Approximation of Inclusive Education in Armenia to International Standards and Practices

Arevik Anapiosyan, senior researcher
Grigor Hayrapetyan, economist
Sofia Hovsepyan, junior researcher

Yerevan 2014

Table of Contents

Instead of Forward

Inclusive Education: perceptions, concepts and realities.

What is inclusion? Who are the beneficiaries of inclusion? And finally, why is there a need for inclusion, if at all? These are the questions that many politicians, field specialists, parents and children, students and professors, and society members wonder about, yet often covertly, and cautious of being mistaken. Inclusiveness is often perceived as a "tool" for incorporating subjective irregularities into seemingly "ordinary" communities. Unfortunately, this notion is prevailing in societies and countries based on positive law and seriously undermining natural rights of all persons. Meanwhile, artificial boundaries that diminish individualities first of all harm those with stereotypes. Inclusiveness is when each and every person, despite of the differences of identities, is considered a full member of a society enjoying the exact same rights and opportunities as other member of the society. Inclusiveness is when a child from a low-income family has the same opportunity to study as a child of a wealthy family; it's when a child with no special educational needs studies with a disabled person and learns to be kind, supportive and helpful. Inclusiveness is when a person with special educational needs (SEN) regains his/her importance as a society member and tastes the opportunities of finding a niche in life. The greatest benefit of inclusiveness is a cohesive society that values the diverse identities of its members and develops into a community that is mature and mighty to make our world a better place to live.

The basic ideology behind the concept of inclusive education is that all students attend and are welcomed by their neighbourhood schools in age-appropriate, regular classes and are supported to learn, contribute and participate in all aspects of the life of the school. This implies that our schools, classrooms, programmes and activities need to be developed and designed the way to accommodate the needs of all students, and be conducive for studying and working together. A very important aspect is the quality of education: parents of all children, regardless the needs, express concerns that quality of education may suffer in inclusive schools. This is a key issue, as if we can ensure quality education, it will become extremely complicated to favour segregated school system no matter how different the hidden motivations could be.

Although Armenia had its first inclusive school back in 2001, when school N27, named after D. Demirchiyan started to provided inclusive education with the support of the "Bridge of Hope" NGO and Ministry of Education, perceptions of inclusive education and attitude towards it in general public is twofold.

A recent report of UNICEF Armenia falls to unveil this reality. More than 50% of the survey respondents consider that a child with physical disabilities should attend a special school. Moreover, 86% of respondents mentioned that a child with intellectual disabilities should go to special schools. Still, eighty-three percent of all respondents think that is will be acceptable for their child to have a classmate with physical disabilities. The percent of those who consider acceptable that a child with intellectual disabilities attend the same class with their child is considerably small – forty-eight percent of all respondents.

The greatest problem with the Armenian perception of inclusive education lies in the absence of a genuine discourse regarding the importance of inclusive education, and

nowadays this discourse is substituted by political rhetoric. And the UNICEF report comes to witness the misperceptions that Armenian general public has vis-à-vis inclusive education and children with special educational needs.

Absence of the discourse gives room for discretion, defines reform priorities that raise concerns, and finally, upholds the knowledge gap in the communities, which could support the reform if properly informed about.

Methodology

This policy research is predominantly based on content analysis of local and international legal framework, international best practices, and qualitative research methods. Data associated with research questions related to educational background of multidisciplinary team members, their training needs, as well as teaching methodologies employed by subject teachers and their training needs were collected with the application of quantitative research methods.

Research setting

The study was conducted in nineteen inclusive schools located in Yerevan, five schools in Shirak marz, two schools in Ararat marz, and two schools in Gegharqunik region. The complete list of schools is presented in Appendix 1.

Data Collection

During the phase of desk review a number of local and international documents were analyzed. Sampling of was done based on primary research of international conventional framework, guidelines of UN and its agencies, including UNICEF and UNESCO. Besides, based on inclusive education implementation country index, best practices of inclusive education implementation in Ireland, Israel, Norway, UK and Canada were studied. Complete list of studied documents can be found in Appendix 2.

During field research the following activities were performed: focus groups, face-to-face interviews with semi-standardized questionnaires, and in-depth and expert interviews. 10 focus groups were conducted with multidisciplinary team members, 50 interviews were conducted with subject teachers, and 13 in-depth and expert interviews were conducted with field experts and reform implementers. Information on interviewees is provided in Appendix 2.

5 Policy Concerns for Implementing Inclusive Education in Armenia

Based on our research we have identified seven major policy related issues that need to be addressed instantly in order to consider the implementation of inclusive education in Armenia a successful reform. First issue is that inclusive education is poorly defined in policies and legal framework, and it is primarily perceived in terms of disability and special needs. This was observed during the analysis of legislation and policies related to inclusive education. So, to address this policy concern we have conducted a comparative analysis of international legal framework, international commitments of the Republic of Armenia, and local legislation.

The second policy concern relates to the lack of holistic approach in the education system, which is conditioned by the lack of formal and practical mechanisms for information flow and exchange of experience among professionals. This matter was indirectly raised in 95% of our in-depth interviews with school principles, members of multidisciplinary teams and subject teachers.

The third and rather salient policy concern is related to education quality vs. enrolment rates: increase of enrolment is prioritized over improvement of the quality of education. A number of experts we interviewed attached importance to the increase in the number of learners attending mainstream education schools. This tendency is also observed in the internationally funded projects, including those with UN. While absolutely seconding all the arguments that bringing a child into school is of utmost importance, we however, note that quality is reciprocal to inclusion. We have addressed this policy concern with the discussion of the multidisciplinary team approach to inclusive education, bluer definitions of learning outcomes, teaching and learning methods, as well as infrastructure and effective use of resources.

The forth policy issue is about capacity building and enhancement in all the spheres and levels of education system related to inclusive education. This policy concern is closely linked to the previous concern, as quality hinges on the capacity of the system in general and education providers in particular. This matter has been addressed by evaluating current mechanisms of capacity development and analysis of the local potential for enhancing the quality of teacher education.

Finally, the fifth policy concern is related to the funding schemes of inclusive education. As it became obvious during the research, funding of inclusive education is conditioned by a number of extra-budgetary factors, among which is the method of need assessment and choice of the funding model, level of corruption in the chain of the funding flow, and surely availability of the funds. This research refers to the funding issues in the light of the current reform narrative (full inclusion and needs based funding).

All the abovementioned policy concerns set the frame of this policy paper, and they are individually discussed in respective chapters.

International Legal Framework and Armenia's Commitments.

International Conventional framework and Armenia

When addressing inclusive education, United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization refers to the right of education or Roma and street children, child workers, people with disabilities, and indigenous and rural people. Here we face the fundamental difference of how the international community sees inclusive education and how it is interpreted in the Armenian reality. Local interpretation is narrowed down to the educational rights of disabled persons, and thus, the insight of the whole spectrum is missing, which brings up distorted local discourse, incomplete legal framework and misconception of inclusiveness. Hence, this chapter aims to open up the essence of inclusiveness in education as it is articulated in international legal documents.

Various international human rights instruments have continuously promoted inclusive education ever since **Universal Declaration of Human Rights** in 1946 (Dr. Charles Malik (Lebanon), et al. 1946). Article 26 of the Declaration says that:

> *"(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.*
> *(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.*
> *(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children."*

UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education (1960) is another foundational international document for the promotion of inclusive education. This convention upholds the right of education for all persons regardless of their differences (race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, economic condition or birth) (UNESCO 1960). It also reaffirms that a parent/legal guardians has the right to choose the education institution best meeting the needs of a child (Article 5.b.). It is important to mention that Armenia is a party to the abovementioned two fundamental international human rights documents.

As we can see, inclusion is never coined down to disability only: it is broader and wider. Inclusion is about everything that challenges exclusion. For instance, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination addresses exclusion based on race (United Nations 1965).

> *"...States Parties undertake to prohibit and to eliminate racial discrimination in all its forms and to guarantee the right of everyone, without distinction as to race, colour, or national or ethnic origin, to equality before the law, notably in the enjoyment of the ... (v) The right to education and training" (Article 5.e. (v)).*

Armenia was accessed to this Convention on the 23rd of June 1993[1], and even though Armenia is largely a monoethnic country and exclusion on the grounds of race might not seem to be a salient issue, inclusive education is not perceived as antidiscrimination towards race, nation and ethnicity.

Armenia has also ratified the **First Protocol to the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights**[2]. The First Protocol involves the right to education (article 2):

> *"No person shall be denied the right to education. In the exercise of any functions which it assumes in relation to education and to teaching, the State shall respect the right of*

---

[1] Source of information – United Nations Treaty Collection Database (https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-2&chapter=4&lang=en accessed 20th October 2014)

[2] Source of information – Council of Europe Treaty Office (http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ListeTableauCourt.asp?MA=3&CM=16&CL=ENG accessed 20th October 2014)

parents to ensure such education and teaching in conformity with their own religious and philosophical convictions."

A number of applications have been made to the European Court of Human Rights where parents alleged that the local authority's segregation of their child in special school against their wishes represents a violation of the right to education under article 2, Protocol 1, and other Conventional rights.

The right to education without discrimination is enshrined in the **International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights** (United Nations 1966). Article 13 of the Covenant states that:

> *"(1) The States Parties to the present Covenant recognize the right of everyone to education. They agree that education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and the sense of its dignity, and shall strengthen the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. They further agree that education shall enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society, promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations and all racial, ethnic or religious groups, and further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace."*

The second part of the Article underlines the accessibility of education "by every appropriate means." 162 countries, including Armenia are parties to this Covenant[3].

As mentioned in the opening of this chapter, the right of education of rural people is once of the foci of inclusive education. UN **Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women** addresses this issue from gender perspective (United Nations 1979). Part 2 of the Article 14 of the Convention mentions that:

> *"States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in rural areas in order to ensure, on a basis of equality of men and women, that they participate in and benefit from rural development and, in particular, shall ensure to such women the right: ...(d) to obtain all types of training and education, formal and non-formal, including that relating to functional literacy, as well as, inter alia, the benefit of all community and extension services, in order to increase their technical proficiency."*

Armenia is among 188 countries party to the Convention[4]. UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women in its exceptional sessions where Armenia's periodic reports were considered concluded that women and girls in rural areas often become victims of prevailing traditional stereotypes prevail, and education is seen as a tool for changing the cultural context (United Nations 1999).

A very important international document is the **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child**. Article 2 of the Convention mentions that there can be no discrimination towards

---

[3] Source of information – United Nations Treaty Collection Database (https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-3&chapter=4&lang=en accessed 20th October 2014)

[4] Source of information – United Nations Treaty Collection Database (https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-8&chapter=4&lang=enn accessed 20th October 2014)

a child based on race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national, ethnic or social origin, property, disability, birth or other status of the child's or his/her parent(s)/legal guardian(s) (United Nations 1989). It is important to notice several important key concepts that the Convention puts forward. The first thing that we have already mentioned is *non-discrimination*, and then comes *the interests of the child*. The later implies that the best interests of the child should be of primary consideration in all actions concerning children (Article 3). The next two key concepts refer to the *optimal development* and *the voice of the child*. Here we witness the underlying significance of giving each and every child an opportunity to grow up as an individual with distinct views and ability to be a full member of a society.

The Convention Article 23 concerns disabled children understanding that they are vulnerable to segregation and discrimination.

> *"(1) States Parties recognize that a mentally or physically disabled child should enjoy a full and decent life, in conditions which ensure dignity, promote self-reliance and facilitate the child's active participation in the community."*

It goes further and states that:

> *"(3) Recognizing the special needs of a disabled child, assistance … shall be designed to ensure that the disabled child has effective access to and receives education… in a manner conducive to the child's achieving the fullest possible social integration and individual development, including his or her cultural and spiritual development…."*

Thus, Article 23 implies that children who have disability should receive special care and support that they can live a full and independent life, and as we observe it is beyond the local understanding of the aim of inclusive education.
Articles 28 and 29 cover the rights of children to education. First, education should be available and accessible to every child and it should respect human dignity of a child, and second, education should aim to develop each child's personality and talents to the full.
Armenia is surely a party to this Convention and should, ideally, respect its provisions[5].

The **UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities** was an important advance for people with disabilities throughout the world and a huge step forward on recognizing the right to education of disabled persons (United Nations 2006). Article 24 states that:

> *"(1)States Parties recognize the right of persons with disabilities to education. …[and] shall ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and life long learning directed to: …(b)the development by persons with disabilities of their personality, talents and creativity, as well as their mental and physical abilities, to their fullest potential;… (2)[states] shall ensure that (a)persons with disabilities are not excluded from the general education system on the basis of disability, …(b)can access an inclusive, quality and free primary education and secondary education on an equal basis with others in the*

---

[5] Source of information – United Nations Treaty Collection Database
(https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-11&chapter=4&lang=en accessed 20th October 2014)

> *communities in which they live; …(d)persons with disabilities receive the support required, within the general education system, to facilitate their effective education:…"*

The significance of this article is that, in fact, it sets the rules of the game for all educational institutions from primary to tertiary level education and it reaffirms the concept that disabled persons are equal members of a society. It is important to notice the provision stating that people have the right to have access to education *in the communities they live*. This is an explicit message that all the community schools have to provide inclusive education. Armenia has ratified the Convention[6], but has signed and not ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention[7]. The Convention establishes a Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities which reviews periodic reports submitted by States on the implementation of the Convention provisions. The Optional Protocol enables individuals and groups in a state party to the Protocol to complain to the Committee that the country has breached one of its obligations under the Convention. Moreover, the Committee can undertake inquiries under the Optional Protocol if it receives reliable information indicating grave or systematic violations by a State of any of the provisions of the Convention. The Committee may also invite the State in question to respond to such information. Although a state ratifying the Optional Protocol may "opt out" of the inquiry procedure, it strengthens the commitment of a state to implement the provisions of the Convention.

As a member of the Council of Europe, Armenia has committed herself towards implementing the provisions of the **European Social Charter** (1961) and the **Revised Social Charter** (1996). Based on these two treaties the Council of Europe developed Disability Strategy 2006-2015, which makes it clear that education for disabled children should be directed towards full inclusion. In the Council of Europe documents it is mentioned that the creation of opportunities for disabled persons to participate in mainstream education is not only important for disabled people, but will also benefit non-disabled people's understanding of human diversity. To meet the strategy goals the member states, in line with a number of other responsibilities, are supposed to review the legislative framework to accommodate the reforms, develop unified educational system (including mainstream and specialized educational provisions, which promotes the sharing of expertise and greater inclusion), enable early appropriate assessment of special educational needs, within the mainstream educational system provide the required support to persons with special educational needs, and finally, make the general educational system and facilities accessible for disabled persons (Cuncil of Europe Committee of Ministers 2006). This strategy implies that Armenia is expected to meet the abovementioned goals by the end of the next year (2015). However, so far Armenia has not been championing the Committee recommendations, not even vis-à-vis the legal framework.

---

[6] Source of information – United Nations Treaty Collection Database
(https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-15&chapter=4&lang=en accessed 20th October 2014)

[7] Source of information – United Nations Treaty Collection Database
(https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-15-a&chapter=4&lang=en accessed 20th October 2014)

Education for All and Salamanca Statement

World conference on Education For All, held in Thailand on 5-9 March 1990, was major milestone on the way to confirming the role of education in human development policy. The two major goals of the **World Declaration on Education for All** (1990) were the universalization of primary education and massive reduction of illiteracy by the end of the decade (UNESCO 1990). This goal was not met by the end of the time mentioned, and the World Education Forum, held in Dakar in 2000, adopted the **Dakar Framework for Action** which sets new goals to achieve by the end of 2015[8] (World Education Forum 2000). Meanwhile, in June 1994 in Salamanca, World Conference was held on Special Needs Education. During the Conference the participant adopted a Statement on the education of all disabled children, which called for inclusion to be the norm. The Framework for Action, adjunct to the statement, introduced guiding principles according to which ordinary schools should accommodate all children, regardless of their physical, intellectual, social, emotional, linguistic or other conditions; all educational policies should stipulate that disabled children attend the neighbourhood school 'that would be attended if the child did not have a disability' (World Conference on Special Needs Education 1994).

Referring to the benchmark set by the **Salamanca Statement and the Framework for Action**, countries were expected to develop their strategies towards ensuring inclusiveness. Armenia also developed its National Programme on Inclusive Education, and it is discussed in the following chapter.

Inclusive Education and Legal Framework of Armenia

Inclusive education in Armenia is regulated by the Republic of Armenia (RA) Constitution, Law on Education, Law on Mainstream Education, Law on Social Protection of Persons with Disabilities, Law on Rights of a Child, and a number of ministerial documents issued by the RA Ministry of Education and Science.

It is important to mention from the very beginning that our research revealed that current legal framework, although having provided an opportunity to considerably develop the field of inclusive education in Armenia, fails to truly ensure inclusion and it is not in line with the internationally accepted guidelines and Armenia's international commitments. However, a starting point of the discussion is that in 2012 the Government of Armenia developed two draft laws aiming to amend the RA Law on Education and the RA Law on Mainstream Education, thus, create inclusive-friendly legal framework. The policy change that the law will bring is that by August 1, 2025, Armenian mainstream educational system will become fully inclusive. This implies that all mainstream educational schools of the country will provide inclusive education, and we believe this will definitely become an achievement.

---

[8] 1. Expand early childhood care and education
2. Provide free and compulsory primary education for all
3. Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults
4. Increase adult literacy
5. Achieve gender parity
6. Improve the quality of education

The draft laws has first been included in the agenda of the 4-day sitting of the RA National Assembly session in October 2012 and it passed the first reading[9]. Later, in September 2014, the texts of the second reading were included in the 4-day sittings of the RA National Assembly sessions in September and October[10], however, upon the request of the Education Committee of the Assembly, the discussion in the sessions has been postponed till 31st of December. By this time the authors of these draft were expected to present the amended texts of the laws[11]. Finally, the law was amended in December 2014, and this implies that relatively complete framework for the development of inclusive education is currently in place.

The significance of the law, is that it *mostly* accommodates the accepted international guidelines for providing inclusive education. To create the policy frame, the key issues of the amended articles will be presented in milestones.

First of all, the correct approach is finally adopted: the law states that inclusive education is for each and every child, including those with special educational needs. This is a tremendous turning point in the perception of inclusive education, and this should be used for developing a genuine discourse. Secondly, the law enables each child to attend the school in the neighbourhood. This provision has been repeatedly mentioned in a number of international commitments of the Country. Introduction of regional pedagogical-psychological support centres is an other positive development: first, it will considerably reduce the technical inconveniences of Needs Assessment, as children won't have to travel to the capital for their need to be assessed, and secondly, support services will ideally make the transition of schools towards full inclusion a little less hectic and quality oriented. There is definitely a risk with capacities of personnel for applying functional assessment, but this risk will be considered in Capacity Development chapter of this policy paper.
Another major achievement is that due to application of functional and not disability assessment, there is a possibility that financing scheme will be modified, and thus there would be less concerns for integrity.

Upon the adoption of the law, there is an urgent requirement of harmonizing the legal framework. The amended Law on Mainstream Education is not well articulated with other legal documents regulating the field, except for the RA Law on Education, and termination of the Law on Education of Persons with Special Educational Needs. Besides the laws, there is a list of by-laws and documents that will have to be redeveloped, amended or created[12].

---

[9] Source of information – Official website of the RA National Assembly:
(http://www.parliament.am/draft_history.php?id=5592 accessed 25th of October, 2014)

[10] Source of information – RA National Assembly: Agenda of the 6th session
(http://www.parliament.am/agenda.php?ID=364 and http://www.parliament.am/agenda.php?ID=369 accessed 25th of October, 2014)

[11] Source of information – RA National Assembly: Extract from the minutes of the Assembly Committee on Science, Education, Culture, Youth and Sport issues.
(http://www.parliament.am/committees.php?do=show&ID=111164&showdoc=940&cat_id=registers&view=print&lang=arm accessed 25th of October, 2014)

[12] The list of recommended documents can be found in the Recommendations section.

Although we mention that the amendment of the law has been a huge step forward in regard to full inclusion, we need to comprehend that there are multiple risks connected with full inclusion, especially considering the current state of art in inclusive education, especially quality dimension.

The following chapters discuss the key challenges the field of inclusive education faces in Armenia today.

Fragmented Communication and Exchange of Experience

Communication between the different spheres and levels of education system is the key for developing a holistic approach of education provision. During our interviews at schools, various organizations, with a number of experts, one phenomenon was consistency observed – there is no culture of information sharing if the information seeker is outside of a certain project circle. Despite the sensitivity of the field, importance of the details and relatively young nature of policies (related to inclusive education), there is no formal and working mechanism for information flow among the professionals. Ministry of Education and Science, local and international organizations and NGOs, which have been in the forefront of implementing inclusive education in Armenia, as well as a limited number of school principles and teachers are usually aware of the developments in the field. However, this cannot be a good practice, as a considerable number of stakeholder stay out of the processes, receive fragmented information, and thus, fragmented understanding of the reform, which in turn results in improper reform implementation.

For instance, the Assessment Centre is currently replacing the standard diagnostic tool of International Classification of Diseases (ICD)[13] with the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health, known more commonly as ICF. This development is a vital step forward in the reform as it not only provides needs-based assessment, but also enables needs-based support and financing (Yesayan 2014). However, information about transition is not properly disseminated: many teachers and professional learn about the undergoing changes from their connections and/or peers, if at all. The Problem is not with the Assessment Centre that fails covering the shift, but it is in the lack of a system for information flow.

Another problem, which was predominantly consistent in the regions (Marzes), is the confusion with the management of financial resources. Our interviewees in regions mentioned that they often do not know how to administer the funds, as there are no specific budget lines except for the expenses on food, transportation and salaries: if there are 'savings' in the budget, there is a risk that it could be frozen. So, school principles often consult with their colleagues in the Capital for 'not being mistaken.' This problem is partially determined by incomplete legal framework, but it is also a result of not having the best practices shared among each other.

Improper communication is not only confusing for the teachers, but also for the learners and their parents: constantly changing practices, without proper explanation and reasoning creates an environment of mistrust towards the system, reduce of motivation

---

[13] International Classification of Diseases (ICD) stands short for International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems

and empowerment, while students and their parents are supposed to be seen as allies for putting the reform forward.

Inclusion vs. quality? Reform priorities and international practice.

Current reform narrative is that by August 2025 all mainstream education schools should provide inclusive education. This implies moving towards full inclusion and this shift protects the education rights of children. Often the educational needs of a child are not being disclosed because a school does not have the capacities to observe the needs, as it is not an inclusive school. In fact, the needs of a child are noticed at elder ages, when educational support cannot be as effective any longer, as if the needs were unveiled at younger ages. Still, the prospective of having full inclusion in a matter of years raises a number of concerns related to the inclusive education reality of Armenia. One of the most salient questions is "whether inclusion will be promoted in conjunction with endorsement of quality of education?"

UNESCO Policy Guidelines on Inclusive Education highlight the importance of education quality, since it stands for cognitive development of a person and promotes values and attitudes of responsible citizenship and creative and emotional development of person (UNESCO 2009). 11th EFA Global Monitoring Report notices that access to education is not the only crisis – poor quality is holding back learning even for those who make it to school (UNESCO 2013/4). Improving learning should be a strategic priority especially among the most disadvantaged groups. Parents often have preference towards special schools, as they are unsure about the quality of education in mainstream schools considering the educational need of their child.

Five dimensions to tackle quality

International research and benchmarking shows that quality of education can be improved by addressing the following five dimensions of teaching and learning processes (UNESCO 2004):

1. **Characteristics of learners:** Learners have differences and their achievements cannot be assessed with ignoring those differences. Learners are coming from various socio-economic background, health, place of residence, cultural and religious identities, and there can potentially be inequalities deriving from gender, disability, race and ethnicity. Thus understanding learners is a key, since it requires flexible and needs based approach and support.
2. **Discourse:** Society and education influence each other and so do state education policies. The context is also influenced by international projects, civil society activities, international developments, etc. Therefore, the context should be considered.
3. **Resources:** It is obvious that effectiveness of schools depends on teachers, textbooks, materials, as well as funding. Thus, human and material resources[14] become determinants for quality of teaching and learning processes. Administration of resources is also important, as their availability is yet not a sufficient condition for quality.
4. **Teaching and learning:** A number of research in education, including higher education, persistently validate that the most important key for quality lies in

---

[14] Human resources include managers, administrators, teachers, support teams, evaluators, etc.

teaching and learning activities. This includes curricula, classroom strategies, learners' motivation, teaching methodologies, and other things.

5. **Learning outcomes:** Achievement of learner is usually assessed against declared objectives. There can also be other proxies for assessment, for example, labor market success. Learning outcomes are also important for comparability purposes.

In short term, quality may suffer, if enrolment rates are high and there are no quality enhancement policies in place. However, in the long run, with implementation of due policies and consideration of the abovementioned dimensions of education quality, right balance between quality and access can be found.

For example, according to our legislation, as well as, international practice there can be no more that 2-3 SEN students in one class (Republic of Armenia Ministry of Education and Science 2010). This proportion is identified based of a profound research to understand the optimal number of SEN children in a classroom where a teacher can address the individual needs of all students. Hence, the quality may suffer if there are more that 3 SEN children in a classroom. However, our observations showed that in Armenian reality this requirement is not followed, and reasons for that are very different: it can be the lack of subject teachers who know how to work with inclusive classes, and can well be limited number of classes for a given grade.

Role of Support teams and teacher assistants

A rather important aspect of inclusive education implementation is the existence of support teams in schools, who address the special needs of the learners. Support team is composed of special educators who know exactly how to work with a child facing a certain educational need. There is no golden formula of the composition of the support teams: usually team members are recruited based on the needs of the school children. In Armenia those teams are called Multidisciplinary teams. The primary role of multidisciplinary teams is to ensure that all children are effectively included in classroom teaching and learning processes, and if a child has certain attainment difficulties, work with her/him individually to catch up with learning requirements.

The composition of multidisciplinary teams is included in a school staff list and approved by the Municipality of Yerevan for the schools is Yerevan, and by local governmental bodies in the regions. According to the Governmental decree on the staff members of mainstream education schools, multidisciplinary teams include special teacher (speech therapist, oligophrenia teacher, sign language teacher, tiflo teacher), psychologist, and social educator (Government of the Republic of Armenia 2010). However, current system has little flexibility regarding the staff members, and it is planned to have more needs-based staff with the current reform towards full inclusion.

There are two approaches on how support teams work according to international practice. One approach is when special teachers and subject teachers are engaged in collaborative teaching, and the second approach is when special teachers work with SEN children after or in-between their regular classes. In Armenia the mixture of these two approaches is practiced with prevailing application of the second approach. It is important to mention that most of the leading European countries (Ireland, UK, Norway, etc) give preference to collaborative teaching as it ensures better quality and better

inclusion. However, implementing a collaborative approach is usually problematic: as our research showed, lack of administrative approval for time for planning meetings was the most frequently cited barrier to collaboration (Nochajski 2002).

During our observations in Armenia we noticed that collaborative team teaching is rarely practiced, and support team members prefer working with SEN children individually than during a class. Meanwhile, it should be noted that collaborative teaching is rather important from on-the-job-training perspective: with team teaching subject teachers learn the methods special teachers use in classroom. Hence, subject teachers become better equipped to work with SEN children and include them in teaching and learning activities. 90% of subject teachers we interviewed lacked teaching methodologies that would effectively include SEN children into the class activities. Lack of methodological tools results in poor quality inclusion and even exclusion. We observed a few cases when a SEN child has a 'special corner' in a classroom where s/he could play and not 'disturb' the class.

The role of support teams is underlined everywhere in the world: teams are important not only for their supportive role to the students but also for the support they provide to the teachers. For this reason team members should be carefully selected based on their educational background and capacities. Armenian reality in this regard is very interesting. First of all, there is no requirement to the background and capacities of the team members: the Government Decree describes the responsibilities and mentions that the employee should have higher education with relevant qualification (Government of the Republic of Armenia 2010). Only for the Social education it mentions that the employee should have educational background in social education and/or social work (Government of the Republic of Armenia 2010). Our Internet survey on the education background of the multidisciplinary team members shows that only 60% of our respondents have relevant professional qualification. Moreover, only 47% of those having professional qualification perform the job related to their qualification. Although this result is not representative as we did not do nationwide survey, and respondents were identified with snowballing method, those taken the survey were teachers most actively involved in local projects and trainings.

This picture of the multidisciplinary teams is deteriorating, especially considering the prospective of full inclusion by 2025. This is a policy level challenge and it should be addressed comprehensively: quality of education and capacity of teachers is highly interdependent, and the role of pedagogical universities, as well as on-the-job and specific trainings is of utmost importance.

During our interviews with school principles and staff members the importance of teacher assistant was constantly mentioned about. As we know, inclusive schools do not have teacher assistants nowadays, and this institution was only piloted in Tavoush Marz, where all schools provide inclusive education regardless of their status[15]. Teacher

---

[15] According to the RA Law on Education of Persons with Special Educational Needs only schools granted with the status of inclusive school can provide inclusive education, and this status implies that they can have varied funding for children with special educational needs, and in Tavoush Marz there are schools, which do have the inclusive school status and receive varied funding. However, there was a pilot project in this region according to which the institute of teacher assistant was introduced and enabled all the schools to admit children with special educational needs. These schools do not have multidisciplinary

assistants, who should ideally have background in special education, will support the inclusion of all children in classroom activities, meanwhile ensuring that ensuring that regular lessons are not disturbed and safety of all children is maintained. We were told about a number of cases when hyperactive children physically hurt or injured their classmates, and we were explained that this could have been avoided had there been accompanying adults, assistants or parents beside them.

With teacher assistants, it is essential to have clear description of the role of the assistant and their relationship to the classroom teacher and the child who has disabilities and/or SEN. In Ireland this person is called Special Needs Assistant (SNA) and they have a long experience when the duties of SNA was confused with those of the teacher or support team. In her article "Toward inclusion of special education students in general education" Lorna Idol (2006) notes that a Instructional assistants should not be assigned to a single student. She mentions that instructional assistant are invaluable in a setting where inclusive education is just being introduced and subject teachers do not have the adequate capacities to with with SEN children. In this setting the easiest option is to assign one assistant to each SEN child, in case there is such a need. However, as her research reveals, this kind of allocation often ends up being a poor use of resources, and furthermore it can lead to over-reliance and a loss of independence for the student(Idol 2006). So, finding the right balance is complicated, yet crucial.

Age-appropriate exposure

Our observation revealed another problematic situation we aim to consider. A number of children with special educational needs end up studying in classes, which is not appropriate to their age. International guidelines on inclusive education indicate that it is vital for children to be exposed to their age-appropriate academic and social stimuli. Hence, if we extract them from their age group, we in fact, distort the philosophy of inclusion. The local rational for changing the age group of a child is the level of academic achievement, however, this is logical fallacy. Achievement should not be the reference point for the choice of the grade. Instead, learning outcomes should be flexible to be adapted to each SEN children, then translated into the individual curricula and finally assessed with adapted methods.

Fortunately, our interview at the Assessment Centre disclosed that according to the current reform rationale students will attend classed with their age-appropriate groups.

Pedagogical-psychological support services

Finally, the last, but not least observation we have regarding the quality of education relates to the role of the Assessment Centre and special schools that are currently being reformed. According to the draft Law on Mainstream Education special schools will be transformed into pedagogical-psychological support centres and will be responsible for the 2nd level of needs assessment (first level is conducted by school staff) and certification. Thus, they turn into regional level assessment centres. Besides, they will have another rather important responsibility – that is, expert support to the

---

teams and their funding is different. Now it is clear that this pilot project won't be extended to other regions of the country, still their experience with teacher assistance will most probably be maintained in all inclusive schools.

implementation of inclusive education at schools. During interviews with reform initiators and implementers it was explained to us that special schools will become a sort of resource centres for providing expertize and professionals. Given the concept that multidisciplinary teams will be formulated according to the needs of the children, it is vital to have a 'bank of experts' that could support a child with given educational needs. However, there is not a clear vision of how the mechanism will work in practice: there are a number of issues related to the availability and mobility of the special teachers, which is not completely sorted out yet.

The most alarming amendment in the law and the reform respectively, is that there will be no special schools or at least the draft law does not envisage educational provisions for the transformed resource centres. Many countries, including those most advanced in implementing inclusive education, maintain parallel systems – provide full inclusion, yet keep special schools with social component of inclusion. In Armenia the rational of having special schools as well as their practice is not conducive to inclusion and it should be definitely changed, however, there are at least X bold reasons why special schools should somehow remain:

1. First of all, it is the right of a parent/legal guardian to chose the educational institution that bests meets the needs of a child, and lack of special schools limits that right.
2. Secondly, special school or special classes adjunct to resource centres is important for research purposes and development purposes. Special classes could be conducted in the physical spaces of schools, so that social inclusion will be ensured, still pedagogical-psychological support centres should have supervision over them for the abovementioned purposes.
3. And finally, there are certain educational needs, which are extremely difficult, if not impossible to meet at inclusive education within the mainstream school settings. Organization of special classes on the physical space of a school could enable all students to have social inclusion. Surely, only extremely complicated needs should be considered for including in special classes, but ignorance of these cases we consider to be inadmissible.

Experts in the Assessment Centre are also concerned with the unclear prospective of this issue, and expressed willingness to maintain at least exceptionally difficult cases under the supervision of resource centres (Yesayan 2014).

Capacity Development and Teacher Education

With the prospective towards full education by 2025 capacity of human resources involved in administration, initiation and implementation of inclusive education becomes foundational and particularly central. Development and redevelopment of discourse, amendment of legislative framework, administration of inclusive education, needs assessment, quality of education heavily hinges on the capacities of persons. Capacities of managers and administrators are important, but capacities of teachers and needs assessors are vital. If we fail to educate, train and prepare quality professionals, we will fail the goal of the reform entirely.

Regarding teacher capacity development and education there are 4 specific policy challenges that need to be urgently addressed in Armenia:

1. Inclusive education is mostly considered to be a problem for subject teachers and inclusive teaching is not considered as a natural way of working. Teachers are confident that 'problematic' children will impact the quality of teaching negatively and see inclusive education as a top down reform imposed by the government.

This perception was prevailing during our interviews with subject teachers of mainstream education schools. Unfortunately, these observations come to witness that there is no discourse on inclusive education and therefore the founding concepts of inclusive education are not properly communicated to our society, if at all.

2. In-service teacher education is not in place, as there is no collaborative teaching, proper channels for communication and exchange of experience. Paradigm of education has grown beyond the institutional boundaries today and lifelong learning is the 21st century premises for education. Thus, in-service education is a solid path towards professional development.

3. Trainings provided by the National Institute of Education, key trainer in the field, are the main activities aiming to enhance the capacities of teaching staff. However, the question of trainers, training topics and materials becomes central as soon as we picture year 2025 and the massive training programmes, which will probably be initiated. Reformation of the training system definitely requires policy level activities.

4. Finally, pedagogical training at institutional settings should become a state priority. Pedagogical institutions of the country are the main feeders of school personnel, including multidisciplinary team members. Mechanisms should be developed to boost the role of these institutions in terms of ensuring the quality of inclusive education implementation.

Institutional and in-service training of teachers

There are multiple organization in Armenia that provide teacher training related to inclusive education. NGO sector has been rather active and effective in providing quality training to the teachers. The major institution which is multi profile, has the lion's share in providing trainings is the National Institute of Education (NIE). Here we have concerns in two sections: topics of the trainings and quality of trainings.

According to our findings, subject teachers receive trainings on substance and implementation of inclusive education, and multidisciplinary team members, in addition to the abovementioned topic, get some training on special education. The quality of trainings, which depends on trainer and training materials, remains questionable.

Most of our respondents, both in subject teachers and support teams, expressed willingness to attend trainings related to methodological tools. Moreover, methodological toolkit is the key attribute our schoolteachers lack. With no proper knowledge and understanding of methods for working with SEN children, teachers refrain from teaching in inclusive classes, build stereotypes and develop unfavorable behavior towards inclusive education, in general, and inclusive teaching, in particular.

Importance of in-service education has already been highlighted in a number of times, and the only additional observation here is that incentives for collaboration among teachers are not explained or shown to them. So, to enhance collaboration and exchange mechanisms should be developed for promoting mentorship and teambuilding.

Why should pedagogical institutions be prioritized?

Pedagogical institutions have two important roles to play in support of the reform towards full inclusion. Their first role relates to being a human resource feeder to the school system. In this regards they first have to provide quality education to their students and include inclusive education related subjects in the curricula of all qualifications. Our findings from the Yerevan State Pedagogical Institution show that all students, irrespective of the qualification, take at least two courses related to inclusive education: 1 mandatory course and one elective. Still, there are no methodological courses on how to work with children having special educational needs. Secondly, the faculty of Special Education should develop a strategy for recruiting enough students to manage covering the demand of graduates with relevant qualifications to be employed in support teams.

The other role that pedagogical institutions should play relates to trainings. Faculty of Special Education of Yerevan State Pedagogical Institution has the capacity to become an organization for trainings. Currently their capacity is not used.

Who will be assessing the educational needs?

We have already mentioned that according to the draft Law on Mainstream Education needs assessment will be conducted at regional levels. We have also presented the positive aspects of this policy change. However, there is a major risk regarding the capacity of the assessors.

The assessment tool, International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health, is a rather comprehensive and complicated tool. We learnt form the Assessment Centre that only some sections of that tool are being translated into Armenian, and we believe it might cause concerns regarding full comprehension of the tool and proper application of it. Moreover, as of July 2014 there was a vision to cluster the needs into certain categories for setting a differentiated funding scheme. Still, it was unclear what would make up those categories, how the clusters will be formed.

Depending on the level of discretion left to the assessor the risk of poor assessment raises if the assessor is not properly trained or is not a field professional with solid experience. Thus, the National Assessment Centre should be very cautious with the translation of the tool and, development and implementation of trainings.

Financing of Inclusive Education

The field of inclusive education has been developing and evolving since the adoption of Declaration of Education for all (1990). It has been evolving since than and continues to promote the action lined accepted in Dakar Declaration (2000)[16]. In other aspects of

---

[16] See footnote 8 for current action lines.

European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education publication (for example Watkins, 2007) it is clearly stated that '*Conceptions of, policies for, and practice in inclusive education are constantly undergoing change in all countries.*' (p.20). Many countries are in the process of reviewing and changing their policies and legislation for inclusive education, based on either knowledge and experiences from on-going pilot projects, by introducing new financing strategies for inclusive education, by implementing new policies/laws regarding quality systems and monitoring for education. Processes of change, however, require tools for monitoring respective developments (European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education 2009).

Despite the common experience of economic pressures and constraints among countries of the North and South (Developed and Developing countries), the literature related to economic issues in inclusive education takes strongly divergent paths. The plethora of large-scale cross-country studies that are undertaken by countries of the North typically focus on national and municipal governmental funding formulae for allocation of public money[17]. In countries of the South, the literature on resource support for inclusive education services focuses instead on building the capacity of communities and parents as significant human resource inputs, and on non-governmental sources of funding. This literature also tends to be case-based on particular countries, regions or programs, rather than large-scale multi-national studies as it is in the North. Strategies for resourcing inclusive education in countries of the South are much more varied and broader in scope - characterized by a focus on linking and coordinating services with health sectors, universities, vocational training programs and etc. (Peters 2004). In this context from our point of view the main reason why countries of the South usually rely on non-governmental sources of funding of inclusive education is insufficient financial resources.

Input and resources denote all aspects provided to the system to achieve a certain outcome. In the field of education, inputs and resources is not only financial resources, or legislation related to education, but also the qualification level of teachers, managers, etc. Education processes transform these inputs and resources into *outputs and outcomes*.

Financing and support of educational services for students with special needs is becoming a primary concern for many countries, regardless of the availability of resources. Limited funds for mainstream education have often been highlighted as factors obstructing implementation of inclusive education. However, the main problem lies in the lack of political will to change the tradition of funding the segregated systems of special schools. The study of development trends show that countries increasingly realize the inefficiency of maintaining multiple administrative and organizational structures and services for providing mainstream education; hence, the maintenance of special schools is considered to be financially insufficient.

Inclusive Education funding models
A recent UNICEF study of the status of inclusive education in Central and Eastern Europe and in the Commonwealth of Independent States discussed the financial

---

[17] North - is referred to developed countries, and South - to developing countries.

incentives for favoring the segregated system of special schools, which in turn considers centralized financing. Decentralized financing implies decentralized decision-making, and this all should boil down to per-student financing. The report correctly notices:

> *"…decentralization efforts have been under way for several years in Armenia. Though, there has been a growing gap in the linkages between policymakers and practitioners due to the failure to establish clear roles and definitions prior to decentralizing many processes*" (UNICEF 2012).

Funding is an essential element of inclusion. If a country advocates inclusion, then legislation and especially financial regulations have to be adapted to this goal. If these regulations are not in accordance with the specified goals, then the chances of achieving objectives are presumably low. In this sense funding may be a decisive factor in achieving inclusion. Country descriptions clearly show that the funding system can inhibit the inclusion processes.

There are three major approaches to funding inclusive education (UNICEF 2012):
Input or per-capita models: Countries with high proportions of students in special schools most often use this funding formula. The funds are paid to regions or municipalities either as a flat grant or a pupil-weighted scheme, or as a census-based count in which all students are counted and an equal percentage of special needs students are assumed across municipalities.

Countries working with this type of input-based funding are Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Relatively low percentages of pupils in special schools or classes may also accommodate needs-based model for the funding of special schools. For instance, in Cyprus, Luxembourg, Spain and Sweden, the special school system is funded by the Government on the basis of the number of learners and their disabilities.

Weakness of the model is the focus on disability rather than educational needs; the number of children with disabilities is not an accurate indicator of actual costs. In addition, this model can serve as an incentive to inflate the number of children with disabilities in order to increase funding; accurate auditing is therefore important alongside measures to provide disincentives to submit false data. Overall, the per-capita model of funding is the most frequently used, but, in some countries, it has been found to have resulted in less inclusion, more labeling and increase in costs due to the need to diagnose and identify individual students.

Resource-based model, also known as a 'through-put' model, involves fiscal policies that mandate qualified units of instruction or programs. According to this model funding is based on services provided rather than on child counts. Countries focusing strongly on this type of decentralized funding are Denmark, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Norway and Sweden. In these countries municipalities hold the responsibility to decide on how inclusive education funds should be used, and on the amount of funding.

This funding model has been criticized by a number of researchers and their general argument is that it promotes learners' placement in existing programmes, rather than adaptation of programmes to meet student needs. Furthermore, schools may be penalized for success when students no longer need services, and funding is lost.

However, recent studies indicate an increasing trend away from child-based models toward resource-based models of funding. In general, resource-based models encourage local initiatives to develop programmes and services and are considered as having great potential because funding focuses on teacher resources and support to provide quality education for students with disabilities. However, without some evaluation or monitoring mechanism, there is no incentive to produce quality programmes or to seek improvements.

Output-based models: This model implies linking funding to cost effectiveness in terms of outcomes for students. None of the countries in our region employ an output-based model. It is exemplified in the US programme "no child left behind", which ties funding and school accreditation directly to student achievement scores, with severe economic sanctions for failure. In the UK, 'league tables' based on student test scores in individual schools are published as a means of holding schools accountable, providing parents with information about which school performs best. 'Unsuccessful' schools will lose students and therefore funding. The policy has been linked to increasing the numbers of SEN children in segregated settings, as it provides a built-in incentive for schools to refer students to special education programmes in order to avoid down-grading their overall results. Output-based models of funding can also serve to penalize schools for circumstances beyond their control, such as high mobility and absentee rates of students, inadequate funding for current textbooks and adapted curricular materials. According to this model funding is not delegated to municipalities but to a higher administrative institutions, such as regions, provinces, counties, prefectures, school clusters etc.

As we can note, current financing model in Armenia is input or per capita model and as we will see later the new possible financing model will be resource based model because it will be based on services provided. This model also assumes the decentralized system, where the municipality has the main responsibility for the organization of inclusive education.

Countries with a strong decentralized system, where the municipality has the main responsibility for the organization of inclusive education, generally report positive effects of their systems. Countries like Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Denmark mention almost no negative side effects of inclusive education implementation and they are generally very satisfied with their funding systems.

Public financing of education

Domestic spending on education has increased in recent years, particularly in low and lower middle-income countries, partly because of improvements in economic growth. Government spending on education increased from 4.6% to 5.1% of gross national product (GNP) between 1999 and 2011, on average. In low and middle income countries it rose faster: 30 of these countries increased their spending on education by one percentage point of GNP or more between 1999 and 2011 (UNESCO 2013/4).

Armenia faced deterioration in its education system along with other public services. Although budgetary spending on general education as percent of GDP has increased from 1.2% in 2002 to 2.75% in 2006, most of the budget funds were allocated for teachers' salaries (RA Ministry of Finance 2010). According to World Bank data in 2011

public spending on education in Armenia was 3.1% of GDP (World Bank. 2013). Here we can state that in recent years, in spite of increased absolute value of public spending, the share of education in GDP decreases. In 2013 public spending on education in Armenia was 2.5% of GDP[18]. As we can see from the above mentioned, with this indicator Armenia does not meet the average number in low and middle-income countries.

Approximately 25 percent of school entrants do not reach high school, while the majority of children with disabilities have limited access to basic education. UNICEF advocates for full access of children with disabilities to education through promoting the establishment of inclusive and child-friendly schools as well as through providing necessary equipment and learning materials to those schools. As a result over 450 children with special educational needs have been successfully enrolled in 13 inclusive schools in the country[19]. According to 2011–2013 Medium–Term Public Expenditure Framework the main goal of the "Inclusive Educational Concept", approved by the Government, is to determine fundamentals for organizing the education of children with special educational needs in mainstream education schools, and for the reforms in special education system. Special importance is attached to the needs assessment of children with special educational needs, which must be arranged in pedagogical-psychological support/assessment centers. There is a progress also with the level of involvement of children with special educational needs in mainstream education schools.

It is widely accepted that countries should allocate at least 20% of their budget to education. Yet the global average in 2013 was only 15%, a proportion that has hardly changed since 1999. Taking into account the above mentioned we can state that 2013 education share in RA budget was only. 9.4%[20]. It shows that financing in education is absolutely not sufficient.

Financing Inclusive education in Armenia
As we have already mentioned, according to the draft Law on Mainstream Education all mainstream education schools of Armenia will provide inclusive education by 2025. This is a risky initiative, as it requires accurately calculated state budgeting and investments in inclusive schools. According to the anticipated amendment to the Law, all mainstream schools should open their doors to children with SEN. However, neither project experts nor representatives from Ministry of Education and Science (MoES) and Ministry of Finance can forecast the growth dynamics of the number of inclusive schools by 2025. There is no accurate calculation, if al all, about the capacity of the state budget to support nearly 1400 inclusive schools in Armenia. But what is more important, no principal financing mechanisms are foreseen to guarantee inclusion for all.

It is unclear what funding model will be introduced. Currently, there are two systems of funding for inclusive education in Armenia: the typical model and the experimental

---

[18] Calculation was done by this report coauthor and it is based on data provided by RA National Statistical Service and RA Ministry of Finance.
[19] Source of information – UNICEF Armenia website (http://www.unicef.org/armenia/education.html accessed 28 October 2014)
[20] Source of information – RA Ministry of Finance (http://www.minfin.am/index.php?cat=72&lang=3 accessed 30 September 2014)

model of Tavush. In the case of typical funding, a month before the beginning of the academic year, the MoES provides the Ministry of Finance with the number of children with SEN who are enrolled in officially recognized inclusive schools. The total number is then distributed into groups of 15 children with SEN. Each group is supposed to have one fulltime special educator, educator, psychologists, and a cook. The funding covers food and transportation costs for children with SEN, plus water and electricity expenses. Other expenditures are determined through the standard procedure used for financing mainstream schools. The Ministry of Finance calculates the annual budget and channels amounts to the regional departments for redistribution. While an annual sum of 100,000 AMD is allocated for each child without SEN, those defined as children with special educational needs receive four to five times more funding, amounting to 400,000 to 500,000 AMD per year. In Tavush region, designated inclusive education funding is allocated using an experimental model, with no additional funding criteria. Schools that do not have students with SEN are funded only to cover the salaries of teacher's assistants, which is equal to 80% of a mainstream teacher's average salary. Officially accredited inclusive schools in Tavush also receive funding to cover special teachers' wages, equivalent to a mainstream teacher's average monthly salary (Center for educational research and consulting 2013).

According to the one of recent studies in Georgia, regardless the method to obtain the cost per unit of increased satisfaction, satisfaction increase is an indicator of increased quality, satisfaction decrease is an indicator for diminished quality; the satisfaction variation is a tool to manage decision in decision-making bodies, meaning, all conditions being equal, a rational decision making body will opt for a decision to increase at maximum the aggregated satisfaction for all disabled children in schools (Ovidiu Mantaluta 2008). Thus, satisfaction of SEN children can become a key determinant for the success of the reform.

The expected model of funding

In the framework of the anticipated amendments to the Law on Education and Law on Mainstream Education, one of the main tasks is try to find out the appropriate service package for the children with SEN. This service package will include psychologist, sociologist, physiologist, transport services, technical services and etc. So the funding model of the Tavush pilot project is not going to become a typical model for funding inclusive education, and as we can infer, a new financing model will be designed. Besides, introduction of ICF based assessment will considerably promote the development of unified assessment system. In recent years there have been a number of significant efforts to develop tools based on ICF's taxonomy and qualifiers. A large number of tools has been developed by health professionals, for example: 'Functional Assessment in Migraine –FAIM'; 'Developmentally Structured Interview for Children with Special Health Care Needs' based on ICF codes; 'Health Measurement in Geriatric Care' using ICF codes ; 'Health Related Quality of Life- HRQOL' based on ICF ; and 'ICF Core Sets Development for the Acute Hospital and Early Post Acute Rehabilitation Facilities'. Recent efforts of Granger "Using Rasch Analysis to Calibrate Measures in the FIM Instrument and the LIFE ware SM System" and Bharadwaj "Development of a Fuzzy Likert Scale for the WHO ICF" scored considerable appreciation among the field professionals (Rangasayee 2010).

Our findings show that it would be better if costs could be separated for each SEN children and thus calculated based on individual needs. This was also suggested inclusive education expert Anahit Baxshyan. According to her it will be more efficient if the financial resources formed and then directed to each SEN children were based on their specific needs.

There are some concerns regarding the incentives for becoming inclusive schools: concerns relate to corruption. Saying corruption we mean inefficient use of financial resources or use of those resources not for its main purpose. Thus, as of 2012, there are 98 functioning inclusive schools in the Republic of Armenia while in 2007 there were 10. Regional distribution also is highly unequal. More than 50% of the schools are located in the capital, while the regions of Ararat, VayotsDzor and Syunik have only one inclusive school each.

It is important to mention that according to the Ministry of Education and Science there are about 8000 children with disabilities, and the Ministry of Education and Science has formal information only about 5000 (2700 of them included in mainstream schools and 2300 of them included in special schools)[21]. This implies that the number of inclusive schools and the number of SEN children included in mainstream education will continue to increase in the coming years. So, the public financing for inclusive education will also continue to increase.

Table 1: State financing of inclusive and special educations in elementary, secondary and high schools (mln. AMD)[22]

	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013	
	Incl.	Spec.	Incl.	Spec.	Incl.	Spec.	Incl.	Spec.	Incl.	Spec.
Elementary	33.0	726.5	79.8	752.1	120.4	747.0	147.0	812.1	233,9	768,6
Secondary	45.2	1,492	119.6	1,111	165.9	1,136	224.4	1,182	291,4	1,167
High	18.6	520.9	20.1	410.7	31.7	422.1	52.1	418.2	49,0	502,6

Analysis of Table 1 shows that we have increasing financing in inclusive education in elementary, secondary and high educations. Also we can state that the biggest financing for inclusive education we have in secondary education. Besides, we see that there is still huge portion of financing allocated for special schools. Taking into account that in accordance with the reform implementation most of special schools will be closed, there can be free financial resources, which can be directed to inclusive education at mainstream schools.

The consideration that closure of special schools will create available funds has been recently validated in one of the UNICEF Armenia projects. Closure of 2 special schools in Suniq Marz saved 178 million AMD, which was used for opening of 2 resource centres, 1 community kindergarten, 2 rehabilitation centres adjunct to hospitals and extended day care with 1meal for 400 persons (Harutyunyan 2014).

---

[21] Validation needed

[22] Source of information – RA State Budget (http://www.minfin.am/index.php?cat=72&lang=3 accessed 12 October 2014)

We can also uphold the transformation of those special schools: transformation of special schools and institutes into resource centers is a very common trend in Europe. Most countries report that they are planning to develop or have already developed a network of resource centres in their countries. These centres are given different names, and different tasks are assigned to them. Some countries call them knowledge centres, others expertise centres or resource centres, however, for most of the resource centres the following tasks are distinguished (European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education 2003):
• Provision for training and courses for teachers and other professionals;
• Development and dissemination of materials and methods;
• Support for mainstream schools and parents;
• Short time or part-time help for individual students;
• Support in entering the labour market

Despite the fact that the highest financing exists in secondary education the number of SEN children is highest in elementary school (see Table 2). This could be justifiable if services provided in secondary school were more than in elementary schools. However, taking into account that inclusive education currently is not being financed based on services provided, we think there are some distortions here. Furthermore, analysis of Table 2 shows significant increase of SEN children during the 2011-2013. These number can either show a genuine trend of parent behavior towards trusting mainstream schools and taking their child to general schools, or it could signal corruption risks.

Table 2 Number of SEN children's in elementary, secondary and high schools[23].

	2011	2012	2013
Elementary	506	672	694
Secondary	438	507	540
High	10	1	1
Overall	**954**	**1180**	**1235**

Recommendations and conclusions

Based on the research findings the following recommendations have been developed:

Recommendation 1: Civil society of Armenia could advocate that Armenia ratify the Optional Protocol of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.

Recommendation 2: In line or immediately after the adoption of the drafts of the Law on Mainstream Education and the Law on Education, all the articulated laws and by-laws should be amended, including:

- Law on Social Protection of Persons with Disabilities;
- Law on Rights of a Child;
- Laws on Financing Inclusive Education (in all mainstream schools and in Tavoush region)
- Statute of current specials schools;
- Statute of the Assessment Centre;
- Governmental decrees on Implementing inclusive education in Armenia, approval of the name-lists of pedagogical personnel at schools, etc.

Recommendation 3: Discussions should be organized to understand and identify the best possible mechanisms for ensuring information flow and transparency.

Recommendation 4: Based on state educational standards, develop flexible learning outcomes and adopted methods for assessing learning outcomes of individual curricula of SEN children.

Recommendation 5: Improvement of teaching methods should become a strategic priority: mechanisms should be developed for promoting collaborative teaching.

Recommendations 6: Develop training packages based on teacher needs assessment and build up 3-tier training scheme.

> In 1st phase teachers get generic exposure to inclusive education, its main underlying concepts, roles and responsibilities, implementation practices and alike. This training should be the same for all – subject teachers and support team. Second tier is specific methodological trainings for subject teachers and support team members in accordance with their qualifications. For example, a teacher of mathematics should learn the exact tools, which s/he needs for addressing the exact needs of children in a classroom. Special psychologist, who supposedly should already have the relevant background qualification, should receive training on the latest international developments in the field. And finally, the 3rd tier of trainings should include very mobile and flexible topics related to specific educational needs. These trainings should be short and precise one-day workshops, which could be organized at schools by training organizations.

Recommendation 7: Pedagogical institutions need to be prioritized and subsidized. State should consider subsidizing pedagogical institutions for the following purposes and reasons:

1. Graduates of all qualifications should be properly trained professionals to enter an inclusive classroom without an additional training. For this reason curricula should be reviewed and inclusive education related courses should be developed and added. Course development requires funding and this is the room where state funding will be extremely important. Still, this expense will be cost effective as, in the long run, state will save on additional trainings.
2. Considering that the faculty of special education is supposed to fill the shortage of human resources for support teams and teacher assistants, the faculty should become attractive for applicants. Attractiveness can be raised by waiving the tuition fee and probably even providing merit-based scholarship. This can be possible only with state subsidies, and given the priority of the reform, it would be rational for the budget to define that priority as well.

Recommendation 8: International organizations should consider allocating resources for supporting the state in providing trainings.

Recommendation 9: Funding may be a decisive factor in achieving inclusion. Considering that special schools will be closed, additional resources would be available for funding the inclusive education. Based on various studies it is clear that decentralized financing (Resource-based) model is likely to be more cost-effective and provide fewer opportunities for undesirable forms of hindering integrity.

To sum up, it is important to highlight that introduction of inclusive education into the Armenian educational discourse back in 2001 was a tremendous achievement. It is rather encouraging that children with special educational needs have started to attend mainstream education schools. However, we have to be extremely careful not to worsen the educational prospective of disadvantaged communities. The Government, international organizations, local NGOs and INGOs, as well as experts and professionals related to the implementation of inclusive education have failed so far to create a genuine discourse which would promote inclusiveness and would value diversity. Besides this framework, quality of inclusion has received less attention: in the long run poor quality of inclusive education will have adverse effects on inclusion. Therefore, current reform should address quality from strategic perspective. Finally, there is a core of experts, teachers and professionals of inclusive education who are not only knowledgeable and experienced, but also passionate about reforming the field to its best performance. Thus, efforts should be combined make the current reform of inclusive education a success and not a fiasco that reforms in our country usually experience.

Advocacy action plan (draft)

The final action plan for advocacy plans will be developed after closed discussions with immediate reform implementers. Below is the initial draft.
1. Organize closed discussions to validate policy concerns, but most importantly, understand who can possibly support us during advocacy.
2. Hold discussions to understand how information flow can be ensured. Possible options:

a. Regular staff meetings should be organized to share information on activities and experience gained at grassroots level (teachers).
   b. This information should be communicated to higher administrative level of the school and the educational system.
   c. Staff exchange could be a method for practice sharing
3. Use the platform of Institute of Public Policy (IPP) for trying to change the discourse.
4. Work with Yerevan State Pedagogical University for making state subsidizing a reality:
   a. Develop a strategy and calculate costs;
   b. Help the University to find funding for curricula review and development;
   c. Discuss the subsidizing possibilities with RA Government.
5. Work with Anahit Bakhshyan for impacting the training reform – development of new training package.

Bibliography

1. Amanda Watkins, Verity Donnelly. " Core Values as the Basis for Teacher Education for Inclusion ." *Global Education Review* 1, no. 1 (2014): 76-92.

2. Center for educational research and consulting. *An Assessment of Implementation of Inclusive Education in the Republic of Armenia.* Yerevan: Open Society Fouondations - Armenia, 2013.

3. Cuncil of Europe Committee of Ministers. "Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers on the Council of Europe Action Plan to promote the rights and full participation of people with disabilities in society." April 5, 2006. http://www.coe.int/t/e/social_cohesion/soc-sp/Rec_2006_5%20Disability%20Action%20Plan.pdf (accessed October 20, 2014).

4. Dr Joseph Travers, Tish Balfe, Dr Cathal Butler, Dr Thérèse Day Maeve Dupont, Dr Rory McDaid, Dr Margaret O'Donnell, Dr Anita Prunty. "Addressing the Challenges and Barriers to Inclusion in Irish Schools." *Special Education Department St Patrick's College.* 2010. https://www.spd.dcu.ie/site/edc/documents/StPatricksCollegeSENReport2010.pdf (accessed October 23, 2014).

5. Dr. Charles Malik (Lebanon), Alexandre Bogomolov (USSR), Dr. Peng-chun Chang (China), René Cassin (France), Eleanor Roosevelt (US), Charles Dukes (United Kingdom), William Hodgson (Australia), Hernan Santa Cruz (Chile), John P. Humphrey (Canada). "THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS." *United Nations.* 1946. http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml#a26 (accessed May 24, 2014).

6. European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. "Development of a set of indicators for inclusive education in Europe. ." Odense, 2009.

7. European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education. "Special Needs Education in Europe ." Denmark, 2003.

8. Government of the Republic of Armenia. "Government Decree on the Approval of the List of Teachers of general Education Schools." *Ministry of Education and Science.* October 14, 2010. http://www.edu.am/DownloadFile/4110arm-Havelvacatestavorum.pdf (accessed October 28, 2014).

9. Harutyunyan, Anna, interview by Arevik Anapiosyan. *UNICEF* (September 2014).

10. HUNT, PAULA FREDERICA. *Evaluation of Inclusive Education Policies and Programmes in Armenia.* Yerevan: UNICEF Armenia, 2009.

11. Idol, L. "Toward inclusion of special education students in general education." *Remedial & Special Education* 27, no. 2 (2006): 77-94.

12. Inclusion International. *Better Education for All: When We're Included Too .* A Global Report , Salamanca: Instituto Universitario de Integración en la Comunidad , 2009.

13. John MacBeath, Maurice Galton, Susan Steward, Andrea MacBeath and Charlotte Page. *The Costs of Inclusion.* Cambridge: University of Cambridge Faculty of Education.

14. Mel Ainscow, Tony Booth and Alan Dyson. *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion.* New York: Routledge, 2006.

15. Michael Shevlin, Hugh Kearns, Michele Ranaghan, Miriam Twomey, Ron Smith and Eileen Winter. "Creating inclusive learning environments in Irish schools: Teacher perspectives." 2009.

16. Nochajski, Susan M. "Collaboration Between Team Members in Inclusive Educational Settings." *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*, 2002: 101-112.

17. Ovidiu Mantaluta, Nino Rukhadze. "Economic Model Cost-Satisfaction In Inclusive Education. Based On Research Made In Georgia." *Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods* 3, no. 4 (2008).

18. Peters, Susan J. *Inclusive Education: An EFA Strategy For All Children.* World Bank, 2004.

19. RA Ministry of Finance. "2007-2009 Medium–Term Public Expenditure Framework." 2010.

20. Rangasayee, Amitav Mishraand R. "Development Of ICF Based Measuring Tool For Inclusive Education Set-Ups." *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal* 21, no. 2 (2010).

21. Republic of Armenia Ministry of Education and Science. "Implementation of Inclusive Education." Order, Yerevan, 2010.

22. UNESCO. "Convention against Discrimination in Education." December 14, 1960. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001325/132598e.pdf (accessed May 24, 2014).

23. UNESCO. *EFA Global Monitoring Report.* Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2013/4, 214-229.

24. UNESCO. *EFA Global Monitoring Report. The Quality Imperative.* Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2004, 35-37.

25. UNESCO. *Policy Guidelines on Inclusive Education .* Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2009.

26. UNESCO. *World Declaration of Education For All.* Jomtein, Thailand: UNESCO, 1990.
27. UNICEF. *The right of children with disabilities to education: A rights-based approach to Inclusive Education.* Geneva:: UNICEF Regional Office for Central and Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, 2012.

28. UNICEF. *The Right of Children with Disabilities to Education: A Rights-Based Approach to Inclusive Education, .* Paris: UNICEF, 2012.

29. United Nations. "Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities." *UN Enable - Work of the United Nations for Persons with Dhttp://www.un.org/disabilities/convention/conventionfull.shtmlissabilities.* December 13, 2006. (accessed May 24, 2014).

30. —. "Convention on the Rights of the Child." *Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.* November 20, 1989. http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/crc.aspx (accessed May 24, 2014).

31. —. "International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination." December 21, 1965. http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx (accessed May 24, 2014).

32. —. "International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights." December 16, 1966. http://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx (accessed May 24, 2014).

33. —. "Second periodic reports of States parties: Armenia." *UN Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.* September 9, 1999. http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/233/17/PDF/N0023317.pdf?OpenElement (accessed May 24, 2014).

34. —. "UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women." *United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women.* December 18, 1979. http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/econvention.htm#article14 (accessed May 24, 2014).

35. World Bank. "World Development Indicators." 2013.

36. World Conference on Special Needs Education. *The Salamanca Statement and the Framework for Action.* Salamanca: UNESCO, 1994.

37. World Education Forum. *Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments.* Dakar: UNESCO, 2000.

38. Yesayan, Vergine ́, interview by Arevik Anapiosyan. *Deputy Director of the Assessment Centre* Yerevan, (July 2014).

Appendix 1

Մարզ	Դպրոց
Երևան	1. Երևանի Հ. կարապենցի անվան համար 6 դպրոց,
	2. Երևանի Մ. մելքոնյանի անվան համար 11 դպրոց,
	3. Երևանի համար17 դպրոց,
	4. Երևանի Ալ. Շրիվանզադեի անվան համար 21դպրոց
	5. Երևանի Դ. Դեմիրճյանի անվան համար 27 դպրոց
	6. Երևանի Մ. Նալբանդյանի անվան համար 33 դպրոց,
	7. Երևանի Վահան Տերյանի անվան համար 60 դպրոց,
	8. Երևանի Ղ. Աղայանի անվան համար 63 դպրոց,
	9. Երևանի համար 100 հիմնական դպրոց,
	10. Երևանի Գայի անվան համար 129 դպրոց
	11. Երևանի Գ. Ստեփանյանի անվան համար 135 դպրոց
	12. Երևանի Սմբատ Բյուրատի անվան համար 125 դպրոց
	13. Երևանի համար 150 հիմնական դպրոց
	14. Երևանի համար 160 դպրոց
	15. Երևանի Սիամանթոյի անվան համար 162 դպրոց
	16. Երևանի Վազգեն Առաջինի անվան համար 168 դպրոց
	17. Երևանի Ա. Նավասարդյանի անվան համար 196 դպրոց
	18. Երևանի համար 197 դպրոց
	19. Երևանի համար 200 դպրոց
Շիրակ	20. Թիվ 7 դրպոց
	21. Թիվ 45 դրպոց
	22. Թիվ 1 դրպոց
	23. Թիվ 40 դրպոց
	24. Թիվ 38 դրպոց
Գեղարքունիք	25. Սևանի դպրոց
	26. Ճամբարակի դպրոց
Արարատի մարզ	27. Արտաշատի համար 1 դպրոց
	28. Նոր Խարբերդի համար 2 դպրոց

Appendix 2

List of main documents studied for the research purposes

Organization	Document
1. Council of Europe	*Recommendation of the Committee of Ministers on the Council of Europe Action Plan to promote the rights and full participation of people with disabilities in society*
2. UNESCO	*Convention against Discrimination in Education*
3. UNESCO	*EFA Global Monitoring Report 2013/4*
4. UNESCO	*EFA Global Monitoring Report. The Quality Imperative 2004*
5. UNESCO	*Policy Guidelines on Inclusive Education*
6. UNESCO	*World Declaration of Education For All 1990*
7. UNESCO	*The Salamanca Statement and the Framework for Action*
8. UNESCO	*Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments 2000*
9. United Nations	*Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*
10. United Nations	*Convention on the Rights of the Child*
11. United Nations	*International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*
12. United Nations	*International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*
13. United Nations	*Second periodic reports of States parties: Armenia*
14. United Nations	*UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*
15. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքը Կրթության մասին*
16. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքը Հանրակրթության մասին*
17. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքը Կրթության առանձնահատուկ պայմանների կարիք ունեցող անձանց կրթության մասին*
18. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքը Հաշմանդամություն ունեցող անձանց իրավունքների պաշտպանության եվ սոցիալական ներառման մասին*
19. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքը Երեխայի իրավունքների մասին*
20. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքի նախագիծը Հանրակրթության մասին ՀՀ օրենքում լրացումներ և փոփոխություններ կատարելու մասին (առաջին և երկրորդ ընթերցման տեքստեր)*
21. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Օրենքի նախագիծը Կրթության մասին ՀՀ օրենքում լրացումներ և փոփոխություններ կատարելու մասին մասին (առաջին և երկրորդ ընթերցման տեքստեր)*
22. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Հատուկ Հանրակրթական Ուսումնական Հաստատություններ» Պետական Ոչ Առևտրային Կազմակերպությունների Եվ Հանրակրթական Դպրոցներում Կրթության Առանձնահատուկ Պայմանների Կարիք Ունեցող Երեխաների Կրթության Կազմակերպման Համար Անհրաժեշտ Ֆինանսավորման Կարգ*
23. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*Կրթության Առանձնահատուկ Պայմանների Կարիք Ունեցող Երեխաների Կրթությունը Կազմակերպող Մանկավարժների Աշխատանքի Վարձատրության Արտոնյալ Պայմանների Հաշվարկման Կարգ*
24. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*Հայաստանի Հանրապետության Ընդհանուր Օրագրեր Իրականացնող Հանրակրթական Ուսումնական Հաստատության Մանկավարժական Աշխատողների Պաշտոնների Անվանացանկ*
25. ՀՀ կառավարություն	*ՀՀ Տավուշի Մարզի Հանրակրթական Դպրոցներում Կրթության Առանձնահատուկ Պայմանների Կարիք Ունեցող Երեխաների Կրթության Կազմակերպման Համար Անհրաժեշտ Ֆինանսավորման*

		Փորձնական Կարգ
26.	ՀՀ Կրթության և Գիտության Նախարարություն	*Ներառական Կրթություն Իրականացնելու Կարգ*
27.	ՀՀ Կրթության և Գիտության Նախարարություն	Հանրակրթության Ոլորտի Բարեփոխումների Հայեցակարգ
28.	ՀՀ Կրթության և Գիտության Նախարարություն	Հայաստանի Հանրապետության Կրթության և Գիտության Նախարարության Հաղորդակցության Ռազմավարությունը /2011-2015թթ./
29.	ՀՀ Կրթության և Գիտության Նախարարություն	Նախադպրոցական Կրթության Բարեփոխումների 2008-2015 Թվականների Ռազմավարական Ծրագիր
30.	ՀՀ Կրթության և Գիտության Նախարարություն և ՀՀ Աշխատանքի և Սոցիալական Հարցերի Նախարարություն	*Սոցիալական Կարիքների Գնահատման Կարգ*

List of interviewees

Organization	Interviewee	Date
1. UNICEF	Mery Poghosyan	June 2014
2. UNICEF	Anna Harytyunyan	24 September, 2014
3. Bridge of Hope	Susanna Tadevosyan	May 2014
4. National Institute of Education	Anahit Bakhshyan	June 2014
5. Assessment Centre	Vergine՛ Yesayan	July 2014
6. Ministry of Education and Science	Department of Mainstream Education	June 2014
7. Ministry of Education and Science	Financial Department	June 2014
8. Ministry of Finance		June 2014
9. Municipality of Yerevan	Tigran Igityan	June 2014
10. Yerevan State Pedagogical University	Mher Melik-Bakhshyan	June 2014
11. Yerevan State Pedagogical University	Armenouhi Avagyan	June 2014
12. Inclusive school N 100	School principal	May 2014
13. Inclusive school N 100	Coordinator of educational issues	May 2014