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### List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DPOs</td>
<td>Disabled people's organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Inclusive Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNE</td>
<td>Special needs education (sometimes written as SEN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCRPD</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Washington Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Background

1.1 Aims and rationale for review
The aim of this systematic review is to identify efforts made to evaluate the educational initiatives and delivery mechanisms of education for children with disabilities and look at the impact in terms of completion of school, participation and social change. The review question is very broad and complex, given that education for children with disabilities is influenced by a very different set of factors in developing and developed countries, and as a result, follows very diverse policies and outcomes. In order to try and provide useful policy guidance to donors as well as other potential users of this review, the protocol attempts to outline a framework that will allow a mapping of a very diverse body of work, and thus lead to an accurate scoping of the existing evidence and present future avenues for further research.

1.2 Definitional and conceptual issues
A battery of international conventions and frameworks\(^1\)\(^2\) have contributed to the definition of the policy arena of education in general, and for children with disabilities in particular - though national legislations and policy play a major role in shaping what education of children with disabilities looks like in each country.

Most stress the fact that the principles for teaching children with disabilities are the same as those for all students and rely on programmes design at the very onset. In practice, however, the policies and implementation of educational programmes have to tackle very diverse factors. In developed (higher income) countries, ‘education of children with disabilities’ relates to very different realities compared to developing (low and middle income) countries where chronic poverty, conflict, political instability and a consistent lack of resources often relegates disability to the sidelines of mainstream programmes. In some countries, particularly the United States, United Kingdom, Australia, and some European countries, public policies have been addressing these issues for decades and have the resources to pursue a coherent learning process. In some countries, international conventions, paired with local initiatives, have led to improvements and increased enrolment and retention rates for children with disabilities. This is not always the case. This is evidenced in the lack of evaluations of the impact of educational approaches, which seem unable to move beyond considerations of physical access/non-access and rates of attendance/non-attendance. As a consequence, despite laudable intentions, education continues to be regarded merely as a service to be delivered, rather then a right. Therefore in practice, the notion of inclusion and equity become secondary to service delivery. As a result, access - which only constitutes the first step - is often perceived as the objective of education programmes for disabled children.

1.2.1 DISABILITY: an evolving concept
Current debates around what constitutes a ‘disability’ reflect how broad or narrow the term can be. However, it is crucial to understand the various means of defining the concept, and to choose a working definition for this review. The concept of disability is shaped by cultural and social understandings, and more recently by political and rights-based inputs from civil society, in particular disabled people’s organisations (DPOs). There are also a range of international conventions and frameworks that seek to promote the human rights, inclusion and mainstreaming of persons with a wide range of

---

\(^1\) UNESCO (1994), The Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Needs Education Salamanca, Spain, 7-10 June
\(^2\) UNESCO (2010), Education For All, Global Monitoring Report: “Reaching the Marginalized”
impairments. This systematic review will mainly refer to the definition of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD 2008), which, besides being the most universal (through the adhesion of 153 countries that are signatories to date), goes beyond the medical approach to cover the social model and the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF). Article One states:

“Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.”

The Convention shifts away from more traditional definitions of disability, namely the medical model and the social model. The medical model focuses on the individuals impairment as a physical or mental ‘problem’ that a person has; while the social model puts forward the argument that persons are ‘disabled’ because of the structure of the society in which they live, which does not accommodate their impairment - they are disabled by the physical, social and attitudinal environments surrounding them.

However, a large majority of researchers, activists, policy makers and practitioners have agreed on the need to move beyond this dichotomous approach to look at the interaction between an individual impairment and the social barriers that lead to a disabling situation. The WHO International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (ICF) aims to provide guidelines for collecting data and other information by looking at disability as a combination of individual, institutional and societal factors that define the environment within which a person with impairment lives. In the ICF, the term ‘functioning’ refers to all the “body functions, activities and participation, while disability is similarly an umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions”. In line with this, the recent World Report on Disability (2011), uses the ICF as its conceptual framework. This definition:

“...understands functioning and disability as a dynamic interaction between health conditions and contextual factors, both personal and environmental Promoted as a “bio-psycho-social model”, it represents a workable compromise between medical and social models. Disability is the umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations and participation restrictions, referring to the negative aspects of the interaction between an individual (with a health condition) and that individual’s contextual factors (environmental and personal factors)” (WHO/World Bank 2011: 4)

Another approach, though not specific to the field of disability but more prominent in the field of human development, is Amatya Sen’s Capability Approach (CA). This approach has gained importance for designing programmes and even more so for assessing impact as it focuses not solely on what a person actually does (functioning) but the range of possibilities that he/she chooses that specific functioning from - the capabilities set (Sen A., 1999). The implications of the Capabilities Approach for the field of disability are wide-ranging. Firstly, rather than trying to ‘label’ a person as disabled of not, it focuses on whether a given impairment leads to vulnerability and difficulty in functioning; secondly, it has the potential to look at the impact of disability on the family and community (in terms of coping strategies, resources and burden) which is crucial in developing countries; thirdly, it focuses on the agency of the person, to take the decisions that s/he has reason to value.

---

3 International Classification of functioning, disability and health, WHO, 2001
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Although these theoretical frameworks and conventions have helped move forward the ways in which disability is understood, they do not provide tangible ways of measurement. The main problem in the field of measuring and assessment is that there is no clear universal agreement on the definition of what constitutes a disability. As a result, prevalence rates (e.g. in national census) can vary enormously, making comparability impossible. To bridge this gap, a global group of experts - known as the Washington Group (WG) - was set up in 2001 to establish an international standard for measurement of disability which can be used in census, and allow national relevance and international comparisons. The WG has defined a set of question, similar to the ICF, that attempt to determine activity and participation limitations, and look not just at the type of disability but the intensity or degree of limitation within a given social, cultural and economic context. However, there is no internationally agreed consensus about his, and as a result a number of national censuses continue to screen disability through very limited criteria (for example, the India Census 2011).

1.2.2 EDUCATION
In the past two decades, understanding of education has moved from programmes that focus on functional literacy towards quality education that makes a real difference in the lives of children and adults. However, despite the considerable amount of funding being made available for education programmes for children with disabilities, evidence of tangible results is still rare.

Article 24 (Education) of the UNCRPD states that:

“States Parties recognize the right of persons with disabilities to education. With a view to realizing this right without discrimination and on the basis of equal opportunity, States Parties shall ensure an inclusive education system at all levels and lifelong learning directed to: (a) The full development of human potential and sense of dignity and self-worth, and the strengthening of respect for human rights, fundamental freedoms and human diversity; (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; (c) Enabling persons with disabilities to participate effectively in a free society”.

More specifically, the Convention lays the five grounding principles for the realization of this right:

“...States Parties shall ensure that: (a) Persons with disabilities are not excluded from the general education system on the basis of disability, and that children with disabilities are not excluded from free and compulsory primary education, or from secondary education, on the basis of disability; (b) Persons with disabilities can access an inclusive, quality and free primary education and secondary education on an equal basis with others in the communities in which they live; (c) Reasonable accommodation of the individual’s requirements is provided; (d) Persons with disabilities receive the support required, within the general education system, to facilitate their effective education; (e) Effective individualized support measures are provided in environments that maximize academic and social development, consistent with the goal of full inclusion”. (Article 24)

The UNCRC recognises the contribution of various educational approaches to meet the very diverse needs of children with different types and levels of disabilities, including the importance of ‘social integration’, with reference to social responsibilities. The importance of access to all basic services for children with disabilities is also promoted, as well as respect for differences. The need to develop a child’s ‘active participation’ is also encouraged. These principles - social inclusion, access and participation - form the basis of what our review will look for in terms of impact and outcomes of programmes and policies.
1.2.3 ACCESSIBILITY: a broader view than mere presence in class

The notion of access encompasses a myriad of factors, which are directly or indirectly linked to the education process. These include physical accessibility (including transport, building access, water and sanitation) as well as genuinely inclusive modes of learning that can be adapted to the needs of the child; the ability of teachers and school staff to adapt information and processes; attitudes of children, parents of children as well as communities and decision makers; beliefs of the family; and policies/state incentives that encourage social inclusion and cohesion. However, often - especially in developing and fragile contexts - the inability to overcome crucial challenges is reflected in the fact that programming and evaluation seems unable to move beyond considerations of physical access/non-access and attendance/non-attendance. Access also requires a change in perceptions and attitudes that are prevalent within a given community, towards children with disabilities. This review will attempt to consider ‘access’ within this broad definition paying specific attention to factors that both enable and maintain access.

1.2.4 Impact and Cost-effectiveness

Impact Evaluation has been “defined (...) as analyses that measure the net change in outcomes for a particular group of people that can be attributed to a specific program using the best methodology available, feasible and appropriate to the evaluation question that is being investigated and to the specific context”\(^7\). For our review we will retain items that clearly state an educational intervention (policy, programme, or project); specify an specific methodology (qualitative or quantitative; and refer to specific educational outcomes (numeric or qualitative).

1.3 Policy and practice background

The main aim of this review is to map the evidence available to understand the impact of projects, programmes and policies that claim to improve accessibility of children with disabilities into education.

1.3.1 Education for children with disabilities

There are a number of approaches that aim to enable children with disabilities by promoting access education. These vary according to country, context, funding available, policy and legislations. We outline the key approaches as used in the review.

Inclusive Education (IE)

Inclusive education promotes the inclusion of children with disabilities within formal mainstream school systems, beyond just as making room for children with disabilities but by truly ensuring that all elements are in place to ensure that they benefit from learning and realize their potential. The Enabling Education Network (EENET) defines IE as a process that: acknowledges that all children can learn; acknowledges and respects differences (age, gender, ethnicity, language, disability, HIV status, etc); enables education structures, systems and methodologies to meet the needs of all children; is part of a wider strategy to promote an inclusive society; is a dynamic process which is constantly evolving; need not be restricted by large class sizes or shortage of material resources\(^8\). However, IE programmes struggle between these theoretical expectation and practical realities. Certain definitions attempt to reconcile these two aspects by introducing nuances in the definitions. According to UNESCO:

---
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“Inclusive education is a system of education in which all the pupils with special educational needs are enrolled in ordinary classes in their district schools, and are provided with support services and an education based on their forces and needs. Inclusive schools are based on the basic principle that all schoolchildren in a given community should learn together, so far as is practicable, regardless of their handicaps or difficulties. They should recognize and take into account the diverse needs of their pupils, adapt to different styles and rhythm of teaching and provide quality education through the appropriate use of resources, school organisation and study plans as well as partnership with the community. There is need to ensure that the services provided correspond exactly to the special needs, regardless of their grades.”

Despite the difficulties faced with implementation, with its strong grounding in human rights IE constitutes a relevant policy and advocacy tool. It brings issues related to social cohesion and justice into sharp focus and constitutes a major impetus for more efficiently addressing the needs of children with disabilities, especially in formal education settings. However, as may be clear from the definitions given above, the concept remains unclear at the theoretical level, which results in difficulties in implementing coherent and sustainable programmes. Many developing countries have initiated mechanisms to ensure that children with disabilities are included in mainstream education programmes; however, this has not been universally successful, and schools do not always mainstream all impairment groups. This leads to a ‘hierarchy of the excluded’, with some impairment groups being further marginalised and excluded. Furthermore, initiatives that are sometimes well-defined at the policy level are often ineffectively implemented due to a myriad of reasons, including lack of resources, teacher training and expectations, and expertise, as well as persistence of negative social attitudes leading to discrimination and exclusion. As a result, IE programmes have often been reduce to simply having children with disabilities present in class, rather than genuinely included and learning. Finally, one of the main challenges of IE today is that in it attempts to reach out to all vulnerable groups (including for example, children with HIV and transient populations), there is a risk that the framework may lead to children with disabilities, and children with non-physical disabilities such as hearing impairments or intellectual disabilities in particular, not having their specific needs addressed.

Special Education Needs (SEN)

Often used as an umbrella term, within countries, SEN usually has a specific legal definition as it has implications for provision and access to education for children defined as having such needs. SEN is also closely related to definitions of disabilities within a given context, and the welfare schemes and policies that are in place for such provisions.

The OECD notes: “those with special educational needs are defined by the additional public and/or private resources provided to support their education. The use of this definition in a consistent manner calls for agreement about the term “additional” and an appreciation of the various kinds of possible “resources provided” which should be considered.”

SEN has been the major framework by which many educational programmes have been designed over the past few decades. It was based on the assumptions that persons with

---


disabilities, especially children, have very precise needs which can only be met in specialised and usually segregated settings. It is therefore essential to gauge the effectiveness of SEN, as it is argued that is of value for children with certain types of disabilities (e.g. autism) who require specific expertise. On the other hand, where resources are more restricted, there are limitations to these separate structures: they are not cost-efficient, can change along with political priorities and hold a view of disability that is rigid and sometimes out-dated.15 Moreover, these programmes maintain segregation between children and are not always in line with a rights-based perspective.

**Integrated Education**

This term is used to refer to a variety of educational systems in different countries; in the field of disability, some countries (for example, India) offer integrated special needs classes for children with severe impairments within formal systems.16 These are segregated units within mainstream schools, though all children interact outside the classroom. This can be a first step towards increasing visibility of children with disabilities, but to date there is limited evidence on its effectiveness as an approach.

**Non-Formal Education and Informal Education: outside the classroom**

Finally, while most of the literature concentrates on classroom-based education, education for children with disabilities not in school, and for adolescents and adults who were not able to attend school is an area of interest. UNESCO defines non-formal education as ‘any organized and sustained educational activities that do not correspond exactly to the above definition of formal education. Non-formal education may therefore take place both within and outside educational institutions, and cater to persons of all ages. Depending on country contexts, it may cover educational programmes to impart adult literacy, basic education for out-of-school children, life-skills, work-skills, and general culture. Non-formal education programmes do not necessarily follow the ‘ladder’ system, and may have differing duration.”17

Studies of non-formal and informal education that will only be included in the review if they fit the inclusion criteria defined below.

**Home-based education**

There are a number of countries where parents opt for home-based education (or home schooling) for children with disabilities. In developing country contexts, a number of home-based interventions that include education are carried out through community based rehabilitation programmes by various organizations. Studies that pertain to these types of intervention will be included in the review.18

**Adult Education**

A recent review of illiteracy among disabled adults undertaken by the LCDIDC19 makes us keenly aware of, and familiar with, the limited literature regarding education for persons with disabilities outside the classroom that should be a component of this Systematic Review. However as we are focusing on children between the ages of 4 – 18 years old, literature on this subject will be excluded from the review.

We will also focus on primary school and above and not early years education or pre-school education. The articles selected for the review will therefore encompass those that focus on formal education (defined as that either following a nationally prescribed curriculum or within a system which gets government funding, including mainstream

---

16 In Northern Ireland, the term ‘integrated education’ is used to refer to the movement to educate Protestant and Catholic children, who have traditionally been segregated, together. See for example: [http://www.ief.org.uk/site/Home.aspx](http://www.ief.org.uk/site/Home.aspx)
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1.3.2 Impact and cost-effectiveness

Cost effectiveness remains a major concern for policy makers and development actors working in the international arena. It is increasingly argued that the cost of IE structures is more effective when compared with SEN structures. However, in contexts where the groundwork for inclusion has not been laid and where education structures are overburdened and understaffed, the cost of including children with disabilities may be higher. Although cost-effectiveness analyses in these contexts are often included in programme evaluations, this often equates to an estimation of cost per number of beneficiaries per programmes, rather than cost-effectiveness. Analysis of cost effectiveness uses various resources in order to define the best means of achieving an impact through a defined action. Our search strategy will identify cost-benefit studies which focus on the financial resources and establish costs per head, for instance, as well as any broader economic benefits of inclusion.

We will take into account two aspects of impact in order to include studies and reports:

a) Studies and surveys that have attempted to assess the results of a given programme/policy. Specific care will be taken to ensure that only the documents that attribute change (positive or negative) or an educational outcome to an identified policy or programme intervention for education of children with disabilities are analysed. Critical appraisal will allow for inclusion of documents that analyse any probable or potential impact of programmes where it is difficult to ascribe an affect directly to an intervention.

b) Documents that provide theoretical and methodological discussions pertaining to carrying out impact evaluations may also be included in the review. These will be considered in terms of their relevance towards policy definition.

1.4 Research background

Since the Salamanca Conference (1994); coming into force of the UNCRDP (2008) and the UNESCO-Education For All (EFA) framework that has been prominent since 2000, issues of accessibility to education have been brought into sharp focus. However, education of children with disabilities has not yet attained the universal levels desired, due to various theoretical and practical concerns, in particular around programme implementation and assessment. These concerns stem from the lack of a coherent view of what constitutes access to education and what works best within which to conceive initiatives. As a result, education of children with disabilities refers to glaringly different realities in high-income countries in comparison to low and middle-income countries or fragile states. The aim of this review is to provide information regarding the impact of education for children with disabilities in the development field where policy makers will need to address some crucial over-arching questions. The focus of this review is to primarily understand how these concepts are now being understood and utilized, and how their impact is being evaluated.

1.4.1 Disability: moving beyond the labels?

The process of labelling who should be included is a political one, which inevitably leads to certain - often the most stigmatised sections of society - being left aside (Eyben &
Moncrieffe 2006). Labelling is also a way of simplifying the approach to programming for humanitarian and development actors who often do not have the resources to adequately evaluate appropriately the needs of the population they are targeting. It is undeniable that in certain contexts (mostly high-income countries), policies are moving from a very restricted view of impairments to take into account conditions that may lead to long or short-term disability. As a result, social policies are not inherently linked to prevalence rates and there are attempts to set up mechanisms that cut across the various ministries to address the needs and requirements of persons with disabilities in an more comprehensive manner. In other contexts, where resources are often more limited, social policies are defined in terms of who and how many the disabled are: prevalence rates are then paramount and definitions of disabilities are often based on restricted models, viewing this as a permanent state and focussing mainly on forms of disabilities that are socially and culturally more accepted and thus more visible.

1.4.2 Output-Outcomes-Impact

This inability to overcome certain crucial challenges is reflected in the fact that current evaluations of education for children with disabilities are overly focussed on considerations of access/non-access and attendance/non-attendance. As a consequence, despite theoretical advances and policy breakthroughs, education continues to be a service to be delivered. Access, which only constitutes a first step, therefore is often perceived as the objective of educational programmes for children with disabilities. What are the efforts made to look at processes, delivery and even completion of school? Beyond this, are there any attempts to assess qualitative outcomes and impact in terms of social change?

1.4.3 Previous systematic reviews

Recent reviews that have been carried out with regards to education of children with disabilities have been more limited in the research questions than the present review in that they have had a:

- Focus on certain forms of disabilities;
- Focus on a certain approach of education (i.e.: inclusive education);
- Focus on certain types of intervention within schools.

Our screening of documents will include the scrutiny of the various systematic reviews that have been carried out since 2000. Our report will summarize the findings of these reviews in order to complement our findings.

1.5 Purpose and rational for review

Increasing accessibility to education for children with disabilities is a complex amalgam of theoretical, developmental and human rights issues, and calls for a series of interventions in terms of policy design, service delivery and programming. A variety of international Conventions and frameworks have contributed to shaping the policy arena of education in general and for disabled children in particular. However, there is a need to understand what these various initiatives have achieved, and identify the gaps that exist within the body of knowledge pertaining to this field of work. This systematic review will tackle interconnected concerns in order to provide a comprehensive picture of the impact of interventions by:
1. Mapping the evidence base relating to the impact of education programmes for children with disabilities;

2. Synthesizing research that evaluates the impact of education initiatives for children with disabilities;

3. Systematically identifying knowledge gaps in this evidence base that hinder policy planning;

4. Providing a systematic synthesis of cost-effectiveness studies that have been carried out over the last decade for education programmes for children with disabilities.

1.6 Authors, funders, and other users of the review

The conclusions drawn by this review will have relevance for donors, practitioners as well as researchers. There is a paucity of research on the impact or effectiveness of interventions within the disability arena, and education in particular. This is despite the variety of interventions used in different countries and contexts (outlined above). The review is also timely in so far as the UNCRPD calls for improved data on disability globally; a call reflected by a shift in donor policies and practices to be more inclusive, in particular the UK Department for International Development and AUSaid.

Authors

The LCDIDC has a proven track record of analysing complex disability issues. Its strategic position between academia (UCL) and NGO (LCD) reflects commitment to bridge the gap between knowledge and practice. As a result it can draw upon a range of experts, researchers and implementers worldwide.

- Parul Bakhshi, lead reviewer, a social psychologist, specialises in education programmes for persons with disabilities. She has conducted systematic reviews on questions of adult literacy programmes and mental health for LCDIDC. She has also carried out evaluations and assessments of education programmes for Save the Children-UK, as well as for UNICEF.

- Dr Maria Kett, co-PI, has undertaken a range of policy-linked, qualitative, action-based reviews that analyse the social and political implications of policies for marginalised and excluded groups. She has also worked on access to education for children with disabilities in humanitarian contexts.

Ms Kathryn Oliver, University of Manchester is an expert on systematic reviews and has experience of working on other reviews and with the EPPI Centre.

Review Group Members

- Prof Nora Groce (LCD) has undertaken systematic reviews on disabled adolescents, women and violence against disabled children for UNICEF, the UN Secretary General’s Office and the WHO.

- Dr Ray Lang (LCD) has an extensive experience in comprehensive review of disability policies. He has carried reviews on disability policies and CBR.

Professor Tony Booth, University of Canterbury
Shari Krishnaratne Evaluation Officer, 3ie
Sunanda Mavillapalli, inclusive education expert, Leonard Cheshire Disability
1 Background

Funders
This review is funded by AusAid, the Australian government international development department.

Other Users of the review
It is anticipated that this review will have relevance to policy makers, practitioner and academics.

1.7 Review questions and approach

Initial Review Question:
What are the impacts of measures to increase the accessibility to education for children with a disability across developed and developing countries and what is known about the cost effectiveness of different approaches?

Revised Review Question
What are the impacts of approaches to increase the accessibility to education for children with a disability across developed and developing countries and what is known about the cost effectiveness of different approaches?

Supporting concerns that will frame the systematic review:

• What educational initiatives have been studied in terms of their impact on children with disabilities aged 4-18 years over the last ten years?
• At what levels are these initiatives being implemented (e.g. primary, secondary)?
• What are the findings of these studies in terms of educational outcomes of children with disabilities?
• What is the evidence on cost-effectiveness for inclusive education, SEN, informal education and integrated education for children with disabilities? Could the money be better spent?
• What is the evidence of acceptability of these approaches by children, parents/carers and the community?
• What do these findings imply in terms of future interventions of the same type?

1.7.1 Specifying the scope of the question

Include broad definitions of disability
We will refer to the broader definition of disability that includes not only impairments but also look at a range of difficulties that require educational support in order to ensure that children are included with education systems. We will therefore follow the broad definition in the UNCRPD: “(...) Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.” (Article 1 UNCRPD 2006)

Focus on Education of children
This systematic review will focus on formal education delivered through school-based settings in order to be comprehensive. Furthermore, we will only include documents that refer to education of children aged between 4 and 18 years, as defined by international
conventions and frameworks (e.g. UN Convention on the Rights of the Child). Consequently, this review will not include education and literacy of adults, nor pre-school and early education interventions.

**Various types of intervention - Different impacts**

The review will include a range from international frameworks, national or regional policies, large-scale programmes or specific projects, large or small. However, in order to assess an impact, we require that the type of intervention is clear within the body of work considered.

In line with this, articles and papers will be screened for type of research that allows the assessment of the impact. Here we include a wide range of research methodologies: quantitative and qualitative surveys, experimental studies and Randomized Control Trials (RCTs), as well as small-scale case studies and qualitative data. Finally, we will include a wide range of indicators to assess impact: qualitative rates as well as qualitative evaluations with regards to perceptions of education for children with disabilities, within schools, families and communities.

**Developed and developing countries**

These are based on the World Bank definitions (see appendix *)

### 1.7.2 Specific Search strategy

**Disability**

It was essential to define the types of disabilities that we will include within our search. Based on inputs from expert topic reviewers, users and funders of the study, and in order to answer the review questions in a coherent and systematic manner, in line with the stated definition, we will include the following types of disabilities:

- Physical disabilities;
- Sensory disabilities;
- Mental illness;
- Intellectual disabilities (learning/behavioural disabilities);
- Epilepsy, fits and seizures.

We will however, exclude conditions that do not result in a specific impairment and that constitute very specific field of research and intervention. More specifically we will exclude any papers that pertain to:

- Chronic illnesses and diseases (cancer, heart disease, diabetes, etc.);
- Communicable diseases;
- Obesity and eating disorders;
- HIV/AIDS related documents;
- Gifted individuals;
- Drug and alcohol related issues;
- Broad mental health issues (depression, stress, etc.)
- Short-term disabling conditions.

**Looking at Outcomes**

In order to determine impact of interventions, we will include studies that provide the following information regarding the impact of an identified intervention, programme or policy:
At least one primary educational outcome:

- Direct educational indicators (enrolment rates, retention and transition rates, completion rates, interruption and dropout rates, literacy rates);
- A cost analysis of the given intervention (cost of education per child, etc.)
- Qualitative outputs (views and opinions of the children, parents, teachers and community members regarding a given intervention).

An additional secondary outcome (process indicators):

- Awareness-raising about disability issues;
- With regards to accessibility of the learning environment (physical accessibility, water, toilets, teaching materials, etc)

Levels and types of Intervention
Various types of interventions will be included within the review: projects and programmes, regional, national and international policies and initiatives. The systematic review will include interventions at all the following levels:

- Child level;
- School level;
- State level;
- Country level;
- International level.

Conceptual Framework for Mapping of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country/Context</th>
<th>Type of intervention</th>
<th>Type of approach of disability</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Policy implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US/Canada</td>
<td>International policy</td>
<td>Special Needs Education</td>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>Quantitative indices (rates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Policy</td>
<td>Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional programme</td>
<td>Integrated Education</td>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGO project</td>
<td>Mixed approaches</td>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School-based Project</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epilepsy/Fits</td>
<td>Qualitative analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia/Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **Methods used in the review**

2.1 **Type of review**

A systematic review assessing the impact of approaches to increase the accessibility to education for children with disabilities will have to identify, screen and critically appraise a considerable and diverse body of evidence to answer the crucial questions of what accessibility to what education for which children with disabilities. In order to achieve this, it is imperative to determine the framework for the review not only in terms of inclusion criteria but also in view of what the main theoretical concepts signify.

This will be a two-stage review:

- The first scoping stage will present a mapping of the work that has been identified and that addresses the research question;
- After discussion with the donors and the review group and in view of the size of the body of evidence identified, we will identify and define future avenues that require further investigation.

2.1.1 **Screening limitations**

**Difference of existing data with regards to ‘developing’ and ‘developed’ contexts**

In terms of impact analyses and cost effectiveness, the body of work referring to policies and programmes in ‘developed’ or higher income countries is considerably larger than that found on ‘developing’, or low income and transitional contexts. The nature of the body of work is also different in countries where national policies have been in place for a number of years, where the state has carried out assessments and evaluations and where academic research centres have undertaken monitoring of impacts (for example, the UK, France, USA). In contexts where the resources are scarcer and where policies for persons with disabilities are often non-existent, the majority of the work had been carried out by international agencies and other non-governmental organizations.

The aim of the review is to focus primarily on the documentation that pertains to work in developing and fragile contexts. Theoretical and methodological documents from higher income countries, which maybe of interest for assessing programmes and policies will be included within our review. We will look at studies that refer to high, middle and low-income countries as defined by the UNDP Human Development Index (HDI).
Flowchart for the screening of documents from electronic databases

**Flowchart for the screening of documents from electronic databases**

**2093 Documents identified through Key word searches**

- **APPLY INCLUSION CRITERIA on Title and Abstract**
  - Publication after 2000
  - Research Design
  - Population Characteristics
  - Type of outcomes
  - Type of education
  - Type of Intervention

- **Exclude Duplicates**

- **Exclude: Publications before 2000**
  - Exclude: Publications with no specified methodology/Commentaries/letters

- **Exclude: Children under 4/Adults over 18/Certain types of disability/chronic conditions/wrong population**
  - Exclude: No educational indicators/No cost-effectiveness

- **Exclude: Informal education/Non-school educational programmes**

- **Exclude: Informal education/Non-school educational programmes**

- **Include: Need full text**
  - Include: Relevant Background Docs

- **Meet All Inclusion Criteria**

- **Provide Information on full text**

**Scrubinizing the grey literature**
The main challenge of this review is to define a search strategy that allows the screening of a very wide and versatile body of work in the grey literature. This includes a number of working documents, policy documents, white papers, technical documents, project and programme reports as well as website information of various organisations, which we will identify through searching relevant websites, and contacting authors and on-going projects. Both peer-reviewed and grey literature will be reviewed using the same key wording tools and appraised accordingly.
2 Methods used in the review

Flowchart for Grey Literature search Strategy

2.1.2 Applying Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria

An exhaustive and comprehensive search strategy will be developed using a two-stage approach. The first stage of the search strategy will be a scoping study, enabling us to produce a map of the evidence base which reviews the body of work in this area. The detailed methods for the second stage in-depth synthesis of the review will depend on the amount and nature of the literature identified and described by this map.

The inclusion criteria will be applied in a successive manner; the document considered will be excluded as soon as it does not meet one of the following criteria:

- **Date of publication**: Include if the study has been published after January 2000.
- **Research design**: Include studies that refer to specific methodology/tools used. These will be considered with a broad definition to include quantitative and qualitative work (RCT, experimental designs with control groups, surveys, interviews, case studies, opinions, etc.) However, in order to assess ‘impact’ of education for children with disabilities, it is essential to verify that some form of assessment of the intervention has in fact been carried out. We will exclude commentaries, essays, opinion papers as well books and chapters.
- **Age of children**: Include documents referring to children aged between 4 and 18.
- **Type of population**: Include documents that refer to the types of disabilities defined in this protocol: physical disabilities, sensory disabilities, mental illness, intellectual/learning/ behavioural disabilities, and epilepsy/fits/seizures. We will
exclude studies that refer to chronic illness and diseases, non-disabled populations as well as conditions that are not included in the list of disabilities defined for this review (communicable diseases, obesity and eating disorders, HIV/AIDS).

- **Measuring an outcome**: Here again, in order to evaluate impact, the document has to present outcomes. These can be of different natures as discussed in this section. However, documents that do not refer to any outcomes or to outcomes that are irrelevant for educational policies will be excluded.

- **Type of education**: Include documents that refer to specific formal or non-formal educational structures. Excludes home-based education. **Identification of an educational intervention**: In order to access impact, it is crucial to identify ‘impact of what’. To do this we will include documents that clearly refer to an educational policy, programme or any other for of intervention for education of children in general.

### 2.1.3 Characterising Included Studies: Key wording

After the initial screening, full texts of documents will be uploaded into EPPI-Reviewer 4 for the electronic database search. A team of reviewers will then code the documents according to various criteria defined in the key wording tool.

### 2.1.4 Identifying/Describing Studies: quality assurance process

In view of the type of information retrieved, we will present a precise description of the studies included in the second phase of our search. This will include a series of quantitative information pertaining to type, country, methodology and results. Moreover, we will also provide relevant information with regards to characteristics of the data that can be essential towards defining and assessments of policies and programmes. These will refer to the gaps in knowledge that were identifies during the first stage of the screening process.

### 2.2 User involvement

#### 2.2.1 Approach and rationale

This review is primarily intended for policy makers, donors and other decision makers in the areas of education for children with disabilities. However we hope it will also be useful to practitioners, as well as academics in the field of education and disability.

The review aims to inform policy makers on:
- The most effective approaches
- The most cost-effective approaches

#### 2.2.2 User Involvement in designing the review

A number of policy advisors from AusAID have been involved in the definition of the objectives and definitions used in the review, from both the education team as well as the disability advisor. The initial protocol underwent extensive consultation from the Disability and Education teams, including the Education Thematic Group in order to ensure the research findings will be useful in informing programming.

On completion of the review, other policy makers will be contacted via personal links, user groups such as the Global Partnership on Disability and Development (GPDD), the International Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC) working group on education, and EENET. Academic audiences will be reached via per review publication, as well as
conference presentations (including the Human Development and Capability Association Conference in Jakarta in September 2012, ands the BAICE 2012 conference in Cambridge also in September on ‘Education, Mobility and Migration: People, ideas and resources’

2.3 Identifying and describing studies

2.3.1 Identification of potential studies: Search strategy

Reports will be identified from three different types of sources that will require adaptation of the overall search strategy: electronic search engines to identify research papers, electronic search of databases of organisations and networks working in the field of disability and education, gaining access to field document through partners and experts/other key informants.

Electronic Searches of Databases

An iterative search strategy for electronic databases will be developed using index terms and free texts terms. Databases to be searched include:

- Google Scholar
- Web of Science, JSTOR
- PubMed Medline
- NSHEED
- Cochrane Library
- Campbell Library
- ERIC
- PsychLit
- Psychinfo
- BEI and AEI
- Econlit and IDEAS repec
- British Library of Development Studies
- LILAC

Scrutinizing the grey literature

As noted above, one of the key challenges of this review will be to define a search strategy that allows the screening of a very wide and versatile body of work in the grey literature. A number of portals will be hand searched using the search terms and relevant documents will be imported for analysis to EPPI reviewer 4.

Websites of Relevant International Portals of Institutions and Research Bodies:
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• Websites of international agencies and consortium working in the field of education (UNESCO, UNICEF, World Bank, INEE etc.);
• Websites of development agencies (USAID, DFID, AUSAID);
• Websites of networks and consortiums working on education and disability (for example, Education International, EENET etc.);
• Websites of development think tanks and institutes working in education (IIIEP, IDS, ODI, etc.).
• Websites of networks and consortiums working on disability (for example, GPDD, IDDC, ADDC);
• Websites of international NGOs working in education and disability (Leonard Cheshire Disability, Handicap International, CBM, Save the Children, etc.).

Contacting experts and key-informants

We requested technical experts within Leonard Cheshire Disability to identify any impact assessments and cost effectiveness studies that may have been carried out within their programmes or referred to over the past decade. We will also send targeted requests via disability-specific list servers (including the International Disability and Development Consortium and the Global Partnership for Disability and Development websites).

All results of the electronic search of journals will be entered into the EPPI-Reviewer 4 database. For the portals of institutions and organisations a database will record the details of each search (date of access, process for key word searching, number of documents identified, number of documents included in search). The documents included in the search will then be manually appraised using the same inclusion criteria than those used for the electronic database search. Finally, we are aware of the fact that we may receive the information from the key informants over a long period of time and in an unpredictable format. We will keep a record of the documents received and provide copies of the ones that pass the inclusion criteria manually.

2.3.2 Mapping the Evidence

This first stage of the search will aim to describe the research to address the review question. More importantly, it will serve to identify the types of documents that address the question of impact evaluation of initiatives for children with disabilities, particularly in developing country contexts. At the end of this phase and in light of the number of documents found through our search, we will revisit the review question after discussion with AusAID, EPPI Centre and key experts in the field, before deciding whether to focus on one of the sub questions identified above.

The electronic academic databases

• First we will apply the key word search to the various electronic databases in order to identify the first series of documents relevant to our search..
• Secondly, following the key word search, we will apply the inclusion criteria to the title and abstract that have been identified through the electronic search. A first reviewer will screen all the documents, removing the duplicates and broadly applying the inclusion criteria. The retained documents will be included following this broad screening. Number of contention documents will be marked as ‘to be discussed’.
• At a third stage, a second reviewer will apply the inclusion criteria to the remaining documents and the disagreements will be discussed with the first reviewer.
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The grey literature

In order to efficiently identify relevant documents from the grey literature we will:

- Hand search most used websites that relate to education of children with disabilities;
- Request technical experts from the field as well as those working within Leonard Cheshire Disability to identify any impact assessments and cost effectiveness studies that may have been carried out within their programmes or referred to over the past decade. We will also send targeted requests via disability-specific list servers (including the International Disability and Development Consortium and the Global Partnership for Disability and Development websites).
- We believe that this constitutes the most efficient strategy in order to include documents that are cited and used in the grey literature. Due to very different structures of the websites, we will have to tailor our search to each website. Once the documents identified through the key word search, the inclusion/exclusion criteria will be applied manually to the documents in order to select the relevant studies. A record of these searches will be included as an Annex in the final report.

2.3.3 Characterising included studies using EPPI-Centre tools

The studies remaining after application of the criteria will be key worded using an adapted version of the EPPI-centre Core Key wording Strategy: version 0.9.7. Additional keywords, which are specific to the context of the review, will be added to the template. All the key worded studies will be added to the larger EPPI-Centre database, for others to access via the website.

2.3.4 Identifying and describing studies: quality assurance process

In view of the size of the body of evidence selected for analysis, the review team will scrutinize the literature in order to present a precise scoping of the existing studies. If the number of documents to be analysed is less that 40, two members of the review team will code each study by applying the key wording tool independently. Discrepancies will be discussed and resolved, with a third reviewer if necessary. The key wording tool, which comprises of closed questions that pertain to the characteristics of the study is sufficiently precise to carry out the scoping exercise. The studies will be divided between the members of the review team; whenever reviewers are ‘unsure’ of the appropriate coding, studies will be discussed and coding settled before analysis.

2.3.5 Mapping the literature

A series of tables will describe the studies in terms of:

- The geographical context: the country setting, urban or rural
- Research methods used: qualitative research, observational studies or experimental designs.
- Research participants: their age, gender, ethnicity, impairment, education or other characteristics, and their social and economic circumstances or health status
- Type of intervention: level, outcome, impact
2.3.6 In-depth review

The second stage of the review will consist of synthesising studies relevant to the sub-questions developed above. Relevant studies will be identified through an analysis of the mapping study.

Extraction of studies and reports screened according to inclusion/exclusion criteria
After the first stage of mapping the studies, and after discussion with the stakeholders, some relevant sub-questions will be selected and relevant criteria developed in order to answer the questions pertaining to this systematic review. In view of the extent of the review, we may present a more detailed scoping of the evidence; focusing on studies relating to a specific region, etc.

Quality appraisal and analysis of extracted studies
The documents screened through the successive phases of the search strategy will be recorded using the EPPI-Centre Key wording Strategy for classifying education research version 0.9.7

Analysis will present an understanding of impact in terms of the type of educational approaches taken; the characteristics of the intervention; the type of impairments that are addressed, as well as in terms of the use of resources at hand. The extracted studies will be appraised by the research team at the Leonard Cheshire Disability and Inclusive Development Centre in order to determine their relevance for inclusion in the review.

2.4 Deriving conclusions and implications

As we have stated throughout the description of the process, the size, content and extent of the body of evidence that this review will need to examine is considerable. After the first screening process we will provide a precise map of the evidence that addresses the research question. This will reveal some immediate knowledge gaps pertaining to impact of approaches to increase accessibility to education for children with disabilities.

Following this, and in view of the resources (time and financial), and after discussion with stakeholders, we will choose the appropriate critical appraisal and methods for synthesising the body of literature available to:

Provide an analysis of the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness studies as well as gaps in knowledge;

Provide guidelines on further avenues for investigation in order to obtain more targeted information that can inform policy and programming for stakeholders.
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Appendices

Appendix 2.1: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Screening on title and abstract

- exclude on year
  exclude *all articles prior to 2000*

- exclude on age
  *include only articles about children aged between 4 to 18 years*

- exclude on research design
  exclude *reports with no methodology; commentaries; letters*

- exclude wrong population
  *chronic illness and disease; injury; communicable diseases; obesity and eating disorders; gifted children; drug and alcohol problems; common mental health conditions*

- exclude on outcomes
  exclude if *no education outcomes such as access, attainment, transition or retention; views of children and families; cost-effectiveness*

- include

- Exclude on type of education
  *exclude informal; non school education programmes*

  - Exclude on type of intervention
    *no intervention identified or non-education related intervention*

  - to be discussed
Appendix 2.2: Key word search for electronic databases

We will use a modified version of the Medline search presented below, adjusted for database indexing and thesauruses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Searches</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Search Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>adolescent/ or child/ or child, preschool/</td>
<td>2164642</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>child*.mp.</td>
<td>1654382</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>teenage*.mp.</td>
<td>12941</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 or 2 or 3</td>
<td>2379066</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>disabl*.ti,ab.</td>
<td>28640</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disability Evaluation/</td>
<td>29506</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mental Competency/</td>
<td>6158</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>cognition disorders/ or mental disorders diagnosed in childhood/</td>
<td>40655</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>disabled children/ or hearing impaired persons/ or mentally disabled persons/ or mentally ill persons/ or visually impaired persons/</td>
<td>10711</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>handicap.mp.</td>
<td>6802</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mental Retardation/</td>
<td>43855</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Child Behavior Disorders/cl, co, di, ec, ed, ep, eh, pc, px, rh, th [Classification, Complications, Diagnosis, Economics, Education, Epidemiology, Ethnology, Prevention &amp; Control, Psychology, Rehabilitation, Therapy]</td>
<td>12745</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5 or 6 or 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12</td>
<td>168668</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot;Mainstreaming (Education)&quot;/ or Education, Special/</td>
<td>8341</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>&quot;inclusive education&quot;.mp.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;special education needs&quot;.mp.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&quot;integrated education&quot;.mp.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>education/ or &quot;mainstreaming (education)&quot;/ or education, nonprofessional/ or education, special/ or schools/</td>
<td>40380</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18</td>
<td>40443</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13 and 19</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4 and 20</td>
<td>2702</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>limit 21 to (English language and yr=&quot;2000 -Current&quot;)</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.3: Websites of grey literature to be hand-searched

UNESCO
UNICEF
World Bank
WHO
INEE
USAID
DFID
AUSAID
Education International
EENET
IIIEP
ODI
IDS
GPDD
IDDC
ADDC
LCD
CBM
Handicap International
Save the Children
Source
European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education
Appendix 2.4: Template of record for grey literature search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Website</th>
<th>Searched by</th>
<th>Date of first access</th>
<th>Date of last access</th>
<th>Pathway followed</th>
<th>Key words searched</th>
<th>Number of documents identified in primary search</th>
<th>Number of documents relevant after screening</th>
<th>Number of documents not available in soft copy</th>
<th>Number of documents requested</th>
<th>Number of documents not obtained</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2.5: EPPI-Centre Keyword sheet including review-specific keywords

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>A.4.2. Maria Kett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.1. ERIC</td>
<td>A.4.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.2. Cochrane</td>
<td>A.4.4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.3. Campbell collaboration</td>
<td>A.4.5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.4. Medline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.5. Psychinfo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.6. Pubmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Publication</th>
<th>B.1. Age group</th>
<th>B.1.1. 4-10 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.2.1. 2000</td>
<td>B.1.2. 11 to 14 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.2. 2001</td>
<td>B.1.3. 15 to 18 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.3. 2002</td>
<td>B.1.4. Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.4. 2003</td>
<td>B.2. Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.5. 2004</td>
<td>B.2.1. Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.6. 2005</td>
<td>B.2.2. Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.7. 2006</td>
<td>B.2.3. Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.8. 2007</td>
<td>B.2.4. Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2.9. 2008</td>
<td>B.3. Type of Disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.1 2009</td>
<td>B.3.1. Autism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.11 2010</td>
<td>B.3.2. Physical disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.12 2011</td>
<td>B.3.3. Sensory disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.13 2012</td>
<td>B.3.4. Learning disability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.14 2012</td>
<td>B.3.5. Multiple disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.15 2012</td>
<td>B.3.6. Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of focus</th>
<th>B.4. Type of intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.3.1 USA</td>
<td>B.4.1. Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.2 UK</td>
<td>B.4.2. Educational intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.3 Australia</td>
<td>B.4.3. Social intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.4 New Zealand</td>
<td>B.4.4. NGOs programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.5 Europe Continent</td>
<td>B.5. Type of School setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.6 Scandinavia</td>
<td>B.5.1. Public school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.7 South America</td>
<td>B.5.2. Private school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.8 Africa</td>
<td>B.5.3. Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.9 South Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.10 South East Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.11 Middle East</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3.12 Worldwide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4.2

#### C. ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.1. Type of study</th>
<th>C.1.1. Research/data</th>
<th>C.4. Specific primary educational outcomes/impact measures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1.2. Review/synthesis (e.g. of research literature; MI data etc.)</td>
<td>C.4.1. Enrollment rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.3. Policy (statement of policy from a central or local government body)</td>
<td>C.4.2. Retention/completion rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1.4. Practice description (descriptive account (not research))</td>
<td>C.4.3. Intermuption/Drop-out rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C.2. Methods Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.2.</th>
<th>C.2.1. Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.2.2. Interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.3. Observation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.4. Secondary data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.5. Literature review/ evidence synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2.6. Not specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C.3. Type of outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.3.</th>
<th>C.3.1. Quantitative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.3.2. Qualitative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3.3. Mixed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.3.4. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C.7. Cost effectiveness

- **C.7.1.** Yes (definite yes)
- **C.7.2.** No (definite no or unlikely)
- **C.7.3.** Not specified

#### C.8. Type of approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C.8.</th>
<th>C.8.1. Special Needs Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.8.2. Inclusive Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.8.3. Integrated Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.8.4. Mixed approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.8.5. Not Specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.8.6. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Comments