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History of Inclusive Education as Equity Strategy

BEFORE SALAMANCA
- Exclusion
- Special Education

TWO TRACK APPROACH
- Special Education
- Integrated Education

INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

AFTER SALAMANCA

The Framework for Action on Special Needs Education adopted at The World Conference on Special Needs Education held in Salamanca, Spain in 1994

Note: Figure created by presenter
“The fundamental principle of the inclusive school is that all children should learn together, where possible, regardless of any difficulties or differences they may have…” (UNESCO 1994 The Salamanca Statement, paragraph 17)

“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 life long learning…” (Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 2006, Article 24)
EFA and Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

World Education Forum (Dakar, 2000)
- Dakar Framework for Action
  Goal 1: Expand early childhood care and education
  Goal 2: Provide free and compulsory primary education for all
  Goal 3: Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults
  Goal 4: Increase adult literacy by 50 per cent
  Goal 5: Achieve gender parity by 2005, gender equality by 2015
  Goal 6: Improve the quality of education

Millennium Development Goals (2000)
  Goal 2: Complete a full course of primary schooling
  Goal 3: Eliminate gender disparity in education
  → EFA and Education MDGs  Target year: 2015
Schooling situation of pupils with disability in developing countries

- UNESCO (2007)---1/3 of the 77 million (6-11 year-old) children currently out of school have a disability. Only 10% of pupils with disability are in school.
- World Bank (2003)---Among 115 million children who are out of school, 40 million are pupils with disability. Only 5% can complete primary school.
Goal 4. Ensure **inclusive** and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

4.5 By 2030, eliminate gender disparities in education and ensure equal access to all levels of education and vocational training for the vulnerable, including persons with **disabilities**, indigenous peoples and children in vulnerable situations.

4.a **Build and upgrade** education facilities that are child, **disability** and gender sensitive and provide safe, non-violent, **inclusive** and effective learning environments for all.
Defining Inclusive Education

We believe and proclaim that:

- regular schools with this inclusive orientation are **the most effective means** of combating discriminatory attitudes, creating welcoming communities, building an inclusive society and achieving education for all;

- moreover, they provide an **effective education** to the majority of children and **improve the efficiency and ultimately the cost-effectiveness** of the entire education system.

Source: Salamanca statement/UNESCO
Defining Inclusive Education

“Inclusive Education is concerned with providing appropriate responses to the broad spectrum of learning needs in formal and nonformal educational settings. .. It aims to enable both teachers and learners to feel comfortable with diversity and to see it as a challenge and enrichment in the learning environment, rather than a problem.”

(Overcoming Exclusion through Inclusive Approaches in Education by UNESCO 2003)
Inclusive Education as Quality Strategy

“The quality of learning can be enhanced by the diversity of student involvement”

“Inclusion produces schools that move away from rote learning and place greater emphasis on hands-on, experienced based, active and co-operative learning.”

(Guidelines for Inclusion: Ensuring Access to Education for All. UNESCO, 2005)

- Inclusive education is regarded not only as equity strategy but also quality-learning strategy.
Challenges for Inclusive Education

However, there are consistent resistances and criticisms against “dumping students with disabilities in regular classrooms” and supports for disability based special education. In reality, many assumes that diversity created in classrooms may be a problem for teachers.

Inclusion damages or promotes quality of education?

→ Conducted comprehensive literature reviews with more than 200 studies.
Empirical evidences: inclusive education effects on learning outcomes of **students with disabilities**

- “Children with severe disabilities in inclusive classes showed substantially greater developmental abilities at posttest than their peers in segregated classes.” (Rafferty et al. 2003 USA)

- “Pupils in special education turn out.... to be behind pupils in regular classes in academic skills.” (Karsten et al. 2010 Netherlands)

- Students (with special needs) who in the first year received all their special programmes within ordinary classes show distinctly better progress than the others (=students who receive adapted teaching in small groups outside ordinary classes).” (Myklebust 2002, Norway)
Contradicting empirical results:
inclusive education effects on learning achievements of students without disabilities. - Positive

- Compared to the non-inclusive schools, mean progress proved to be higher in inclusive schools. (Rouse and Florian 2006 UK)
- Students without special needs performed slightly better when the number of students with special needs in their classes increased (Demeris et al. 2007 Canada - reading, writing and mathematics)
- Students in inclusive classes proved to achieve better than children in non-inclusive classes. (Cole et al. 2004 USA - reading and mathematics)
Contradicting empirical results: inclusive education effects on learning achievements of students without disabilities. - Negative

“We found a small, negative and statistically significant relationship between school inclusivity and the attainments of students mainstream schools.” (Farrell 2007 UK)

Children in inclusive schools achieved somewhat lower than children in non-inclusive schools. (Dyson et al. 2004 UK)
Contradicting empirical results: inclusive education effects on learning achievements of students without disabilities. – No difference

- “There were no differences for reading scores between students in inclusive and non-inclusive classes. ...However, the pattern was unclear: some inclusive classes showed less improvement in performance than non-inclusive classes, while other classes showed more improvement than non-inclusive classes”. (Huber et al. 2001 US reading and math)

- “For academic achievement, no differences were found between students without SEN in inclusive and non-inclusive classes.... For socio-emotional functioning, some differences were found, but the practical importance of these differences is unclear, since the effect sizes were small.” (Ruijs et al. 2010 Neatherlands)

- There are no differences in attitude towards people with disabilities between non-disabled students in inclusive and non-inclusive classes in a secondary school. (Wong 2008 Hong Kong)
Overall

There are no adverse effects on pupils without SEN of including pupils with special needs in mainstream schools, with 81% of the outcomes reporting positive or neutral effects. (Kalambouka 2008, various but mostly developed countries)
Evidences on the productivity of diversity and inclusion from Business and Management Studies

“New research provides compelling evidence that diversity unlocks innovation and drives market growth” (Hewlet et al. 2013, Harvard Business Review)

“Diversity and Inclusion: A Formula for Success - Diversity is a key driver of innovation and is a critical component of being successful on a global scale.” (Forbs Insights 2011)

“One of the most important ingredients for creative thinking is diversity. We all know that diverse teams produce more creative results than teams in which all members are from a similar background.” (Baumgartner 2014, Innovation Management)
International diversity and innovation

Link with innovation


Correlation between foreign student numbers and innovation = 0.7.
Correlation between foreign research students and innovation = 0.6

Source: Van Damme 2010
Growing attention on non-cognitive skills

21ST-CENTURY SKILLS

ATC21S started by internationally defining 21st-century skills as four broad categories.

WAYS OF THINKING
- Creativity and innovation
- Critical thinking, problem-solving, decision-making
- Learning to learn/metacognition (knowledge about cognitive processes)

TOOLS FOR WORKING
- Information literacy
- Information and communication technology (ICT) literacy

WAYS OF WORKING
- Communication
- Collaboration (teamwork)

WAYS OF LIVING IN THE WORLD
- Citizenship – local and global
- Life and career
- Personal and social responsibility — including cultural awareness and competence

Source: ATC21S (2013)
UNESCO, Delors Report
Learning: The Treasure Within (1996)
(a report to UNESCO by the Commission for Education in the XXIst Century)

HDR The 4 Pillars of Learning
- Learning to know
- Learning to be
- Learning to do
- Learning to live together
Sustainable Development Goals (2015-30)

Goal 4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all

4.7 By 2030, ensure that all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including, among others, through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture’s contribution to sustainable development.
Knowledge Gap
-- Potentials for further research on quality and inclusive education

- The most empirical studies are from the Western developed countries. Almost no empirical studies in Asia and developing countries. necessity to have more studies in this region.

- The most empirical studies are on cognitive skills. More studies need to assess the effects of inclusive education on non-cognitive skills development of students without and with disabilities in inclusive settings vs. segregated settings.

- PISA, PISA for development, SEAMEO-INNOTECH’s new initiatives and other international assessments needs to include some diversity and disability indicators in school, teacher and student surveys to see the effects of diversity created in classrooms on students cognitive and non cognitive achievements.
Surveys and Interviews were conducted with demand-side actors (represented by parents/guardians) and supply-side actors (school principals and teachers) in Cambodia, Mongolia and Nepal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand-side</th>
<th>Supply-side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 School Principles</td>
<td>500 Teachers of CWDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Teachers of non-CWDs</td>
<td>500 Parents of CWDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 Parents of non-CWDs</td>
<td>500 Parents of Drop-out CWDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Parents of OFS CWDs</td>
<td>50 Parents of OFS CWDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CWDs: Children with disabilities; OFS: Out-of-school*
Why inclusive education?

Educating children with disabilities together with children without disabilities in regular classrooms (inclusive education) ............... as compared to educating children with and without disabilities separately.

1. is more effective in providing educational opportunities for all children,
2. can promote better learning achievements (e.g. reading and mathematics) of children with disabilities
3. can promote better learning achievements (e.g. reading and mathematics) of children without disabilities
4. can promote better social skills (e.g. communication and problem solving skills) of children with disabilities,
5. can promote better social skills (e.g. communication and problem solving skills) of children without disabilities,
6. contributes to building a harmonious society through educating children with and without disabilities together.
7. Children with disabilities have the right to be educated in regular classrooms.
Perception on inclusive education by parents of children with and without disabilities in Cambodia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>With</th>
<th>Without</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build a harmonious society</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better social skills for children with disabilities</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better learning achievements for children without disabilities</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better learning achievements for children with disabilities</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better social skills for children without disabilities</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide equal educational opportunities</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the right to be educated in regular</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classrooms</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **strongly agree (%):**
- **agree (%):**
- **disagree (%):**
- **strongly disagree (%):**

Without, With
Perception on inclusive education by teacher training on disabilities education received or not in Cambodia

- **Build a harmonious society**: 20.7% (strongly agree) 73.9% (agree) 3.3% (disagree) 2.2% (strongly disagree)
- **Promote better social skills of children with disabilities**: 5.4% (strongly agree) 79.4% (agree) 13.0% (disagree) 2.2% (strongly disagree)
- **Promote better social skills of children without disabilities**: 5.4% (strongly agree) 78.3% (agree) 14.1% (disagree) 2.3% (strongly disagree)
- **Promote better learning achievements of children with disabilities**: 6.5% (strongly agree) 64.1% (agree) 28.3% (disagree) 1.1% (strongly disagree)
- **Promote better learning achievements of children without disabilities**: 8.4% (strongly agree) 67.4% (agree) 22.5% (disagree) 1.7% (strongly disagree)
- **Provide educational opportunities for all children**: 15.2% (strongly agree) 54.4% (agree) 27.2% (disagree) 3.3% (strongly disagree)
- **Promote better social skills of children without disabilities**: 8.7% (strongly agree) 64.0% (agree) 24.4% (disagree) 2.8% (strongly disagree)
- **Provide educational opportunities for all children**: 6.5% (strongly agree) 57.6% (agree) 32.6% (disagree) 3.3% (strongly disagree)
- **Have the right to be educated in regular classrooms**: 22.8% (strongly agree) 63.8% (agree) 23.3% (disagree) 2.3% (strongly disagree)
- **Have the right to be educated in regular classrooms**: 18.0% (strongly agree) 75.3% (agree) 5.4% (disagree) 4.5% (strongly disagree)
Perception on inclusive education by teacher experience teaching children with disability or not in Cambodia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>No experience</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>No experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote better social skills of children with disabilities</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better social skills of children without disabilities</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a harmonious society</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better learning achievement of children with disabilities</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better learning achievement of children without disabilities</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote better learning achievement of children without disabilities</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide educational opportunities for all children</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide educational opportunities for all children</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the right to be educated in regular classrooms</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the right to be educated in regular classrooms</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree (%)</td>
<td>Agree (%)</td>
<td>Disagree (%)</td>
<td>Strongly disagree (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most parents and teachers think that educating children with disabilities in regular classrooms promotes both better learning outcomes and better social skills of both children with and without disabilities. However, more teachers disagree to the positive impact of educating children with disabilities in regular classrooms on learning achievements compared with that on social skills.

Most parents and teachers think that educating children with disabilities in regular classrooms is more effective in providing educational opportunities for all children, and More than 90% of teachers agree that educating children with disabilities in regular classrooms contributes to building a harmonious society and children with disabilities have the right to be educated in regular classrooms.

There are almost no differences of perceptions between parents of children with and without disabilities, between teachers with and without training on disability education and between teachers with and without experiences of teaching children disabilities.
Policy implications for the SDGs and its monitoring instruments.

- Recognize Inclusive Education as quality strategy to have a positive impact on students’ achievement, specially on non cognitive skills.
- Monitor “inclusive” educational environments for students and develop instruments to measure its impact on cognitive and non-cognitive skills.
- **Inclusive education can be a powerful driving force of SDGs Goal 4.**
Thank you!
How do we try to measure quality and equity in this current MDGs/EFA Frameworks?

Revisiting EFA Development Index:

- universal primary education (goal 2), proxied by the total primary net enrolment ratio;
- adult literacy (goal 4), proxied by the literacy rate for those aged 15 and above;
- gender parity and equality (goal 5), proxied by the gender-specific EFA index (GEI), which is an average of the GPIs for primary and secondary gross enrolment ratios and the adult literacy rate;
- quality of education (goal 6), proxied by the survival rate to grade 5.
How do we try to measure quality and equity in this current MDGs/EFA Frameworks?

Revisiting Official list of MDG indicators on Education by UN

Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education

- **Target 2.A:** Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

- **2.1 Net enrolment ratio in primary education**
- **2.2 Proportion of pupils starting grade 1 who reach last grade of primary**
- **2.3 Literacy rate of 15-24 year-olds, women and men**

Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women

- **Target 3.A:** Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and in all levels of education no later than 2015

- **3.1 Ratios of girls to boys in primary, secondary and tertiary education**
- **3.2 Share of women in wage employment in the non-agricultural sector**
- **3.3 Proportion of seats held by women in national parliament**
Can these indicators capture “Quality of Education”?  
Oh, oh......They are mostly looking at quality as “Input” only.

| Goal 6: Quality of Education | 41. Percentage of primary school teachers having the required academic qualifications  
| 42. Percentage of school teachers who are certified to teach according to national standards  
| 43. Pupil/Teacher Ratio (PTR)  
| 44. Pupil/Class Ratio (PCR)  
| 45. Textbook/Pupil Ratio (TPR)  
| 46. Public expenditure on education as a percentage of total government expenditure  
| 47. Percentage of schools with improved water sources  
| 48. Percentage of schools with improved sanitation facilities  
| 49. Percentage of pupils who have mastered nationally defined basic learning competencies  
| 50. School life expectancy  
| 51. Instructional hour |
Criticizing is easy!

- Can we be satisfied with these indicators to monitor the progress of quality, equity and inclusion of education? No, but....
- We need to monitor the global goals after 2015 anyway.
- We need to monitor not only educational input but also content, process, output and outcomes.

→ Do we have any alternative ways of monitoring education goals?
Do we have any alternative ways of monitoring education goals? – Policy

a. **SABER in general:**
The what, why and how of the Systematic Approach for Better Education Results  
*Source: SABER Overview, World Bank, April 2013*

* SABER (Systems Approach for Better Education Results)  
* An initiative currently being developed by the World Bank along with partners around the world that helps countries systematically examine and strengthen the performance of their education systems to achieve learning for all.  
* SABER is developing diagnostic tools that benchmark education policies according to evidence-based global standards and best practices.  
* Determine and compare the levels of commitments of national governments.
a. **SABER in general:**
The what, why and how of the Systematic Approach for Better Education Results

*Source: SABER Overview, World Bank, April 2013*

**The 13 Domains of SABER**
SABER monitors a part of policy process for educational progress.

School Autonomy and Accountability

SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability (SAA) documents and analyzes school-based management policies aimed at increasing autonomy and accountability at the school level and within the education system, in both developing and developed countries. By deepening school autonomy and accountability, school systems can redefine incentives structure to create better conditions for teaching and learning. Autonomy and accountability do not generate incentives in isolation; they are intertwined with the assessment of teachers and learning at the school, with the use of information, and the role of school councils. Such interconnections are critical in improving the education system as a whole, which is at the core of SABER’s approach.

- What does SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability do?
- How does SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability help countries improve education policies and systems?
- What matters most in school-based management policies?

Policy Goal – Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Autonomy in Budget Planning and Approval</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Autonomy in Personnel Management</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of the School Council in School Governance</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of School and Student Performance</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>EMERGING</td>
<td>ADVANCED</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Accountability</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
<td>ESTABLISHED</td>
<td>LATENT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability do?

SABER-School Autonomy and Accountability aims to help education systems and reform efforts to define school-based management policies.
SABER pilot rubric in Equity and Inclusion

This pilot SABER rubric has been uniquely developed by JICA Research Institute (Dr. Kazuo Kuroda, Ms. Makiko Hayashi and Dr. Takako Yuki) as part of an original pilot activity in an attempt to contribute to the SABER domain on “Equity and Inclusion”

The objective of utilizing this rubric is to determine and compare the levels of commitments of the national government in achieving equity and inclusion in policy frameworks, targeting different social groups from four perspectives, from five dimensions and from four patterns

The four perspectives include; equity of access, equity of resource inputs for quality of education, equity of outputs/learning achievement and diversity (inclusion)

The five dimensions include; gender, ethnicity, disability, income gap, rural/urban

The proof and explanation of evidence-based education policies will be judged from sources including; policy documents of the Ministry of Education, and policy documents developed in alignment with the international community (e.g. EFA National Action Plan).
What equity are we trying to look at through the SABER pilot rubric?

**Equity of Education:**

**1) Equity of access:** Levels of commitments of national governments towards equity of quantitative distributions of educational opportunities for different social groups.

**2) Equity of resource input for education:** Levels of commitments of national governments towards attaining equity through school factors such as pupil-teacher ratio, teaching methods and learning materials.

**3) Equity of learning achievement (equity of learning outcomes):** Levels of commitments of national governments towards attaining equity in student performance.

**Inclusive Education:**

**4) Diversity (inclusion):** Levels of commitments of national governments towards how widespread the notion of embracing diversity in education has become explicit.
(3) *Equity of learning achievement (equity of learning outcomes):* Levels of commitments of national governments towards attaining equity in student performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of dimension</th>
<th>Pattern 1</th>
<th>Pattern 2</th>
<th>Pattern 3</th>
<th>Pattern 4</th>
<th>Proof and Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Disability</td>
<td>No government policy for disability in equity of learning achievement.</td>
<td>Disability in equity of learning achievement is recognized as one of the national policy goals.</td>
<td>Legal and administrative frameworks are structured to promote and achieve equity of learning achievement for disability.</td>
<td>Allocation of the national budget is assured to promote and achieve equity of learning achievement for disability. (Or equity of learning achievement for disability is already achieved.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Income gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rural/Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Equity of access

2. Equity of resource input for education

3. Equity of learning achievement (equity of learning outcomes)

4. Diversity (inclusion)