Тенденции развития инклюзивного образования

Елена Николаевна Дзятковская
Доктор биологических наук, профессор
«Институт стратегии развития образования Российской Академии образования»
Москва, Россия
dziatkov@mail.ru
[ID] 0000-0002-8187-1160

Антон Дмитриевич Дзятковский
Доктор философии в области образования, Ведущий менеджер по разработке программного обеспечения Platinum
Москва, Россия
dziatkov@mail.ru
[ID] 0000-0001-7408-3054

Аннотация

Цель статьи – проанализировать современные тенденции развития инклюзивного образования в мире. Сделан вывод о расширении этого понятия, увеличении числа стран, охваченных этим процессом, разнообразии используемых моделей, усилении их социального контекста, обращении к междисциплинарному подходу и осознании большого числа нерешенных проблем.

Ключевые слова

интеграция; инклюзия; модели инклюзивного образования; тенденции.

Введение

It is generally accepted that the legal and political basis for co-education of physically and mentally handicapped children with normal children emerged in the early 1960s. However, history shows that in the 1920s and 1930s in some German provinces (e.g. Brandenburg, 1832, 1838) education authority circulars prescribed that blind and deaf children should be admitted to elementary school. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen (1789) played a key role in spreading this practice. Samuel Heinicke (1727-1790), the founder of German surdopedagogy, organizer and leader of the first educational institution (school) for deaf children in Germany, is considered the pioneer of this idea. In 1803 in Seitz (Germany) an additional class for "mentally handicapped children" was opened in a school for the poor. The European experience of co-education at the beginning of the 19th century was strongly influenced by the ideas of J. G. Pestalozzi (1746-1827), about the necessity and possibility of educating all children and preparing them for future working life, about versatile child development in accordance with their nature and needs, about the importance of education for mentally retarded, physically and socially challenged children (Furyaeva, 2018).

The first European experience of co-education revealed many problems in the development of children with disabilities. Therefore, in the second half of the 19th century, the idea of creating special educational

institutions to provide education for people with disabilities by qualified teachers, which was progressive for that time, spread in Europe. Until the 1970s, the idea of isolating children with disabilities from their peers and giving health professionals primary responsibility for their education was dominant. However, in the 1970s, some countries began to question the medical approach to children with special needs, seeking their full social and educational integration into society.

Материалы и методы исследования

The active assimilation by the world community of the global humane idea of human rights, born on the European continent under the influence of the consequences of World War II (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948), is accompanied by a growing commitment to the joint education of ordinary children and children with disabilities. In 1994, at the World Conference on Special Needs Education in Salamanca, held under the auspices of UNESCO, the term 'inclusion' was introduced by governments and international organisations and the principle of inclusive education was proclaimed (The Salamanca statement, 1994). According to the Global Education Monitoring Report "For All Means All" (2021), the social value of the idea of inclusive education can be compared to the prohibition of slavery or apartheid (Global Education Monitoring, 2021). For people from socially vulnerable groups, it is a way to eliminate discrimination in the educational process, a key to social justice, to overcome their social exclusion and the possibility of realising their rights to jobs.

In the 21st century, the process of introducing inclusive education has embraced the entire civilised world. At the turn of the century, the leaders of several leading powers named this direction of the educational process as a priority concept (European Agency for Development, 2018). The concept of inclusive education has been supported by UNESCO, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the OECD and the World Bank. In 2006, the UN adopted the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). Article 24 of the Convention calls on States Parties to 'ensure a system of inclusive education at all levels'. European states, despite a difficult period of migration and demographic challenges and austerity measures, take seriously the promise of "inclusive education for all" (Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).

In 2000, the OECD's Education for All project and the UN Global Agenda, including the Millennium Development Goals for universal primary education, were adopted, which have now evolved into Sustainable Development Goal 4 of the Global Agenda 2030 (2015) (Sustainable Development Goals, 2015).

Результаты и обсуждение

In the 21st century, the ideas of inclusion have moved beyond just the ethical realm. It has been linked to sustainable development, society's rethinking of the interaction between society and nature as a whole, and has been called the moral imperative of a sustainable development society, which has complemented the environmental imperative of valuing all life on the planet. Ideas of inclusion have come to be seen in terms of sustainable development because they put new meanings into the idea of harmonising human nature and social development. The "cult of usefulness" is being transformed into a "culture of dignity", of respectful acceptance and support for people with disabilities (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2018). Under Sustainable Development Goal 4, accessible education for all throughout life is presented as education for sustainable development (Sustainable Development Goals, 2015). Inclusive education is now an officially accepted trend in education systems in 75% of countries, and continues to be embraced by more countries. However, perceptions of models of co-education for people with different learning needs have changed historically.

It is believed that a society cannot be sustainable if it excludes anyone, and education cannot be of high quality if it is not inclusive (European Agency for Development, 2018). It is no coincidence that social inclusion is included in SDG 8 "Decent work and economic growth" (Sustainable Development Goals, 2015). There has also been a change in the way children with different learning needs learn together. Since the mid-twentieth century, first in the USA and then in Europe, the term mainstrim(ing) has appeared. At first it was used more often in the USA in relation to problems of racial, ethnic minorities, later - to children of immigrants, and from the 60s of the 20th century it came into speech on the European continent and was used in the context of people with disabilities (invalids). Initially, responsibility for the development of these children was attributed to health

and social care, and their interaction with regular children was limited to informal communication: learning was under the same roof: side by side, but not together (specialised groups, classes in mass educational organisations). In the 70s the term 'integration' emerged which emphasised social and educational integration in the same class. Its aim was to 'normalise' children in order to fit into the existing model of learning, without adapting it to disabled people. However, the introduction of integration has shown that the mere presence of a child with special educational needs in a regular mass class cannot yet be a guarantee of a meaningful education. The UNESCO Education Monitoring Report "For All Means All" (2021) states that by providing access to mainstream schools for children with special needs, but by segregating them into separate classes or teaching them in separate programmes, schools emphasize their specificity and contradict the principle of inclusion: it is not just each child who matters, but each child who matters equally (Global Education Monitoring, 2021).

If integration implies that the child has to adapt to the education system, inclusion implies that the system has to adapt to the needs of the child. Inclusion is a change in the organisation of school systems and environments, aiming to meet the diverse needs and learning opportunities of all children. The focus shifts from what the child cannot do to what they can do. Inclusion means that the school should be designed to educate any child: some will need a separate education programme, some will need a ramp, a lift.

UNESCO's analysis of education by a set of indicators revealed that a number of countries retain the option of integration (learning side by side rather than together), which is presented as inclusion. The policy of 'crossing them out' (segregating them) and 'stressing' their particularities persists, with academic success as the main criterion for assessment. UNESCO notes that inclusion needs to be understood as a process, and that this process is long, complex and demanding, with no tolerance for formalism. Formal inclusion, where a child is given access to a mainstream education system without the necessary facilities, is a hidden form of discrimination. In this case, the child's situation does not improve, but rather deteriorates (Global Education Monitoring, 2021).

While inclusion originally referred to children with disabilities, today inclusion is understood broadly: when all children, regardless of their social status, racial or ethnic origin or disability or religion, can learn together and successfully socialize. In today's understanding, inclusion means that all children, regardless of their physical, mental, intellectual, cultural, ethnic, linguistic or other conditions, are included in mainstream education, learning together with their non-disabled peers in the same mainstream schools, where all students of a given age receive an equivalent educational experience in an environment that best meets their needs and preferences. This broad understanding of inclusion is understandable, as every child needs learning methods and support mechanisms to help them succeed and become a member of society. Each child needs to be dealt with individually, regardless of whether or not he or she has a developmental disability, and multilevel tasks allow each child to be dealt with at his or her own pace and capacity, so that education can 'reach out' to each child. That is, the global community rejects a narrow understanding of inclusion and envisages the creation of a flexible education system that serves the needs of different groups of students and contributes to the elimination of all forms of discrimination (Anastasiou, 2015; Global Education Monitoring, 2021; Hodkinson, 2009).

However, widening the notion of inclusion has had mixed results. There are countries that, due to their historical cultural traditions, categorically do not accept the positions of sexual minorities. Furthermore, the mentality of society and its historically ambivalent attitudes towards 'otherness' cannot be changed overnight.

Reviews of inclusive practices have led some researchers to conclude that the notion of inclusive education has reached a tipping point, as perceptions of increasing numbers of students with diverse educational needs increase (2). Many countries have already reached a plateau of inclusion in recent years and some, like Australia, are becoming increasingly less inclusive. In a 2018 OECD report, Australia ranked fourth (out of 36 OECD countries) in a ranking of segregated school systems. The reason is the widening gap in educational attainment between students from advantaged and disadvantaged families who are unable to attend prestigious schools. Students from disadvantaged families or minority groups in Australia are more likely to be diagnosed with a disability or impairment, and one in three students from disadvantaged backgrounds miss key developmental milestones in their first year of school (Social inclusion in Australia, 2010).

But while Australia was one of the first countries to embrace inclusive education after the Salamanca Conference, many countries are still at an early stage and are faced with the fact that the transition to inclusion

requires a fundamental restructuring of all education. Inclusion implies systemic changes in general, vocational and higher education at three levels simultaneously: macro (policy, legislation, funding scheme), meso (municipal administration, schools) and micro (classroom, educational process) and means a significant transformation of culture, policy and practice in all formal and non-formal educational settings. This is a major challenge that encourages inclusion to be seen not as a fact but as a long-term process. The EFA Global Monitoring Report 2021 emphasises that moving away from an education system which suits some children but forces others to adapt cannot happen with a stroke of the pen. All countries have problems and none have yet reached the ideal (Global Education Monitoring, 2021).

This has prompted the Committee on Disability to allow governments to define inclusive education for themselves, which can be interpreted as an implicit acknowledgement of all the difficulties and dilemmas in overcoming the obstacles to full inclusion. In Norway, for example, all secondary schools are inclusive and implement different systems of education, ranging from fully immersive to partially inclusive. What makes Norwegian schools very different is the presence of nine adults for every seven children. Each child has his or her own assistant. A teacher is assigned to the group. Rehabilitation therapists, psychologists, speech therapists, sign language interpreters, doctors, and educators are available. The school day starts with 15 minutes of common lessons, then children go to their individual classes and attend lessons according to individual programme (Flem, 2020). At the same time, in many countries in Asia and Africa, inclusion is still in its infancy.

Analysis of European practices of inclusion points to important elements of socio-cultural transformation, such as public support for inclusion; a culture of relationships between those involved in integration; trained teachers; adapted curricula and assessment; a supportive and accessible school environment; collaborative teaching and learning; individualization and flexibility of educational processes; diversification of educational services; changes in the educational environment; and development of professional development programmes for teachers. The students' sense of belonging to an inclusive school is a factor that is taken into account. For example, students in the European region are three percentage points less likely to feel that they are a stranger in school than their peers in other regions. Only 1 in 10 students in Albania and Belarus feels like an outsider at school. At the same time, students from the Czech Republic, Poland and the Russian Federation showed the lowest results in a survey of children on whether they were happy at school (Global Education Monitoring, 2021).

Italy has a long history of school inclusion. The School Integration Act of 1971 guaranteed the right of all children with disabilities, except those with the most complex needs, to study in mainstream classes, while a 1977 law obliged primary and secondary schools to apply the principle of inclusion. Annexes to the Education Act stipulated that children with disabilities should go to school close to home and study in classes with their peers, class sizes should not exceed 20 and there should be no more than two children with disabilities. Such children should be provided with qualified support from teachers and multidisciplinary professionals working with them in agreed programmes. In Italy today, more than 90% of children with disabilities are educated in mainstream institutions. Law No. 104 on the Right of Children with Special Needs to Enrol in Mass Schools, adopted in 1992, emphasises not only socialisation but also quality academic teaching. For example, Article 13 guarantees "support for the activities of special educators" and stipulates that such educators "take part in co-teaching the classes in which they work, participate in the formulation of education and training programmes and review and verification of the activities of class and college councils and teachers". The assistance package includes guarantees of family participation in the creation of an individual programme for the child. The Italian Ministry of Education, together with the Ministry of Technology Innovation, adopted a programme to support the development of e-education for persons with disabilities and persons with disabilities called "New Technologies and Disability", a project which is currently being actively developed. It aims at creating a database of national, European and international practices for training students with disabilities for use by teachers and others; providing special training for operators (teachers) working in e-learning; increasing the number of technological and software tools for teaching persons with disabilities; conducting research and increasing experience in e-learning for persons with disabilities. If secondary schools do not accept students with disabilities on the grounds of a lack of adequate human resources, the courts immediately oppose these decisions. Denial of school

transport is considered direct discrimination, and lack of sufficient hours for learning support or communication is considered indirect (Anastasiou, 2015).

According to the UNESCO Education Monitoring Report in 30 Western and Eastern European and Caucasus countries, the implementation of inclusive education is hampered by a narrowed understanding of inclusion (based on health, language, ethnicity or religion); unpreparedness of teaching staff; and the persistence of standardised assessment procedures that sow the seeds of exclusion. For example, the International Programme for Student Assessment (PISA) excludes children who have not reached grade 7, children from remote and special schools, students with moderate or severe intellectual or physical disabilities, and children with insufficient language skills (Global Education Monitoring, 2021).

In Australia, educational reforms by the neoliberalist government to standardise the national curriculum, introduce a nationwide testing regime and a school comparison tool have contributed to increased segregation. According to Artiles (2003), there are 'winners and losers' in any standardised curriculum, with disadvantaged groups and/or minorities being the most likely losers (Boyle, 2020).

Analysing the evolution of models of disability helps to understand general trends in the inclusion process (Isăilă, 2021; Oppression, 2012; Rothman, 2010).

Historically, the first model was that of mercy. "Disability" was seen as a tragedy, a broken fate, and the disabled person was seen as an unfortunate person in need of pity, love and lifelong care. Even today, the creation of inclusive classes is often seen as a kind of charity for children classed as 'special'. In the educational process, there is an emphasis on them, rather than on every child, which is a hidden form of segregation.

The medical model that emerged next in history qualified 'disability' as a human condition that arises from damage at body level and requires lifelong treatment or medical support, as the diagnosis is 'forever', with little or no prospect of its removal. Hence the lowered expectations for the child's academic success, family life and life career. "Children with special needs were placed in institutions, where specialised approaches, programmes and methods were taught, focusing on nosology. Learning difficulties were attributed both to intellectual disability and to negative personality traits (stubbornness, disobedience, unwillingness to learn, etc.). The medical model did not take into account that children 'without a diagnosis' may also have defects that do not manifest under favourable conditions. The medical model also dictated the language used by teachers: it was full of medical terms (special needs, therapy, rehabilitation, retardation, defect, impairment, diagnosis, etc.).

In the second half of the 20th century, with the development of ideas about the social barriers of 'special' children, a social model of disability began to emerge. The social model aims primarily to remove the social and cultural barriers that stand in the way of including people with disabilities and impairments in active social life. The principles implemented by the social model: the value of each person does not depend on their abilities and achievements; everyone is capable of feeling and thinking; everyone has the right to communicate and to be heard; all people need each other; true education can only take place in the context of real relationships, all people need peer support and friendship; for all learners, progress is more achieved in what they can do than in what they cannot; diversity enhances all aspects of human life (Global Education Monitoring, 2021).

As the social model of disability has spread around the world, the number of special schools has decreased and the number of schools called inclusive schools has increased. However, they do not always provide an appropriate environment. Therefore, in some countries, although a broad definition of inclusion is used, schools continue to focus primarily on the special educational needs and disabilities of 'special' groups of learners. Although the social model of disability is progressive compared to the medical model, it has been criticised if it is absolutist, detached from medical and biological indications. The medical approach cannot simply be discarded. A shift from the medical model to the social model, accompanied by a rejection of the medical model, is fraught with a worsening of the situation of vulnerable children. The promise of inclusive education will not be fulfilled if the social model is implemented without considering remedial indications (13).

A means of building a continuum between medical and social approaches to inclusion might be a model whereby biological (genetic, anatomical, physiological, biochemical, etc), psychological (emotions, attitudes, values) and social (cultural, social environment, financial situation) factors all play an important role in the development of an illness or a disorder in a person. This approach will help to overcome the reductionism of medical and social models. It relies on an understanding of the importance of the compensatory capacity of the

organism, its ability to find "workarounds" to the defect if favourable psychosocial conditions are created for it. That is, the level of defect compensation is determined by both the organism's reserve forces and external socio-cultural factors. This approach is implemented in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health of the World Health Organization (ICF) (International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health). It links human functioning with health conditions, environmental factors (socio-cultural and natural) and the personal attributes of the individual. The ICF is a holistic view of the individual that takes into account both his or her biological capabilities and the role of the social environment in shaping health resources, compensation for disability, socialisation and self-actualisation.

Importantly, the ICF does not divide people into "normal" and "special", as every person may have some degree of disability or disability during their lifetime. In fact, the ICF is a classification of the 'health components' of any individual. Disability is seen as impaired functioning in the environment (in different activities and spheres of life). This comprehensive assessment of a person's functioning makes it possible to assess the rehabilitative potential of the person's environment. This extends the notion of a barrier-free educational system and draws attention to a person's internal resources for recovery, their adaptation-compensatory potential, their self-identification, their internal picture of health and illness, and their motivation for self-healing. ICF is a universal tool for describing problems of human functioning, which is used by doctors, rehabilitation therapists, social workers, educators and psychologists in many countries of the world. Today, the ICF is used to organize inclusive education in Italy, Germany, Bulgaria and is being introduced in Kazakhstan.

Заключение

Trends in the changing understanding of inclusion reflect the process of humanization and democratization of society. Inclusion is changing from a narrow pedagogical concern to become a societal transition towards sustainable development in which people can live together and value diversity. Notions of the quality of education are changing - as education that is accessible to all, 'without excluding or marginalizing anyone'. Attitudes towards inclusion are changing as the focus tends to shift from medical diagnoses to health resources - body, person, culture and social environment. Although the trend towards inclusion in education is worldwide, the problems involved cannot be regarded as having been solved. Therefore, inclusion has come to be seen as a long term process, transforming not only education itself, but also society as a whole, including law, policy, funding, administration, design, equipment, etc.

Список литературы

1. Anastasiou D., Kauffman J. M., Di Nuovo S.F. (2015) Inclusive education in Italy: description and reflections on full inclusion // European Journal of Special Needs Education, 30(4)

2. Boyle C. & Anderson J. (2020). The justification for inclusive education in Australia. PROSPECTS. V.49.

3. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities //United Nations. Department of Economic and Social AffairsDisability // URL: https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html

4. European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2018) / Inclusion Europe. Promoting common values and inclusive education: reflections and messages. URL: https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/promoting_common_values_and_inclusive_education.pdf

5. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2018) / Inclusion Europe. European Agency Statistics on Inclusive Education: Methodology report. (A. Lénárt, J. Ramberg and A. Watkins, eds.). Odense, Denmark. URL: https://www.european-agency.org/resources/publications/EASIE-methodology-report-updated-2018

6. Flem A., Keller C.E. (2020) Inclusion in Norway: a study of ideology in practice // European Journal of Special Needs Education, 15(2).

7. Furyaeva T.W. (2018) Pedagogy of integration/inclusion in Germany: history and modernity (the middle of XX – beginning of XXI centuries) // Journal of Modern Foreign Psychology, 7(1).

8. Global Education Monitoring Report (2021). Inclusion and Education: All means all. Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. URL: https://www.european-agency.org/resources/publications/gem-report-2021.

9. Hodkinson A., Devarakonda Ch. (2009) Conception of inclusion and inclusive education. A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in India // Research in Education. Vol. 82. № 1.

10. International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). World Health Organization // https://www.who.int/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health

11. Isăilă N. (2021) Social inclusion in the context of informational society // Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 46. URL: https://cyberleninka.org/article/n/153483

12. Oppression: A Social Determinant of Health / Ed. E.A. McGibbon (2012). Black Point, Winnipeg: Fernwood Pub..

13. Rothman J.C. (2010) The Challenge of Disability and Access: Reconceptualizing the Role of the Medical Model // Journal of Social Work in Disability and Rehabilitation. Vol. 9. № 2–3. URL: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20730675/

14. Social inclusion in Australia: how Australia is faring Australian social inclusion board (2010). Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. URL: https://textarchive.ru/c-2084762.html

15. Sustainable Development Goals. United Nations. Department of Economic and Social AffairsSustainable Development. URL: https://sdgs.un.org/goals

16. The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education (1994). URL: https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/salamanca-statement-and-framework.pdf

Trends in inclusive education

Elena N. Dzyatkovskaya
Doctor of Biological Sciences, professor
Federal State Budgetary Scientific Institution "Institute for Strategy of Education Development of the Russian Academy of Education
Moscow, Russia
dziatkov@mail.ru
0000-0002-8187-1160

Anton D. Dziatkovskii
PhD in Education
Lead Business Development Manager at Platinum Software Development Company
Moscow, Russia
dziatkov@mail.ru
0000-0001-7408-3054

Abstract
The aim of the article is to analyze current trends in the development of inclusive education in the world. The conclusion is made about the expansion of this concept, the increase in the number of countries covered

by this process, the variety of models used, the strengthening of their social context, the appeal to an interdisciplinary.

Keywords
integration; inclusion; models of inclusive education; trends.

References
1.   Anastasiou D., Kauffman J. M., Di Nuovo S.F. (2015) Inclusive education in Italy: description and reflections on full inclusion // European Journal of Special Needs Education, 30(4)
2.   Boyle C. & Anderson J. (2020). The justification for inclusive education in Australia. PROSPECTS. V.49.
3.   Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities //United Nations. Department of Economic and Social AffairsDisability // URL: https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.html
4.   European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education (2018) / Inclusion Europe. Promoting common values and inclusive education: reflections and messages. URL: https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/promoting_common_values_and_inclusive_education.pdf
5.   European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2018) / Inclusion Europe. European Agency Statistics on Inclusive Education: Methodology report. (Odense, Denmark. URL: https://www.european-agency.org/resources/publications/EASIE-methodology-report-updated-2018
6.   Flem A., Keller C.E. (2020) Inclusion in Norway: a study of ideology in practice // European Journal of Special Needs Education, 15(2).
7.   Furyaeva T.W. (2018) Pedagogy of integration/inclusion in Germany: history and modernity (the middle of XX – beginning of XXI centuries) // Journal of Modern Foreign Psychology, 7(1).
8.   Global Education Monitoring Report (2021). Inclusion and Education: All means all. Central and Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. URL: https://www.european-agency.org/resources/publications/gem-report-2021.
9.   Hodkinson A., Devarakonda Ch. (2009) Conception of inclusion and inclusive education. A critical examination of the perspectives and practices of teachers in India // Research in Education. Vol. 82. № 1.
10.   International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). World Health Organization // https://www.who.int/classifications/international-classification-of-functioning-disability-and-health
11.   Isăilă N. (2021) Social inclusion in the context of informational society // Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 46. URL: https://cyberleninka.org/article/n/153483
12.   Oppression: A Social Determinant of Health / Ed. E.A. McGibbon (2012). Black Point, Winnipeg: Fernwood Pub..
13.   Rothman J.C. (2010) The Challenge of Disability and Access: Reconceptualizing the Role of the Medical Model // Journal of Social Work in Disability and Rehabilitation. Vol. 9. № 2–3. URL: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20730675/
14.   Social inclusion in Australia: how Australia is faring Australian social inclusion board (2010). Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. URL: https://textarchive.ru/c-2084762.html
15.   Sustainable Development Goals. United Nations. Department of Economic and Social AffairsSustainable Development. URL: https://sdgs.un.org/goals
16.   The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education (1994). URL: https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/salamanca-statement-and-framework.pdf