermore, participants and presenters agreed that mobilising human resources is crucial for the development of inclusive environments, and that it should be a priority at both national and school levels. Some participants shared country practices that aim to generate a dialogue between municipalities and stakeholders at the school level and also examples of monitoring mechanisms.

Presenters reiterated that the use of the Index for Inclusion might be perceived as challenging by some teachers due to its length and level of detail. To overcome this, training on how to use the Index to teachers and the school management should be available. Some participants also highlighted that inclusion can be contextualised differently across education systems and may even show variations between schools. This heterogeneity might affect implementation of inclusive policies and practices. However, if school leaders have a comprehensive understanding of inclusive education, inclusive practices can be implemented with fewer obstacles. Moreover, presenters stressed that inclusive education is a result of a collective endeavour and school leaders need to be supported in this effort. Finally, some participants highlighted the need to equip teachers with the right tools to be able to support change towards inclusive education systems.

Summary of Session 2: Indicators for inclusion at the school level: How can we measure inclusion in schools and classrooms?

Developing and applying indicators at the school level is essential for monitoring and evaluating policies and practices of inclusive education. Different country experiences and their use of indicators can shed more light on the benefits of inclusive practices, but also on the existing challenges. To foster inclusive school environments, there is a strong need for national leadership and a collective effort for change. Therefore, a dialogue between stakeholders can help create a framework for inclusive education.

It is important to design indicators for inclusion with clear objectives. The Index for Inclusion is a self-evaluation tool for schools to help them identify barriers to and subsequently develop an inclusive school setting. The resource is formed by a set of questions building the Index. One key characteristics of the Index is that it does not focus on a particular group of students (e.g. those with special education needs), but focuses on all students.

Through mobilising resources and analysing barriers to participation and learning, schools can become inclusive for all students. For instance, the European Commission and Council of Europe (EU/CoE) Joint Project “Inclusive schools: Making a Difference for Roma Children” applies a systematic approach to identify the main barriers to inclusion and participation. Ultimately, the aim of the project is to help schools decide what kind of services, support and activities are needed to develop an inclusive environment.

Even though there is no common definition of inclusive education and the concept is contextualised differently across countries, it is important to learn from policies and practices in various education systems. Inclusive education is an on-going process and despite the differences, a common pillar is coordination between stakeholders. Willingness both at the national and local level is also key to drive change towards inclusion. Lastly, in order to address the needs of diverse students, student voices could be included in school development to identify and tackle barriers to inclusion and participation.

CLOSING REMARKS

Mr. Paulo Santiago thanked participants for their active involvement and emphasised the role of the Forum as an engaging peer-learning opportunity for participating countries and organisations. Mr. Santiago also thanked presenters from UNESCO, OECD/WISE, the University of Glasgow/University of Manchester and the European Commission/Council of Europe for the stimulating insights in their presentations and in the plenary discussions. He also thanked participants for their active engagement. Mr. Santiago proceeded with a summary of the activities and discussions, and highlighted some of the key take-away points.

The Forum participants emphasised the importance of data collection for monitoring, measuring, funding, self-evaluation and accountability purposes. The use of indicators is essential not only at the system level, but also at local and school levels. However, to be effective, indicators should be developed with a clear rationale and purpose. In particular, indicators should: i) reflect perceptions of school agents, in particular learners; ii) be learner-centred; iii) capture inequalities and exclusions; and iv) provide information for learners of diverse backgrounds and in vulnerable positions.

The Forum stressed that challenges remain in developing and applying indicators for inclusion. Some of these include:

- Lack of a common definition of inclusive education;
- Data gaps in the areas of curriculum design and teacher training;
- Poor coverage of the most marginalised and vulnerable learners, due to the risk of labelling and data privacy concerns;
- Balancing the need for more disaggregated data to monitor and target students with costs of data collections, sensitivity/privacy issues and labelling risks;
- The need to take intersectionality into account; and
- Limitations of indicators in capturing all the relevant information due to measurement difficulties.

Therefore, in overcoming these challenges and eliminating barriers to inclusion and participation, national leadership is essential in moving schools and systems in an inclusive direction. Mr. Santiago concluded the session by reiterating that inclusive education is an on-going process and indicators are key in identifying and monitoring existing challenges to achieve inclusive systems.

This work is published under the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of OECD member countries.

This document, as well as any data and any map included herein, are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

The use of this work, whether digital or print, is governed by the Terms and Conditions to be found at <http://www.oecd.org/termsandconditions>.

© OECD 2022

For more information on **Strength through Diversity**
visit: <http://www.oecd.org/education/strength-through-diversity/>

If you have questions, you can reach us at
Edu.Inclusion@oecd.org