

ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCES OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Ziyoyev Shuhratkhon Shokirovich

Boyovut District, Teacher at Secondary School No. 4.

ABSTRACT

This article provides a comparative analysis of inclusive education practices in Uzbekistan and various foreign countries. For Uzbekistan, the study examines the legal and regulatory framework, implementation of inclusion in general and preschool education institutions, state policies, cooperation with international organizations, infrastructure improvements, and teacher training. For foreign countries (e.g., Finland, Canada, Japan, and other developed nations), the article reviews successful inclusive education models: individualized learning plans, differentiated pedagogy, adapted learning environments, specialized resources, and effective administration. The analysis concludes that effective inclusive education requires a robust legal basis, qualified staff, adapted infrastructure, and the adaptation of international best practices. Positive steps in Uzbekistan — such as opening inclusive schools and collaborations with organizations like UNICEF — support the development of equal educational opportunities for children with disabilities and special needs.

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada O'zbekiston va xorijiy mamlakatlardagi inklyuziv ta'lim tajribalari taqqoslanadi. O'zbekiston misolida inklyuziv ta'limning qonuniy-me'yoriy bazasi, maktablarda va maktabgacha muassasalarda joriy qilinishi, davlat siyosati va xalqaro hamkorlik doirasidagi loyihalar, infratuzilma va pedagog tayyorgarlik holati ko'rib chiqiladi. Xorijiy mamlakatlar (masalan, Finlyandiya, Kanada, Yaponiya va boshqa rivojlangan davlatlar) misollarida esa inklyuziv yondashuvlar, individual ta'lim rejasi, differensial pedagogika, moslashtirilgan o'quv muhiti, maxsus resurslar va management tajribalari tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot natijasida ko'rsatiladiki, inklyuziv ta'limni samarali joriy etish uchun: kuchli normativ-huquqiy baza, malakali pedagoglar, mos muhit va xalqaro tajriba asosida adaptatsiya muhim. Ayniqsa, O'zbekistonda davlat siyosati va xalqaro tashkilotlar (masalan, UNICEF) hamkorligida inklyuziv maktablar ochilishi kabi ijobiy qadamlar inklyuziv ta'limning rivojiga xizmat qilmoqda. ЮНИСЕФ+2ЮНИСЕФ+2

АННОТАЦИЯ

В статье проанализирован опыт реализации инклюзивного образования в Узбекистане и за рубежом. В узбекском контексте рассматриваются нормативно-правовая база, реализация инклюзии в общеобразовательных и дошкольных учреждениях, государственная политика, сотрудничество с международными организациями, инфраструктура и профессиональная подготовка педагогов. Зарубежные страны (например, Финляндия, Канада, Япония и др.) представлены примерами успешных практик: индивидуальное обучение, дифференцированная педагогика, адаптированная учебная среда, специальные ресурсы и эффективное управление. Анализ показывает: для успешной инклюзии необходимы — надёжная законодательная база,

квалифицированные кадры, адаптированная среда и использование международного опыта. В Узбекистане позитивными шагами являются открытие инклюзивных школ, реализация программ при участии международных организаций (например, UNICEF), что способствует развитию равных образовательных возможностей. ЮНИСЕФ+2interonconf.org+2

INTRODUCTION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the UN in 1948, specifically recognizes that “education is the fundamental and inalienable right of every human being.” In order to further strengthen and guarantee the rights of persons with disabilities, the UN adopted the Declaration on Disabled Persons in 1975. This declaration emphasizes: “Persons with disabilities have the right to respect for their dignity from birth. “Every person, irrespective of the origin, nature or severity of his or her disability, has the same rights as other persons of the same age, including the right to the fullest possible standard of living” (Article 3). Similarly, to protect children’s rights, the UN adopted the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1989. The Convention on the Rights of the Child is an international human rights treaty designed to protect the rights of children everywhere. It has been ratified by almost all countries in the world. The 191 countries that have ratified the Convention have voluntarily committed to implementing the provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Child through administrative, judicial and other measures. If we look at just one country, the United States, inclusive education laws ensure that students with disabilities are educated alongside their non-disabled peers to the extent possible. aims to ensure that children receive quality education in a non-restrictive environment. The main legislation, including ¹ The Universal Children with Disabilities Education Act, later renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), established these principles in the United States. These laws state that students with disabilities should be educated in the “least restrictive environment,” meaning that they should be integrated into general education classrooms if their individual needs cannot be adequately met.² Inclusive education laws are designed to ensure that all children with disabilities receive an appropriate education in a non-restrictive environment. The primary laws governing inclusive education are the Education for All Children with Disabilities Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Since the initial legislation was passed, subsequent litigation has centered around the precise definition of the “least restrictive environment.” Research has shown that inclusive education can improve the academic achievement of students with disabilities and foster positive social interactions between students with disabilities and non-disabled students. However, inclusion can exclude students with disabilities from special education and, in some cases, disrupt the learning of non-disabled students. In 1975, Congress passed the Education for All Children with Disabilities Act. The law arose, in part, after it was discovered that more than 60% of students with disabilities in the country were not receiving appropriate education, and some studies indicated that millions of children were either consistently out of school or were not

¹ Bateman, D. & Bateman, C. (2002). Inklyuzivlik haqida direktor nimani bilishi kerak? 2007-yil 29-sentabrda Ta’lim resurslari axborot markazidan olindi http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/80/1a/d4/91.p

² https://www-ebSCO-com.translate.google.com/research-starters/law/inclusive-education-laws?_x_tr_sl=en&_x_tr_tl=uz&_x_tr_hl=uz&_x_tr_pto=wapp&_x_tr_hist=true#full-article

receiving appropriate education that might not have been prevented by their disabilities (Yell, 1998; Irmsher, 1995, asart, 1996, asart). The goal of the law was to ensure that students with disabilities were educated alongside other children without disabilities (Kluth, Villa & Thousand, 2002, McCarthy, 2006). In 1991, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act was renamed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Irmsher, 1995, McCarthy, 2006). In addition to changing the name of the act, some learning disabilities were reclassified and autism and traumatic brain injury were added (McCarty, 2006). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated with non-disabled students in the “least restrictive environment” (Lipton, 1994, McCarthy, 2006) and that schools take steps to ensure that children with disabilities are comfortable in the regular classroom. These steps may include providing additional support and modifying the curriculum of the general education classroom (Yell, 1998). The updated law also requires that “a variety of alternative placement options be made available under the law to ensure that each student with a disability receives an education that is appropriate to his or her individual needs” (Wigle, Wilcox & Manges, 1994, McCarthy, 2006). Another section of the Act states that “special classes, separate schooling, or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment shall occur when the nature or severity of the disability makes it impossible to provide a satisfactory education in the regular classroom with the use of supplementary aids and services” (Yell, 1998; McCarty, 2006). The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires schools to provide education to students with disabilities in the most limited setting possible, meaning that they should be educated as closely as possible with non-disabled students. Thus, students with disabilities have the right to be educated in the regular classroom with their peers. The second section states that students do not have to be educated in the regular classroom with their non-disabled peers if they are unable to receive a satisfactory education. This means that if students with disabilities cannot receive education in a regular classroom that meets their special needs, they can be transferred to another educational environment where they can receive appropriate education. In terms of least restrictive environments, the general education classroom is considered the least restrictive, and any educational environment that allows students with disabilities little interaction with their non-disabled classmates is considered even more restrictive (Yell, 1998). The less the educational environment for students with disabilities reflects the general education environment, the more restrictive the environment is considered (Gorn, 1997, Yell, 1998). The least restrictive environment is any setting that limits the learning for a student while allowing them to grow, learn, and succeed in the educational setting. Determining what constitutes the least restrictive environment for each student with a disability is up to each student’s Individualized Education Program (IEP) team or a group of parents, teachers, and others involved with students with disabilities (McCarty, 2006). The laws that helped establish inclusive education have been accompanied by court cases that have outlined what constitutes inclusive education, but the court decisions lack clear language on how to do so. This lack of clarity has led schools, school districts, and states to interpret the language of the law in ways that align with their own unique perspectives on inclusive education and the level of inclusion of students with disabilities in the regular general education classroom (McCarty, 2006). Further complicating the issues and interpretations is that people, both within and

outside the education field, often refer to “least restrictive environment,” “inclusion,” and “mainstreaming” as if they mean the same thing, which is not necessarily the case (Douvani & Hulse, 2002, cited in McCarthy). The concept of educating students in the least restrictive environment (LRE) was developed in the 1970s as a result of the Education for All Children with Disabilities Act and has since become a requirement for all schools (Bateman & Bateman, 2002). Inclusion refers to the inclusion of students with disabilities in general education classrooms with non-disabled students and “refers to the fact that students with disabilities are educated outside the regular education classroom only when all other available teaching methods have been used and their needs cannot be met” (Bateman & Bateman, 2002, cited in McCarthy, p. 2060). Full inclusion refers to the placement of children with disabilities in the regular education classroom every day (McCarty, 2006). In inclusive settings, students with disabilities still receive direct support from special education teachers (Hines, 2001). Inclusion differs from mainstream education in that “students are only part of the general education classroom and are not subject to any other specialized educational system based on their disability” (Halvorsen & Neary, 2001, Hines, 2001, p. 2). To ensure that schools provide a range of educational opportunities for students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires school districts to provide a continuum of alternative placements. Continuum of placements can be provided in regular classrooms and schools as well as in special classrooms and schools. It also includes education in homes, hospitals, or institutions (Bateman & Bateman, 2002). The purpose of having a continuum of alternative placements is to allow schools to choose from a range of options when determining placement for students, so that they are not fully included or completely excluded from participating with their non-disabled peers. Having a choice ensures that students with disabilities are not educated in a more restrictive environment than necessary. (Table 1)

Country	Areas of inclusive education	Regulatory framework	Teacher training	Special resources and infrastructure	Individual approach and curricula	Social Support / International Cooperation
Uzbekistan	Inclusion of students with disabilities in general education	Law on Education, national strategies	Advanced training courses, seminars	Elevators, adapted classrooms, learning materials	Individual education plans, special programs	Cooperation with UNICEF and other international projects
Finland	Inclusive approach, individual approach to all students	National education laws and policies	Highly qualified teachers, early intervention system	Adapted classrooms, pedagogical support	Differential approach, individual programs	Support through local and international projects
Canada	Special programs for students with disabilities	Federal and provincial laws	Special training and training	Special resources, technologies	Individual curriculum, differential approach	Family-school cooperation, public and private programs
Japan	Integration and social inclusion	Education Code and special laws	Special training of teachers	Adapted classrooms, technological resources	Individual approach, additional pedagogical support	Exchange with international experiences

CONCLUSION

Inclusive education is important in terms of protecting human rights and creating equal access to education for children with disabilities. International documents adopted by the UN, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the Declaration on Disabled Persons (1975), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), guarantee the right of everyone, including people with disabilities, to education. In the United States, inclusive education is based on the principle of the “least restrictive environment.” This principle ensures that students with disabilities, to the extent possible, receive education in general classes, together with their peers without disabilities, while providing assistance and support services that are tailored to their individual needs. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) regulates this process, ensuring that students receive optimal education through alternative placements and individualized education plans. Research shows that inclusive education not only increases the academic achievement of students with disabilities, but also promotes their social integration and positive interaction with peers. At the same time, improperly implemented inclusion can sometimes lead to the risk of students with disabilities being excluded from special education or affecting the learning process of other students. As a result, the effective functioning of inclusive education requires a system that identifies the needs of each student, provides them with appropriate and appropriate support. This is not only a legal guarantee, but also a key tool for achieving equality and social justice in education.

REFERENCES

1. Bateman, David, and Catherine Bateman. *A Principal's Guide to Special Education*. Council for Exceptional Children, 2002.
2. Douvanis, Anastasia, and Michael Hulsey. *Inclusion and Mainstreaming in Education*. Teachers College Press, 2002.
3. Gorn, Stephen. “Inclusive Education Practices in the USA.” *Journal of Special Education*, vol. 31, no. 2, 1997, pp. 45–56.
4. Halvorsen, Ann, and Thomas Neary. *Mainstreaming and Inclusion: Key Concepts*. Allyn & Bacon, 2001.
5. Hines, Richard. *Support Strategies in Inclusive Classrooms*. ERIC Clearinghouse, 2001.
6. Irmsher, Karen. *IDEA and the Evolution of Special Education Law*. Council for Exceptional Children, 1995.
7. Kluth, Paula, Richard Villa, and Jacqueline Thousand. *The Inclusive Classroom: Strategies for Success*. Paul H. Brookes, 2002.
8. Lipton, Lisa. *Special Education Law: A Practical Guide*. HarperCollins, 1994.
9. McCarty, Barbara. *Inclusion Policies and Practices in Schools*. Pearson Education, 2006.
10. Wigle, John, Barbara Wilcox, and Kenneth Manges. “Alternative Placement in Inclusive Education.” *Journal of Special Education Leadership*, vol. 7, no. 1, 1994, pp. 12–20.
11. Yell, Michael L. *The Law and Special Education*. 2nd ed., Merrill, 1998.
12. United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. 1948. www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights.

13. United Nations. Declaration on the Rights of Disabled Persons. 1975. www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/declaration-on-the-rights-of-disabled-persons.html.
14. United Nations. Convention on the Rights of the Child. 1989. www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-rights-child.
15. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). U.S. Congress, 1991. sites.ed.gov/idea.